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Preface

Undergraduate students in Linguistics, once they have mastered the basic analytical tools of their discipline, are in the enviable position of being able to make real contributions to our knowledge of human language. Usually, however, no permanent record is kept of the work done by undergraduates in fulfillment of their course requirements. The Strathy Language Unit has launched this series of Undergraduate Working Papers in order to remedy this situation. The focus of the series is language in Canada; the aim is to record some of the linguistic discoveries and arguments made by undergraduates at Queen's University and to provide succeeding classes of students with models to be emulated and stimuli to further research.

Volume 1 (2000) presents the work produced by the first class of LING-202, Canadian English, taught by Dr. Elaine Gold in the fall of 1999. Canadian English is a second-year half course with no prerequisite. Thus, students in the class had different levels of linguistic training and approached their research from quite varied academic backgrounds. Their papers range over topics such as Amerindian words in Canadian place naming, mechanisms of adopting French words into Quebec English, and social strife over a plural morpheme in the name of a Toronto neighbourhood. We believe anyone with a special interest in language will enjoy these fruits of undergraduate scholarship.

Our thanks to Linda Garrison, the Administrator of the Strathy Language Unit, for shepherding the manuscript through the editing process.
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Copies of this publication are available at a cost of $9.00 (shipping included).
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WHAT'S IN A NAME?
CANADIAN NATIONAL PARKS WITH ABORIGINAL NAMES

Mary deBakker

Naming

Canada has over 450,000 official geographical names (Rayburn 1997: vii). These are names approved by the Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names (CPCGN). Toponyms chosen by this committee describe not only settlements but all significant features of the Canadian landscape. They are borrowed from a myriad of languages and nations, including Aboriginal ones.

The Native peoples of Canada can be divided into 77 separate nations. The people of these nations collectively speak 53 distinct languages from 12 different language families (Assiniwi 1996: 9). The geographic names contributed by these languages "reveal significant cultural and environmental aspects of a community's identity" (CPCGN 1992: 1).

Before Cartier's arrival all places of importance to the population in what is now Canada were named in one or several of these 53 languages. The Aboriginal cultures of North America had an oral tradition and as a result names relevant to the people's lives were passed down from generation to generation in spoken form. Presumably these names changed as the languages underwent phonological changes. The names of places that were abandoned for long periods of time were eventually forgotten. Forgotten names were replaced with new ones if there was need.

The arrival of Europeans has had a profound effect on Aboriginal traditions and language, as well as on the toponymy of the continent. European explorers did not speak Aboriginal languages and Aboriginal toponyms had little significance for them. Not only did the names lack meaning to the continent's newest arrivals, but they were also difficult to pronounce. In general, Aboriginal languages have phonological systems which are quite distinct from European languages. The explorers and European settlers were not linguists and would doubtless have had a difficult time hearing, let alone reproducing, the sounds in the names:

Often the white man's transliterations of the Indian names have been such crude approximations of their original pronunciation as to be almost farcical. Father Morice, a topographer [who published the first comprehensive map of the Interior of British Columbia in 1907 and] who spoke various Indian
languages, declared it would be best not even to attempt to preserve the original Indian names. (qtd. in Akrigg and Akrigg 1969: 1)

This attitude was a common one for the larger part of the twentieth century. Moreover, before the turn of the twentieth century, there was no international phonetic alphabet, and the English and French alphabets were not equipped to transcribe the sounds of Aboriginal languages. These linguistic realities contributed to the renaming of Canada's topography.

The new names recorded in writing represented a loss, a devaluation of the oral traditions of Canada's Aboriginal peoples. Beginning with first contact, this devaluation has since continued practically unabated. The Government of Canada has to a certain degree recognized this problem and is beginning to implement some damage control. The CPCGN has stated that "written communication has been threatening [these] rich oral traditions to the point that much will be lost unless systematic programmes are followed to record and preserve oral tradition" (CPCGN 1992: 1).

It is possible that the places of Canada were renamed, not only because of the linguistic incompetence of the early settlers, but also for a more sinister reason. It was one way of taking the land from Aboriginal peoples. It has been suggested that "naming places was one way of extending ownership claims" (Berg & Kearns 1996: 99). Giving a place a name made it, or some part of it, the name's. "Such naming produces a form of 'linguistic settlement' that produces places through the simple enunciation of intentions to do so" (99). The new travellers and inhabitants of North America were also trying to make sense of their environment. Naming is also a process of encoding bias (Spender 1991: 165). The bias that has been encoded in Canada is a European one. As a result, names chosen reflected European culture, geography, and history.

Names which cannot draw on past meaning are meaningless. New names, then, have their origins in the perspective of those doing the naming rather than in the object or event that is being named, and that perspective is the product of prefigured patterns of language and thought. New names systematically subscribe to old beliefs; they are locked into principles that already exist and there seems no way out of this even if those principles are inadequate and false. (Spender 1991: 164)

The new names given to the topography of North America drew mostly on European meaning.

*The National Parks*

Canada has 38 National Parks. For over 100 years the government has been setting aside these lands, which are "protected for public understanding, appreciation and
enjoyment, while being maintained in an unimpaired state for future generations" (Woodley and Carruthers). The aim is to create a park in each of the nation's 39 geographic areas for preservation. However, this has yet to be achieved. Parks created so far are preserved by "ecosystem management" a system that "aims to integrate biological, physical, and sociological information" (Woodley and Carruthers). Part of the sociological information that is to be integrated and considered in the park's creation is the heritage of the area's first inhabitants, including their language and toponyms. In recent years parks have been much more conscious of the effects and implications of naming. Consequently the most recently created parks tend to have names of Aboriginal origin. Moreover, some parks that should have received an Aboriginal name are being renamed.

In the following section I will examine the names of Canada's 38 National Parks. I will also examine the toponyms from within the boundaries of several of the older parks.

AUYUITTUQ NATIONAL PARK

Auyuittuq National Park was established as Baffin Island National Park in 1972. Three years later its name was changed to the current one. Auyuittuq means "land of big ice" or "place that does not melt" in Inuvialuktun (Rayburn 1994: 18-19). This name is not a traditional one. The elders of the community nearest to the park created this name.

AULAVIK NATIONAL PARK

The name of this park in Northwest Territories means "place where people travel" in Inuvialuktun.

BANFF NATIONAL PARK

This park does not have a name of Aboriginal origin.

CAPE BRETON HIGHLANDS NATIONAL PARK

Cape Breton Highlands National Park does not have a name of Aboriginal origin. However, I examined Parks Canada's map and I noticed there are two prominent places within the park that seem to have Aboriginal toponyms. These are Ingonish Island and Ingonish Bay.

Ingonish is a name derived from a Mi'kmaq word which may have been either niganis or niganiche (Rayburn 1997: 176). However, the meaning of both these words is unknown. Niganis was the name recorded by Cartier and Ingonish was derived from it by a misprint.
ELK ISLAND NATIONAL PARK

The park itself has an English name. However, examining the park map I noticed two prominent features with Aboriginal names. The first, Astotin Lake, is the largest lake in the park; the name means "lake of many islands" in Cree (Parks Canada 1974a).

The second, Tawayik Lake, is the second biggest lake in the park. I could not trace the name's etymology.

FATHOM FIVE NATIONAL PARK

This is a place name not of Aboriginal origin.

FORILLON NATIONAL PARK

This National Park was originally inhabited by Mi'kmaqs, yet none of the toponyms on the official park map reflect that. They are all in French.

FUNDY NATIONAL PARK

Fundy is not a word from an Aboriginal language. On the park map there is one place, Chignecto Campground, which has an Aboriginal name. The word Chignecto comes from the Mi'kmaq word *signikt* which means "foot cloth" (Rayburn 1997: 75).

GLACIER NATIONAL PARK

This park is in a region not used by Canada's Aboriginal population because of unfavorable living conditions. However, there seem to be a lot of Native names on the map. Unfortunately, I could not trace the origins of most of these names. These places included Nakimu Caves, Illecillewaet Neve, and Geike Glacier. I did find a possible meaning for Illecillewaet Neve. The word *illeciliewaet* comes from the Okanagan word for "swift water" (Rayburn 1997: 175).

GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS NATIONAL PARK

This park does not have a name from a Native language.

GRASSLANDS NATIONAL PARK

This is another park which does not have an Aboriginal name.

GROS MOME NATIONAL PARK

Gros Mome is not a name of Aboriginal origin.
GWAI I HAANAS NATIONAL PARK RESERVE

GWAI I HAANAS NATIONAL PARK RESERVE

Gwaii Haanas was established in 1988 in order to preserve the wilderness of the region as well as the ancient Haida cedar villages. However, when it was created the park was not given a Haida name. Originally it was called South Moresby National Park Reserve. In 1989 the name was changed to South Moresby/Gwaii Haanas National Park Reserve. In 1993, the name was once again changed to Gwaii Haanas, Haida for "islands of wonder and beauty" (Rayburn: 1997).

IVVAVIK NATIONAL PARK

Ivvavik National Park was established in 1984 as Northern Yukon National Park. Ten years later, in 1994, the name was changed to Ivvavik "place of giving birth and raising young" in Inuvialuktun (Rayburn 1997: 179).

JASPER NATIONAL PARK

Jasper does not come from an Amerindian language.

KEJIMKUJIK NATIONAL PARK

The name Kejimkujik, according to Parks Canada, comes from a Mi'kmaq word that means "place that swells". Rayburn (1997: 175) suggests "swelled private parts" or "fairy lake" for possible explanations. However, these romantic notions of the name's etymology are not shared with the people who maintain the Canadian Geo Names website (National Resources Canada). They say that the etymology is uncertain and proffer "sore parts" and "attempting to escape" as possible meanings for the park name. The discrepancy suggested by my various sources is interesting. Especially interesting is the fact that Parks Canada chose to publish the meaning which is least likely to offend. It is remarkable that Kejimkujik was chosen as the name despite its potentially offensive origins. The Aboriginal name was probably maintained, despite its ambiguity, because the park was originally established as an Indian reservation.

Kejimkujik park contains Peskowesk Lake and Peskowesk Brook. Peskowesk is probably derived from an Aboriginal language; however, I could not find it in my sources.

KLUANE NATIONAL PARK

The name Kluane means "whitefish place" in Tlingit (Rayburn 1994: 26).
KOOTENAY NATIONAL PARK

Kootenay was derived from the word *k'otunaxa* which means "strangers" or "people from beyond the hills". According to Parks Canada the springs within the park have been a meeting place for Native peoples for thousands of years. This park also contains Haiduk and Oke Mountains, which I would imagine are of Aboriginal origin.

KOUCHIBOUGUAC NATIONAL PARK

Kouchibougouac comes from the Mi'kmaq language. Its meaning is "little river of the long tideway" (Rayburn 1997: 196).

LA MAURIE LE NATIONAL PARK

I found four names on the Park map that seemed to come from Aboriginal languages. The first is the Mattawin River. The Algonquin and Ojibwa word *mattawa* means "meeting of the waters" (Rayburn 1997: 240). It is most likely that the name for the Mattawin River was derived from this. The second is Wapizagonke Lake. The name for this lake comes from the Abenaki *wawabizak* which means "bemache cravant" in French (Assiniwi 162) or "brant" (an Arctic goose) in English. I could not find meanings for the third and fourth toponyms. They are Anitikagamac Lake and Isaie Lake.

MINGAN ARCHIPELAGO NATIONAL PARK

Breton, the Celtic dialect of Brittany, is where this park's name actually came from. However, it was commonly believed for a long time that Mingan was an Aboriginal name.

MOUNT REVELSTOKE NATIONAL PARK

The park doesn't have a First Nations' name. On the map I examined, the only toponym that seemed obviously Native was Clachnaeudainn Creek. I was not able to determine its origins.

NAHANNI NATIONAL PARK

This park's name comes from the name of an Athapascan tribe in the Northern Rocky Mountains (Rayburn 1997: 262). Nahanni means "people of the west".

PACIFIC RIM NATIONAL PARK

The area surrounding the park has many Aboriginal toponyms. However, within the park boundaries the only place name that seemed to be of Native origin is Quisitis
Point. I was not able to discover its meaning.

PRINCE ALBERT NATIONAL PARK

"Undoubtedly the area was a trapping, hunting, and fishing ground for the Cree and Chipewyan Indians but unfortunately much of the colour of that era hasn't been recorded" (Parks Canada 1974f). Despite the admission that much Native culture has not been recorded, the map of Prince Albert National Park has more names of obvious Aboriginal origin than any other park map I encountered. These include Waskesiu Lake, the name of which comes from the Cree word for "red deer". My sources did not shed light on the other names: Kiyam Lake, Wabero Lake, Wassegan Lake, Tiriska Lake, Bagwa Lake, Witsukitshak Lake, Kapesiwin Lake, and Namekas Lake.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND NATIONAL PARK

PEI was originally called Abegweit which means "cradled in the waves". However, there is no record of this fact or any Aboriginal history whatsoever in this national park's literature.

PUKASKWA NATIONAL PARK

The name Pukaskwa comes from an Aboriginal language. It is officially of unknown meaning (Rayburn 1994: 27). However, the people at the Ojibway and Cree Cultural Centre say that the Pukaskwa's correct orthography is Pukasu. This word describes what people do when they cook the marrow from the bones of animals (Parks Canada Website).

POINT PELEE NATIONAL PARK

The name comes from French.

QUITTINIRPAAQ NATIONAL PARK

The region that encompasses Quttinirpaaq National Park was known to the Inuit and used by them for about 3000 years. However, roughly 500 years ago it was abandoned for unknown reasons. This abandonment led to the eventual forgetting of the places in the park environs. Even in Inuit legend there is no tradition of names for this region. Europeans have completely renamed the area. Because of the lack of Inuit names for this area, according to Hattersley-Smith (1998: 1), the English names that had evolved since 1852 would probably never be replaced by Inuit ones. Yet only a year after Hattersley-Smith made this prediction, the park itself was renamed. Quttinirpaaq was known as Ellesmere Island National Park until 1999. I would
assume that its renaming was a result of the realization of the new territory of Nunavut in April 1999. Quttinirpaaq means "top of the world". In Quttinirpaaq National Park there are only six Inuit topographical names. Four of these geographical features were named after Inughuit (Greenlander) travellers. The names of these men were Eginwah, Nukapinguaq, Ooblooyah, and Ootah. The features that bear their names commemorate them in the same way that European explorers are commemorated (Mackenzie River, Nelson River). The other two Inuit toponyms in this park are Mount Omingmak and Oopik Island. The meanings of these words are unknown to me.

Riding Mountain National Park

Riding Mountain National Park is located in the Province of Manitoba. The park area was originally home to Assiniboine and Cree tribes. The only names suggesting this history are Ministik Lake and Wasegaming Lake.

Sirmilik National Park

Sirmilik National Park is a park in Nunavut that seems to be fairly new as I had a very difficult time finding out anything about it. Sirmilik means "the place of the glaciers".

Saguenay/St. Lawrence Islands National Park

Saguenay could be an Aboriginal word. St. Lawrence most definitely is not.

Terra Nova National Park

Minchin Cove is a toponym in Terra Nova National Park, of possible Aboriginal origin, but I could not find its meaning.

Vuntut National Park

The name for Vuntut National Park comes from the Gwitch'in word for "crow flats". The park was established in 1994 (Rayburn 1997).

Wapsuk National Park

Wapsuk National Park was created in 1996. Its name is Cree for "white bear" (Rayburn 1997: 426).

Waterton Lakes National Park

This park does not have a First Nations' name.
WOOD BUFFALO NATIONAL PARK

The only name that is of obvious Native origin on the Parks Canada map of Wood Buffalo National Park is Mamawi Lake. This lake is located close to a reservation. The word *mamawi* means "together" in Cree (Assiniwi 1996: 79).

YOHO NATIONAL PARK

Yohe means "wonder" or "excitement" in Cree (Rayburn 1994: 25). Yohe Park also contains several mountains with Aboriginal names whose meanings are unknown to me. These are Odaray, Wiwaxy, and Wapta.

*The Parks Canada Initiative and Canadian English*

The effect of all this on Canadian English has been an adoption of words of Aboriginal origin into our dialect. Usually the names are adopted without any realization of their significance. The words are taken as ones that denote a place and nothing more. These names could potentially be thought of places that are exotic and far away due to their lack of significance to anglophones. Another effect that I have informally observed of the adoption of Aboriginal names into the Canadian lexicon is that anglophones tend to forget them, and even if they do remember them, they seem to have a very hard time remembering how to spell them. I have noticed this especially with the word Nunavut. This new territory created in April seems to be very difficult for all of my friends at Queen's to remember or spell. Reasons for this could include its newness and the fact that university undergraduates live in an insulated bubble. But, perhaps it is telling of the entire population. Despite the butchering by anglophones of Aboriginal names, I applaud the government's current efforts to name and rename places in a way that recalls the country's Aboriginal heritage.
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AMERINDIAN TOponymy OF ONTARIO

Julia Howarth

Toponymy is the study of the place names of a region. Place names are often overlooked or taken for granted; however, their origins are very reflective of a country's culture and history. The term Amerindian applies to all Aboriginal peoples of Canada and the Americas. "Some of the most interesting and euphonious Canadian place names are attributable to Amerindian and Inuit sources" (Hamilton 1978: 6). Canada has a multitude of names that originate in Amerindian languages. The country's name itself is derived from the Aboriginal word *kanata* meaning "a cluster or collection of huts". This word was originally used to refer to any community but its meaning became more vast and more specific when explorers arrived and believed that the term referred to the entire land mass of this country (Rayburn 1994: 11). The names of four of Canada's provinces and two of the territories are also Amerindian words.

This paper will focus on places in Ontario that owe their names to Canada's Amerindian heritage. In this paper, 108 place names and their meanings will be examined. The complete list of these places can be found in Appendix A. All of the definitions or derivations of these place names are cited from William B. Hamilton and David Scott.

The Rejection of Amerindian Toponymy

Up until fairly recently, the assigning of place names was largely accidental. Often in the past there were wide variations in the spelling interpretation of certain place names and even the location of certain places. More than one name was sometimes assigned to a single place. Recently, many place names have been standardized.

Place names are supposed to form a permanent register or index of the course and events of a country's history. "They are fossils exposed in the cross section of that history marking its successive periods; and so lasting are they that records in stone or brass are not to be compared with them for endurance" (Hamilton 1978: 1). Unfortunately, many place names of Amerindian origin did not endure through the latter part of the nineteenth century. During this period, Native place names were often rejected. This occurred for a number of reasons. First, these names were sometimes difficult to pronounce. Second, Native place names were often viewed as too simplistic. And lastly, many Amerindian words and place names were difficult to translate into the English or French language (Hamilton 1978: 6). Consequently, the
original Amerindian place names were rejected in favour of more common or traditional English words.

Toponymy Committees

In 1948, the Canadian Board on Geographical Names was established. In 1961, this board was renamed The Canadian Permanent Committee on Geographical Names (CPCGN). The main responsibility of this Committee is to deal with all questions of geographical nomenclature affecting Canada (Hamilton 4). The CPCGN lists fourteen principles which are used as guidelines when naming or renaming places. These principles attempt to make sure place names are uniform across the country and are not duplicated. One of these principles, Principle 10, refers directly to Amerindian toponymy:

Names of Amerindian origin will be recorded according to a recognized Romanized Orthography or according to the considered opinion of recognized linguistic authorities. (Hamilton 1978: 16)

The committee that has done the most to ensure the preservation and restoration of Canada's Amerindian toponymy is the Toponymy Commission of Quebec. In 1979, this commission decided that names and spellings used by Native people should be respected (Rayburn 1994: 138). This committee has already overseen the changes of numerous place names back to their original Amerindian renderings in the province of Quebec. Currently, work is being done to make the same changes in the rest of Canada. The work done by these numerous committees dedicated to the study of place names will ensure that Amerindian names will not be disregarded in the future.

Categorizing Amerindian Toponymy

Place names that are truly unique to Canada are those of the Aboriginal peoples. Amerindian toponyms can be organized into three distinct categories. First, and most commonly, the toponym may describe an outstanding physical characteristic of a place, the geography. Sixty-eight percent of the place names under study in this paper fit into this category.

Examples.

Cataraqui "rocks drenched in water"
Niagara Falls "thundering waters"
Etobicoke "place where the alders grow"

The second category involves names which commemorate an important individual or group of individuals from Amerindian history. For this reason, these names are not as obviously from Native origin. Eight percent of the place names discussed in this study
form this group.

*Examples.*

Brantford -- named after Mohawk Chief Joseph Brant  
Deseronto -- named after Mohawk Chief John Deserontyou  
Iroquois -- named after the Amerindian tribe

The third category includes English place names that are direct translations from the original Amerindian name. Approximately nine percent of Amerindian place names fit into this category. Often, the exact meaning of the Native words have been substituted with a simpler, more concise term.

*Examples.*

Coldwater -- translated from *gissinausebing* meaning "cold water"  
Lake Superior -- translated from *kitchigami* meaning "great water"  
Ear Falls -- translated from *otak powitik* meaning "listening water"

As mentioned above, there are also many places which originally had Amerindian names but which were renamed. In many cases, names commemorating early settlers have been used instead of Amerindian ones.

*Examples.*

Gore Bay -- originally *pushkdlinaang* meaning "barren hill"  
Maitland -- originally *menesatung* meaning "healing waters"  
Owen Sound -- originally *wadinedon* meaning "beautiful valley"

A number of other place names in Canada probably fit into this final category. Unfortunately, the records of place names are not complete and, therefore, there are a number of places whose original names remain unknown. From the data collected for this paper, it is evident that English names have been substituted for at least 15 percent of place names of Amerindian origin. Unfortunately, this number is probably an underestimate.

There are over one hundred communities in Ontario, as well as a large number of lakes and rivers, whose names reflect an Amerindian influence. All of these names fit into one of the three categories listed above. For a complete list of the place names of Aboriginal origin in Ontario and their meanings, see Appendix A.

*Linguistic Patterns*

A number of linguistic patterns exist in Amerindian toponymy. Due to the vast number
of Aboriginal languages and dialects, these patterns are sometimes difficult to discern. The spelling of the place names is arbitrary because they are mostly imperfect renderings of what Native people may have said to explorers. In turn, these explorers provided their interpretations to publishers and map makers (Rayburn 1994: 136). As a result, it is often difficult to find identical morphemes in the data. The following are the linguistic patterns that have been extracted from the Amerindian data.

1. The morpheme /matta/ or /mata/ appears in a number of Amerindian place names. It signifies a convergence or meeting of two bodies of water.

   (a) Matachewan  "meeting of the currents"
   (b) Mattagami  "where the waters meet"
   (c) Mattawa  "where a river flows into another body of water"

2. The morpheme /manitou/ refers to a great spirit.

   (a) Manitouwadge  "cave of the great spirit"
   (b) Manitouwaning  "home of the great spirit"
   (c) Manitoulin Island  "any great spirit worthy of worship"

3. The morpheme /notta/ derives from the Algonquin word for Iroquios. The morpheme /saga/ signifies an outlet. Both morphemes are found in (b).

   (a) Nottawa  "Iroquios"
   (b) Nottawasaga  "Iroquois outlet"
   (c) Wasaga Beach  "outlet"
   (d) Mississauga  "large river outlet"
   (e) Saugeen  "river outlet" or "at the mouth of a river"

4. The following allomorphs belong to the same morpheme or may only be imperfect spellings: /kapiska/ or /kapuska/ signifies a division.

   (a) Kapiskau Lake  "obstructed lake" or "divided lake"
   (b) Kapuskasing  "the divided waters"

Kapuskasing is the name of a lake, a river and, probably best known, a town in Northern Ontario. The name was originally applied to the bodies of water and was later extended to the town.

5. For the final pattern, no common morpheme can be extracted. The connection between these place names is semantic. Onaping, from the Cree /onumunaning/, and Wunnumin Lake are both thought to refer to the colour of the wood chips left behind by beavers (Hamilton 1978: 193).
(a) Onaping  "red paint" or "vermilion"
(b) Wunnumin Lake  "red paint" or "vermilion"

It is also interesting to note that a number of Aboriginal morphemes are repeated in place names which do not appear to have any semantic similarities. For example, the morpheme /wawa/ exists in the place names Petewawa and Wawa, but the meaning of these words could not be more different. Petewawa means "where one hears the noise of the river" while Wawa means "wild geese". Many more linguistic patterns probably exist in Amerindian toponymy. However, a number of factors make these patterns difficult to extract and, unfortunately, not a lot of literature on this subject exists.

