

# Orthographic Variation and Linguistic Nationalism

by John M. Lipski

1. It is a generally acknowledged fact that the boundary between two nations is usually founded on no empirical basis other than political convention, but rather constitutes an arbitrarily drawn line bisecting a continuum of social behavior. Particularly in the case of linguistic usage, even between two countries reputedly using different languages, it is most often found that the transition from one country to the next is a smooth one, passing through various levels of bilingualism, bidialectalism, and hybrid border dialects. This state of affairs represents somewhat of a sociological paradox, for while speakers within a given country are generally aware that adjacent countries exhibit differing speech patterns, the elusive nature of dialect boundaries leads to the inevitable failure of attempts to clearly delineate the linguistic frontiers. It is even more of a paradox in view of the fact that, as with flags, modes of dress, and social customs, language may become an instrument of nationalism, serving to identify the origin of the speaker, and aiding him in maintaining his political and social independence from the rest of the world. The resolution of this paradox is one of the most significant problems facing modern dialectologists, and it is only comparatively recently that accurate and substantive insights into the nature of dialect differentiation have been brought forth. The fact remains, however, that for the linguist and the untrained speaker alike, the linguistic habits of contiguous dialects and languages continue to give the impression of constituting discrete and clearly delimited zones, however inaccurate this impression may be in reality. Thus, a speaker may choose to employ his language as a vehicle of nationalistic sentiments, to distinguish himself from residents of neighboring countries or regions. Since every speech community is embedded in a matrix of social and political interaction, linguistic nationalism may assume a variety of forms, depending upon the motivation for such feelings and the individual ramifications of the particular situation. Within the confines of a single nation, linguistic diversification may be

used to single out geographical origin, and to maintain and identify social class and caste boundaries.<sup>1</sup> Conscious use of a given set of forms as opposed to competing variants may take place either in a downward direction, as when an élite class strives to maintain its linguistic aloofness from the working class, or in an upward direction, as when a lower-class speech style is stubbornly retained as a gesture of defiance.

2. Linguistic variation as a nationalistic weapon is most frequently employed within the confines of a single nation or state, to sort out rival factions represented by the various languages or dialects. Nationalism arises in an individual when he feels threatened, either from above or from below, and feels he must take positive measures in order to preserve his accustomed life style. Linguistic nationalism results from the fear that one's own language or dialect, together with the social norms it represents, is in danger of being engulfed or replaced by a different set of variants. Since it is generally impossible to dissociate linguistic nationalism from more general nationalistic sentiments, any feelings of linguistic self-consciousness which manifest themselves across national boundaries presuppose the existence of an active cultural struggle, with the culture and language of one country threatening to dominate that of the other. For the language of one country to completely supplant a different language of another country is a major undertaking; consequently, few such cases occur. In those cases, however, where neighboring countries share dialects of the same language, there arises the possibility for more subtle influence and interaction involving sentiments related to linguistic self-awareness.

3. When two adjacent countries or regions share only marginally different varieties of the same language, the stage is set for demonstrations of nationalistic behavior involving language differences. The most salient points of linguistic divergence which are employed in such cases lie in the realm of phonology and lexical differentiation, and occasionally also encompass differences of syntax, accentuation, and melodic rhythm. The fact that a studied choice of pronunciation or vocabulary may be used to convey sociological or political overtones has been frequently noted and investigated. In addition, to differentiation involving the spoken

1. For the use of linguistic variation to delimit social classes, see, in particular, William Labov, 'The social motivation of a sound change', *Word* 19 (1963) 273-309; 'The study of language in its social context', *Studium Generale* 23 (1970) 30-87. Discussion of some of the linguistic differences to be found among the castes of India is found in D.N.S. Bhat, 'A new hypothesis on language change', *Indian Linguistics* 31 (1970) 1-13; also, Stephen Oren, 'Linguistic nationalism and sectarian advantage', *La Monda Lingvo-Problemo* 5 (1973) 1-17. For a recent discussion of the linguistic situation in some modern African nations see Alfred E. Opubor, 'Language and the communication of power', *La Monda Lingvo-Problemo* 4 (1972) 65-72.

language, however, there remains the area of variation in the *written* form of a language, which also embodies the possibility to serve as an identifying signal of emotional attitudes. While a great deal of effort has recently been directed toward the study of spoken language as an indicator of social awareness, the rôle of the written language in such cases has hardly been touched. This is significant in view of the crucial function which the written word performs in the modern world, and any comprehensive characterization of the embedding of language in a social context will ultimately have to incorporate data relating to the use of written language.

4. The English language as used in Canada has traditionally been a battleground between warring factions, and even today persists the controversy over whether the English spoken in Canada more nearly resembles that of Britain or the United States. By and large, it appears to most observers that Canadian English bears a striking resemblance to the 'Yankee' speech of the United States, a matter of some chagrin to Britishers and Canadians alike. The reasons for this resemblance are many, not the least of which is the fact that, while Canada and the United States have shared the same parent language for more than 200 years, much of Canada was originally settled by emigrants from the American colonies, which thereby gave the Americanization of Canadian English an early start. More significant in the long run, however, is the tremendous social and economic influence exercised by the United States over Canada, particularly in the past century. It is virtually impossible to exist in Canada without coming across evidence of American products, corporations, and even social customs. One aspect of this profound influence has been the influx of the American dialect into Canada, transmitted via books, records, periodicals, news reports, television and radio broadcasts, and other similar sources. It is hardly possible to find Canadian communities where this American influence has not penetrated, with the result that more and more Canadians are beginning to speak more and more like their neighbors to the south. At first glance this might not seem like a very serious problem, for there have never been many features of Canadian English which were not found in at least some areas of the United States.<sup>2</sup> In order to understand the impact of such linguistic tendencies on Canadian citizens, it is necessary to take into consideration the entire set of relation-

2. A noteworthy example, useful for spotting Americans in Canada, is the pronunciation of the last letter of the alphabet, which is *zed* in Canada and *zee* throughout the United States. Many Canadians feel that the interrogative *eh?*, found throughout the country, is of Canadian origin, although it is also found in parts of the United States and Great Britain. The non-Canadian origin of this form has been demonstrated by Walter S. Avis, 'So *eh?* is Canadian, eh?', *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 17 (1972) 89-104. Further examples of uniquely Canadian terms may be found throughout the book by Mark L. Orkin, *Speaking Canadian English* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1971).

ships between Canada and the United States. As noted above, the American economic and social influence in Canada is tremendous; it is impossible to speculate on the extent to which the United States may be said to 'dominate' Canada, but the fact remains that Canada has become increasingly Americanized; economically, politically, socially, and of course linguistically. Needless to say, this encroaching foreign influence has engendered feelings of resentment among many Canadians, sentiments which range from vague grumblings about 'foreign ownership' to hostile bursts of nationalism demanding to 'keep it Canadian'. Although the influence of American society makes itself felt in every walk of Canadian life, the most consistent anti-American sentiments are voiced by the upper middle and intellectual classes, who feel that not only their economic freedom but also their social individualism is being swallowed up by a foreign power. The working classes, while also participating in the general feelings of resentment, are more liable to compromise themselves if they join openly in the national outcry, since many of them are employed by Canadian subsidiaries of American corporations, and nearly all of them make use of commercially available well-known American consumer products, even in competition with locally-produced goods. Geographically, the anti-American feelings appear to be strongest in English-speaking eastern Canada (including Montréal), particularly in Ontario. In the Maritime provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, such tendencies are diminished, as they are in the prairie provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan. In Alberta, standing on the edge of the prairies, there is a fair amount of anti-American feelings, particularly in the major cities, Edmonton and Calgary, while in British Columbia, particularly Vancouver, anti-American sentiments are heightened by the presence of a large number of American draft evaders.