In conclusion, "the study of place names will always reveal the astounding diversity and depth of Aboriginal peoples' contributions to contemporary Canada" (Geographical Names Website). Unfortunately, in the past, a number of these names were lost. Now attempts to preserve and reinstate names of Amerindian origin are increasing due to the work of committees dedicated to our country's history such as the CPCGN and the Toponymy Commission of Quebec. It is important for all Canadians to recognize the history that can be represented through toponymy and to preserve place names whenever possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>Amerindian Name</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abitibi Lake/River</td>
<td>abitah</td>
<td>half-way or middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algoma</td>
<td>-goma</td>
<td>lake or water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algonquin Park</td>
<td>algomequin</td>
<td>those on the other side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Algoomaking</td>
<td>at the place of spearing fish and eels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atikokan</td>
<td>akkoka/attikoka</td>
<td>one who is skillful at everything or caribou bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attawapiskat River</td>
<td>atawabiskat</td>
<td>rock bottom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobcaygeon</td>
<td>abobkajewan</td>
<td>the narrow place between rocks or where the water comes through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>bobcajewonunk</td>
<td>shallow rapids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataraqui</td>
<td></td>
<td>place where one hides or rocks drenched with water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa</td>
<td></td>
<td>people with moccasins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coboconk</td>
<td>koashkobacong</td>
<td>where the gulls nest or water falling over a smooth rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couchiching</td>
<td></td>
<td>a group of pine trees or at the edge of a whirlpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekwan River</td>
<td>equam</td>
<td>the river far up the coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Erie</td>
<td></td>
<td>long-tailed, referring to a panther or wildcat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etobicoke</td>
<td></td>
<td>place where the alders grow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gananoque</td>
<td></td>
<td>rocks rising out of the water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gogama</td>
<td>gogama gigo</td>
<td>jumping fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaministiquia River</td>
<td></td>
<td>where there are islands in the river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanata</td>
<td></td>
<td>a cluster or collection of huts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapiskau River</td>
<td></td>
<td>obstructed or blocked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapuskasing</td>
<td></td>
<td>divided waters or bend in the river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>Amerindian Name</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagawong</td>
<td></td>
<td>where mists rise from the falling waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kakebeka Falls</td>
<td></td>
<td>the river with short bends and many islands or the place where there is always plenty of game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashechewan</td>
<td></td>
<td>swift current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keewatin</td>
<td></td>
<td>north wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenogami Lake</td>
<td></td>
<td>long water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komoka</td>
<td></td>
<td>place where the dead lie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoulin Island</td>
<td>manitowin</td>
<td>a supernatural object calling for fear or worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matachewan</td>
<td></td>
<td>meeting of the currents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattagami</td>
<td></td>
<td>where the waters meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattawa</td>
<td></td>
<td>where a river flows into another body of water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetawan</td>
<td>maganetawan</td>
<td>swiftly flowing water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitouwadge</td>
<td></td>
<td>cave of the great spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitowaning</td>
<td></td>
<td>home of the great spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manotick</td>
<td></td>
<td>long island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michipicoten</td>
<td>mishibigwadunk</td>
<td>place of bold promontories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minaki</td>
<td></td>
<td>beautiful country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindemoya</td>
<td></td>
<td>old woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missanabie</td>
<td></td>
<td>pictures on the water or reflections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>michi</td>
<td>large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>saki</td>
<td>outlet, a river having several outlets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimico</td>
<td></td>
<td>the place of a wild pigeon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakina</td>
<td></td>
<td>land covered with moss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanticoke</td>
<td></td>
<td>crooked creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napanee</td>
<td>appanea</td>
<td>flour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>Amerindian Name</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Falls</td>
<td>animi-bee-go-ong</td>
<td>thundering waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nipigon</td>
<td>nipisisinan</td>
<td>continuous water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nipissing</td>
<td></td>
<td>little body of water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottawa</td>
<td>Iroquois</td>
<td>Iroquois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottawasaga</td>
<td>nahdoway or nahdowa</td>
<td>outlet, Iroquois river outlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>sagi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogoki River</td>
<td>mekowikew</td>
<td>he is swift (referring to the river)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omemee</td>
<td></td>
<td>pigeon or dove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onaping</td>
<td>onumunaning</td>
<td>red paint or vermilion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>onitariio</td>
<td>beautiful lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>kanadario</td>
<td>sparkling or beautiful water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td></td>
<td>carrying place or crossing of a stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>adawe</td>
<td>to trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otoskwin River</td>
<td></td>
<td>elbow (referring to a river)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opasatika</td>
<td></td>
<td>drying place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penatanguishene</td>
<td></td>
<td>the place of white falling sands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petawawa</td>
<td>pitawewe</td>
<td>where one hears the noise of the waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikangikum</td>
<td></td>
<td>dirty water narrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay of Quinte</td>
<td>kinte/kantay</td>
<td>a meadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheguandah</td>
<td></td>
<td>to burrow oneself under the branches of a cone-bearing tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Lookout</td>
<td></td>
<td>place where Ojibway watched for raiding Sioux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux Narrows</td>
<td></td>
<td>battle place between Iroquois and Sioux</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saugeen River</td>
<td>saging</td>
<td>at the mouth (referring to a river)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place Name</td>
<td>Amerindian Name</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scugog</td>
<td></td>
<td>muddy bottom or submerged land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>tarantou</td>
<td>place of meeting or trees rising out of the water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timagami</td>
<td></td>
<td>deep water or deep lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasaga Beach</td>
<td>nottawasaga</td>
<td>outlet of invaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washago</td>
<td></td>
<td>sparkling waters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waubaushene</td>
<td></td>
<td>meeting of the rocks or place of narrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wawa</td>
<td></td>
<td>wild goose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weagamow Lake</td>
<td>wauwiyaeyaun</td>
<td>round or oval lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wikwemikong</td>
<td></td>
<td>bay of the beaver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wunnummin Lake</td>
<td>onaping</td>
<td>red paint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winisk</td>
<td></td>
<td>groundhog or woodchuck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commemorative Ontario Place Names**

Brantford       named after Mohawk Indian Chief Joseph Brant  
Deseronto       named after Mohawk Chief John Deserontyou  
Fort Hope       named for the Fort Hope Indian Band  
Iroquois        named for the Amerindian tribe  
Muskoka         named after Chief Misoqukey  
Orono           named after Chief Orono  
Paudash          named after Chief Captain Paudash  
Tecumseh        named after Chief Tecumseh

**Translations from Amerindian**

Coldwater       translated from Gissinausebing  
Ear Falls        Otak Powitik meaning "listening falls"  
Echo Bay         translated from an Amerindian word meaning "reverberation of sounds as voices"  
Groundhog River  translated from Akswikidie Kipi  
Larder Lake      variation on the translation of "hanging storehouse"  
Lake Superior    translated from Kitchigami, "great water"
North Spirit Lake  translation of Memequish, "spirit of the woods"
Thunder Bay  translated from Animikie Wekwek
Thessalon  a corruption of Neyashewun, "a point of land"
Summer Beaver  translated from Ojibway

Superseded Amerindian Names

Allenford  originally was Amerindian word for "driftwood crossing"
Blind River  originally Penebawabikong, "sloping rock"
Burlington  originally called Brant's Block after Chief Joseph Brant
Caledonia  originally called Seneca, "stone snakes"
Cape Croker  originally Neiyosheonegaming, also an Indian Reserve
Chapleau  originally known as Nemegosee
Gore Bay  originally called Pushkadinang, "barren hill"
Haileybury  originally Matabanick, "the place where the trail comes out"
Kincardine  originally was the Amerindian word for "clay bluff" or "sand dune"
Maitland  originally Menesatung, "healing waters"
Owen Sound  originally Wadineednon, "beautiful valley"
Parry Sound  originally Wausakausing, "shining waters"
Peterborough  originally Nogojiwanong, "the place at the end of the rapids"
Port Elgin  the site of a 14th century Iroquois village
Port Hope  originally Ganaraski, a Cayuga village
Rice Lake  originally Pemecoutayan, "lake of the Burning Plains"
Sault Ste. Marie  originally Pawating, "bounding or turbulent waters"
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WHAT'S IN A NAME?
A STUDY OF THE CONTROVERSY IN THE BEACH(ES)

Michelle Whyte

What can we say about a district, a fair-sized chunk of the biggest city in Canada, that does not, after 7 or 8 decades, know its own name?
--Robert Fulford

1. Introduction

Toronto is a large city, comprising what some describe as many "little villages". These areas have great historical backgrounds and, especially to native Torontonians, each name evokes an image of a very specific scenery, architecture and/or culture. Cabbagetown, the Annex, Riverdale and Yorkville provide examples of just a handful of these well-known neighbourhoods. Within some of them, there may be debate over exact physical boundaries, or the importance of certain historical landmarks. There is one area, though, which has its own unique controversy. This Toronto "village" has a linguistic debate over what exactly to call itself! There is, in a long-established east-end neighbourhood, a great controversy over the inclusion or omitting of a plural morpheme at the end of the name. Some people call this area along the Toronto lakeshore "The Beach" while others use "The Beaches". It seems that this variation has a historical significance, which may serve to explain why long-time residents are so emotional over this issue.

I set out to observe exactly how frequently the variant forms are heard, hoping to determine a causal factor in the use of one over the other. As well as speech, I looked at written forms of usage by visiting the official area website and examining the use of the two forms in a chatroom. Finally, I looked at the naming of local establishments and institutions, which provided some surprising results and really illuminated the deep complexity of the confusion over the name.

2. The Survey

In order to determine the use of the variants in everyday speech, I decided to conduct a personal survey within the area itself. I traversed the main street of the region, Queen St. East, and approached people who were by themselves. This was to prevent the possibility of any of their responses being influenced by someone else. My questioning was brief, as I needed very little information:

1) Were you born in Toronto?
2) How would you refer to Queen St. East and the surrounding area?
3) How long have you lived in this area?
4) May I ask your age?
5) I recorded their gender.

I tried to keep relatively equivalent numbers of males and females (21: 29) and, also, age groups. These I divided into 4 categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) under 25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) 26-45</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) 46-60</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) over 60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number: 50 respondents.

After compiling the responses, I began to see a definite pattern emerging almost immediately; the factor I was hoping to find jumped out at me. Age was the overwhelming determinant that affected the use of one variant over the other. Over all, 23 out of 50 respondents (46%) used the plural marker (The Beach-es), while the remaining 27 respondents (54%) said the name without it (The Beach-Ø). But, as Figure 1 shows, 82 per cent of those people over 60 (Age Group 4) used the singular, and only 33 per cent of those under 25 (Age Group 1) used this form. It is therefore apparent that a process of age-grading is going on. "The Beach" is the variant of the older generation, while "The Beaches" is that of the younger one. But, as Figure 2 shows, the length of time they have lived in the area seems to be another contributing factor. The longer the respondents have lived in the neighbourhood, the less likely they are to use the plural form. The factors of birthplace and gender were much less significant, as can be seen in Figure 3.

Figure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% [-es]</th>
<th>% [-Ø]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. &lt;25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 25-45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 46-60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. &gt;60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>(#23)</td>
<td>(#27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[-es]</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td>19 (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-∅]</td>
<td>19 (70%)</td>
<td>8 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Born in Toronto</th>
<th>Born Elsewhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[-es]</td>
<td>10 (43%)</td>
<td>13 (57%)</td>
<td>7 (30%)</td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-∅]</td>
<td>11 (40%)</td>
<td>16 (60%)</td>
<td>14 (52%)</td>
<td>13 (48%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned earlier, I had predicted the results before actually sitting down to examine the data collected. I did this based somewhat on my observations over my lifetime as a resident of the area. But one Age Group 4 respondent confirmed these suspicions with her answer to my questions. When I asked her what she called the area, she succinctly answered, "The Beach, of course." Then, in a very derisive manner, she followed with, "It's just the youngsters that use that Beaches stuff, and I've lived in The Beach all my life--I know the name!!"

3. The History

After determining the usage today, I thought I'd better take a look at a bit of history in order to determine the origins of this obviously deep-seated controversy. Was it really just the young vs. the old? In his article "Memories of the Beach: The Evolution of a Village in our Biggest City", long-time Beach resident Robert Fulford provides an excellent interpretation of exactly where the variance stems from. In fact, he begins his article with a discussion of the controversy: "The choice of name has become loaded with meaning, as if the very soul of the place were in question..." (60).

The area was originally three distinct "Beach" areas. There were two residential zones (Kew Beach to the west and Balmy Beach to the east) with Scarboro Beach Park separating the two. Between 1902 and 1925, this park, itself a beach, was like the Coney Island theme park. But, at its closure in 1925, this area was replaced by affordable housing (which still stands). This linked together the two other zones, so
that the region became one united mile-long beach stretching along the waterfront.

So, if the name "The Beach" is the name of the older generation, when did the newer form come into being? According to Fulford, he can trace the arrival of "The Beaches" back to the early seventies. And, he relates this to a grand change in the nature of the area. Back in the early 1900s, the area was very quiet and autonomous. Like many small towns, few ventured outside and few ventured in. The area was distinguished by "mom and pop" stores that supplied the essentials to local Beachers. Needless to say, the area was unfashionable and nothing to be compared with the Yorkville of its day. Nevertheless, around 1970, a few stores began to change ownership. Small proprietors were bought out by some bigger names, the type of goods being sold changed, restaurants and bars(!) started going in, all of which altered the reputation of the area. This change, to what Fulford calls "Trendsville", started attracting people from all over Metropolitan Toronto, especially in the summer months. They took advantage of the beautiful beach and enjoyed shopping and dining on the increasingly trendy stretch of Queen St. E. The local people grew resentful of this influx of people into their quiet neighbourhood and there was, briefly, a genuine resistance organized--Beach Residents Against Tourists (BRAT)--but this didn't last long.

It was the events of 1985 that firmly planted the seeds of the name controversy. Local merchants decided that area commerce could be improved if they followed the practice of Cabbagetown and Yorkville and put up street signs carrying the name of the area. So, in the spring of 1985, fourteen signs went up, boasting the name "The Beaches". Well, not surprisingly, there was an uproar. Old Beach residents phoned members of the Ontario legislature, they contacted their aldermen and conducted door-to-door petitions to remove the signs. One man wrote to The Ward Nine News (the Beach paper of the day) saying that their name had been "bastardised". After less than a month of this intense lobbying, the city conceded and replaced the "offensive" signs with simple ones with no "village" name printed on them. For the moment, there was peace.

4. The Local Merchants and Other Evidence

When I read about these historical events, I thought that perhaps the names of those new stores in the seventies might have contributed to the changeover to the use of the plural form. To gather the names of many establishments, I visited the official area web-site and, immediately, was taken aback. This "official" site is the-beaches.com! I supposed that young technology was being used by the younger generation, so the site name made sense. But, reading further into the welcome message, I realised just how confused the usage of the two forms has become. They were both present in the same sentence: "This section is... of general interest to Beach residents or people interested in The Beaches neighbourhood...". Here is a web site "to represent Toronto's Beach/Beaches community...". Talk about sitting on
the fence!

Within the section on local businesses, entitled Beach Tour, the addresses for many of the merchants were listed as "Beaches, Toronto". Looking closer at each of the listings, I found what I had expected. Of those establishments advertised on the site that used the area name in their monikers, 39% (5 of 13) used the form of the name with the plural, while the remaining 61% used The Beach or simply Beach, e.g., Beach Pets. I looked into the dates of establishment for some of the companies to see if the older ones were more likely to use the older name form. But, surprisingly, except for The Beach Gallery, which has been around for over twenty years, most of the stores employing the Beach form were relative newcomers (established within the last 3 to 10 years). The places which used the Beaches form, on the other hand, all seemed to have been established around the period of time that Fulford described as the turning point: the mid-1970s. One of these places, Beaches Co-op Playschool, I attended as a toddler in the early 1980s. I can attest to its link to the trendiness that Fulford said arrived about that time. It was definitely the popular nursery school choice for the young mothers of the area, many of whom (my mother included) had just moved into the enlivened "new" area.

Under the section of local businesses, I also ran across a listing for Beach Metro News (formerly The Ward Nine News) which is the community paper. In the caption beneath its heading I read the phrases "serving the Toronto Beaches community" and "what's happening in the Beach". I was interested in finding out if the editors of this long-established, highly regarded local institution had any opinion on this controversy. Therefore, I sent an e-mail to one of the editors (Bill MacLean) and received a reply simply stating: "We are greatly aware of this controversy .... Here at Beach Metro News we officially use the Beach." He made no comment on the variant usage I had found on the website.

My final destination within the website was a visit to its chatroom: "Beacher's Corner". This arena provided me with some written evidence to reinforce the spoken data that I had gathered earlier. Almost everyone in the chatroom used the more conservative form of the name (without the plural) when referring to the area. Many of them qualified their usage by referring to themselves as "lifelong beachers". Those who failed to use this form often identified themselves as "outsiders": one man from the Riverdale region (a neighbouring community) asked, for example, "Is there someone in the Beaches community who...?" Another man from Scarborough posed the query, "Where does the 'Beach' or 'Beaches' officially end?" I suppose he didn't wish to ruffle any feathers with that one.

5. Conclusion

It is made greatly apparent by the above research, that this controversy, which began in the late 1970s, continues and flourishes to this day. Perhaps it is not present in the
harsh forms that it took at its birth, e.g., BRAT and the war of the signs. But, it is evidenced by those I spoke with—the older beach residents expressing disdain over the use of the "younger" form. It is present in the fact that the local paper has to take an "official" stand on the issue. Finally, it is ever apparent in the tentative way that people approach any reference to the area, often using both terms simultaneously so as not to offend.

While the data in the charts (Figures 1, 2, and 3) illustrate a definite decline of the older form in the younger generation, I believe that the charts also illustrate exactly the confusion that reigns at present over the name. The name is at a point in its evolution where many speakers actually use both variants interchangeably and most, especially those who feel no emotional ties to the "old Beach", notice no distinction between the two. Looking historically, there is an irony here. At its inception the area was a compilation of three distinct beaches. Therefore, the assumption that Beaches is actually the more conservative term would not be illogical.

Having grown up in the area, I have been exposed to both variants extensively, especially because I came into existence twenty years ago myself, right about the time that the changes were taking place. As a young person, I use "The Beaches" from time to time and think nothing of it. But, if I were to be asked pointedly what I called the area, as a patriotic resident, I would think about the "right" form and would say "The Beach". This is what my grandmother would have wanted me to say.

Bibliography


Beaches Toronto Community Website. URL: http://www.the-beaches.com.
INVESTIGATION INTO PRESCRIPTIVE VARIATION IN CANADIAN ENGLISH
SPELLING:
A STUDY OF FOUR NEWSPAPER STYLE BOOKS

Jonathon Herd

"Dictionaries are diagnostic; the Style Guide is prescriptive." So states the Introduction to *The London Free Press Style Guide* of 1986. My focus will be the spelling standards set down by this and three other Canadian newspaper style books. I will dwell mainly upon instances where what is prescribed as correct in one guide conflicts with what is set down as standard by another, and accordingly the bulk of this paper is contrastive. By identifying these instances where spelling preference varies, I will illustrate some of the features that define Canadian English. I will also make use of two recent word usage manuals, *The Canadian Press Stylebook* (1999) and the *Guide to Canadian English Usage* (1997) to make some comments concerning what some have termed the "bi-modal" nature of Canadian English. In this way I shall look at some of the problems this feature of Canadian English poses to those who seek to establish spelling and word usage standards in Canada.

The four style books analyzed do not date from the same time. The aforementioned *The London Free Press Style Guide* dates from 1986, three years after the earliest of the four, *The Toronto Star Stylebook*, was published. The two other guides, *The Globe and Mail Style Book*, and *The Gazette Style* (Montreal) were published in 1995. This study, then, takes in variations in spelling which have occurred over a period of twelve years.

For the sake of avoiding unnecessary repetition, I will use the following key when referring to each style book: *The Toronto Star Stylebook* (TS), *The London Free Press Style Guide* (LFP), *The Gazette Style* (GAZ), and *The Globe and Mail Style Book* (GM).

Table 1 is a list of a number of spelling and word usage variations that are prescribed in the four style books. Only shown are instances where there is disagreement between two or more guides as to which variant is to be used. The blanks are instances where no information is given in the guide about the word.

Table 1 demonstrates three of the four guides favour the American practice of dropping the *u* in words like *color*, *rancor*, and *savior*, though TS is not completely consistent in that it retains the *u* in *glamour*. This is unusual, as generally the style books show consistency throughout in choosing one form or the other, either the British *u* retention, or the American practice, for the sake of uniformity. One other instance of inconsistency in TS is the spelling of *Saviour* when referring to the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-or/-our</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-l-/ll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hyphenation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flier/flyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gantlet/gauntlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuque/toque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>license/licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mold/mould</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preventive/preventative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependant/dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analyze/analyse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center/centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moustache/mustache</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebecer/Quebecker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>racket/racquet (tennis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grey/gray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hicuped/hiccupped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpretive/interpretative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreseeable/foreseeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furore/furor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memoranda/memorandums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omelette/omelet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volcanos/volcanoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whiskies/whiskeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collectible/collectable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fjord/fjord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imposter/impostor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Christian one. LFP and GAZ are both regular in their preference shown towards the American -or spellings, while GM goes the other way by following the British model in all cases. This it does by claiming that it is restoring "...traditional Canadian spelling where American usage had come to prevail" (Thorsell 1994: 3). As an aside, this issue of what constitutes a "Canadian spelling" is central to questions regarding Canadian standards. For example, the Canadian Press (the national organization through which Canadian newspaper exchange new stories) preferred the American variant, -or, in all cases for eighty years before doing an about face and adopting British spelling in 1998. This it did apparently in response to pressure from its readers and staff, who preferred the -our spelling as being more "Canadian". Thus the -our spelling was adopted as a standard. This is an instance where a prescribed spelling style is changed in response to public appeal, which may be a factor that can be used to explain some of the spelling variations which exist between the four style books.
Labour/labor provides another instance of variation, with only GM consistently using the British variant labour. However, it allows for the American spelling labor when referring to proper names in the United States (e.g., Labor Department). TS and GAZ go the opposite direction, prescribing the U.S. spelling except for the British "Labour Party", while LFP prescribes the labor variant for all cases.

In terms of doubling the / at word-final position and when adding a suffix, TS lays out rules thus: use a double / at the end of a word if it is preceded by an a, (e.g., enthrall, recall, install, but strangely, appall), and a single / in all other cases (e.g., instil, enrol, fulfil). Words with the suffix -ful are to use a single / (e.g., wilful, skillful), and double / in non-final position when preceded by a single vowel (e.g., travelled, instilled, but an exception to the rule--totaled). There is no doubling when the affixes -ist, -ism, -ment or -ish are added (medalist). These practices show a combination of British and American forms--the British usually use the single / at the end of a word (appall, instil, distil, enrol, fulfil, enthral), while the American norm is to double the / in those words, and to retain the doubling when the suffixes -ed, -ing and -ment are added. LFP agrees with TS in its spelling except for the spellings totalled and medalist, where the / is doubled. GAZ is irregular in its prescription, offering the American spellings enroll, appall and install, but the British fulfil, instil and skillful. The doubling of the / in front of the suffix -ed is generally not followed, although totalled and travelled are variations. GM appears consistent in its use of the double / at the end of a word (e.g., enroll, fulfill, skilful), and before -ed (e.g., enrolled, fulfilled, totalled). However, it breaks from the American tradition by dropping / before -ment (e.g., fulfilment, enrolment, instalment). The Guide to Canadian English Usage reports that those who use only the single / at the end of a word tend to double it before endings beginning with a vowel (e.g., appalling, enthralled, totalled) and keep it single before endings beginning with a consonant (e.g., enrolment, fulfilment), as per the traditional British practice. However, there seems to be a fair amount of borrowing in the style books of aspects from both the American and British practices.

To hyphenate or not to hyphenate--that is the question. It is addressed by TS, which simply gives a list of when to, and when not to, hyphenate. Thus straitlaced is one word, as is teenager, but good-will, knick-knack, co-ordinate and co-operate. The style book admits that there are no hard and fast rules, but adds that compound words generally do not take a hyphen except in the following contexts: "two vowels would otherwise run together, the word might be difficult on the eye, it's a new or unfamiliar coinage, or it's simply too long to go unhypenated" (Campbell 1983: 23-24). LFP also uses hyphens in co-operate, knick-knack, long-time (the adjective) and film-maker, and generally agrees with TS in this respect. GAZ offers some variations, however, prescribing strait-laced and film-maker be hyphenated, while knickknack, straitjacket and longtime appear as one word. GM favours strait jacket as two distinct words, and while long-time and strait-laced get the hyphen, knickknack and filmmaker do not. Co-operate and co-operate are hyphenated in GM, a practice that contradicts what the Guide to Canadian English Usage suggests is usual (i.e., cooperate,
coordinate). Disagreement reigns! In relation to the instances of variation described so far, there seems no consensus. The Canadian Press Stylebook offers this quote: "If you take hyphens seriously, you will surely go mad" (Tasko 1995: 201).

TS follows the British practice of making a spelling distinction between dependant (the noun) and dependent (adjective). LFP agrees, while both GAZ and GM favour the American practice of using dependent as both noun and adjective. This is an instance of the two older style books agreeing on one variant and the two more recent ones favouring the other.

The British tradition of making a distinction between the nouns licence and practice, and the verbs license and practise (as opposed to the American license and practice for all forms) is upheld by some style books. TS favours the British way, as does LFP. GAZ prefers the American spellings, GM asks its writers to use practice and licence for both the verb and the noun of the two words. This usage of licence as a verb is a variation found only in the Globe and Mail guide.

TS and GAZ make a distinction in spelling between mold (as in a shape or the verb "to shape") and mould (the furry, fungal growth). LFP and GM do not, offering the spelling mould as standard for both meanings. The Guide to Canadian English Usage states that mold is more common in American spelling for both senses of the word, and mould in British (and Canadian) spelling (again, for both senses).

Similar to the dependant/dependent paradigm above are the distinctions between the words preventative and interpretative, and their variants preventive and interpretive. Both GM and TS prescribe the latter variants for both the noun and adjective of each word, a practice identified by the Guide to Canadian English Usage as being by far the more common in Canada. The other two style books make a distinction, though, between the adjective preventative and the noun preventative, while offering interpretative as the only permissible option for both the noun and adjective.

Now looking at Table 2, we see that the general pattern relating to the use of either the American or British spellings is a lack of consistency. While GM, for example, opts for the British spellings of axe, racquet, grey and centre, it follows the American lead in disfranchise, mustache, appall and omelet. Table 2 shows examples where the four Canadian style books all agree with one another in their recommendations, yet their choices differ in the spelling tradition they represent.

The column to the right shows what the four books chose as their standard, and the first two columns display the spelling common in each of the American and British English spelling traditions. The British forms defence, offence and theatre are chosen as standard, while the American variants judgment, plow (both the verb and noun), anemia and anesthetic are followed. This borrowing in Canadian English from the two
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Style Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>offence</td>
<td>offense</td>
<td>offence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theatre</td>
<td>theater</td>
<td>theatre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defence</td>
<td>defense</td>
<td>defence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>axe</td>
<td>ax</td>
<td>axe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plough</td>
<td>plow</td>
<td>plow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>judgement</td>
<td>judgment</td>
<td>judgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anaemia</td>
<td>anemia</td>
<td>anemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anaesthetic</td>
<td>anesthetic</td>
<td>anesthetic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

spelling customs is common throughout Canadian writing, a function both of English Canada’s British origins and its proximity (and susceptibility) to the United States. It is this Canadian habit of following not one tradition (as New Zealand and Australia have done—following the British model) but both systems, that many commentators have identified as the "Canadian Style".

The Department for the Secretary of State states, in its own style manual, entitled The Canadian Style (1985):

We have sought to establish standards and thereby dispel the uncertainty surrounding these matters.... But the standards and recommendations presented here should not be interpreted as categorical rejections of alternate forms which certain publishers may require. In this regard it should be borne in mind that the English language has long resisted attempts to impose on it a single, universal norm of style and language. (20)

This quotation seems very apt when discussing the preferred spelling of two words, fiord/fjord and veld/veldt. TS states that veldt (not veld) is correct, while GM states it is to be spelled veld (not veldh). Similarly, GM prescribes fiord (not fjord) while GAZ opts for fjord. The inclination for one spelling over the other here is not one related to relative correctness, as most dictionaries offer both spellings, and the Guide to Canadian English Usage reports that for fjord and fiord the usage in Canada is about the same. One wonders what criterion there was for the choosing of one over the other—there is no reason for identifying one spelling as being "more correct" than the other. The motive seems to be more of pushing for stylistic uniformity, which, when combined with the aforementioned Canadian practice of borrowing (seemingly at random) from both American and British spelling systems, poses problems. That is to
say, the need for choosing one spelling over another obviously at times necessitates
the picking of one variant over another that is equally correct (the *fiord/veldt* problem
is a good example). *Correctness*, then, becomes a question more of style than of
linguistic suitability. This is certainly what has been noted in the examples of
prescriptive variation and concurrence that we have seen thus far.

Returning to the above quotation, one could well substitute "Canadian English" for
"English", as the *Guide to Canadian English Usage* displays. Far from being a
prescriptive manual, it seeks to lay out the many spelling and semantic variations used
in Canadian English, some of which have been mentioned above, mostly forgoing the
promotion of one over the other. It states in its Introduction that this co-existence of
different forms and variations and the refusal to accept the imposition of a single
uniformity of spelling could well be what constitutes the Canadian Standard. We can
clearly see a different approach moving from the four style books, where the aim is to
promote a uniform style, to a usage guide that describes the various ways language is
used in a society, rather than prescribing a particular variant. In this, the *Guide* is far
more diagnostic than prescriptive. This has probably much to do with who wrote it,
(i.e., linguists versus newspaper editors) in that they were perhaps under less
pressure to stipulate a preferred usage than were the editors who wrote the style
books.

However, I have diverged a little from the path I was following, which was more
comparative and contrastive than philosophic. My aim was to illustrate some of the
spelling variants that manifest themselves in written English in Canada. These
variations in spelling are a function of two factors, the first being the need in many
circles for standards and uniformity in written English, and, the second being the
existence of two spelling traditions, which have equally deep roots, in Canadian
English. The subsequent lack of consistency in spelling within Canadian English, as
demonstrated in my investigation of the four newspaper style books, is one of the
defining features of Canadian English.
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CANADA'S BI-MODAL SPELLING TRADITION: CHOOSING BETWEEN
AMERICAN AND BRITISH SPELLING VARIANTS

Diala Homaidan

Over time, spoken Canadian English has managed to maintain certain unique features that distinguish it from other national varieties of English, such as Canadian Raising and the famous Canadian *eh?* Canadian English spelling, on the other hand, which was mainly governed by British English spelling conventions in the past, has more recently been referred to by Jack Chambers as "a vexed area where Canadian usage seems at best to be divided, at worst confused." Chambers' statement refers to the different spelling preferences, the veering between British and American conventions, found in Canada today. Seeing that Canada once strictly followed British spelling rules for nationalistic reasons, I was interested in studying Canadian patterns of spelling a little further, looking for a possible relationship between one's sense of nationalism and his or her spelling preferences. Thus, I have conducted a study with one hundred Queen's University students in Kingston, Ontario, evaluating their nationalism and their spelling preferences. This paper will discuss my study and results in detail as well as offer some historical background on English spelling in Canada, looking particularly at the *-our/-or* debate.

The British, valuing their spelling rules, were not impressed with the American variants that resulted from the spelling reform introduced by Noah Webster after the American Revolution:

The differences most frequently found appear to give many Britons special pain and hence attract their special attention--appear to impress them not merely as foreign, but as ugly, and not merely as ugly, but as crude and ill-bred and bumptious. (Vallins 1965)

Webster's move was a patriotic move, an attempt to deliberately differentiate American spelling from British spelling, to promote sentiments of national exclusiveness and national solidarity (Vallins 1965). The British reaction to the American spelling variation was definitely a form of anti-Americanism as opposed to a strong reaction to an introduction of new spelling variants.

Today, Canadian spelling is very arbitrary and this can be attributed not only to the influence of Canada's historical ties to Britain and its physical proximity to the United States but also to settlement history, the press's choice of spelling, and differences in internal factors such as spellers, dictionaries, and textbooks used by school boards across the country (Fee and McAlpine 1997). According to Marjorie Gann (1996) of
Quill and Quire, "When we force teachers to forage [for textbooks], what they buy is as likely to feature the Statue of Liberty as the CN Tower."

Our country is torn between British and American spellings and, apparently, it is the only one suffering from this bi-modal spelling tradition. Australia, New Zealand, India, Hong Kong, Ghana, and most of the rest of the English speaking nations have followed Samuel Johnson's lead (Dictionary of the English Language, London, 1755), while the United States and its territories, including Hawaii and Puerto Rico, have followed Noah Webster's lead (An American Dictionary of the English Language, New York, 1828). Webster's dictionary included variants like -or for -our, -er for -re, etc. "Present-day American spelling differs, when it differs, pretty much according to and as a result of the comparatively few principle of reformed spelling that Webster and his successors clung to" (Clark qtd. in Vallins 1965).

Webster urged that -or should be preferred, at least in words such as hono(u)r, labo(u)r, and colo(u)r after looking at Standard Modern French honneur as compared to Latin honor and concluding that the English word derived from the Latin form (Vallins 1965). Webster had a second analogical argument that we should write labor, not labour because we write laborious, not labourious. However, this argument was not very effective when he recommended center instead of centre because we write central, not centreal. Webster's recommendations, despite the lack of strength in his arguments, prevailed in the United States.

Various spelling patterns distinguish British English spelling from American English spelling (Inter-play translation Website). Here are six main ones:

1) The final consonant in forming derivatives is always doubled after one vowel in both stressed and unstressed syllables in British English but the consonant is doubled only in stressed syllables in American English.

re 'bel---> rebelled, 'tra vel---> travelled (Brit. English)
re 'bel---> rebelled, 'tra vel---> traveled (Am. English)

2) Some words ending in -re in British English end in -er in American English: centre, theatre (Brit. English)
center, theater (Am. English)

3) Some words ending in -ogue in British English end in -og in American English: analogue, catalogue (Brit. English)
analogy, catalog (Am. English)

4) Some words ending in -our in British English end in -or in American English: colour, labour (Brit. English)
color, labor (Am. English)
5) Some verbs end in either -ize or -ise in British English but only in -ize in American English:
harmonise, harmonize (Brit. English)
harmonize only (Am. English)

6) British spelling uses -ce vs. -se endings to distinguish nouns from verbs, whereas American spelling usually prefers -se:
defence (N), offence (N), pretence (N), practice (V)
(Brit. English)
defense (N), offense (N), pretense (N), practise or practice (N or V)
(Am. English).

The -our/-or debate will now be examined in more detail. It predates Webster. Prior to the 1800s written English everywhere began replacing -our with -or in such words as governour, terorr, and errour. Americans simply adopted the change wholeheartedly and began using -or endings exclusively. It then became a matter of honour outside the U.S. to retain the -our endings in spelling (Tasko 1998). In 1890, despite the fact that -or endings were in common use, Sir John A. Macdonald himself decided that Canada would use -our endings in federal government documents. Yet Canada's national news agency spelled such words without the u for 81 years. It was not until 1998, that the Canadian Press recommended in its Stylebook (or style manual) that -our prevail in humour, fervour, candour, etc.

For the -our advocates, it is a matter of passion. For them, -or is an Americanism, as much a threat to cultural identity as the uttering of zee instead of zed. Both should be avoided. For the -or advocates, -or is a cleaner, more consistent, and more modern way of spelling. Many words ending with -or have been used in Canada long enough to be considered Canadian.

The Canadian Press felt, in a way, caught in the middle of the -our/-or debate. The news agency's role is to be a strong proponent of distinctly Canadian spellings and it publishes spelling and style guides that are followed by many Canadian media and businesses. However, it long stood behind the shorter -or spellings (Tasko 1998). In 1998 that changed because -our was found to be the preferred spelling of many newspaper readers and of 77 percent of CP's ninety-five member news publishers (Canadian Press Newswire, Aug 31, 1998). So the newspapers that owned CF urged the editors to switch to -our.

According to the Oxford Guide to Canadian English Usage, "For some Canadians, -our is a marker of Canadian spelling." Preferences for the spelling vary across Canada, as shown effectively in a study done by Robert Ireland in 1979. The provinces which at that time leaned more towards -our were Ontario, British Columbia, and English-speaking Quebec, while the rest of Canada leaned towards -or.
Today, the most recent version of the *Gage Canadian Dictionary* lists both the *-our* and *-or* spelling variants in its headwords, acknowledging the preferred status of *-or* in some regions of the country such as Alberta. The *Gage Canadian Dictionary* also lists *travelling/traveling, traveller/traveler* as equals, for both variants are used. Preference is shown, however, for *calibre, catalogue*, and *metre* over *caliber, catalog* and *meter*. A government style guide advises editors to consult the *Gage Canadian Dictionary* and choose the word presented first for it is the one considered more common or acceptable.

All of these different American and British variants are included in my study. Do people actually choose a specific spelling according to their sense of nationalism? My hypothesis is that, yes, the stronger one's nationalistic attitude, the stronger one's preference for British spelling; in other words, nationalistic people will make more of a conscious effort to retain British variants. The traditional spine of Canadian nationalism has been anti-Americanism, which peaked during the 1960s and early 1970s.

There is no contesting the conclusion that Anti-Americanism has been a long-standing and central component of Canadian nationalism, one whose roots go back to the influx of United Empire Loyalists following the American War of Independence, to the fear of military invasion after the American Civil War, and to the threat of American manifest destiny as settlement spread westward at the end of the nineteenth century. (Gibbins 1995)

Anti-Americanism is expressed through opposition to things American, more specifically, to American influence in Canadian economic, political, and social life (Gibbins 1995). Spelling is part of language and social culture; therefore, I predict that a speaker with strong nationalistic attitudes would be more likely to express anti-Americanism by making a conscious effort *not* to choose American spelling variants.

My study involved a survey that evaluated Canadian students' spelling, particularly looking at a potential correlation between nationalistic attitude and usage of British spelling variants. A definition of nationalism was provided and the measure of it was on a scale of 1-5 (1 being low, 3 being neutral, and 5 being high). Participants were all Queen's students in the 18-25 age group. There were 44 male students and 56 female students, all educated in Canada, randomly chosen around campus, in various school buildings. The survey was in the format of a questionnaire, presenting thirty pairs of words, each pair consisting of the American spelling variant and the British spelling variant of the word. Among the variants included were *-our/-or, -rel/-er, -og/-ogue, ae/e* and *-yse/-yze*. The words were not separated into columns according to origin but randomly placed in two columns in order to avoid the appearance of a choice between two systems. The participants were instructed to circle THEIR spelling of the words and not to circle a word if it did not correspond with their own
spelling. At the end of the questionnaire, a question was included asking the students whether they had a specific reason behind the choice of their spelling.

A score was produced for each student by calculating the percentage of the use of British variants. When s/he chose not to circle either of the two words presented, that answer became part of the British-spelling-NOT-chosen percentage.

My results have made me aware of how varied Canadian students' choice of English spelling can be. There is a lack of consistency in the choice of variants and this is mentioned in the Oxford Guide to Canadian English Usage. For example, the preferences are not consistent across the whole set of -our/-or words: students were less likely to choose -or for the spelling of colour but were more likely to chose it for the word favor. The Guide to Canadian English Usage also reports that Canadians generally prefer spelling some words the British way, e.g., centre (not center) but others the American way, e.g., program (not programme) and this is reflected in my own data, where 66 percent of the hundred students surveyed chose centre (British spelling) over center (U.S. spelling) and 74 percent chose program (U.S. spelling) over programme (British spelling). I will now discuss the focus of my survey, which was the relationship between nationalism and a preference for British spelling.

Chart 1 shows no sign of a substantial correlation between one's sense of nationalism and one's preference for British spellings. At nationalism rating 1 (low), the students chose the British spelling 62 percent of the time; at rating 2, 67 percent of the time; at rating 3, 62 percent of the time; and at rating 4 and 5, 61 percent and 66 percent of the time, respectively. There is no pattern seen with an increase in nationalistic attitude. It can be noted, however, that over half of the time (63.6%), British spellings were preferred in the thirty pairs of words provided.

Charts 2 and 3 factor the role of gender into the relationship between nationalism and preference for British spellings. There is no difference between male and female students for correlation between nationalism and preference for British spellings. The scores for neither males nor females show a relation to nationalism. It can be noted however that males who rated themselves as a 4 on the nationalism scale scored a higher preference for British spelling (66 percent) than did the females who rated themselves in the same category on the scale; the latter scored only 60 percent. It is also interesting that the averages for the use of British spelling is identical (63.5 percent) for both males and females.
Chart 1
Relationship Between Nationalism and Preference for British Spellings

Nationalism Scale

Percent of British Spelling Used
Chart 2
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Relationship between Nationalism and Use of British Spelling by Females
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Nationalism Scale
A study done in 1984 by the Freelance Editors' Association (today known as the Editors' Association of Canada) that surveyed Canadian academics, editors, writers and publishers about their spelling preferences generated some interesting results. Table 1 compares my results to this 1984 survey. The data for the 1984 survey has been taken from the Cornerstone Creative Communications website.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British Spelling</th>
<th>% of Queen's students preferring the British spelling</th>
<th>% of people in 1984 survey preferring the British spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>rejected by almost all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarette</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colour</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrol</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that compared to the publishers, editors, writers, etc., polled by FEAC, Queen's students lean more towards the -er ending in centre, do not even consider the American spelling variant for cigarette (cigarett), have a stronger preference for the -u in colour and are less likely to use the -ce ending in defence. The use of the ae-instead of e- in aesthetic and the preference of a single -l at the end of enrol generated almost identical results for the two groups. The -yse ending is clearly more used by Queen's students than by the FEAC members surveyed in 1984, who strongly preferred the use of -ize endings.

When conducting my study, I assumed that the students were roughly aware of the differences between British spelling variants and American spelling variants and my results showed quite the opposite. This supports Fee and McAlpine's (1997) claim in the Oxford Guide to Canadian English Usage.

Canadian readers take in variant spellings every day, often without really thinking about it. And if they do think about it, they may think they are using
the British spelling when they are using the American, or vice versa. (465)

This phenomena is reflected in my results: more than half of the time, when students
answered that the reason behind their choice of certain spellings was because they
"preferred the Canadian spelling," they had chosen many variants that were American.
Students of today seem to be confused about what is Canadian (that is, what is
traditionally British) and what is American in terms of spelling. What is perpetuating
the confusion? As mentioned earlier in this paper, our own press has played a role.
The American mass media, American textbooks in schools, and American computer
spell-checkers have also been influential. In fact, many students included in their
survey that they had chosen specific spellings they had learned from the
spell-checkers on their computer. The default language is American English and one
needs to make the effort to change it to British English Spelling. According to Errol
Miller (1999), writing in ATA Magazine:

One of the failures in the attempt at standardizing the English language has
been the difference between British and American spelling. The problem is
increasing because so much of the computer software being used in Canada is
American... How are teachers to deal with students who argue that their
computers approved of their spelling?

What can be inferred from my results in general is that there is inconsistency in the
choice of American or British spellings, unrelated to strength of nationalistic attitudes.
An improvement could be made to the study by using the method of dictation instead
of questionnaires, in order to facilitate the production of more natural responses.
Looking at two familiar spelling variants might have influenced some students in their
choices. Dictation would generate a more "immediate" spelling of the words. Another
element in my study that could be taken into consideration is to rate one's
anti-Americanism as opposed to his or her Canadian nationalism for students tend to
make more of an effort to not be American than to be Canadian.

The lack of correlation between Canadian nationalism and use of British spellings
could also have been due to another factor—a general weakening of nationalism and
anti-Americanism among students. As Gibbins (1995) points out:

Anti-Americanism seems increasingly dated and passé within the brave new
world of NAFTA, Internet and the World Wide Web, globalization and a rapidly
decentralizing federal state.

Perhaps it is partly for this reason that American spelling is much more present in
written Canadian English than it ever was.

According to my results, nationalism does not affect the pattern of Canadian students'
bi-modal spelling. In fact, my results reinforce previous studies of Canada's spelling
situation by revealing inconsistent patterns of usage of American and British spelling variants. I've rejected my hypothesis since the data did not reveal a substantial relationship between one's nationalistic attitude and one's spelling preference.

It seems that only a very small percentage of Canadian students today, regardless of their level of Canadian nationalism, make a conscious effort to spell according to the British spelling convention, once the predominant Canadian style of spelling. Only a few of them even seem to be aware of the major features that distinguish British spelling from American spelling. This could be explained by the weakening of anti-Americanism or simply by the influential presence of the American written language in newspapers, computer spell-checkers, textbooks, and on the internet.
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CANADIAN NATIONALISM, ANTI-AMERICAN SENTIMENT AND USE OF CANADIAN SPELLING AND PRONUNCIATION VARIANTS

Sandeep Prasad

Introduction and Literature Review

Since Confederation, many have said that being pro-Canadian involves being anti-American to a degree. Some have also gone as far as to claim that Canadian nationalism is tantamount to anti-Americanism. There are many characteristics that distinguish Canada from the US, such as the state taking an active role in the economy and in social services, a peacekeeper foreign policy, and domestic policies emphasizing multiculturalism and public order (Laxer 1992). And indeed, some Canadians do take pride in these differences and the many others that exist, such as the difference between Canadian and American films. Laxer reports that the continued presence of many of these differences is being threatened and that if these are lost, Canada will not be able to survive as an independent country. With this present danger, one expects that Canadians would be trying to maintain the linguistic characteristics that distinguish Canadian English (CE) from American English (AE), because cultivating differences between the two countries would ensure Canada's continued independence. However, this is not the case.

The decline in use of Canadian linguistic variants is well documented. Chambers (1998) reports that the results of his survey of the Golden Horseshoe region in south central Ontario show that CE is dropping many distinctively Canadian lexical and pronunciation features in favour of American variants. Examples include the loss of the yod [j] before [u] in words such as student, news, and new; the total replacement of the aspirated [hw] with [w], and the replacement of the past tense form dived with dove (1998). Chambers suggests that there are still many shibboleths that distinguish the English of Canadian speakers from American ones, such as the pronunciation of the grapheme z, the retention of yod in the final diphthong of avenue, and the pronunciation of lever as /Ì]/er. Nylvek's (1992) survey of CE in Saskatchewan confirms Chambers' findings for the most part, and she also reports that the use of American variants for words such as lieutenant [lütnten], and missile [misl] are now more common than their respective "Canadian" variants. Further, she states that young people are using the American variants of the grapheme z [zi] and the word lever [lever] more than adults, indicating that some American variants will become the standard in CE. Chambers (1995) suggests a reason for the decreasing use of Canadian variants. He states that the decline of CE as a unified variety of English coincides with the decline of Canadian nationalism (1995). Using all of these findings as a foundation, the current study investigated three basic research questions:
1. Are Canadian nationalism and anti-American sentiment related?
2. Is a person's use of Canadian spelling and pronunciation variants, including ones that are no longer common in Canada, related to his or her views of Canada and the United States?
3. Do sex and age interact with the correlations above?

Method

A questionnaire (see Appendix A) was designed and administered to 80 people living in and around Trenton, a small city in southeastern Ontario. Participation was voluntary and all participants completed the survey while in the waiting room of a physician's office. Participants were given a generic statement about "linguistic usage and social attitudes" (see Appendix A) but were not told of the exact nature of the study before they filled out the questionnaire. After completing the survey, the participants were told about the research questions and thanked for their participation.

The questionnaire uses four scales to assess both linguistic usage—spelling (Part One) and pronunciation (Part Two)—and attitudes toward Canada and the United States (Part Three). The first scale (S) measures use of spelling and pronunciation variants that are common in Canada but differ from those of the United States. An example of a spelling item from S is the pair colour/color, and an example of a pronunciation item from S is the st[a]ne/st[k]ne pair (do you rhyme shone with lawn or loan?). The second linguistic scale (R) assesses the retention of spelling and pronunciation variants that were at one time common in Canada but for which, now, the American variant has become standard in CE. For example, R includes the items focussed/focused and [left]tenant vs. [lut]tenant, for spelling and pronunciation, respectively. Decisions regarding which pronunciation items belong in which scale were made using primarily the results of Chambers (1998). Items that were reported to be shibboleths by Chambers (1998) were assigned to scale S, whereas items for which the American variant was reported to be becoming more common were assigned to scale R. For items on which Chambers (1998) did not comment, Nylvek's (1992) results were used to make the decision. It should be noted here that many of the pronunciation items were taken directly from Chambers' survey called the Dialect Topography of the Golden Horseshoe (Chambers 1992). The remaining items were items discussed in Nylvek's (1992) paper and were adapted to keep with the general style of the remaining questions. For Part One (spelling), decisions regarding which items were assigned to which scale were based on the reporting of The Canadian Oxford Dictionary (1998) as to which variant was Canadian, British, or American. In cases where the dictionary did not specify this, the order in which the variants were presented was taken into account. It is important to note that Part One contains a few misleading items, where one of the spellings is generally considered incorrect, such as potatoe/potato and community/community, which were included in an attempt to prevent a participant from correctly guessing what part of the survey was assessing. Part Three comprises the remaining two scales, which were designed to
include items that would measure the participant's level of Canadian nationalism (C) -- that is, their attitudes toward Canada -- and their level of anti-American sentiment (A).