The upper classes of Canadian society, being the most literate and articulate, are in the best position to utilize their language as a messenger of nationalistic sentiments. The fact that he might be mistaken for an American is horrifying to many a Canadian, and great care is exercised to retain or cultivate those speech habits felt to be most distinctively 'Canadian'. At least one language school, in Vancouver, offers courses to the local citizens encouraging them to 'Canadianize your English'. It is when visiting the United States or speaking to Americans in Canada that many Canadians attain the full extent of their linguistic self-consciousness, being careful to make *been* sound like *bean* and not like *bin*, pronouncing the *t* of *often*, making *again* (and *against*) rhyme with *rain* and not with *then*, and so forth, even though in unguarded moments the 'American' variants may also slip through. At the present time, given the extreme variability and elusiveness of the situation, it is impossible to offer any truly meaningful statistical data, since this would entail a preliminary determination of individual attitudes on a variety of matters. Roughly

speaking, however, linguistic self-consciousness in Canada and principled elimination of expressions or pronunciations felt to be American is found least frequently among farmers and residents of small towns, followed by urban blue collar workers, with white collar workers, university personnel, and others of high education and social standing going the furthest toward defending the Canadian linguistic norm. Many speakers are not even aware of their variable behavior, since it has become a normal part of their lives, and many of these individuals become hostile and resentful when their linguistic heterogeneity is brought to their attention. Regardless of their personal attitudes, however, most Canadians are aware that their language is somehow different from the English of the United States; the critical factor, from a sociolinguistic point of view, is the degree of explicit knowledge of such differences, together with the motivation to allow one's own language to be consciously guided by this knowledge. To date, no study of the use of Canadian English (as opposed to American English, not French) as an instrument of nationalism has been undertaken; indeed, given the complex nature of the problem, any such study will have to be executed with the greatest caution, taking into account a great number of partially independent variables. This is not the place to add any further details to the study of the vagaries of spoken Canadian English; instead, a number of observations may be made as regards the *written* version of English in Canada.

5. Orthographically speaking, Canadian English lies between the norms of Britain and those of the United States. When Noah Webster effected his spelling reforms on American English, Canada, being still under British domination, was little inclined to follow the lead of the rebellious Yankees. As a result, the spelling of Canadian English retained a markedly British flavor, although the natural evolution of Canada sufficed in itself to eliminate certain British variants, such as *tyre*, *carburettor*, *gaol*, *cypher*, *kerb*, etc. Of far greater importance, however, has been the direct American influence on the spelling of Canadian English. This influence has been propagated along various channels: by Americans settling in Canada, by textbooks and other reading material printed in the United States, by Canadian scholars and journalists who have been educated in the United States, by the contributions of American news services to Canadian newspapers, and so on. The end result, as might be expected, is a hybrid spelling system, resembling both British and American usage, and at the same time differing from both. In a book called *Speaking Canadian English*, Mark Orkin noted:<sup>3</sup> 'Torn between British and American example, Canadian spelling does not follow a consistent pattern. On what one may call the 'official' level, British spelling is mandatory in Canada'. To make matters worse, since residents of Canada are exposed to two sets of variants

3. Orkin, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

almost from the time they learn to read, a great deal of confusion is often created, yielding individuals whose spelling is inconsistent, full of hypercorrection, and exhibiting multiple variants of a single word.

The existence of noticeable spelling variations between the United States and Canada has been seized by individuals on both sides of the border hoping to exploit yet another aspect of the Canadian language for political and social purposes. Since for many words both the British and the American spellings are 'acceptable' in the strict sense, the choice of one variant over the other permits the transference of more subtle nuances and connotations. More specifically, in view of the ever-present American influence, spellings à l'américaine are apt to arouse little attention, since they are becoming increasingly commonplace. On the other hand, use of the British variants, regarded as 'Canadian' as opposed to the American spellings, may indicate a desire to clearly refute any American influence, since such variants are never used in the United States.<sup>4</sup> It is true, however, that not all standard British orthographic variants are current in Canada, and among those that are, some are felt to be more obviously 'British/Canadian' than others. Moreover, these observations must be tempered by the presence of a positive mystique surrounding all things British in Canada, including the English language, which often leads to imitation through motives of social prestige, rather than nationalism.