Results

Of the one hundred questionnaires that were distributed, eighty were completed and returned. There were too few male respondents (15) to allow analysis of the data with respect to sex. Thus, the respondents were assigned to three categories based on their reported ages: Young (Y: 14-29), Middle-Aged (M: 30-49), and Older (O: 50-69). It was felt that there were enough respondents in each age category (Y: 13; M: 46; O: 21) to include this factor in the data analysis.

The data were analysed in two main ways. First, the responses to Parts One and Two were compiled for each variant by age category. These results can be found in full in Appendix B. Second, every questionnaire was coded and each was assigned a score on each of the four scales. Regression analysis was then employed to analyse the various scores. A moderate, positive correlation ($r = 0.468$) between Canadian nationalism (C) and anti-American sentiment (A) was found. This suggests that indeed there is some degree of relatedness between attitudes toward Canada and the United States. It seems that the data suggest that if one holds strong, positive attitudes toward Canada then one would also tend to hold strong negative ones toward the United States. However, this correlation also implies that it is quite possible for a Canadian to be ambivalent or even feel negatively toward Canada but harbour a strong anti-American sentiment. With respect to age, no significantly different correlations between these two scales were found. However, t-tests performed on the mean scores of the two scales indicated that the average score on the anti-American sentiment scale was significantly lower ($p < 0.05$) for people in the Older category ($\bar{x} = 25.57$) than the Middle Age category ($\bar{x} = 37.04$).

Regression analysis was also performed between the scores on the two attitude scales, C and A, and the two linguistic scales, S and R. This analysis yielded only very weak correlations (for S and C, $r = 0.152$; for S and A, $r = 0.036$; for R and C, $r = -0.073$; and for R and A, $r = -0.076$). Thus, the data suggest that on average, a person's attitudes toward Canada and the United States are not related to their usage of either current or former Canadian spelling and pronunciation variants. As with the other correlation, age did not interact with these results. In other words, when age was factored into the analysis, no significantly different correlations were found. Thus, it would seem entirely possible for a person to use primarily Canadian linguistic variants, all the while feeling extremely negative toward Canada but loving the United States.
Discussion

One result of this study, the moderate, positive correlation between pro-Canadianism and anti-Americanism, has been explained by other authors (see Chambers 1995 for further comment) and has been discussed to some extent in the Introduction to this paper. Indeed, the results of the linguistic components of the study (see Appendix B) are consistent with and reinforce the findings of Nylvek (1992) and Chambers (1998). There are, however, some results that demand further explanation.

The result of the focussing/focusing item on Part One of the survey was quite surprising. The overall lack of use of the Canadian variant, focussing, and its decrease in use as age decreases suggests that the variant will eventually disappear altogether in Canada. This is particularly surprising as the "Spell Checker" function on both Corel WordPerfect and Microsoft Word, the two most common word processors, list focussing as the correct spelling when they are set to use their CE database. Under this database, both will return focusing, the American variant, as incorrect. The problem is that many people are unaware that they are capable of switching the database their word processor uses, and thus many people might be unaware of which spelling is the Canadian one. When no choice is made, the default database for both word processors is AE. If this lack of knowledge of Canadian tools continues, one could expect the eventual decline in use of any Canadian spelling variant that people use without knowing it is Canadian.

The finding that Canadians aged 50-69 (Category 0) hold less negative attitudes toward the States than those aged 30-49 (Category M) fits perfectly into Chambers’ (1995) discussion of the rise and fall of Canadian nationalism. People in Category M would have been in their early teens and twenties in the late 1960s, at a time when young Americans themselves were quite anti-American and antigovernment and protested US involvement in Vietnam. In Canada, this was a time when anti-American, Canadian nationalist movements were able to find a populist base (Chambers 1995) and young Canadians themselves would have been greatly affected by the prevailing sentiment of the time. On the other hand, Canadians now aged 50-69 would have been in their teens and twenties during the 1950s which was the time when continentalism began to grow in Canada (Chambers 1995). Thus an explanation of the finding can come from the differences in the political climate in Canada at the times when people in the two age categories would have been adolescents.

The lack of correlation between the attitude scales and the linguistic scales suggests that there is no connection between people’s attitudes toward Canada and the United States and their use of current and former Canadian variants. There are a few possible reasons why these attitudes are not affecting behaviour. First, people might not know which variant is the Canadian one, and so a person holding strong, positive attitudes toward Canada could be using an American variant thinking it to be
Canadian. Second, people might not feel that linguistic differences between Canada and the United States are important to ensuring a distinct Canadian identity. With the significant influx of American culture, some Canadians might take a "don't sweat the small stuff" attitude and feel it more important to preserve multiculturalism, for example. Third--but I think most unlikely--people might not perceive their choice of variants as reflecting their attitudes toward Canada.

Given my findings, I believe that standards in CE should be defined by what people use rather than by what they "should" use as Canadians. My data suggest that preserving linguistic differences is not related to higher Canadian nationalism. While some confidence can be placed in the results of this study, replication of its results is crucial. In replicating the study three main improvements should be made. First, more items for the linguistic scales should be included to ensure a better measure of variant use. Second, the pro-Canadian and anti-American scales should be redesigned to include equal numbers of items assessing each of the three components of attitudes--cognitive, affective, and behavioural. Third, the survey should include a short literacy-assessment scale, the results of which determine inclusion in the analysis. The high selection of the incorrect variant potato and responses to syntactically complex items on the attitude scale that were inconsistent with responses to other items indicate that literacy was a problem with some participants within the sample.

Conclusion

Three basic research questions--the heart of what this study investigated--were posed at the outset of this paper and must now be answered. First, regarding Canadian nationalism and anti-American sentiment, these attitudes are related to some degree. Second, the data suggest that a person's use of Canadian spelling and pronunciation variants, including ones that are no longer common in Canada, is not related to his or her views of Canada and the United States. Third, with the one exception discussed above, age was not a significant factor in either of these relationships.
Appendix A: The Survey

Hello! I am a Queen's University student taking a Linguistics course that requires me to do a small project. I am doing this project on language use and social attitudes. I have designed a questionnaire for my project and I invite you to volunteer to complete it. This will be of assistance to me for my course. It will take 10-15 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The data derived from the questionnaires will be used only for my project and you will not be identified in any way. You are completely free to decide not to participate in the study and to discontinue participation at any time. I would greatly appreciate any assistance you can give me with my project.

Thank you,
Sandeep Prasad

Thank you for helping us with this survey. We don't want you to take a long time answering these questions. Your first answer is likely to be the best one, so please don't look back. Answer each question as it comes. Additionally, please do not look ahead. Please finish the first page before you look at the second, and so on. Please do not go back and change your answers. Please keep the following in mind: There are no "correct" answers to any of these questions. We are only interested in your answers. Before we begin we need some general information about you:

Sex: (please put an x in the appropriate place)

___ male    ___ female

Age: (please put an x in the appropriate place)

___14-19    ___20-29    ___30-39    ___40-49

___50-59    ___60-69    ___70-79    ___ over 80

Were you raised predominantly in Canada from ages 8 to 18?

___ Yes    ___ No (if no, where?) _________________________________
Part One

From the following pairs of spellings, please circle the spelling of each word that you usually use when writing them (please do not select what you think the correct spelling is):

- focussed  focused
- potatoe  potato
- color  colour
- hypothesise  hypothesize
- programing  programming
- valour  valor
- realize  realise
- connexion  connection
- neighbor  neighbour
- determined  determinned
- favour  favor
- focusing  focussing
- programmed  programed
- commitee  committee
- honor  honour
- woolen  woollen
- centre  center
- community  communitity
- ocher  ochre

Part Two

For this part of the survey, we are interested only in what you say when you are among friends not what you think you should say. In cases where you use more than one of the choices, please select which you say more often.

1. What do you call the knob you turn to get water in a sink?

1a. What do you call the knob you turn to get water outdoors or in the garden?

2. Which do you say?  □ Yesterday he dove into the quarry.
                          □ Yesterday he dived into the quarry.

2a. Which do you say?  □ The submarine dived to the floor of the sea.
                          □ The submarine dove to the floor of the sea.
Time-saving tip: When you come to a question with CAPITALS, you are going to be asked about your pronunciation of that word. Look at that word and say it to yourself. Then you might find the question easier to answer.

3. For you, does VASE rhyme with face, days, cause, has?

4. Does the ending of AVENUE sound like you or oo?

5. In ASPHALT, the PH sounds like f. Does the S sound like sh? □ Yes □ No

6. Does SHONE, as in 'The sun shone brightly', rhyme with Joan or John?

7. Is the ei of EITHER pronounced like the ie of pie, or the ee of bee?

8. Does the mi of SEMI-, as in semi-final, sound like my, or like me?

9. Does the ti of ANTI-, as in anti-pollution, sound like tee, or like tie?

10. Do you pronounce the letter Z as zee, or as zed?

11. Does LEVER, as in 'Pull the lever', rhyme with cleaver or clever?

12. Is the ei of NEITHER pronounced like the ie of pie, or the ee of bee?

13. Does NEWS sound like nyooze or nooze?

14. Do you pronounce LIEUTENANT as lef-tenant or as loo-tenant?

15. Does ROUTE, as in 'paper route', rhyme with shout or shoot?

16. Does LEISURE rhyme with seizure or pleasure?

17. Does the u in STUDENT sound like the oo in too, or the u in use?

18. Does the sch of SCHEDULE sound like sch in school, or sh in shed?

19. Does the end of MISSILE rhyme with sill, or with tile?

20. Does the ti of MULTI-, as in multi-millionaire, sound like tie or tee?

21. Do you pronounce NEW like noo or nyoo?

PLEASE DO NOT TURN THIS PAGE UNTIL YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL THE QUESTIONS UP TO THIS POINT. ONCE YOU HAVE TURNED THIS PAGE,
PLEASE DO NOT GO BACK AND CHANGE YOUR ANSWERS.

Part Three

Please circle the number corresponding to your level of agreement or disagreement for each of the following statements. For all statements, 1=completely disagree, 5=neutral, 9=completely agree.

**Canadian culture is the same as American culture.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**I would gladly live in the States for a period of time if it would bring me financial benefits.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Canadians would be missing out if there were no Canadian national broadcaster such as the CBC.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Canadians should feel connected as Canadians.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Canadian content and programming in TV, radio, magazines, films and books should be increased.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**On average, Canadians are smarter than Americans.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**The USA has too much involvement in the affairs of Canada.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Canada should become part of the US.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**The American dream is my dream.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**The American way of doing things is the right way.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**On average, Americans tend to be more "full of themselves" than Canadians.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>completely disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>completely agree</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer to live in the States because of the weather.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would oppose Canada's becoming part of the US, even if there were some economic benefits to doing so.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian culture must further distinguish itself from American culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of Canada's profile internationally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada should start using American dollars for all financial transactions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US has too much say in the affairs of other countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer to live in the States than Canada.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US does not dominate the world.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would prefer to be an American.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Americans tend to be overly self-confident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On average, Americans tend to be more peaceful than Canadians.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US has too little involvement in the affairs of other countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the US were to dominate the world, this would be a &quot;good thing&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canadian culture is distinct from the culture of any other country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to be Canadian.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be offended if I were mistaken for an American.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian nationalism is a &quot;good thing&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On average, Americans are more intelligent than Canadians.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The US has too little say in the affairs of Canada.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On average, Canadians tend to be more good-willed than Americans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On average, Canadians tend to be more egotistical than Americans.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Results for Parts One and Two
Part One Results (Spelling Variants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Overall %</th>
<th>Y (14-29) %</th>
<th>M (30-49) %</th>
<th>O (50-69) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>focussed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potatoe*</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colour</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hypothesise</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programming</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valour</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realise</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbour</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favour</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focussing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programmed</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honour</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woolen</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centre</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ochre</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*this item is not an accepted variant but is included for comparison purposes.
### Part Two Results (Pronunciation and Word-Choice Variants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Overall %</th>
<th>Y (14-29) %</th>
<th>M (30-49) %</th>
<th>O (50-69) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tap</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[veiz] or [vaz]</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aven[ju]</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh[ŋ]ne</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ay]ther</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sem[i]</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ant[i]</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zed</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l[i]ver</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n[ay]ther</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ju] in news</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l[ɛ]tenant</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r[u]t</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɛʒər]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>st[ju]dent</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ʃ]edule</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miss[ai]l</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mult[i]</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ju] in new</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CANADIANS AND THE MASCULINE GENERIC

Lea Komaromi

Why I wrote this study

I have always tried to be a politically conscious person, which for me involves using inclusive written language. I use he/she instead of the generic he or plural they. I say policewoman when I mean policewoman and policeman when I mean policeman. And it would be a sorry day in my life when I used the word mankind to describe human beings. But this conscious choice has not been made by everyone, and it is a conscious choice since what comes most naturally to North Americans is the masculine generic and the "universal" he. Being aware of the injustices that exist in the media and in the popular language, I determined to discover what Canadians were saying and to compare our usage to our American neighbours'.

Hypothesis

It was my hypothesis that Canadians would be more inclusive in their language than Americans but would nonetheless use the masculine generic more than gender neutral terms. I concluded this after considering the tolerance and acceptance Canadians have shown to ethnic minorities and immigrants (the Canadian cultural "mosaic") as opposed to the way they are treated in the United States (the "melting pot").

Method

Three different studies were performed in order to discover what Canadians are using in their written language and in written media and what is accepted nationally. I came up with the following tests for the three studies.

A. By using the Strathy Language Unit's computer database of Canadian newspapers I was able to find the number of times a certain word appeared in a Canadian newspaper in a given year (in my study, this was 1996). The newspapers included were the Ottawa Citizen, the Hamilton Spectator and the Toronto Sun. Newspapers provide a good sample of word usage for two reasons, outlined by Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard (1995). First, newspapers are targeted to an educated audience, and as such will be concerned with the seriousness and correctness of their material. And, second, newspapers are addressed to both genders, since both men and women read them regularly. Technically, they should not favour one gender over the other. I compared my Canadian newspaper information to American data that I found in the study
done by Caldas-Coulthard. These findings were organized in chart format and compared.

B. The purpose of the second study was to find out what was considered grammatically correct or possible by the powers that be in Canada. I looked in four dictionaries:


I made a chart that compared the four dictionaries; the words I looked up were the same words I looked for in the newspapers on the computer database. I also consulted the Guide to Canadian English Usage to check for the grammatical and Canadian use of pronouns. I then made conclusions about which words were acceptable and most widely used, based on the findings in the dictionary and newspaper study.

C. The third study involved a questionnaire which was filled out by people of a variety of ages (most were female) for a total of seventeen. There was no respondent selection process. Its purpose was to evaluate what Canadians are using in their informal language. Three types of questions appeared among a total of twenty-four. The first part involved respondents reading a passage of two sentences quickly (to imitate the reading of a newspaper article) and covering it after so as to prevent going back to search for answers. Four questions were asked on the content of the passage, the first three being red herrings to lead the reader away from trying to find something wrong. The fourth question was the important one, although it was asked casually enough to not raise suspicions. The second part of this study was 15 straightforward short-answer questions, and the third part was fill-the-pronoun-in-the-blank. I then compared these answers to the results I found in the media and to Caldas-Coulthard’s U.S. results.

Results—General

A. Nine categories of words were looked up on the database. Out of those nine categories, in seven the masculine generic was used the majority of the time, and of that seven, six had a majority percentage of over 95%. The two categories that did not use the masculine generic the majority of the time were the fireman category and
the repairman category. Firefighter's was used 92% of the time, and repairer was used 72% of the time. Words that were used minimally but exist in the media and are obviously accepted as words include policewoman, repairwoman, chairwoman, chairperson, humankind, businesswoman and businessperson. Words that were not in the database include firewoman, repairwoman, garbage woman, sanitary engineer and workwoman.

B. In the 1969 editions of the American and Canadian dictionaries, two words that I looked up did not exist: firewoman and firefighter. In the new 1997 editions, firefighter has an entry, but firewoman is still not acknowledged as a word. For the most part, any title ending in man is described generically. For example, a policeman is a member of the police force, which implies that this term can be used regardless of gender. The only exceptions are spokesman—the definition specifies that it is "a man who speaks for another or others." As well, the Gage Dictionary (1997) distinguishes a fireman as "a male firefighter", whereas the American Webster's Dictionary (1997) simply says "a firefighter." There is still no entry for firewoman. The Canadian and American dictionaries are quite similar apart from this example. The generic masculine words accepted as universal in Canada are policeman, chairman, landlord, congressman and mankind. In the United States they are policeman, chairman, landlord, fireman, congressman and mankind. See Appendix A for complete results. The Guide to Canadian English Usage addresses this issue. Regarding the word chairman, for example, the usage is analysed as follows:

chairman: man or woman in charge of meeting or organization  
chairwoman: woman in charge of meeting or organization  
chairperson: as early as 1970 was used; it is recommended for use  
chair: recorded as early as 1658; also recommended

This usage guide also notes that job titles are moving away from being gender specific, for example:

waiter, waitress --> server  
saleslady --> clerk, sales representative  
workman --> worker  
paperboy --> carrier  
policemen --> police officer  
firemen --> firefighter

similarly, mankind --> people, humankind, human beings

C. In the first part of the questionnaire (Part A), the highest percentage of respondents (35%) did not notice that a policeman was later referred to as a she. The second greatest group, however, recognized the pronoun error and considered it ungrammatical (24%). Eighteen percent recognized it but saw nothing wrong.
Of the 8 questions that I analysed in Part B, four of them yielded the masculine generic for the majority (firemen, fireman, landlord and chairman) and four of them yielded gender neutral terms (police, spokesperson and either humankind, humans, or people). In Part C (pronouns) it became clear that the majority either used he exclusively or had no consistency (36%, 18% respectively). The next greatest percentage used he and she alternately (12%). Pronouns are also commented upon in the Guide to Canadian English Usage. In order to avoid the generic he, the authors provide several alternatives:

- rewrite to avoid pronominal adjectives
- use plural forms
- use he or she
- alternate between the masculine and feminine (i.e., first sentence he, second sentence she)
- only use she
- use s/he
- in speech, use they after words like anyone, one, etc.

The guide suggests the first three options are the smoothest in writing.

I will now take each word and draw conclusions based on my three studies.

Policeman

When the police are mentioned in the newspaper, 96% of the time the reference is to a policeman or policemen. I find it hard to believe that policewomen are not involved in these newsworthy events 96% of the time. This usage in the media is in contrast to my survey, where no one picked policeman when asked who they would call if their dwelling place was broken into to. The majority (71%) said the police. The dictionaries, however, still decree it acceptable to use policeman generically. Policewoman, however, refers only to a woman.

Fireman

All of my sources were unanimous: the term firewoman does not exist. It is not in any of the dictionaries, in any of the newspapers during 1996, and no one in my survey mentioned or considered that a firefighter could be a fireman or a firewoman. The results of this kind of biased language will be discussed.

Landlord

When asked who rents out a house or apartment, 65% of my respondents said a landlord, while 29% said a landlord or landlady. This is low compared to the 95% of time these rental unit owners were referred to as landlord(s) in the media. The term
landladies never turned up in the newspapers, and landlady only 5% of the time. It is safe to assume that when referred to in plural, the masculine generic is used. The dictionary study was quite revealing. According to the new Gage Canadian Dictionary, landlord refers to a he or she and it specifies that the legal term, regardless of gender, is landlord. In the Webster's, a landlady can own and lease apartments, houses and land, but a landlord can lease apartments, buildings and land; apparently even their roles are different. These are, however, improvements from the old Canadian dictionary, where a landlady could be the wife of the landlord. No, a landlord could not be, according to this dictionary, the husband of the landlady.

Mankind

Mankind could mean men, but the whole human race is its first meaning according to all the dictionaries. Of course, womankind refers to women collectively. I have not figured out the logic of why the dual meaning does not work either both ways or not at all. Webster's goes so far as to point out that mankind is without reference to sex, even with the word man it in. The people who filled out my survey surprised me in that they tried to find alternatives. The majority of people (48%, as opposed to 41% who used man or mankind) used a neutral term, either humankind, human(s), people or person. This is encouraging. In the newspapers however, the human race was called mankind 72% of the time and humankind 27% of the time. I hope that my survey is more indicative of the future than the popular media or the dictionaries.

Chairman

This is another example where my survey did not reflect the usage in the newspapers. The generic masculine was used 95% of the time in the newspapers, with chairwoman specifically 3.1%, and chairperson(s) 1.7%. Let's compare the newspaper findings to the American findings of a similar study: chairwoman is used only 0.3% of the time, chairperson 0.1%, and chairman 99.5%. My survey response was dramatically different: respondents used a neutral alternative (chairperson, chair, head) 47% of the time, and the masculine generic also 47% of the time. This split could show a change in trend toward the more neutral term. In the dictionaries, chairman and chairperson are generic whereas chairwoman is specific to females, and in Webster's Dictionary, chairwoman does not even exist.

Spokesman

Another business term is spokesman. In the old dictionaries, spokesman was a generic term, but in the 1997 dictionaries, spokesman refers only to a man! Therefore, anyone who uses spokesman to refer to a woman is grammatically incorrect. This change is evident in my survey: 65% of people picked spokesperson, 18% picked speaker, 12% wrote leader and only 6% chose spokesman. In the newspapers, spokesman or -men was used 75% of the time, whereas spokesperson
was used 7%, and *spokeswoman* a surprising 17%. Here, my survey and the language used in the Canadian newspapers are quite at odds.

**Potential Problems**

Problems or errors that could have affected my survey include the following: I did not have a selection process, which means that people with English as a second language could have answered the survey, which might have changed the answers. As well, Americans and English speakers from another country could have answered it, defeating the purpose of interviewing Canadians and changing some of the percentages. Certainly, having a larger study with a larger variety of ages and a more equal sex ratio would have given me a better idea of who is using what type of language. Finally, regional and urban/rural influences could have had an effect, as well as the socioeconomic status of the respondent. These things I did not check. If I happened to only interview people of rural backgrounds, for example, the results would not be indicative of all Canadians.

**Ramifications**

Through my research on the media and with average Canadians, I can conclude that the everyday language we use is more inclusive than the language we encounter in the newspaper. Out of six categories (*policeman*, *fireman*, *landlord*, *chairman*, *mankind* and *spokesman*) my respondents chose a neutral term the majority of the time in four out of the six, whereas the newspaper used the neutral term for the majority of uses only once (*firefighters*). This tells me that Canadians are becoming more aware of the inclusiveness of their language, although some areas of improvement are necessary (*landlord*, *fireman*, etc). There is not a great difference between the findings in the American newspapers and the Canadian ones, although if a difference must be noted, our percentages favoured the neutral terms a little.

The reader might be asking the question at this point, why does this matter? Since women began entering the work force, it has been noted, "Ce changement du statut de la femme dans le monde du travail entrein des repercussions d'ordre linguistique particulièrement intéressantes" (Vignola 1990). As I have heard Joan Chittister say, if something is not in the language it is not in the structure, and if it is not in the structure it does not exist. If women are not in the language, i.e. the structure, then they do not exist. Their identity is taken away, as well as their voice and power. In order for change to be effected, the media needs to be more aware of the language they are using in order to set a standard of acceptance. The dictionaries need to acknowledge that a woman is not included when the term *man* is used. Grammar and usage books need to stress the importance of inclusive language, such as using *he/she* or *they*, in order for this type of style to be accepted and practised. If this survey is to be trusted, I have hope for the future.
# Appendix A: Dictionary Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>policeman</td>
<td>member of the police force</td>
<td>member of the police force</td>
<td>member of the police force</td>
<td>...or woman member of the police force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police</td>
<td>the member of such a force = policeman</td>
<td>the member of such a force = policeman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policewoman</td>
<td>female member of the police force</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chairman</td>
<td>one who presides</td>
<td>a person who presides at or is in charge of a meeting</td>
<td>one who presides</td>
<td>the officer in charge of running a meeting, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chairwoman</td>
<td>a woman who presides...</td>
<td>a female who presides...</td>
<td>a woman who presides...</td>
<td>no entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chairperson</td>
<td>person who presides over an assembly</td>
<td>a person who...</td>
<td>a person who...</td>
<td>a person in charge of...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spokesman</td>
<td>a person who speaks on behalf of another or others (speak + man)</td>
<td>a man who speaks for another or others</td>
<td>a person who speaks on behalf of another or others (speak + woman)</td>
<td>man or woman or person; one who speaks for another or for a group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spokeswoman</td>
<td>a woman who speaks on behalf...</td>
<td>a woman who speaks for another...</td>
<td>a woman who speaks on behalf...</td>
<td>no entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>form of a title</td>
<td>title for a man, used before his last name or the name of his rank or office</td>
<td>form of a title</td>
<td>before a man's name, or sometimes before a position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td>title of courtesy</td>
<td>a title for a married woman</td>
<td>title of courtesy</td>
<td>a title of respect before a married woman's name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>a title of courtesy</td>
<td>for a woman or girl</td>
<td>a title of courtesy</td>
<td>a title of respect before a woman's name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss</td>
<td>title of address</td>
<td>a girl or young woman, unmarried woman, or a title given to a female winner of certain competitions: Miss Canada</td>
<td>title of address</td>
<td>polite form of address to a young woman, young unmarried woman, girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landlady</td>
<td>woman who owns and rents estate, especially</td>
<td>a woman who owns buildings or land that she rents to others</td>
<td>same as Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>a woman who owns and leases apartments, houses, land, etc. to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>owns and rents estate, especially dwelling units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) a woman who runs a rooming house or inn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) wife of a landlord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landlord</td>
<td>a person from whom a tenant leases land, buildings</td>
<td>a person who owns buildings or land that he or she rents to others</td>
<td>same as Houghton Mifflin</td>
<td>a person or organization that leases apartments, a building, land, etc. to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or dwelling units 2) a man who runs a rooming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) an innkeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>house or inn: inn keeper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fireman</td>
<td>man employed by the fire department</td>
<td>a male firefighter</td>
<td>man employed by the fire department</td>
<td>a firefighter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firewoman</td>
<td>no entry</td>
<td>no entry</td>
<td>no entry</td>
<td>no entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firefighter</td>
<td>no entry</td>
<td>a member of the fire department</td>
<td>no entry</td>
<td>a person who fights fires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>congressman</td>
<td>a member of US congress</td>
<td>a member of congress</td>
<td>a member of US Congress</td>
<td>a member of congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>congresswoman</td>
<td>a female member of US congress</td>
<td>a female member of congress</td>
<td>a female member of US congress</td>
<td>a female member of congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>congressperson</td>
<td>no entry</td>
<td>no entry</td>
<td>no entry</td>
<td>no entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mankind</td>
<td>1) the human race 2) men as distinguished from women</td>
<td>1) the human race; all human beings 2) men collectively</td>
<td>same as Canadian entry</td>
<td>1) human beings thought of as a group without reference to sex; humankind 2) men as distinguished from women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>womenkind (Gage entry)</td>
<td>female human beings collectively</td>
<td>women collectively</td>
<td>same as Canadian entry</td>
<td>women thought of as a group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix B: Comments on the Survey**

M20-35
In grade 10 English, my teacher repeatedly taught the class to be consistent in pronouns in the singular or plural. She always uses 'he' or 'his' when most people use 'they' or 'their' even though she's female. Some time later, I got in the habit of always using s/he, him/her, or his/her, etc. whenever appropriate, especially in personal letters, in order to be grammatically correct *and* not appear to favour one gender. (It was 11 years ago when I took grade 10 English.)
Lea--way to go on the survey--just in filling it out I've realized just how male dominated our society still is.
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Heather Newell

1. Introduction

J.K. Chambers conducted a linguistic survey of the Toronto-Hamilton-Niagara area and published the results as "Dialect Topography of the Golden Horseshoe" (1992). In this paper I will discuss what I found by applying J.K. Chambers' survey to Kingston, Ontario. I will compare my Kingston findings to those of Chambers, focusing on the variables that are becoming more American. I will discuss the Canadianness vs. Americanness of these lexical and phonological variants and the diminution of that distinction.

2. Variables and Informants

The participants in my survey consist of fifteen 14-19 year olds, nine 20-39 year olds, twelve 40-59 year olds and eight 60-79 year olds--for a total of 44. The linguistic variables I will discuss are:

1. chesterfield vs. couch
2. yod-dropping in student, news and avenue
3. the loss of the [hw]/[w] distinction in whine/wine and which/witch
4. dove vs. dived and snuck vs. sneaked
5. sem[a]/ant[a] vs. sem[i]/ant[i]
6. zed vs. zee
7. sh[ə]ne vs. sh[ɔ]ne
8. [i]ver vs. [ɛ]ver

Each of these variables has distinctive Canadian and American realizations and I will look at whether Kingstonians, as compared to residents of the Golden Horseshoe, are moving toward or away from the Americanisms, or if they are standing their ground.

3.1 Chesterfield

The term chesterfield used to describe "the upholstered piece of furniture that 3 or 4 people sit on in the living room" (Chambers, Topography of the Golden Horseshoe Questionnaire) is thought to have been brought to Canada by immigrants between 1901 and 1911 (Chambers 1995). It soon became the dominant term used for this piece of furniture in Canada, while couch was and remains the dominant term in the
U.S. As the data shows us, Canadians have adopted couch as their dominant term over the last few decades.

**Figure 1: Kingston: chesterfield vs. couch**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Couch %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2: Chambers' Golden Horseshoe Survey: chesterfield vs. couch**

(Chambers, "The Canada-U.S. Border as a Vanishing Isogloss: The Case of Chesterfield")

As we can see the pattern here is very similar. The more extreme data from the younger people in Kingston could be because Kingstonians are more influenced than those in the Golden Horseshoe by the Americanism but I believe it is more likely that this is just an effect of the 8 years between the conducting of this survey in Kingston (Nov. 1999) and the conducting of the original Golden Horseshoe survey (winter 1991-92). In Kingston 0% of the 14-19 age group answered chesterfield while 93% of them answered couch. The other 7% (=1 person) answered sofa.
3.2 Yod-Dropping

The presence of [j] (the first sound in you) between the alveolars [n] or [t] and a following [u] is typical of Canadian speech. In the following graphs we can see that this feature is being dropped in favour of the yodless American pronunciations in the cases of student and news. The same change is occurring much more slowly, if at all, in avenue.

**Figure 3: Kingston: instances of [ju]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% [ju]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>a=67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>s=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>a=83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>s=25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a=avenue s=student n=news

**Figure 4: Chambers' Golden Horseshoe survey: instances of [ju]**

(Chambers, "Dialect Topography of the Golden Horseshoe")
From these graphs we can see that the Kingston data for *news* has the instances of [ju] increasing in the youngest two age groups. The rest of the data are similar though: in both instances of the survey the incidence of [ju] in *avenue* is much higher than in both *student* and *news*. We see the same phenomenon here in the *avenue* data as in the *chesterfield* data—the youngest group has lost a noticeable amount of the feature in the last eight years.

3.3 The loss of *[hw]*

Here again we can see that the Canadian pronunciation *[hw]* is losing ground to the *[h]*-less American version. These graphs show the instances where *[hw]* is *not* present in the pronunciation of *whine* and *which*.

**Figure 5: Kingston: *[w]* instead of *[hw]***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% <em>[w]</em> not <em>[hw]</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ajn=whine  
*ttʃ=which*

**Figure 6: Chambers' Golden Horseshoe survey: *[w]* instead of *[hw]***

(Chambers, "Dialect Topography of the Golden Horseshoe")
If my assumption is correct, that the time that has passed between the surveys is significant, then we see here that in the loss of [hw] Kingston is on exactly the same path as the Golden Horseshoe but is about 10 years behind.

3.4 Dived/Dove and Sneaked/Snuck

*Dived* and *sneaked* are historically the most common past tenses of *dive* and *sneak*. *Dove and snuck*—created by analogy with strong verbs—were first significantly American and have now also become the preferred lexical choice of Canadians.

Figure 7: Kingston: instances of *snuck*

![Figure 7](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% snuck by</th>
<th>% snuck into</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>b=100</td>
<td>i=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>b=100</td>
<td>i=100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>b=93</td>
<td>i=93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>b=50</td>
<td>i=50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b=snuck by          i=snuck into

Figure 8: Chambers' Golden Horseshoe survey: instances of *snuck*

![Figure 8](image)

(Chambers, "Dialect Topography of the Golden Horseshoe")

The Chambers' survey shows that *snuck*, by 1992, had almost completely overshadowed *sneaked*. My survey in Kingston shows that for the youngest two age groups *snuck* has risen to 100%. I hypothesize that this is now the case in the Golden Horseshoe as well.

Figure 9: Kingston: instances of *dove*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

h: subject=he
s: subject=sub

Figure 10: Chambers' Golden Horseshoe survey: instances of *dove*

(Chambers, "Dialect Topography of the Golden Horseshoe")

Here again we see the similarity in the speech patterns of Kingstonians and residents of the Golden Horseshoe. It is apparent that in both areas *dived* began to give way to *dove* earlier than did *sneaked* to *snuck*. This similarity emphasizes the fact that my survey can act as a chronological extension of Chambers'.

Note that from here on I do not have specific graph data from the Chambers' survey. I will look at the Kingston responses and then compare them all to Chambers' percentages of overall Canadian and American usage.
3.5 [a] vs. [i] in semi- & anti-

These data seem to be fairly unpattered in Kingston, but we do see one strong trend moving away from the American [a] pronunciation (semi rhymes with hi rather than me) from the oldest to the next age group. The instances of [a] in anti- are on the increase again in the youngest group but the instances of [a] in semi- are staying fairly low. These data do become more interesting in terms of overall percentages, which we will look at in Section 4.1.

Figure 11: Kingston: instances of [a] in semi- and anti-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% [a]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>a=40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>a=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>a=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>a=25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{a=anti, } \text{s=semi}\]

3.6 zed vs. zee

In this graph we see that in Kingstonian speech there is strong movement away from the Canadian pronunciation zed toward the American pronunciation zee. It is interesting to note the anomalous data of the oldest group, who use zed only slightly more than the youngest group. This could be purely chance in respondents, or there could be a historical reason for the data that I am unaware of. Without the specific data from Chambers' survey to compare my finding to, I cannot tell if it is a general occurrence.

Figure 12: Kingston: instances of zee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% zee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7 sh[aj]ne vs. sh[o]ne

Here we see that up until about 40 years ago the Canadian pronunciation sh[aj]ne (like Shawn) was at 100% in Kingston. Recently though it has been creeping toward the American pronunciation, which rhymes with bone.

![Figure 13: Kingston: instances of sh[o]ne](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% sh[o]ne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8 [i]ver vs. [ɛ]ver

L[ɛ]ver (rhymes with never) is the more American pronunciation. This data, like the data for semi- and anti-, does not give us a telling pattern of change. The interesting data will again come in the next section when I look at the overall percentages for the graphs in sections 3.5 to 3.8, as well as the overall percentages for avenue.

![Figure 14: Kingston: instances of [ɛ]ver](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% [ɛ]ver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-79</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Overall Percentages and their Indications

Figure 15: Golden Horseshoe Data (American and Canadian) in Comparison to Kingston Data

(American and Canadian data from Chambers, "Dialect Topography of the Golden Horseshoe")

The data for each item show that in the last eight years in Canadian speech (assuming that Kingston and Golden Horshoe dialects are virtually identical) there has been movement toward the American variants. I do not know how much American speech has changed in the last eight years but I am working under the assumption that their variants are more stable because they are having a prolonged effect on Canadian speech.

5. Conclusion

In this paper I have looked at 15 variables found in the "Topography of the Golden Horseshoe Survey" (Chambers 1992). For each variable I have seen a tendency (chronological or statistical) of moving toward the American variant. The Kingston survey, done 8 years after the Golden Horseshoe survey, shows remarkably similar tendencies leading me to the conclusion that both districts are part of a single dialect region. Since the Kingston data in most cases show further movement from the Golden Horseshoe results toward the American variant, I conclude that we will see over time an erosion of isogloss lines along the Canada-U.S. border. This tendency seems to be fairly uniform across Canada, reinforcing the uniformity of its standard (i.e., most common) dialect.
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WHAT ARE YOU SAYING?  
AN ANALYSIS OF THE HISTORY IN CANADIAN ENGLISH

Linda Leroux

During a high-school exchange in Quebec, I was fascinated by the French-speaking teens as they mimicked the sounds in the lyrics of current pop English hits. Some even "corrected" their friends with equally inaccurate renditions. They lustily sang the words they could identify. I was particularly amused because I could remember my friends and I behaving just the same way at home when our English radio station played the one French hit song. The French/English language barrier is not a new subject to Canadians, but the rural/urban barrier is. How much real understanding is there of rural words used in urban conversation? This barrier is perhaps less dramatic, but it produces a similar effect in that the majority of speakers of Canadian English (CE) are repeating sounds bereft to them of meaning. Without background knowledge or context, Canadians can no longer interpret the lively words and phrases that originated in our history. Our linguistic connection with the root of our nation's identity becomes severed.

This severance has not been an intentional amputation. Instead, the technological advances over the past century have gradually withered the viability of traditional occupations. Less than 150 years ago, the majority of Canadians were earning their livelihood from the land and sea. Seventy-five percent of the population lived on farms. Many others worked as lumbermen, miners, and fishermen. The urbanites accounted for only a small minority. Contrast the statistics from the 1991 Census: only 16.4 percent of the national work force were employed in the above four sectors. Canadians residing on farms dropped to 3.2 percent, with 38 percent of the farm operators earning their primary income off-farm. In the same year, 61.7 percent were living in Canada's 25 metro cities--an increase of 1.5 million in the five years since the previous census. As well, in that same five year period, a total of 163 municipalities reached populations of over 26,000, and two cities near Toronto each grew 71%. With the age of industrialization came the steady increase of the urban population and the decrease of the rural base. Opportunity for steady employment drew country people into the cities, while the suburban sprawl consumed former farmland. These dynamics were simultaneous with increased immigration. Clearly, for myriad reasons, the popular image of Canadians working the land is purely historical.

But what was the legacy of the pioneering era? Without becoming overly nostalgic, we can say that survival in Canada's harsh conditions has always depended on a blend of resourceful independence and co-operative support. Many lessons and
survival skills were vividly passed along in the evolving language that became CE. "People feel their identity is reflected in their language" (Fee 1997: iii). A review of the rural vernacular is as much a study of our nation's development as it is of its language.

The following sample representation of words and expressions chronicle the major periods and events that shaped Canada into the complex community it is at present. This study includes true Canadianisms, that is, words and phrases coined in Canada, words borrowed from the French or Amerindian languages, and clipped, altered, blended or conjoined morphemes from two or more immigrant languages. My priority has been portraying a realistic perspective of each period rather than protecting cultural sensitivities. No offence is intended; indeed, I hope that greater awareness of etymologies may increase historical understanding, expose entrenched biases and improve appreciation toward all cultural influences that comprise our national identity.

"The European adventurers were novices in the wilds, and those who survived were the ones who availed themselves of native know-how and materials" (Chambers, in press). As Quebec sent out the first explorers, *coureurs de bois* and *voyageurs*, French and Aboriginal terms, ironically, were the first distinctive elements of CE. Many Native terms are now in International English: *skunk, raccoon, kayak* and *Canada,* "a village of huts*. Examples of the French assimilations into CE are *canoe, plateau, gopher, vamouche* (go bug!), and *penthouse* (from *pente,* "slope", referring to a lean-to or makeshift addition to a house, shed, or barn). Currently meaning a top-floor luxury suite, *penthouse* is a word that has moved decidedly upscale. French place names across Canada and French vocabulary in early CE underscore the founding influence of this official language. The entitlement and legitimacy of Aboriginal peoples in Canada has just begun to be acknowledged by means of numerous official name changes throughout Canada.

"It took two centuries for the settlers to cover the vast expanse and they arrived in four significant waves of immigration. Each wave had linguistic implications—that is, the immigrants influenced the way in which English is spoken in Canada to some extent" (Chambers, in press). After the French, the Loyalists and British arrived, cleared and worked the land. The language received new cultural exposure. Many of the words from this time are still used, some in an unrecognized form. *Kit and caboodle* combines the British term for uniform (*kit*) and US term for crowd (*bodle*), to mean the whole group and their gear. In Canada, *scallawag,* an imported Scottish term for poor, uneducated, and often undersized farm labourers, still affectionately refers to rascally youngsters, whereas in the US, it took a more derisive tone. The numerous Irish settlers in the Ottawa Valley popularized the term *shanty:* from Gaelic *sean toigh* "old house," "crude hut or building". It now typically refers to sugar shacks in the maple bush. *Teamster* has come a long way etymologically. Based on *team,* "pulling together" (Room 1986: 263), at first, it meant the driver of a team of horses hauling some type of load, then it evolved in the automotive age to refer to a truck driver, and
then to the labour union which represented them.

Lumbering, mining, fishing, farming, and ranching, the occupations of early Canadians, were soon the subjects of phrases that are still spoken today. Conceived literally, these expressions are still effective in the figurative sense. Many terms are self-explanatory: examples include "have a burr under your saddle blanket"; "have a bee in your bonnet"; "chip off the old block"; "scarce as hens teeth"; "putting the cart before the horse"; "took the bait, hook, line and sinker"; and "can't hit the broad side of a barn". There is no sense in "beating around the bush": this expression definitely requires an explanation. Trying to scare a small animal out of the bush by beating the branches or ground around it, rather than directly going in after it, reveals fear or inability to take control. The expression is now used when someone is talking around a difficult subject instead of speaking to the point. (Contemporary challenges are often more conceptual than physical.) "Bet your boots" entered the language in the Depression era when money was scarce. Boots are essential in the cold, wet and mud. This valued asset was carried to spare wear whenever possible. Betting boots, one of the last possessions to be risked, was a serious gamble. In the days of steam engine railroads, the "big wheel" was high gear. Driving the big wheel meant going as fast as one was able. The long steady process of breaking (taming) a wild or young horse sometimes resulted in the rider being bucked off. If he hit the ground face first, he "bit the dust". The current meaning has shifted from being shamefully defeated to dying or failing. "Cream of the crop" was the milk produced by the farm's best cow. (Until recently cream was a highly desired component of milk.) The expression now means the best of a group or of the highest class. An unbridled or uncontrolled horse who "has his head" will endanger its rider with a terrifying ride. The expression applies to someone who seizes the lead and acts irresponsibly. Oats are a high energy feed, converted quickly. Someone "feeling his oats" is rambunctious or has spurts of activity. The metal head of an axe or hammer could cause major damage if it came flying off its wooden handle. So if someone "flies off the handle", he or she is emotionally out of control. Because age in horses and donkeys was judged by the length of their teeth, "long in the tooth" labels someone old. By the same principle, "looking a gift horse in the mouth" means judging what a gift is really worth. "Make hay while the sun shines" is a rural saying about setting priorities and time management: get the work done when the weather is good since moisture ruins the hay crop once it has been cut. To "pan out", meaning to work out well, is from the gold-rush days. Prospectors swished gravel in their pans looking for gold. Pesky wild oat seeds, carelessly scattered, sprout into unwanted plants in a legitimate crop. "Sowing wild oats" currently describes the reckless behaviour of youth. All of these expressions, which we use without giving them a thought, relate to our ancestors' occupations. Obviously, in their era instruction often took the form of analogies.

Despite the struggles, or more precisely because of Canadians' struggle to survive, CE started developing new terms of its own. Several terms sprung forth in reference to the everyday facts-of-life and functions in the farmhouse and barn. Some were
politely euphemistic, others blatantly blunt and most were humorous. They referred to partakers of booze, degrees of insobriety, bathroom and bedroom activities. These terms I have not included.

English speakers of other countries do not refer to a quilt as a comforter (Thain 1987: 43). Chris Thain explains this Canadianism as a prairie term: a wrap provides comfort in bed during their harsh winds and bitter cold winters. Other Canadianisms explained by Thain are hightailing which comes from tail-lifting action of fleeing deer and glommers, which is a clipped form of conglomerate. Glomming youth gather and hang around together. At such a time, they may glom onto or grab hold of any opportunity that arises. Some claim that no one but a Canadian can be truly bushed: physically and psychologically exhausted from working hard in the bush or elsewhere. Haywire, a light gauge wire used for binding hay or straw bales, was also often used to repair equipment in a temporary manner. It was an accessible, all-purpose fix-it material that was, in fact, in the long run quite ineffective. Thus haywire means disorganized or generally gone awry. Hash started as a mixture of cooked meat, vegetables and potatoes chopped for frying and served again—a jumbled mess. Now to hash and rehash means to review and discuss, often ad nauseam. Pot-shots were fired at wild game in close range, with little regard to codes of sport hunting, for the meat was to go straight into the pot, instead of being stored for future use. Now the expression refers to firing off casually aimed insults. A rut is a groove or deep track made in the ground by a wheel. In a figurative context, it is a boring routine or a fixed way of thinking. The words tease and tizzy both evolved from the bristle weed, teasel, commonly used separate the fibres of wool, lift the nap of fabric, or fluff hair. By extension, the words have been applied to humans, rubbing each other the wrong way or becoming frazzled.

Many of the same human and environmental situations faced by earlier Canadians are still met today. Indeed, with the examples of herbal remedies and traditional wisdom regarding environmental responsibility and conservation, we realize that society has "progressed" to the point where we must go back and learn from the past, in order to keep going forward.

Further waves of immigrations— from Eastern Europe and Asia—and the settling of the west increased the diversity of the Canadian population. "One of the peculiarities of Canadian English west of the Maritimes is that the Loyalist settlement was overwhelmed, at least numerically, and nonetheless determined what Canadian English was to be, at least in the cities. The astonishing complexity in rural Canadian English is in part a consequence of the nature of settlement outside of the areas taken by the Loyalists" (Pringle 1983: 116). The appalling, harsh conditions of life in the settlements forced many to move on. "The rate of turnover was very high— up to 80%" (Pringle 1983: 118) in one township between 1840-50. Even so, much of the prairie land granted to German and Ukrainian farmers in the nineteenth century is still occupied today by their descendants. The 1991 Census identifies 6% and 3% of
Canada's working farms as owned by those of German and Ukrainian descent respectively. Some Slavic and German expressions have been equally enduring. *Doozer* (or *doozie*) was introduced into CE by the Ukrainians for whom *duze* means "very" or "extremely". Canadians use the term to emphasize anything that is big or exceptional. *Shenanigans* is believed to be a blend of the German words *schinageln*, "to work" and *Schenigelei*, "a trick*. *Shenanigans* has always been associated with trickery and perhaps first referred to thieves who gave the impression of laborious activity for the purpose of diversion and deceit.

"The linguistic aspect of the Canadian mosaic owes something to the fact that the pressure on newcomers to adjust has always been less forceful in Canada than in the US. [It owes] more to the relatively high proportion of speakers of other languages.... Canadian multicultural policies officially favour the maintenance of immigrant languages whether they were brought in the eighteenth and nineteenth century and have survived, or have arrived in more recent immigrations" (Pringle 1983: 116).

At times, the settling of Canada was not a quiet or gentle process. The tone was hard-edged. Some terms exhibiting this reality have since softened, others have not. A *skid row* was a logging road, prepared with greased skids, over which logs were dragged by teams of mules, horses or oxen. The skid roads into early Vancouver and Seattle passed through derelict districts catering to lumbermen, seamen, miners, construction workers, unskilled workers, transients, etc. The skid road district offered cheap lodging, missions, soup kitchens, beer parlours, brothels, and thrift stores. After logging operations moved inland, the name became generic and was applied by the transient workers as they landed in other North American cities to the districts with similar characteristics. *Road* became *row*, reflecting the typical cityscape--block-style buildings. The Irish *shebeen*, "mugful", and the French *cabane* combined to form the Canadianism *shebang*, referring to the rowdy taverns along the Ottawa River banks where loggers and rivermen spent their pay on wine, women and song. Now the expressions refers more generally, and more sedately, to "the entire lot", "an event with everything". *Hooch* is a clipped form of the name of the Hoochinoo Amerindian tribe from Alaska. During the Klondike gold rush, the tribe became notorious for drunkenness. *Hooch* referred to their distilled molasses-based liquor, and by the end of the nineteenth century, to any illegal booze.

When the derogatory basis in these etymologies is understood, the CE speaker can choose whether or not to use such terms. According to Fee, "Beliefs about the 'correct' use of language do have a social reality" (1997: vii). Therefore, recent cultural sensitivities can be respected. "If even Fowler admits that usage produces conventions, not the other way around, who decides what is acceptable?" (Fee 1997: xi). The nation's identity is as mutable as the language it speaks. The 1991 Census taken just before Canada celebrated its 125th anniversary revealed that the fraction of the Canadian population claiming British or French descent was less than one third. It is important to know who we are and why. CE vividly suggests to us that we are a
humbly honest, supportive community which respects diversity and the richness that it brings. We acknowledge the harsh elements of our reality and struggle to protect our dwindling resources and our threatened independence. If we remember the characteristics that brought us this far, individually and collectively, we'll have the resources to cope with whatever we face. In disregarding the evidence within our Canadian English language, we risk the loss of some of the essence of our national identity. On the other hand, exploring and explaining our language brings a harmony that can be enjoyed throughout the country.
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DISCOVERING IDIOMS

Nadia Daniell

Idioms are a universal but peculiar element in languages. Although they are often playful and humorous expressions, they also function within the confines of linguistic structure. Phrases such as "It's raining cats and dogs" have become intrinsic to the English language and their meanings seem to be learned whole and to go beyond the meaning of the individual words in the phrase. Idioms in Canada reflect the diversity of experience across the nation. Expressions from Nova Scotia such as "That's good enough for the girl I go with"--the traditional way to say something is satisfying--are adequate proof that language is governed, not only by lexical rules, but by a social framework as well (Poteet 1988: 52). As such, idioms have both inclusive and exclusive characteristics, which either help a person embrace a culture or misunderstand it altogether. Idioms are the idiosyncrasies of a language; they function as endearing sayings which bind together those who know their meanings. They serve an especially important function for Canadian English because we tend to forget that we have a language which has its own distinct linguistic features.