The most salient orthographic variation to be found in Canadian English is the suffix which is spelled *-our* in Britain and *-or* in the United States, including such pairs as *favor-favour*, *neighbor-neighbour*, *flavor-flavour*, *color-colour*, *odor-odour*, *labor-labour*, etc. While no confirmatory statistical data are available yet, it is the impression of the present writer that it is this alternation which is most frequently used to exploit the Canadian/American dichotomy, as it is the most commonly associated 'Canadian' spelling. The uses to which such orthographic variants are put vary considerably, and it is surprising the extent to which public awareness dictates the use of a particular variant. Generally speaking, the forms in *-our* add a positive stamp of Canadian origin to an otherwise nondescript document or product. It is curious to note that, while various Canadian labor organizations employ the spelling *labor*, the federal and provincial governments, in keeping with the established tradition, all boast a department or ministry of *labour*. Organizations and individuals publishing documents discussing Canada's rôle in relation to the United States, or the search for a uniquely Canadian self-image, invariably employ the variants in *-our*, thus indicating an increased 'Canadian index' which comes into effect whenever this emotionally-charged issue is broached. On the

4. Except in certain stereotyped situations, such as the spelling of *glamour*, the use of *favour* on wedding invitations, and the fossilized forms *theatre* and occasionally, *centre*.

other hand, when discussing topics not relating to the 'Canadian identity' problem, many Canadians, especially journalists and politicians, appear to use the forms in *-or* with much higher frequency. Of course, there do exist many Canadians who conscientiously learned the British spellings in school, and who have used them consistently ever since, without overtones of nationalism. It may, however, be affirmed with a good deal of generality, that the 'Canadian index' of forms in *-our* rises proportionately to the nationalistic content of the material under consideration; this may at times be observed by sampling political campaign literature, letters sent to newspaper editors, articles published by Canadian journalists, and other sources of similar sentiment.

As a further offshoot of the employment of the British variants in *-our* to certify *bona fide* Canadian origin, this practice has been picked up by many Canadian manufacturing firms, who wish to let the general public know that their products are made by a genuine Canadian corporation (most such products bear in addition some explicit reference to this fact). This procedure is apt to backfire, however, since many Canadian subsidiaries of American companies have also adopted the use of British spelling (as well as *en face* French translations) in order to arouse a minimum of hostility in the prospective customer.

The use of the *-our* forms as a nationalistic marker leads to inevitable cases of hypercorrection and inconsistency among unskilled practitioners of this technique. The most common offense is inconsistency, particularly involving forms derived from words in *-our*; thus, the same label or document may contain both *colour* and *colorful*, *neighbour* and *neighborhood*, *flavour* and *flavoring*, *honour* and *honorable*, and so on. There are also examples of hypercorrection, resulting from the capricious British spelling norms; for instance, the form *vigourous* appears from time to time, and *tremour* has also been noted. The extent to which awareness of orthographic differences between Canadian and American English is equated with nationalistic sentiments is illustrated by a classroom situation reported to the present writer, in which a visiting professor, whose native language was not English, proceeded to write *neighbor* on the blackboard, only to be greeted by jeers from the students, who informed him that he had written the 'American' variant.

Another spelling variation enjoying some popularity as a nationalistic device is the alternation *er-re*, exemplified by such pairs as *theater-theatre*, *center-centre*, *fiber-fibre*, etc. Unlike the case of the words in *-our*, only the more commonly used words in *-re* are generally found in Canada, and the number of people who use this variation as a nationalistic device is probably quite small. As in the United States (where *theatre* is often found, and *centre* sometimes in proper names), the variants in *-re*, except for omnipresent *centre*, are felt by many people to be somewhat affected, and confined to governmental and university usage. Even in the latter

categories there is variation; for example, in the city of Edmonton, the periphery of the central business district is dotted with signs pointing to the downtown area, some reading *city centre* and others *city center*, in apparently random distribution. Nonetheless, there are some individuals who do use the spellings in *-re* to signify their exclusively Canadian origin, especially in the east, although the number of such persons appears to be steadily decreasing.

Among other British orthographic variants, few are current in Canada, and the ones that are to be found are generally used inconsistently and without regard for nationalistic feelings. One spelling which is popular, however, particularly in university and government circles, is *programme*, instead of the American *program*, particularly in eastern Canada, where the presence of French *programme* may aid in its retention. The use of the variant *programme* is not common in everyday life in most of western Canada, but where it does appear it lends a distinctively Canadian flavor. The overall usage of *programme* appears to be dying out, but it is significant, for example, that the calendar of the University of Alberta speaks only of the *honors program*, while the brochure of the Canadian Studies department offers admission to the *honours programme*. Other British spellings, such as the ending *-ise* for the American *-ize*, are used erratically in Canada, often with unconscious inconsistency. Although the American spelling is quite common, many Canadians use the ending *-ise*, even though the *z* may reappear in derived forms, common examples include *analyse* vs. *analyzability*, *realise* vs. *realization*, etc. The only British spelling which has permanently implanted itself in Canadian English is *cheque*, found to the complete exclusion of the American *check*. French reinforcement may be at work in *cheque*, also.