At a time when Canadian English seems barely distinguishable from American, idioms provide a reason to remember that we do indeed speak Canadian. Every time we use the expression "If you kill one, fifty more come to his funeral" or "Strong as an ox and twice as good-looking" (Poteet 1988: 111), we are engaging in a linguistic event that is distinctly Canadian. The mere use of these idioms locates us in Canadian not American culture. That idioms are distinct and important in many languages is shown by the number of books published attempting to translate them for outsiders. One can be lost within a language if not familiar with the common phrases. Wayne Grady defines the importance of idioms on a cultural scale, and he describes them as "vehicles for expressing a culture [that] are also examples of that culture." Certain words play through the "fabric of a culture and take their places in it to create a pattern, a pattern that defines us" (Grady 1998: 5).

While one part of the linguistic research of idioms is historical and cultural, there is a more detached side to the study which involves the examination of idioms under linguistic rules. Even with a generally accepted definition of the term "idiom", linguists still vary in opinion on the properties and function of the idiom within the English language; much theory has been developed around idioms.

The structure of idioms varies with use, which has led to the creation of multiple idiom categories. All, however, have unique lexical, syntactic and semantic features. By dissecting the idiom along these parameters, we get closer to understanding how the
brain comprehends these phrases differently from literal language. If we are simply interested in a conceptual analysis of idioms we can ask how death has been associated with "kicking" and "buckets" (Cacciari and Tabossi 1993: 12). But idioms can be looked at from a more scientific point of view if we want to understand the movement of meaning from undisputed literal language to highly subjective metaphorical language. Linguists have focused their studies on mapping out the process of moving from the literal meaning of individual words to the abstract meanings of idiomatic phrases. All modern linguistic studies of idioms owe a debt to the definition of the term that first appeared in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (OED) in 1928:

An idiom has been defined as a form of expression, grammatical construction, phrase etc. peculiar to a language; a peculiarity of phraseology approved by the usage of a language, and often having a significance other than its grammatical or logical one. (qtd. in Makkai 1972)

The OED notes that the idiom is a peculiar element in language, unusual because it is a phrase that often cannot be meaningfully translated into a different language. This is because an idiom has "a significance other than its grammatical or logical one", meaning that there is a metaphorical component to idioms which must be looked at as a whole rather than through individual words. With "to kick the bucket" it is easy to see how understanding the words "kick" and "bucket" does not translate into the term's figurative meaning, which is to die. Another key element of the idiom is that it is correct and accepted merely because it is used. From this definition it is easy to see how the idiom contradicts many established linguistic rules, thus creating the need for theoretical explanation. Idioms appear in many structural varieties and "yield certain distinct subpatterns--some perhaps universal, others specific to each language; nevertheless idiomaticity represents a basic theoretical stumbling block" (Makkai 1972: 32). The ability to accommodate the behaviour of idioms has been seen as a major theoretical challenge in linguistic studies.

The problem is that idioms have an internal structure which interacts with syntactic and semantic systems differently from other phrases. Through the use of both syntactic (identifying words as verbs or nouns, etc.) and semantic knowledge (finding associated meanings of words) one should be able to discern the meaning of a phrase such as "let me undress a chair for you". Yet the properties of idioms are not captured satisfactorily by any of the current grammatical frameworks (Cacciari and Tabossi 1993: 56). Although the sentence above is not grammatically incorrect, it does not make sense to anyone who does not associate the statement with taking clothes off a chair so that a guest may sit down. Even though listeners may fully grasp the concepts of the individual words, "chair" and "clothes", they will likely think chairs do not wear clothes; therefore this sentence makes no sense. Obviously, the sentence makes no literal sense. This leads to Cristina Cacciari's observation that many idioms are structured in syntactically appropriate ways, but this structure cannot be used, in combination with the meanings of the idiom's individual words, to derive
the idiom's figurative interpretation (Cacciari and Tabossi 1993: 27). To go back to our previous example, "to kick the bucket" is a grammatically correct verb phrase; however, its idiomatic meaning does not correspond to the phrase's syntactic structure. This poses a problem to the already established linguistic rules which clearly show how the relationship between syntax and semantics should provide the correct meaning of a phrase.

The spectrum of idioms crosses a wide variety of expressions to include clichés, proverbs and metaphors. Linguists have devised a conceptual framework to define the relationship between literal and figurative language, the "endpoints of a continuum", and expressions are drawn to one particular pole or the other according to paraphrasability (Makkai 1972: 76). Idioms range right across this spectrum from phrases that are quite easily translated through paraphrasing to those that are completely figurative expressions.

This has lead linguists to study how an individual processes the meanings of figurative expressions without using the patterns of syntax and semantics. Linguists suggest two possible avenues for deriving idiomatic meaning: direct and compositional access. The main difference between the two theories is that the first, direct access, avoids using the formal linguistic process of comprehension, while the second, compositional access, involves comprehension of an expression by calling upon the literal meaning of words to bridge the gap between metaphor and social meaning. The primary assumption behind the direct access approach is that "idiom meanings are apprehended by direct memory retrieval, not by linguistic processing" (Cacciari and Tabossi 1993: 163). This is seen as possible because entire idiom phrases are stored in the brain as "long words" alongside singular words.

This theory appears plausible because most idiomatic expressions in one's native language are encountered in a daily context. Such a familiarity with an expression, such as "to kick the bucket", renders the mind able to process the idiom as a single unit. The contention of the direct access model rests on the initial assumption that "idiom look-up cannot begin until the idiom itself is recognized as a configuration, that is, as a unitary expression with a meaning beyond that of its constituents" (Cacciari and Tabossi 1993: 161). It is important to realize that linguists are not suggesting that arbitrary statements can be immediately stored in the memory and instantly retrieved. The memory and retrieval of idiomatic phrases is comparable to other memorized strings of words such as lines of poetry and lyrics of songs. It is believed that the brain engages in memory retrieval when it comes to understanding the meaning of an idiom because of the efficiency of the "look-up" method over standard linguistic processing. "The to-die meaning of kick the bucket is understood more quickly than the literal meaning of striking a pail with one's foot" (Cacciari and Tabossi 1993: 165). If this theory is true then there is only one final assumption to make about the direct look-up model: that there is no analysis that guides the associations we make between an expression and its meaning. Cacciari and Tabossi describe the way we
learn the meaning of an expression as arbitrary. They go on to describe the way we
learn the meaning of all words as an arbitrary relationship between a linguistic unit and
its referent. At first the composition model may appear to be a polar approach to
theorizing about idiomatic comprehension. However, this model is not so much an
opposite theory to direct look-up as it is a complementary one, describing different
degrees of idiomaticity on the literal-figurative scale.

According to the compositional theory, idioms can vary from apparently unitary
phrases (e.g., "by and large") to expressions whose idiomatic meanings are derived
jointly from their literal meanings and allusional content (e.g., "spill the beans")
(Cacciari and Tabossi). This contradicts the notion that the comprehension of
idiomatic expressions avoids the linguistic process altogether. Idioms fall somewhere
on a continuum of literal and figurative meanings. Thus, those phrases that can be
understood by calling upon syntactic and semantic processes lie further away from the
purely figurative extreme. The phrase "to kick the bucket" bears no resemblance to
the meaning to die, and thus, is purely figurative, whereas an expression such as "to
spill the beans" can have a literal association. Cacciari and Tabossi theorize that it
would not be surprising if the pairing of a word such as "spill" and the concept of
divulge came to be represented in the lexical memory (Cacciari and Tabossi 1993:
160). The function of literal meaning works hand in hand with "context-appropriate"
meaning so that meaning is activated through the recognition of a word in a certain
context and in relation to its literal meaning.

Canadian idioms such as the ones used in the introduction to this essay can be seen
as a destabilizing element in linguistics because they do not fall within framework
necessary to derive literal meaning. Culturally, however, idioms are a stabilizing force
uniting people through shared sayings and adding to a community's sense of
collectiveness. Due to Canada's vast size and geographical variances it would be
impossible to examine all the idioms of Canada in this paper. If we focus on Nova
Scotia, however, it is easy to detect how being a maritime province has shaped many
of the province's expressions. The number of expressions using the word fish is very
telling of this, indicating that fishing is one of the main ways of making a living. But
one can derive much more from their sayings than just what people do for a living.
The expressions used by the people of this region also reflect a laid-back attitude and
generous hospitality. In addition, Nova Scotian idioms are very telling of the racial
tensions that have existed between blacks and whites, and they add historical context
to certain relationships in Nova Scotia. Idioms are a universal element in language
and, while their meanings might be ambiguous to outsiders, the concept behind these
expressions is familiar to insiders, which makes learning them possible. If there is any
fear that Canadians have only a few unique linguistic characteristics we need not look
further than our everyday expressions, from East to West Coast, to lay that fear to
rest. In fact, while Canadian raising, British spelling and our "zed" pronunciation are
all popular features of CE, they say more about where we come from than about who
we are (Grady 1998: 12). Idioms, on the other hand, are important because they
reflect who we are today, our attitudes, humour and our sense of place within Canada.

When it comes to studying idioms, one can become serious and try to describe them "on the basis of their relative degree of semantic transparency" or casual and note that "shatting along on my uppers" (just barely getting by) is a possible response to "How are you doing?" Idioms can be endlessly examined for their lexical features by linguists or historically and culturally studied by their users. Although the usage of idioms appears to be fairly flippant, their meanings are clear and controlled, involving the proper "intonation, context and the linguistic as well as interpersonal functions" (Smith and Wilson 1979: 26). Idioms are a linguistic as well as a social phenomenon. Defining the absolute linguistic processing of idioms has been controversial. Nevertheless, their study has provided for some interesting insights into how we as humans, regardless of our language or region, process idiomatic expression in the same way.
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CANADIANISMS IN ANIMAL AND PLANT VOCABULARY

Olivia Chong

Canadianisms in Animal and Plant Vocabulary

The instinct to explore played a considerable part in the formation of the vocabulary of Canadian English, and this instinct manifested itself in the desire to attach names to things. All those things that we consider part of the environment such as mammals, birds, and plants entered the vocabulary early. Most names of mammals, birds, and plants in Canada were either descriptive ones, referring attributively to distinctive habits, markings or forms, or were borrowings from other languages. The purpose of this essay is to discover the Canadianisms among animal and plant names. First of all, what does a "Canadianism" actually mean? Where are such words from, when did people start to adopt them, and what are their characteristics? The very idea of a Canadianism is obviously linked to the concept of Canadian identity or nationhood. So next, we will determine whether the names of animals, birds and plants are Canadianisms from a linguistic point of view.

It was important to identify the many fur-bearing animals back in 1505 because the fur trade had come to dominate the Canadian economy. For example, we can find early references to "Catts of the mountaigne" (cats of the mountain) replaced by catamount by 1822. These terms were used to describe mountain cats and referred to various wilds cats, especially the lynx or cougar. Most of the animals named at that time were hunted for their fur, but wolverines were an exception. Due to their crafty and predatory habits, they were known by a wide variety of names, such as, beaver-eater (1763), black devil (1793), devil of the woods (1900), Indian devil (1853), and plain devil (1911). The most feared of all Canadian species of bear was the grizzly bear (1752), referred to earlier, in 1743, as the grizzled bear. The cinnamon bear (1821) describes not a separate species but a colour phase of the common black bear (1743) and was known to the fur traders as the yellow bear (1793). The great white bear (1600) or polar bear of the Arctic, was also known as Nanook (1854) derived from the Eskimo nanuq. Thus, you can see animals' names are usually derived from their characteristics, behaviour, shape or size.

The next large family of animal is the bison, better known as the buffalo (1691) in North America. Buffalo and the earlier buff (1583) were borrowed from the French buffle. The word buffalo is used as the first and second element of some compound words, e.g., buffalo boss (1834), buffalo range (1896), musk buffalo (1791), white
buffalo (1793), wood buffalo (1810), etc. Others examples of borrowed names can be found in the family of Cervidae, which includes the moose, caribou (1665), and various species of deer. The meaning of the existing English word deer was extended and it was used in the Canadian north as early as 1577 to refer to the caribou. There is also a common term for deer in British Columbia, mowich, which was borrowed from Chinook Jargon (the West Coast Aboriginal lingua franca). The word moose itself is not a Canadianism, but it acts as the first element of thirty-five compounds that are, for example, moose-calling (1872), moose pasture (1896) and moose-veal (1902). Thus, borrowings and word-compounding contributed to vocabulary development in Canada.

Besides these big animals, Canada has a large class of rodents and rabbit-like mammals. The beaver, of course, is the most important species. The beaver’s range covers most of the country except for the treeless areas of the far north. The word beaver is not a Canadianism, but it forms part of sixty-three recorded compounds that are. Beaver appears in fifteen as the head noun, for example, black beaver (1670), land beaver (1760), and also coat beaver (1679), parchment beaver (1682), and mittain beaver (1735), which come from the grading and valuing system of the fur trade. Among the forty-eight compounds in which beaver is an attributive are beaver dam (1754) and beaver medicine (1784).

Names for Canadian birds are less imaginative than those for mammals because most of them were coined by extending the meaning of the names of European birds. But there are still distinctions in the birds’ names since attributives were added. The result is highly descriptive but exceedingly dull names: white partridge, white goose, blue goose, Canada goose, and so on. The early ornithological items in the Canadian lexicon run heavily to partridge, goose, and pheasant because these were useful sources of food (McAtee 1958). Some parts of Canada have various kinds of interesting bird names; for instance, in the Atlantic Provinces, tinker (1771) and turr (1853) were used for the razor-billed auk. One borrowing from an Aboriginal language is Ha-ha-wie or hah-wee-a (1795), from the Algonkian, which refers to the pintail duck.

The word goose itself is not a Canadianism, but with an attributive it forms many. The Canada goose, also known as a Gronker (1785), is one example. Others include the lesser Canada goose and lesser snow goose, which are called brants in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia; Ross’s goose is called barking wavey or galoot (in reference to unwary behaviour). More examples of attributive compounds are blue goose, cackling goose, white-fronted goose, greater snow goose, eastern Canada goose, etc. Other species, like the duck, work in the same way by adding an attributive to form names like ring-necked duck, wood duck, Labrador duck, Ruddy duck, etc. The expansion of the reference words has become another distinctive method of naming mammals or birds in Canadian English.

Besides animals, Canada has a wide range of flora, some of which have distinctly
Canadian names. For example, rock tripe is a translation of the Canadian French coinage tripe de roche, meaning "rock guts." It is "an edible lichen found attached to certain rocks by a threadlike holdfast" (Scargill 1967). Aboriginal people blended a smoking mixture from a variety of plants. The ingredients varied from tribe to tribe and place to place, but might consist of dried bearberry leaves, dried sumac leaves, red-osier dogwood bark and tobacco (Scargill 1967). This mixture was called kinnikinick in Cree and Ojibwa.

I have found a plant's name that has a little story behind it, which I think shows its Canadian evolution. In British Columbia, some local folk said dogwood was actually first called dagwood, from the lumberjack's jargon of the nineteenth century where a dag was a wedge or skewer made from a very hard wood like Pacific dogwood (Casselman 1985). Yet, for five hundred years, dog, prefixed to an English word, had denoted something worthless or contemptible, thus dogwood took over as the term, even when the hardness of this wood made it very far from useless (Casselman 1985). The corpse plant or ghost flower is a pale sprouting parasite with a spooky-white flower nodding downward that lives only briefly (Scargill 1967). The evanescence and look of the plant are reflected in its name. The most productive of the attributives for the formation of Canadian plant names is wild. It seems that anything that grew in nature was simply called wild: wild oats (1744), wild cherry (1769), wild turnip (1796), an obsolete name for the jack-in-the-pulpit, and wild grape (1798) (Canadian Encyclopedia 1988). Indeed, the attributive wild figures largely in name formation of Canadian English.

Next I did a survey about whether people were familiar with a sampling of names of mammals, birds, and plants in Canada that I had chosen. Ten males and eight females, all Queen's students, were questioned either by e-mail or face-to-face. Their ages ranged from 18 to 25 and all of them grew up in Canada. This survey cannot give a standard or pattern since only eighteen students were asked. However, it does give me a general idea of what people think or feel about these vocabulary items. See Table 1.

Nine out of ten men and seven out of eight women had never seen the word catamount. Sixteen out of the total eighteen students surveyed had never seen the word mowich before. Note that catamount was used in 1822 to describe wild cats, whereas the word mowich is still used in British Columbia to mean deer. Remember my results represent only a small portion of students at Queen's. Four of the next seven bird names mentioned in my list were unfamiliar to more than half the students. These are ha-ha wie, gronker, yellowlegs and murre. Of the plant names, kinnikinick, rock tripe and corpse plant are among those that get the highest vote from students as unfamiliar.

The second question of the survey asks whether respondents think the names are Canadianisms. Among the mammal names, the votes are more spread out but you
Table 1

The following table shows a list of words, please answer the questions and follow the instructions.

1) Have you seen these words before? 
   Put an X in column 1 if you have not seen the word or if you do not think it exists. (You can leave a blank if you have seen the word.)

2) Do you think the following list of words are Canadianisms (i.e., words unique to Canada)? 
   Put an X in column 2 if you do not think it is a Canadianism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:_________</th>
<th>Age:______</th>
<th>Did you grow up in Canada? Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Have you seen this word before?</td>
<td>(2) Do you think the word is a Canadianism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grizzle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha-ha-wie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gronker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowlegs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trillium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireweed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinnikinick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labrador Tea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Tripe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpse Plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

can still see more than half of the males think *catamount, wolverine, grizzle* and *buffalo* are not Canadianisms. The students do not think these are unique to Canada, but most students agree *Nanook* has Canadian identity. The results for the next group of names are not uniform but most students agreed *ha-ha-wie* was a unique
word in Canadian English. The numbers revealed that different students had different points of view about Canadianisms and it is very hard to find a standard. *Trillium* was one name most people thought unique to Canada.

In conclusion, about sixty percent of the animal and plant vocabulary of Canada consists of compound words formed with attributives. Often attributives refer to the plants' or animals' habits, size, colour, or shape. Many names are transformed or borrowed from other cultures, such as those from Native tribes, like the Algonkian, or from European tongues such as French. But to ascertain whether vocabulary is recognizably Canadian can be very difficult and the answer you get may depend on the person you ask. We can see the advantages of the typical Canadian methods of naming as they are practical and efficient, but the Canadian lexicon is at risk for a lack of variety!
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CANADIANISMS: WHERE DO THEY COME FROM?

Jody Primeau

1. Introduction

Canadian English, like any other dialect of English, or any other language for that matter, has constantly been affected by language change. Since its early beginnings with the first wave of immigrants around 1776, Canadian English has constantly acquired new words. At the same time it has been losing words due to disuse and changes in social attitudes. These Canadian English words or phrases are called Canadianisms. But what is a "Canadianism"? This question has raised a lot of debate. In fact, "Canadianism" is not an easy word to define, as Walter S. Avis pointed out in his Introduction to the Dictionary of Canadianisms on Historical Principles (DCHP). According to his definition, a Canadianism is "a word, expression, or meaning which is native to Canada or which is distinctively characteristic of Canadian usage though not necessarily exclusive to Canada" (DCHP 1961: xiii). Yet this definition in the front of the dictionary seems, in fact, to be both narrower and vaster than that found under the headword "Canadianism" in the body of the dictionary: "A linguistic feature, as of pronunciation, morphology, syntax, vocabulary, orthography, that is characteristic of Canadian English" (DCHP). As you can infer from this second definition, there are many types of Canadianisms: lexical, grammatical, orthographic, and phonological. The purpose of this paper is to analyse lexical Canadianisms and the diverse ways they entered Canadian English.

2. Lexical Canadianisms

It is not surprising that the vocabulary of the English language spoken in Canada does not differ enormously from that used in other parts of the English-speaking world. In fact, the bulk of the words used are common to all speakers of all varieties of English. So, English speakers from Australia, South Africa, Hong Kong, and the Caribbean would no doubt be able to communicate effectively with someone who speaks Canadian English (CE). There are, however a number of words that are unique in usage in Canada.

Lexical Canadianisms can be classified into four main categories. Three are proposed by McConnell in her book, Our Own Voice. Her first category is new words that are created based on existing English words or morphemes. The second process involves creating extensions of the meanings of words already in the language. The third type of vocabulary creation, according to McConnell, is borrowing from other languages.
have included a fourth category called archaisms. This process involves old words that have fallen out of use elsewhere but are retained in Canadian English.

2. Creation of New Words

This first category of lexical Canadianisms consists of new words that have been created from existing words. Often when settlers first reached the New World, they did not have names to describe their new situation. As a result they often relied on existing words to help them out. There are many ways this can be accomplished including compounding, blending, onomatopoeia, acronyms, clipping and conversion.

2.1 Compounding

Compounds occur as a result of taking two existing words and combining them to create a new word. McConnell (1979) indicates that this is the most common way Canadianisms are created. Some examples include, Hudson's Bay blanket (i.e., a compound of Hudson's Bay and blanket), Hudson's Bay start (a first short leg of a long journey), pie social and picnic shelter.

Compounding is, however, not the only method of creating new terms. They can also be created by blending parts of two or more words together. If you blend the words snow and dirt, you would get the word snert. Casselman (1999) claims that pesky children in Saskatchewan are told to go find some snert. Generally, blends in CE are the result of Canadian discoveries and initiatives. For example, Canadian biologists crossed the muskellunge and pike creating a new species of fish, called muspike. Examples of blending are also seen in the vocabulary of our health organizations (e.g., medicare) and our political organizations (e.g., Socred).

Onomatopoeia, unlike compounding and blending, does not involve creating words from existing words. Instead, onomatopoeic words are those that sound like the object that they describe. Typical examples of this process are animal names like chickaree and chewee. Chickaree imitates the chatter of a squirrel, while chewee is based on a bird call. Another CE example is rattle, which is a mountain stream, although this is a localism of Newfoundland (McConnell 1979).

Some particularly interesting Canadianisms occur when long phrases or words are reduced to initials. These may be acronyms, which are usually pronounced as a word--SIN, CEGEP, and CUPE are typical examples or initialisms where the acronym is pronounced letter by letter. Canadian government abbreviations often use this method: CLC (Canadian Labour Congress), PM (Prime Minister), NFB (National Film Board), OPP (Ontario Provincial Police), etc.

Clipping is another process through which Canadianisms can be created. It is a word-formation process that shortens a longer word (or phrase) to create a new word that
has the same meaning. An illustration of this would be Mountie, which is a clipping of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Other examples include the Soo for Sault Ste. Marie, and Ontario Hydro, which is a short form for Hydro-Electric Commission of Ontario.

2.2 Meaning extensions

Extending the use of words already in a language can be done in several different ways. First of all, settlers would often use existing words from Britain and France, and extend their meaning to cover new, often similar, realities in the New World. An example of this would be the word band, which McConnell (1979) describes in Canadian English usage as a "group of Indians in a given area and recognized by the government as a group" (56). This meaning has been extended to compounds such as; band list, band constable, band council. Band, therefore, in CE has acquired a specific reference that is not known in other varieties of English. Words like reeve, county, concession, and confederation have undergone similar semantic extensions in Canada.

A second type of extension occurs when personal and geographic names get extended from proper noun to common noun. These names often involve compounding (discussed in 2.1). The McIntosh apple is a clear illustration of this process. It is named after its original grower John McIntosh. Other examples include Winnipeg couch (folds out to make a bed), Digby chicken (smoked herring), and Stanfields (long underwear).

A metaphor is another type of extension. It involves the "understanding of one concept in terms of another" (O'Grady and Dobrovolsky 1996: 637). Another way of expressing this is that a word is identified with something different from what it literally denotes. McConnell uses black ice, corduroy road, and skin ice as examples. Canadian idioms can also function metaphorically: "There's no grain in that silo"; "He's a hurricane on a ten cent piece" (Casselman 1999: xv).

Euphemisms are also a popular way of extending word meaning. Instead of referring directly to death, it is possible to say "taking a dirt nap in a bone orchard" (Casselman 1999: 27). In reference to someone who is not too bright, Casselman offers "He's a few clowns short of a circus"; "If brains were vinegar, she wouldn't have enough to pickle an egg"; and "He doesn't have all his cornflakes in the same box" (1999: 98). Some bathroom euphemisms include "I've got the backdoor trot"; "I'm going to water the lilies"; and "I have to go and wring my mitt" (Casselman 1999: 28).

2.3 Borrowings from other languages

The third major category of lexical Canadianisms consists of words that have been borrowed from other languages. This comes as no surprise since languages have
always influenced neighbouring languages. Many Canadianisms have been created in this manner. Explorers were in contact with various languages. The first Europeans often depended on the Amerindians to provide words and vocabulary to describe features of vegetation, animals, geography and topography that they did not have words for. Examples from Amerindian languages are muskeg, toboggan, kayak, papoose, ookpik and wapiti. Many Canadian place names such as Onaping and Saskatoon, are borrowings from Amerindian languages. It is quite likely that the very name of this country derives from the Iroquoian word kanata meaning "community". Frequently, Amerindian words entered Canadian English by way of Canadian French (McConnell 1979: 81).

Canadian English has also borrowed directly from French and Canadian French. This, of course, is due in part to Canada's bilingual status. When English and French speakers became neighbours, both languages began influencing each other and have been doing so ever since. Portage, prairie, rapids, and concession are examples of Canadian English borrowings from French.

An interesting example of borrowing comes from Japanese. CE has borrowed the words Issei, Nisei, Sansei, and Yonsei (Fee and McAlpine 1997). These Canadianisms are mostly understood in areas where there is a large Japanese population, such as in British Columbia. Issei refers to Japanese immigrants who came to Canada between the late 19th and early 20th centuries. In Japanese it has the meaning of "first generation." Their children are called Nisei and the third generation is called Sansei. The fourth generation, the children of Sansei, including many children born of mixed marriages, are called Yonsei.

Borrowed words, as shown above, often maintain their original form. However it is not unusual for these borrowings to be altered to fit better into the phonological or semantic systems of the target language. For example, French tarte rappée became rawpie, rappee or rappie pie in English, and bête de la mer (the name of a young harp seal in Newfoundland) became bedlam. (McConnell 1979: 68).

2.4 Archaisms

As previously mentioned, Canadian English has maintained several words that have fallen out of use in Britain. Some examples of this category are the CE expression "I guess", meaning "I suppose", and the word trash meaning rubbish (McConnell 1979). Other archaisms include fall to describe the period between summer and winter, and deck for a pack of cards. It is not surprising that these words did not evolve semantically in Canada as they did in Europe, since once they were transported to the New World, they were geographically cut off from the linguistic developments in the Old World.
3. Conclusions re Lexical Canadianisms

Evidently, as languages are transported to new surroundings, the need for new words to describe new situations arises. Given that languages constantly evolve, the transported languages will develop differently from the languages spoken in their place of origin. Canada proved no exception. The English language in Canada has been supplemented by the creation of lexical Canadianisms using the various methods discussed above. In CE is reflected Canadians' history, culture and general way of life.
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NEWFOUNDLANDISMS IN *GREAT BIG SEA* LYRICS: VOCABULARY AND PRONUNCIATION

Denis Heng

Newfoundland is an island with a colourful history of sailors, traders, and pirates. Then, as now, music and humour helped pass the dark nights and the long winters. One of the most successful bands to come out of Newfoundland this decade has been Great Big Sea (GBS), a band that writes and performs music in the maritime tradition of their seafaring ancestors, fueled with the power and intensity of this modern age. Described as "a really aggressive folk band that marries traditional Celtic music with modern rhythms," (GBS Website 1999), GBS has set out with the intention of promoting the culture and image of Newfoundland around the world. Newfoundland English (NE) diverges from standard Canadian English in many ways--pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, idiom and meaning. Adapting the definition of a Canadianism used in *The Dictionary of Canadianisms* (Avis et al. 1967), a Newfoundlandism can be defined as "... a word, expression, or meaning which is native to [Newfoundland] or which is distinctively characteristic of [Newfoundland] usage though not necessarily exclusive to [Newfoundland]." This essay will examine how the Newfoundlandisms GBS use, in particular, their vocabulary and accent, impact on their mission of sharing Newfoundland culture with the world.

Canada is a big country, but, despite its vastness, the character of Canadian English (CE) is surprisingly uniform. CE is highly homogenized with a fairly standardized speech pattern from the Atlantic to Pacific Oceans and from the Arctic to the United States border. An exception to this homogeneity of CE is NE. Due to its very different settlement pattern and colonial history, Newfoundland is one of the most linguistically distinctive regions of English-speaking Canada. Three factors contributing to the distinctiveness of Newfoundland dialect are, first, its absorption of nonstandard regional and social variants from parts of the British Isles; second, its preservation of variants that were once acceptable or even standard in earlier stages in the history of British English; third, its innovations, which did not spread beyond the island.

There are many factors that contribute to the shaping of the linguistic characteristics of a region. NE emerged from a seventeenth and eighteenth century base of southwestern English and southeastern Irish settlement. Although Irish presence in Newfoundland dates back to the early seventeenth century, the majority of Irish settlers did not arrive until the first four decades of the nineteenth century (Clarke 1997). Descendants of these Irish settlers almost exclusively populate the entire southern Avalon Peninsula, south of St. John's. Hailing from communities such as St. John's, Petty Harbour, Carbonear and Outer Cove, all four members of GBS live on
the Avalon Peninsula, and speak with a Newfoundland accent that resembles an Irish lilt.

Immigrants from southwest England settled the majority of the rest of the island. In the more northerly sections of the Avalon peninsula and to the immediate west of it, there is much mixed Irish/southwest English settlement. Due to the isolation of Newfoundland it didn't join Confederation until 1949. Settlers experienced about three hundred years of local development with minimal influence from mainland CE. This allowed a number of local linguistic subsystems to become well established, especially in pronunciation and grammar. As early as 1836, the existence of distinct subregional dialects was noted by Archdeacon Wix (Story 1965). Even to this day, communities separated by as little as 20 kilometres may have manners and speech that are quite different from one another.

From this environment and heritage comes the music of GBS, which can be described as an energetic combination of Celtic rock and sing-along folk. It remains unmistakably traditional. Of the 55 songs that Great Big Sea has recorded, 28 are remakes of traditional songs that have their roots in mostly Irish, but also Scottish and English, ditties which are at least four or five hundred years old. Within these traditional songs, there are several examples of distinctive NE vocabulary items, unknown in the rest of Canada. Associated with these unique linguistic features are stories and connotations that make them ideal vehicles to convey Newfoundland culture and heritage. It is not surprising that some special NE vocabulary involves fishing. Words and phrases such as great big sea, sods and rinds, flakes, and donkey riding are associated with the sea and the fisheries that have sustained Newfoundland to this day. "Great Big Sea hove in Long Beach" is the first line to a traditional Newfoundland song that describes the historical event of several tidal waves that destroyed several Newfoundland communities and caused decades of hardships. Big, when used in association with the sea, is taken to mean "forceful or violent" (Dictionary of Newfoundland English) and hove is the past tense of heave for Newfoundlanders.

"Sods and rinds to cover your flakes, cake and tea for supper, / Cod-fish in the spring of the year fried in maggoty butter" (Great Big Sea 1993): these lyrics from the song "I'se the B'y" exemplify Newfoundlandisms derived from the sea. Let me explain some marine vocabulary. Fishermen returning with their catch of codfish would have the task of drying the fish in order to preserve them. Once they had reached the foreshore, they would build a platform called a flake. A flake was usually made of branches and covered with turf or chunks of peat and bark, known as sods and rinds in Newfoundland. Upon this covering the split cod would be laid down to dry. If the codfish were not cured properly, they became infested with the larvae of blowflies from the beach—the maggots begin to breed. There is another Newfoundlandism in the title, "Donkey Riding", a song about the hard lifestyle of some Newfoundlanders. A donkey is a kind of winch on a timber ship. Riding the donkey involves straddling the
winch and turning it, which is hard, sweaty work that was usually helped along by music and singing. The lyrics of GBS songs address the harsh themes of dwindling fishstocks and everyday Newfoundland life. At the same time their music conveys the optimism, the sometimes ridiculous positivism of Newfoundlanders.

The second category of Newfoundlandism I will look at deals with alcohol. Newfoundlanders are a good-natured people who have been known to enjoy the occasional alcoholic beverage during those long, dark, Newfoundland winter nights. GBS makes several allusions to this popular Newfoundland past time. Jack Hinks, a Newfoundland superhero, is described as a "seafaring, sailmaking, gambling, capering, grog-drinking hero" (Great Big Sea 1999). A grog refers to a shot of liquor. "Jakey's Gin" also makes reference to some other famous Newfoundland alcoholic beverages in its second verse. "Some people say that the pinky is fine, / Others will swear by a drop of moonshine, / But as for myself I'll a bottle of each / Mixed in with a gallon or dipper of screech" (Great Big Sea 1999). Pinky is a slang term for a type of very cheap port named "Pink Lady". A dipper is any sort of container used to dip into a barrel of alcohol to obtain a drink. Moonshine refers to any illegally distilled alcohol and screech is a popular name for a variety of cheap, dark Jamaican rum that was found at the very bottom of the barrel. Screech is the popular name for this alcohol because apparently you will screech when you drink it; you will screech first when you are intoxicated with it and then you screech in the morning as you recover from the night's festivities.

The final category of Newfoundlandisms I'll discuss is those words and phrases that have meanings specific to Newfoundland. These include the terms "kitchen party", the Blue Puttees, and the Beothuks. In the song "Goin' Up", one of Newfoundland's most famous traditions, the kitchen party, is described. GBS's website plays upon this and invites everyone to their own online kitchen party. In essence, a kitchen party is much like an all-night house party in which everyone tends to hang around the kitchen instead of, say, the living room. In the past, before central heating, the kitchen woodstove would be the centre of the house and would create a warm meeting place during those cold, Newfoundland nights. The kitchen is still central. As the night goes on, the stereo gets shut off, the furniture is moved off to the side and someone starts to sing and play; others start to dance jigs and reels. In this setting, many of the traditional songs that the group has rearranged were learned.

One of the defining features of Newfoundland, and in fact, any type of folk music, is its oral tradition. It is the spirit of the songs that GBS sing that is more important than exact lyrics. Acknowledging this oral tradition, although GBS have decided to post the lyrics to their original songs, they do not intend to publish the lyrics of the traditional songs that they have redone. "We didn't learn our songs from lyric sheets. We didn't even learn them from albums. We learned them from people singing" (Great Big Sea Website). GBS intends to carry on the traditional Newfoundland way of passing on songs from person to person and generation to generation.
The twentieth century is part of Newfoundland heritage and GBS is doing its part to immortalize the recent history of Newfoundland. "Recruiting Sergeant" is a song that commemorates the sacrifice of the Blue Puttees, the volunteer members of the first contingent of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment in World War I. The Newfoundland Regiment was raised from scratch and their uniforms were homespun. When the time came to make the puttee, the strip of cloth that goes around the soldier's calf like a legging, they could not find any more of the khaki broadcloth used for the uniforms. They were, however, able to scrounge blue broadcloth, and from that they made the puttees and hence the nickname of the Newfoundland Regiment, the Blue Puttees.

GBS has not only celebrated the strong Irish/English character of Newfoundland. The Beothuks is another term with a meaning specific to Newfoundland that has found its way into their lyrics. "Demasduit Dream" is a GBS original work that expresses some thoughtful sentiments on Newfoundland's now extinct Native people. Ethnologists are not quite in agreement about the language family of the Beothuks, but it is generally accepted that they were probably a small branch of the warlike Algonquians, who at that time were the masters of northeastern Canada. With the settling of North America, many Native peoples were displaced. GBS lyrics are written from the point of view of the Beothuks: "We ran like frightened partridge when the strangers came to talk, / Bringing sickness round them and the thunder in their walk. / We ran into the valleys, we ran into the hills. / The young, they ran before us, driven by a stranger's will" (Great Big Sea 1999). When they were driven into the interior of Newfoundland, the resources were not sufficient to sustain year-round occupation. Traditionally, the Beothuks had exploited the rich resources of the coast for nine or ten months of every year. The Beothuks slowly became extinct.

Along with Native people and British settlers, French settlers also colonised North America. "Trois Navires De Ble" is a traditional work song GBS has recorded that acknowledges the music and culture of the little known French community, isolated on the west coast of Newfoundland. The presence of a French community in Newfoundland is not so surprising when you consider that St. Pierre and Miquelon, the two islands that have remained in France's possession since the Treaty of Paris, are less than 30 kilometres from Newfoundland's southwest shore. Communities elsewhere in Newfoundland also have their roots in the French tradition; Harbour Grace on the Avalon Peninsula was founded in 1517 as Havre de Grâce.

Newfoundland's history as a sort of fishing station to many nations of the world contributed to its diversity. Together Irish, English, French and Native peoples have had a hand in shaping the culture and linguistic character of Newfoundland today.

The final linguistic feature that this essay will examine is pronunciation or accent. The Newfoundland accent is not readily apparent in the recordings of GBS because artists normally do not sing in their native accent (cf. the Spice Girls). Also, members of the band have made a conscious effort to tone down their accent so that the general public can understand their lyrics in most cases. The songs "Mari-Mac", "End of the
World", and "Little Beggar Dude" are three exceptions to this observation. "Mari-Mac" has a Scottish origin, but it came to St. John's, Nfld. from Ireland. The chorus of "Mari-Mac" is a tongue twister and accelerating the song is a local trick. The only way that this can be accomplished is if the lyrics are sung with a Newfoundland pronunciation:

Mari Mac's mother is making Mari Mac marry me.  
My mother is making me marry Mari Mac.  
Well, I'm going to marry Mari, for when Mari's taking care of me  
We'll all be feeling merry when I marry Mari Mac. (Great Big Sea 1995)

When pronounced with a Newfoundland accent, it sounds more like this:

Mahri Mac's modder's makin' Mahri Mac mahry me. 
My modder's makin' me mahry Mahri Mac. 
Well, I'm gonna mahry Mahri, for when Mahri's takin' care o'me 
We all be feelin' merry when I mahry Mahri Mac.

Features of a Newfoundland accent evident in this song include pronouncing the voiced, interdental (th) as a voiced, alveolar (d), so that a word such as mother sounds like modder; eliding words that end in -s to the next word; and replacing the ending -ing with -in'. Finally, associated with this song is the Newfoundlander's distinction between merry and marry. Most Canadians pronounce these two words the same way.

Other examples of Newfoundland pronunciation are as follows. Many words spelled with ea, such as tea, rhyme with way. This allows the couplet "It's the old shavin' lotion that's made me this way; / Sweeter than Pepsi and stronger than tea" (Great Big Sea 1997) to rhyme. Many Newfoundlanders still pronounce words that contain oi or oy with the sound in eye. The result is that for Newfoundlanders, the following word pairs both sound like the second word in the pair, as it is pronounced in standard CE: toil/tile, boil/bile, toy/tie, boy/by. The best example of this in GBS's music is their remake of the traditional Irish ditty "I'llse the By", or "I is (am) the Boy". The possessive pronoun my is also replaced with ma. And the sound /h/ is added in front of words beginning with a vowel, while the letter /h/ at the beginning of a word is not pronounced. So the line "I hear with my ear" comes out "I ear with me hear."

One of the unique aspects of Canada is that it celebrates its diversity. The richness of Newfoundland's culture stems, in part, from its age compared to the rest of Canada's provinces and the fact that it has been quite far removed from other communities in the rest of Canada for many generations. While most provinces have discarded their ancestors' music, Atlantic Canada has not. In Newfoundland's case, proximity to the United Kingdom and late entry into Confederation have kept those musical ties binding. The isolation of small communities and the inhabitants' strong interest in their
own community helped to preserve local cultures within Newfoundland and to develop a heightened sense of local "patriotism". Music means that much more to people and GBS exudes an enormous amount of pride in their Newfoundland heritage.

Although GBS has enjoyed successful tours all over Canada, as well as in the United States and Europe, the band still takes an active part in Newfoundland culture, living in St. John's, Newfoundland. And everywhere they play, they paint Newfoundland in a positive light. From their albums, and definitely from a live performance, you can discern more than a little bit of heritage pride. Even their website contains links to Newfoundland culture and tourism sites. Newfoundland vocabulary, accent and pronunciation are all present in the songs sung by GBS. If they omitted these linguistic features, GBS would not do justice to their intentions of promoting Newfoundland culture.

The essence of Newfoundland music is to have fun no matter what hard times you might be having. One of GBS's strengths is that they have successfully put a twist on traditional music that bridges the gap between generations. They have been able to intertwine music with a powerful and resonant contemporary charge with traditional Newfoundlandisms. The band members are aware of the power of good music as well as good lyrics and as one of the band members puts it, "We find it fun to juxtapose these morbid concepts and stuff, with the latest jigs, so people are actually whistling it the next day, and then they find out the real words, and they go `Oh my God!'" (Great Big Sea Website 1999).

Linguistic features form an important part of Newfoundland culture and by actively incorporating them in their lyrics, GBS promote the proud heritage that they come from.
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QUEBEC ENGLISH: THE COMMUNITY OF ANGLOPHONES AND ITS LANGUAGE

Naoko Tomioka

Introduction

A non-Quebec-born English speaker who comes to the province of Quebec will quickly realize that the English spoken in Quebec contains French words and expressions that are quite puzzling to those without knowledge of French. And its lexicon is not the only thing that makes Quebec English different from other dialects of English. The anglophone community in Quebec has been experiencing social changes that have had a direct impact on their language. Quebec is a place where language itself is a big political and social issue.

To study Quebec English, a definition of the Quebec English speaker is necessary. Different theorists use different definitions, but my study will focus on people born in Quebec who speak English as their first language. Those who were born and grew up elsewhere speaking English could use their knowledge of other varieties of English to judge the acceptability of certain items, and that would not show us what is acceptable in Quebec English. Tom McArthur’s study, *The English Language as Used in Quebec* (1988), is used here to show that, indeed, Quebec English is quite different from Standard Canadian English. The results of this study suggest to me two possible explanations as to how French words are borrowed into English. One hypothesis is that French words are introduced by Quebec francophones speaking English. They use some French words here and there and anglophones who are exposed to their speech become unable to distinguish French words from English words (Hypothesis 1). My second hypothesis is that anglophones in Quebec who speak both English and French daily, start to use French words in their English sentences (Hypothesis 2). McArthur’s survey does not give us the information that would allow us to choose one hypothesis over the other.

We also need to consider the social change that the Quebec anglophone community has gone through. The enactment of Bill 101 has raised the status of the French language by making it the only official language of Quebec. Those who would not otherwise have learnt French now need to demonstrate their proficiency in French in order to apply for a job, and once one learns a language, it can be used in different settings. For example, anglophones might use French at work, and then also, in school, at home, with neighbors, with friends, with a parent, with children or with a spouse. Those who are exposed to French in certain ways might be more willing to accept new loan words borrowed from French. In other words, bilingual anglophones
may use more French expressions in their English discourse than monolingual anglophones. The extent to which French is used in one's life, of course, affects both the level of willingness to use French words and the level of awareness that one is using a French word in English discourse (McArthur 1988). More research is needed to study exactly how the French language affects the language of Quebec anglophones.

McArthur's Survey

McArthur did a survey of special lexical items in Quebec English (McArthur 1988). These expressions were in the English newspapers in Quebec, and he, as a non-Quebec-born anglophone, was unfamiliar with them. His study shows that Quebec English (QE) is distinct from the Standard English in Canada in that it contains lexical items borrowed from French which are not accepted elsewhere. He, as a lexicographer, studied only the lexical items specific to QE, but, as he notes, a "full model of QE would ... contain phonetic, orthographic and grammatical, as well as lexical components." Although it is not a full description of QE, McArthur's study gives a good idea about the influence of French language on QE. Anglophones who use French in their daily communication are likely to put a French word in an English sentence, without realizing that their interlocutors need to have a knowledge of French in order to understand that sentence. One of the respondents of McArthur's study comments:

I remember using words like "permanence, Anglophone, Francophone, inscription, formula" with U.S. visitors to our school and simply by the blank looks on their faces, I could tell that I was not communicating with them.(70)

This shows that these French loan words have become part of the Quebec English lexicon and can no longer be distinguished by Quebeckers as foreign words.

McArthur's survey does not distinguish the responses of monolingual anglophones and bilingual anglophones, for most of the respondents were professionals working in Quebec and were assumed to know some French. A pattern of penetration from French into English through the communication of bilinguals (into the speech of monolingual anglophones) would suggest that as the number of bilinguals is increasing in Quebec, so is the rate of borrowings taking place. This view is contrary to my Hypothesis 1, (anglophones pick up French words from the English of francophones) Hypothesis 1 would suggest that the rate of borrowing would slow down as anglophones started to use French with their francophone interlocutors, since this would decrease the amount of anglophone exposure to the English spoken by francophones.

McArthur's study shows the influence of the French language upon Quebec English at a lexical level. During his stay in Quebec, McArthur, as a foreigner (a Scot), found quite a few expressions which he regarded as unacceptable, for they were French
expressions and not English to him. However, his impression of the anglophone community in Quebec was that it "does not ... appear at present to be much concerned about avoiding or correcting gallicisms, nor does there appear to be any conception of a social crime that might be called 'committing a galicism'" (McArthur 1988: 1). Though there are scholars who do express anxiety about the future of the anglophone community in Quebec (Caldwell 1998), the majority of people do not consider that the use of French words will result in Quebec English becoming considerably different from English spoken elsewhere. McArthur considers bilinguals to be the medium bringing more gallicisms into Quebec English vocabulary. This view is supported by Caldwell (1998) and Lieberson (1970): bilingualism is one major factor affecting the cultural and the linguistic assimilation of anglophones in Quebec. Thus, the need for a survey using French proficiency as a factor is evident and will be discussed later.

McArthur began to prepare his survey by picking from the Montreal Gazette, the major English newspaper in Quebec, lexical expressions which are not seen in World Standard English (WSE) or in Standard Canadian English. He found three elements formed this local vocabulary:
1) province-specific English expressions
2) straight insertions of French expressions into the flow of English
3) adaptations of French items into the flow of English in a typical English way

Of these, the third element was McArthur's "special interest in this survey," because this is the area "where the reality and vitality of QE can best be identified quite regardless of appreciative or deprecative attitude towards such language behaviour" (8). Although he categorizes English speakers in Quebec into five groups (anglophones who have minimal contact with French, anglophones who are acquainted with local French, francophones who use English, people whose mother tongue is neither English nor French, but speak both English and French, and bilingual people who use both French and English), he did not sort his respondents into these categories. The respondents of his survey are categorized as: Quebec anglophones (anglophones who were born in Quebec), non-Quebec anglophones, francophones, or others. In order to compare his study with the theories of other scholars, only the responses of the two groups of anglophones are noted below. McArthur himself assumed that, because his respondents were professionals in Quebec, they "know French well enough to get by" (30).

In the survey, the respondents (200 in total, 94 of whom were anglophones) were asked to categorize given lexical items into four categories. These categories are:

C0 internationally accepted expressions
C1 locally accepted expressions
C2 locally dubious expressions
C3 locally ambiguous and unacceptable expressions
Each response in C0 or C1 indicates an attitude of acceptance and each response in C2 or C3 shows a tendency towards rejection of the lexical item as part of QE vocabulary. The results of the survey show a great discrepancy between the judgment of Quebec anglophones and non-Quebec anglophones. For example, 57% of non-Quebec anglophones put "professor" (= teacher) under C2 or C3, while 65% of Quebec anglophones consider it acceptable (C0 or C1). In general, Quebec anglophones are more tolerant of French lexical items used in English sentences, and they also show doubt about their acceptability outside Quebec.

This survey shows that, indeed, QE contains French loan words which are not accepted elsewhere, and "Quebec anglophones veer detectably away from WSE towards French usage" (74). The inclusion of non-Quebec anglophones was useful in demonstrating the infectious nature of QE. As McArthur notes, "a period of time in Quebec, in contact with QE and with French in everyday situations, clouds an immigrating anglophone's perceptions of WSE and earlier attitudes to certain usage" (75). Though monolingual Quebec anglophones were not included in his survey, it seems likely that their speech contains these French loan words too.