As noted previously, it is unfeasible at this time to offer significant statistical data concerning spelling variation in Canada, since collection of such data presupposes a detailed sociological survey inquiring into the individual motivations resulting in given spellings. The problem is further complicated by the presence of foreign citizens, Canadians who learned only the British variants in school, Canadians who identify positively with the British heritage, and Canadians educated in the United States, all of whose spelling choices would presumably be independent of sentiments of linguistic nationalism. The best that can be hoped for at the present is a rough overview of the social and geographic distribution of the variants in question. In this spirit, a number of informal surveys were conducted as part of the present investigation, which will ultimately have to be coupled with more specific individual information.

First, a search was made through the business listings (Yellow Pages) of the major Canadian telephone directories, for evidence of orthographic variation among the advertisements. The variant *color-colour* was chosen for study, and in each directory, all the entries were scrutinized under the

headings of printers, portrait photographers, and photo finishers, all of whose announcements use the word *color/colour* frequently. Portrait photographers represent a service which would be sought after by members of the general public, while photo finishers would deal with a more restricted clientele. Printers, in view of the range of services offered, represent an intermediate position.

The overall results are as follows. In Halifax, the variant *color* predominates, with only two examples of *colour* being found, among printers. In Montréal, usage is tied among printers; there is a preference of about 5 : 3 for *color* among photographers, while among finishers the preference is 6 : 1 for *color*. In Ottawa, the national capital, usage is tied among finishers, while *colour* is favored 6 : 1 among printers and 2 : 1 among photographers. The situation is similar in Toronto, where usage is about even among finishers, while *colour* predominates 2 : 1 among photographers and an impressive 18 : 1 among printers. In the prairie cities of Winnipeg and Regina, only the variant *color* is to be found. Turning to Alberta, in Calgary, the preference runs about 2-3 : 1 in favor of *color* in all categories, while in Edmonton this proportion rises to about 5 : 1. Finally, in Vancouver, *color* is preferred by a 2 : 1 margin.

These results must be tempered by the overall heightened British influence in eastern Canada, as well as by the lack of information regarding the origin and nationality of the individuals placing the advertisements. Moreover, in the category of photo finishers, the frequent usage of the trade name *Kodakcolor* acted to offset the usage of the variant *colour*, although *Kodakcolour* was found at times. Nonetheless, general regional tendencies do emerge from this survey.

Next, a survey was made of a number of university calendars, checking, in the introductory sections, the spellings of the words *honor/honour*, *program/programme*, and, in departments of psychology, also the variants *behavior/behaviour*. While on the one hand providing data relating to the intellectual community, university calendars are a less than ideal source of orthographic data, since they are usually the result of a scrapbook-like composition, with individual departments and frequently even individual instructors supplying separate sections. Thus, only the most general tendencies may be observed.

In Nova Scotia, Dalhousie U. consistently uses *programme*. In New Brunswick, the University of New Brunswick employs the variants *programme*, *honours*, and *behaviour*, while Mount Allison U., although following the same pattern, alternates with *program* in the introductory sections. In Québec, McGill, Loyola University of Montréal, and the former Sir George Williams U. (now Concordia U.) employ the British variants, although *behavior* was also found in the Loyola catalogue. In Ontario, *honours* and *behaviour* predominate, being found exclusively in the catalogues of Brock U., the University of Toronto, Queen's U. and

Waterloo Lutheran U., and alternating with the variants in *-or* in Carleton U., the University of Western Ontario, Laurentian U., and University of Guelph. *Programme* was to be found at all but three of the Ontario universities. In the prairie provinces, the catalogues of the universities of Manitoba and Saskatchewan exhibit *honour* and *behaviour*, while the latter uses the variant *program*. In Alberta, the American spellings are found in the bulletins of the University of Alberta (Edmonton), and the British variants in those of the University of Calgary. Finally, in British Columbia, the University of British Columbia (Vancouver) alternates *program* and *programme*, while keeping *honour* and *behaviour*. Simon Fraser U. (Burnaby/Vancouver) uses only the British variant *behaviour*, while all the British variants are to be found at the B.C. Institute of Technology (Vancouver).