**Bill 101**

The major social changes that anglophones in Quebec have been going through cannot be explained without mentioning Bill 101. In 1977, the Parti Québécois passed the Charter of the French language, called Bill 101, which recognized French as the only official language of Quebec. It "had the effect of making French the language of work." Since 1977, "everyone seeking a job or a promotion must speak French and only French is required unless the employer can prove that another language is necessary" (Heller 1985: 77). Heller gives examples of an interesting linguistic reversal that has been taking place in the workplace. In the past, if there was language contact at the workplace, it was between anglophone employers and francophone employees. "It was the francophone employees, naturally, who became bilingual" (76). Especially in Montreal, "the French spoke English but the English did not have to speak French". The fact that Bill 101 has been in effect for more than twenty years might make it appear that all the anglophones in Quebec now speak French and that French is the only language spoken in Quebec. This, of course, is not true. The reality is complex. While, in the past, English was clearly the dominant language, and English was the language used when one did not know the preferred language of his/her interlocutor, now, "language choice is potentially a political statement" (80). A wrong choice of language can cause insult or injury. In the workplace, generally, a knowledge of French is a requirement, and "anglophones in line for promotions are passed over if their knowledge of French (as measured by government tests) is inadequate" (84). Even those monolingual anglophones who are already in a high position feel left out when a meeting is conducted in French. In the public service, however, it is important for employees to know both English and French and to choose correctly which language to use in a given situation, since the
provider wants to be seen as having given services efficiently and courteously, and the client wants to be seen as a legitimate recipient of such services" (87). To some Quebeckers, interaction with a stranger is uncomfortable until they know which language the other party prefers. In order to be polite, some people still choose English when they consider that it is the preferred language of their interlocutor.

But if we look at the overall picture, the major effect of Bill 101 is that it raised the social status of the French language. Heller mentions that the effect has been taking place slowly, and people have been trying to adjust to the new system. Now it is becoming more and more important for an anglophone to learn French for occupational purposes and for smooth social interaction. To study this impact on the English in Quebec fully, research must be done that takes into account age, language used at work, language used for education and language used at home. The social change caused in 1978 suggests that the speech of anglophones who became adolescents after the enactment will contain more French words than those who were already in a secure position by that time. My hypothesis is that the number of French words accepted in English sentences will be higher as the subject's age goes down.

Education

Elsewhere in Canada, it is often noted that the decline of the study of English in the school curriculum has left Canadians without their own clearly defined language standard. Young Canadians are more easily influenced by the media and American English programming and journalism. In Quebec, anglophones are exposed, through a more personal means of communication than the media, to the French and English spoken by francophones.

Caldwell (1998) suggests that education with a clear definition of what it means to be an anglophone in Quebec is needed for linguistic and cultural maintenance of the anglophone culture in Quebec. He cites the introduction of Chambers Report (Quebec, Ministère de l'Education, 1992, qtd. in Caldwell 1998: 285): "The mission of English education is to see that students achieve a knowledge of their English language 'cultural heritage'". Anglophones in Quebec need to learn what Canadian English is and what it means to be an anglophone in Quebec, in order to develop a clear sense of identity as part of the anglophone community. Without this, anglophone communities are going to be absorbed into the majority francophone community of Quebec.

Caldwell suggests that education is a factor in determining how many French words one uses in English speech. Those who go or went to school where English grammar is taught extensively may be more aware of the use of French words in colloquial English than those who did not go through extensive English grammar studies. It is also likely that anglophones educated in French may be less aware of the French words used in English.
Occupation

It is possible that different kinds of work are associated more closely with English or French and, therefore, line of work may be an indicator of how well the worker knows French or how much the worker uses French on the job. If Hypothesis 1 is correct, then those who work in English with English-speaking francophones are more likely to accept new French loan words. On the other hand, if Hypothesis 2 is true, those who use French in the workplace are more likely to use French words when speaking English. In addition, those who work with non-Quebec residents in English are more likely to recognize French words than those who only work with anglophone Quebeckers. For the study of Quebec English then, it may be more important to distinguish different kinds of occupation, rather than the more typically studied variable--levels of social-economic status.

Choice of Residential Area and Migration

The area of residence affects the extent to which an anglophone uses French. An anglophone living in an English-speaking area in Montreal does not have the same everyday experience as one living in a predominantly francophone area of Quebec. The former would talk with his neighbors in English, do shopping in English and find English newspapers readily available, while the latter would more likely speak and read French every day. By living in an English area one reduces the need to use French in the community.

In his 1970 paper, Lieberson argues that Montreal has the "potential for the maintenance of both major ethnic and linguistic groups" (218). This prediction is based on his study of the ethnic and language distribution of metropolitan Montreal in 1961, which shows that anglophones and francophones were highly segregated from each other. He believes that spatial isolation is a "vital mechanism for linguistic maintenance" (Lieberson 1970: 220). An important finding was that monolingual anglophones tend to choose to live in an area where there are a large number of anglophones, rather than in an area where one needs to use French (230). Those people of British origin living in a concentrated area are likely to be monolingual anglophones and those of British origin living among French people tend to be bilinguals or francophones. An ethnic and linguistic group in concentration is more successful in maintaining its linguistic and cultural traditions than individuals living among members of other ethnic or linguistic groups. Lieberson does not consider bilingualism as a factor affecting the residential pattern in the future. He explains:

Although there is considerable bilingualism among both groups and therefore an "exposure to risk" that the acquired tongue may be passed on as the next generation's first language, the fact that bilinguals in each ethnic group tend to locate in areas where their monolingual compatriots are found tends to reduce this danger to the mother tongue. (245)
He also believes that anglophones who have learned French and are living in an English dominant area tend to forget their French and become monolingual again. This reflects the past reality, when anglophones living in Montreal did not need to learn French, for it was the francophones who learned and spoke English. This was not true for anglophones living outside Montreal. The anglophone communities were not always large enough to maintain all the daily communication in English; therefore, such anglophones needed to use French.

Since the enactment of Bill 101, numbers of anglophones have left Quebec. At times the rate of population loss seemed to indicate that anglophones as a community might not maintain themselves (Caldwell 1998). The rate of out-migration among anglophones has lowered recently, and most recent statistics show that the population is just large enough to maintain itself.

Lieberson's theory of language being safely maintained in concentrated areas was written before the enactment of Bill 101, and the situation is likely to have changed with the raised status of the French language and increased likelihood of anglophones learning French. Still, the effect of residential area upon the speech of the residents is worth studying.

As mentioned earlier, those living in English-speaking areas of Montreal and those living in predominantly French-speaking areas might exhibit different attitudes toward or awareness of new French loan words.

**Bilingualism**

McArthur considers bilingual anglophones and francophones to be the ones introducing French items into English. A corollary of this hypothesis, that borrowing of French words is via bilinguals (and from them into the speech of monolingual anglophones), is that bilinguals accept new lexical items that monolingual anglophones do not. The percentage of bilingual anglophones compared with monolingual anglophones is indeed increasing (Caldwell 1998), and so is the influence of the culture of Quebecois upon English Quebeckers. Caldwell points out an increase of intermarriage between anglophones and francophones. He considers intermarriage an indicator of social interaction. An anglophone married to a francophone would quite likely be exposed to the French language much more than an anglophone who had not inter-married, and given the rising status of French, French could well be the preferred language used with the children. Lieberson (1970) has a contrary view: even bilingual anglophones tend to live in proximity to other anglophones and, therefore, they are more likely to marry anglophones than francophones. A survey which employs the level of proficiency in the French language as a variable is needed to indicate which hypothesis is correct.
To summarize, if bilinguals are indeed using more French words than monolingual anglophones, the statistics will show that bilinguals are more accepting of the new lexical items borrowed from French. This would prove my Hypothesis 2. If Hypothesis 1 is true, the level of proficiency in the French language may be no indicator of how accepting one may be towards new French loan words.

Conclusion

A full study of the genesis of Quebec English needs to take into consideration the social and political change the community is going through. McArthur's study shows that Quebec English has its distinct vocabulary, which contains French words not accepted in other English-speaking areas. Regarding French loan words, the judgment of anglophones born in Quebec tends to resemble that of francophones. This led me to the two hypotheses of how French words are introduced into the Quebec English lexicon. For further study, the subjects need to be sorted in a way that indicates exactly which factors affect their willingness to accept these loan words. Bill 101 definitely had a political and social impact on the anglophone community and its effect could be seen in the language. Yet those who had already achieved their social status before 1978, when the law was passed, and those who have been educated and sought a job since the enactment of Bill 101 may have been affected differently. The language in which one was educated and the amount of language teaching one received could affect one's awareness and attitude towards the French borrowings. Occupation and language used in the workplace could affect the speech habits of individuals. Those who use French in the neighborhood and at home may be more accepting of French words in English than those who do not use French in a personal setting. The other possibility is that those who communicate with English-speaking francophones in personal settings may be more accepting of French loan words. A survey that takes all of these factors into consideration is needed for a thorough description of Quebec English and the historical change it is going through.
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BILINGUALISM AND THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE: A SURVEY

Anne-Marie Sulymko

Just how does French influence Canadian English? In part, this is what Tom McArthur tried to examine in his study of Quebec English (QE), *The English Language as Used in Quebec* (1989). McArthur established which French words were being used by anglophone Quebecers. Of course many languages are spoken in Canada, but French and English are the only two that are recognized as national languages. As a result of Canada's official bilingualism, it is not surprising that Canadian English (CE) and Canadian French (CF) influence each other. The purpose of my research is to determine to what extent CF has influenced CE in the largest Canadian urban centre: Toronto.

I conducted a survey to determine how French has influenced English as spoken in Toronto (TE); this survey tried to determine what French words have been used in TE. This survey was based on the study conducted by McArthur. Before starting this research I had a hypothesis: I expected to find the bulk of the respondents in my survey to be less tolerant of French words within their own vocabulary than the respondents of McArthur's survey. The basis for this assumption the fact that anglophones in Toronto are exposed to French less frequently than those who live in Quebec, and therefore one would expect their vocabulary to contain fewer French words.

First, what I will present is the TE survey itself: its structure, its general results, and the in-depth study of certain words. The structure of the TE survey will be discussed by reviewing its similarities to and differences from McArthur's survey. The general results will be presented and compared to McArthur's findings, and then selected terms will be examined more closely from the perspective of the respondents' knowledge of French. The next section of this paper will examine the various problems that occurred with the survey. The third section will analyse the findings of the TE survey by examining bilingualism in both Canada and Ontario, the effect of French immersion schools on TE, and the French/English ratio in Toronto and Quebec.

McArthur's survey was used as the basic structure for the TE survey. It is therefore important to understand how McArthur created his survey. Essentially, in McArthur's survey on QE respondents placed a group of French words into various categories indicating their level of acceptability in English usage. McArthur divided his survey into five parts. The first section was the description of the different categories (each included a few details and an example), which he labelled C0, C1, C2 and C3. The
second section of his survey was the listing of 25 terms (all of which were French words). Each term was accompanied by a definition, and an example of how a speaker of QE might use it in an English sentence. The third section asked for information about the respondents, such as their names, their mother tongue, and place of work. In the fourth section, the respondents were asked to sort each term into a category (C0-C3). The last section required the respondents to categorise the 25 terms according to their emotional responses (they approved, disapproved or were neutral) to the term in question. McArthur had 200 respondents to his survey.

Though the Toronto survey, which is the basis for this paper, uses a structure similar to that of McArthur's survey, there are some variations. The changes were made for two main reasons: to shorten the survey and to make the survey more appropriate for the Toronto area (a location outside Quebec). It was my belief that the length of McArthur's survey would overwhelm some respondents and cause them not to respond at all. Therefore, the first change that was made was to select some, not all, of the terms that McArthur used. I tried to use four items from each of McArthur's categories, two that matched his predictions regarding acceptability and two that did not. I favoured terms that I found particularly interesting. Another change in the survey was the shortening of the description of the various categories. It was my belief that the way that McArthur described his four categories was too lengthy and that the overabundance of detail could possibly lead to confusion. The condensing of the category descriptions allowed me to fit both the answer sheet and the descriptions of the various categories onto one page. I found this practical for two reasons: first, fewer pages made the survey seem less overwhelming, and, second, the respondents did not have to flip from one page to another to refer to the various categories.

Another difference between the TE and QE surveys is the presence of an extra category in the QE survey. In McArthur's survey, the first four categories that are presented refer to perceived levels of acceptability of French words in English usage. McArthur then asks respondents about their own "emotional response" to each term. The categories in the QE survey do not take into consideration that some of the respondents may not even be familiar with certain items. Since the respondents of the TE survey are living in a predominately anglophone environment, I knew some of the French terms presented in the survey might be alien to them. Therefore, in the TE survey, the section of the QE survey that asked respondents to rate each item in regards to their emotional response was eliminated. The TE survey focused solely on levels of acceptability, partly because I preferred to stay focused on one set of data.

There are two more changes that were made. The first is that there are a few items that were added to the questionnaire due to personal interest. The added words are expressions that I, as a francophone, have occasionally used as part of my English vocabulary: autoroute, close the lights, and vernissage. The last change to McArthur's survey was in the respondents' personal information page. First, the respondent's name was no longer requested. I found that this question was
unimportant and damaged the confidentiality of the survey. The second change was
the addition of the question "How long have you been in Toronto?" This question was
necessary for the TE survey because it determined whether a particular survey would
be included in the results or not (further explanation will be given for this below). The
last modification to the respondents' personal information page was in the distribution
of the age groups, with McArthur using four age groups and the TE survey using only
three. Though the TE survey has fewer groups, unlike the QE survey, it includes
people under 20 (in McArthur's survey, the youngest age group is from 20 to 29). A
copy of the TE survey is provided as an appendix to this paper.

There are also differences between the TE and the QE surveys in the method used to
conduct the surveys. The TE surveys were given out randomly and respondents were
allowed to complete the survey at their ease. It appears that McArthur's respondents
were monitored as they completed the survey, creating a more formal setting.
Because the TE surveys were handed out randomly, there was no filtering process as
there appears to have been in the QE survey (where there is an almost identical
number of francophone and anglophone respondents). Certain completed TE surveys
were rejected, while all QE results were compiled. There were two reasons why a TE
survey was discarded. The first reason was that the respondent had been in Toronto
for under two years. I found that to have an accurate picture of what TE was, the
respondents had to have a general feeling for TE and two years seemed like a fair
cutoff. The second type of survey that was not counted was one where a respondent
answered more than one answer to a question on the personal information page.
Some individual answers to questions on the word classification sheet were ignored as
well, either because a respondent did not classify the item at all or classified it in two
different categories or between two categories.

Though there are some differences between the two surveys, it is my belief that the
gist of the surveys is the same. Because the two surveys are fairly similar, the results
can be compared. The overall results of both surveys are interesting. Thirteen terms
were studied in both surveys. The respondents from the TE survey indicated that they
are more accepting of four of these terms than the respondents of the QE study.
These items are anglophone, library, professor, and remark. Among these four terms,
the words library and remark are very strongly favoured. This is proven by the fact
that the majority of the TE respondents placed these terms in the C0 category
(acceptable anywhere) as opposed to the QE respondents who placed these items in
the C3 category (ambiguous, unnecessary). The TE results indicate that the term
professor is more readily accepted by TE respondents than QE respondents: 93% of
TE respondents categorised professor in C0, while 34% of QE respondents placed
this term in C3. The term anglophone is also more readily accepted by TE
respondents, however, only slightly so. Most TE respondents place anglophone in the
C0 position (55.9%), while the QE respondents placed this term in C1 (84%). There
are five items that TE and QE respondents categorize the same way: delay,
depanneur, garage, perspective, and recuperate. There are also three words that QE
respondents were more tolerant of than the TE respondents: animator, formation, and subvention. However, QE respondents were only slightly more tolerant of these terms, with only one category difference for every term. According to this data, it appears that Torontonians are more accepting of many French words in their English vocabulary than Quebecers. Many words that anglophones from Quebec do not accept and would find ambiguous in an English sentence, Torontonians appear to accept in English speech without thinking twice about it.

This trend is further indicated by where most TE respondents categorized the majority of their answers. In contrast to the QE responses, the majority of Torontonians' responses were placed in C0 (40%), followed by C2 (17.1%), C3 (16.1%), C1 (14.9%) and C4 (10.1%). (Note that C4 represents terms that are unfamiliar and that this category does not exist for QE respondents.) The respondents from the QE survey placed most responses in C1 (29.2%), followed by C3 (27%), C0 (26.6%), and C2 (20.1%). As we can see in Table 1, Categorisation of Terms, the respondents from the TE survey tend to categorise more items in C0. The items that the TE respondents did not place in the C0 category are spread out fairly evenly throughout the other categories. A general analysis of the data collected suggests that Torontonians are, on the whole, more accepting of the presence of French words within their English vocabulary. Anglophones living within Quebec appear to be more guarded towards their use of French words in their English vocabulary.

Table 1: Categorization of Terms
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All respondents of the TE survey indicated their knowledge of French. The respondents did this by putting a check beside the description that they believed best matched their knowledge of French. The descriptions that they could choose from were: "I do not know any French"; "I only know a few words and sentences"; "I can speak a little French, but I have difficulty following a conversation"; and "I can easily follow a conversation in French". It is interesting to study this variable to observe how the answers of the respondents with respect to specific terms vary according to their knowledge of French. The terms *animator* and *subvention* will be examined. *Animator* was generally less accepted by the TE respondents than the QE respondents. Many QE respondents (35%) categorized the word in C1 while the majority of the TE respondents (32.7%) placed the term in C2. It is interesting to see how the responses change as the respondent's knowledge of French increases. An overwhelming majority of the respondents who could speak only a few French words and sentences (60%) placed *animator* in C2. In comparison, the majority of the respondents (36%) who could speak "a little" French placed the term in C3 (36%), with C0 a close second, counting for 27.2% of the responses. Many of the respondents who were fluent in French put *animator* in C0 (46.6%). It appears that the more fluent one is in French, the less one hesitates to use this term. *Subvention* is another term that is interesting to study, with many of the TE respondents (32.1%) unfamiliar with the term, thus placing it in C4. The respondents from the QE survey placed the term in C3. (Though they did not have an "unfamiliar" category to choose from, McArthur makes no surmise about what his respondents did when they did not understand a term.) Almost half of the TE respondents who spoke very little French (40%) were not familiar with *subvention*. The respondents who spoke a little French also did not know the term; 36.6% of these respondents categorised the term in C4 as well. There is a fairly significant change when it comes to the respondents who spoke French fluently; only 20% of these respondents were unfamiliar with the term, and C2 was the most popular response (33.3%). It is clear from the terms *animator* and *subvention* that as a Torontonian's knowledge of French increases, so does his or her willingness to accept a French word as English vocabulary.

There were a few problems associated with the TE survey. The first problem involved the survey itself. The survey was first tested on one subject to get some general feedback, for example, about the time commitment required. Some changes were made to the survey after this initial test—the category definitions were revised and shortened and the format of the survey was revised to allow the survey to fit onto fewer pages. Though the survey was condensed and simplified, some of the respondents still found it confusing. They thought that there were still too many papers and that the flipping of pages created some confusion. There was obviously some misunderstanding about the way to fill out the survey. Although I tried to make it clear that one was to check only one category per response, some respondents still checked more than one answer. One respondent also checked more than one level of French to indicate knowledge of the language. Although I had tried, once again, to be clear about only checking one choice, some further explanation was obviously
needed.

I was pleasantly surprised by the number of respondents. I distributed 50 surveys and 41 surveys were completed. I found this 82% response rate exceptional, especially considering the confusion that some respondents expressed. As shown by the TE survey, Torontonians seem to be more accepting of French words within their English vocabulary than anglophones from Quebec. Though Toronto (and Ontario in general) is mostly an anglophone area, Torontonians are familiar with certain French terms. The reason for this is the topic I will turn to next.

Although English is still the language of the majority, there has been a large increase in the number of individuals who are bilingual (Grenier 1990: 44). According to Statistics Canada, the rate of bilingualism in Ontario has grown, from 9.3% of the population in 1971, to 11.7% of the population in 1986 (Bourbeau 1989: 29). This increase in bilingualism has probably had a significant effect upon this study. Because more anglophones are speaking French, they have the ability to incorporate French words into their English vocabulary. And also the odds that they will be understood by other anglophones when they add a French word into their conversation is greater. An explanation of why Ontarians (and thus Torontonians) are becoming increasingly fluent in French is the increase in French immersion schools (Grenier 1990: 40). Grenier points out the Ontario has the highest enrolment in French immersion in Canada; in 1988 (the last available data in Grenier's paper) Ontario had 108,000 students enrolled in French immersion programs (Grenier 1990: 43). This is a drastic increase, as ten years earlier (in 1978) there were only 12,764 students enrolled. This is an 846% increase in enrolment. This increase indicates that Ontarians in general have increased their knowledge of French.

Although this explains why anglophones are familiar with French words, it does not explain why they are less reluctant to use them in English than anglophones in Quebec. To explain this, I propose the following analysis. As Table 2 below demonstrates, in Toronto French is a minority language and English is a strong majority language. In Toronto, over 70% of the population is anglophone and under 5% of the population is francophone (Bourbeau 1989: 21). However, Quebec anglophones are a minority and francophones are the majority (Bourbeau 1989: 21). Anglophones in Quebec may feel more pressure to preserve their language and may refuse to use certain French words. The opposite would be true for Torontonians, as part of an overwhelming majority, anglophones do not feel threatened by the francophone population.
Although my original hypothesis was that Torontonians would be less accepting than anglophones from Quebec in accepting French words as part of their vocabulary, it is obvious from this survey that this is not the case. My original reasoning was that Torontonians would not be as tolerant of French words because they would not be as familiar with them. Although there were some terms that seemed to be unfamiliar to the respondents of the TE survey, the majority of the terms were not only familiar to them, but also more readily accepted by them than by the QE respondents. There are two conclusions that can be drawn from this study. The first is that TE is more accepting than QE of the usage of French words within the English language. The second conclusion is drawn from the first: there is a definite difference between TE and QE. Thus, it would be interesting for a survey to be conducted across all of Ontario to see if the results found in Toronto are similar to those of the rest of the province.
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Appendix: Toronto English Survey

Read the following items and then assign them to their categories on the accompanying answer sheet.

1. **anglophone** - a person (group or institution, etc.) using the English language. She works in an **anglophone** school in Montreal.

2. **animator** - a (dynamic) organizer or (group) leader. He is one of the best **animators** we've ever had for this kind of course.

3. **autoroute** - highway. We had to drive on the **autoroute** for 5 hours to get to your cottage.

4. **close the lights** - turn off the lights. Remember to **close the lights** when you leave the room.

5. **delay** - a period of time; a time limit; a deadline. They gave him a **delay** of six weeks in which to find the money.

6. **depanneur** - a corner store. I'll get some bread at the **depanneur** on the way home.

7. **formation** - training (in a subject, skill, etc.). The proper **formation** of professional people is important in any society.

8. **garage** - a shelter for a motor vehicle. I parked your car in the **garage**.

9. **library** - a place where you can buy books; bookstore. There are several good **libraries** here where you can buy books like that.

10. **perspective** - an angle; a point of view. He looks at political events from a long term historical **perspective**.

11. **professor** - a teacher. He is a good **professor** of French at one of the local secondary schools.

12. **recuperate** - to get back; salvage; recover. The company has managed to **recuperate** large quantities of waste materials for re-use.

13. **remark** - to notice. Did you **remark** what she was wearing at the party last night?
14. **resume** - to summarize
   He spoke for two hours, then carefully **resumed** the main points.

15. **subvention** - a grant or subsidy
   We are hoping to get a generous government **subvention** in order to proceed with some serious research in this field.

16. **vernissage** - art gallery opening
   Are you going to the **vernissage** at Robertson's Gallery?

**Answer Sheets**

Age Group (please circle one)

under 20

20 to 39

40 +

Sex M ☐ F ☐

Mother Tongue____________________

Identify your knowledge of French:

☐ I do not know any French
☐ I only know a few words and sentences
☐ I can speak a little French, but I have difficulty following a conversation
☐ I can easily follow a conversation in French

Place of Birth____________________

How long have you been in Toronto?____________________

Occupation____________________

If you answered "student", please indicate at what level_________
Check (✓) the category that you consider each of the items in the questionnaire belong to. If you strongly feel that the item occupies a midpoint between categories, mark it accordingly. **Please refer to the explanation of each item on the accompanying page.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>C0</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. anglophone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. animator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. autoroute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. close the lights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. delay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. depanneur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. formation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. garage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. recuperate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. remark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. resume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. subvention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. vernissage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of Categories**

**Category 0-C0**

You feel free to use the item anywhere in the English-speaking world. Example: I'm certain there was a **telephone** on the **table**, but he **insists** that there wasn't.
Category 1-C1

You feel comfortable using the item in a French environment, yet you fell increasingly uncomfortable using the item as you get further and further away from the French environment.
Example: How many years of *scolarity* does she have?

Category 2-C2

The item as presented here occurs because of French influence, but replaces a perfectly satisfactory English expression. It is clear in the French context; however it causes confusion when it is used in the English context.
Example: He hopes to get a good *note* on the exam (=grade; result; mark)

Category 3-C3

Similar the C2, but different in that the item clashes with a standard English expression which *cannot* reasonably be replaced. Used in an English context, its use would cause serious misunderstanding.
Example: I was a little deceived (=disappointed) by what she exposed (=presented) at the *reunion* (=meeting) last night.

Category 4-C4

You are unfamiliar with the term.