Finally, a survey was made of letters to the editor found in major Canadian newspapers. Here, due to the highly sporadic occurrences of the variants in question, no numerical counts could be effected. Again, a detailed statistical analysis will have to await a comprehensive demographic, ethnographic and sociological survey of the areas and individuals involved, so that at the present moment no conclusive results may be reported. In general terms, it was found that the variants in *-our* were found with any regularity only in Ontario and occasionally in Vancouver, with only slight and probably statistically insignificant attestations found in the remaining provinces. Even in Toronto and Ottawa, the proportion of variants in *-our* was much lower than those found in the telephone directories and university calendars. However, among the material examined, no explicitly anti-American commentary was found, so that it was impossible to verify the observations reported earlier.

All in all, one may note the heightened use of certain British/Canadian orthographic variants in eastern Canada and in Vancouver, areas in which feelings of Canadian nationalism, as well as anti-American sentiments, currently run strong. While the lack of additional information precludes establishing the conclusiveness of this parallel, one hopes that future investigations utilizing a broader data base may at least profit from these initial findings.

6. That orthographic variation is used as an instrument of linguistic nationalism in Canada appears certain in many cases, although to what degree it is impossible to specify. The implications of this state of affairs for the overall study of language in its social setting should be obvious, in view of the preceding observations. It is necessary to bring the study of orthographic variation within the scope of sociolinguistics if situations like the one in modern Canada are to be accurately characterized. Moreover, such uses of the written and spoken language must be taken into account when contemplating any sort of language planning, for the success of any such venture depends upon the extent to which new

proposals fit into the established schemata of social interaction. The preceding remarks were offered merely as a stimulus for future research and observation of a highly interesting and unique form of linguistic behavior. It is therefore hoped that the observations embodied in this note may be incorporated into a more general theory of sociological semiotics.<sup>5</sup>

5. An earlier version of this paper was presented to the 14th annual Names Institute of the American Name Society, Madison, New Jersey, on May 3, 1975. Thanks are due to the participants of the Institute for their helpful comments and suggestions, particularly those of Professor Richard E. Wood.

## RESUMO

### Ortografia Variado kaj Lingva Naciismo

La limo inter du nacioj estas ofte arbitra linio, ankaŭ rilate al la lingvo. Politika divido ofte apartigas identajn aŭ tre similajn ĉelimajn dialektojn. Tamen la lingvo povas servi kiel simbolo de nacieco, kiel divido disde la najbaroj. Lingva memkonscio kaj naciismo povas montriĝi subtilaj, kiam la du najbaraj ŝtatoj uzas saman lingvon, aŭ tre similajn formojn de la sama lingvo.

La lingva simbolo de naciismo povas okazi en la parola lingvo. La elekto de iu prononco aŭ vorto por konsciaj naciismaj celoj estas ofte pristudita. Tamen ekzistas ankaŭ la variado en la *skriba* lingvo, kie la elekto de aparta formo ankaŭ povas montri memidentigon kaj emocian memkonscion. Kaj la skribita vorto estas ja tre grava en la nuntempa mondo.

Pri la angla lingvo en Kanado tradicie okazas disputoj, ne nur kontraste kun la franca, sed (en ĉi tiu studo) en ties pozicio inter la brita kaj usona angla. Je bedaŭro de multaj kanadanoj kaj britoj, oni ĝenerale notas, ke la kanada angla tre similas al la usona. Unue, granda parto de Kanado estis komence popoligita de elmigrantoj el la usonaj kolonioj. Sed pli grava estas la fortega socia, ekonomia kaj kultura influo de Usono en Kanado. La usona dialekto enpenetras Kanadon per la amasmedioj. Pli kaj pli da kanadanoj ekparolas kiel iliaj sudaj najbaroj. Unuavide tio eble ne ŝajnas grava problemo, ĉar ĉiu aspekto de la kanada angla estas trovebla ankaŭ ie en la usona angla. Tamen la politika efiko estas tre granda, ĉar multaj kanadanoj amare sentas la usonan 'regadon' de Kanado. La ĉefaj kontraŭantoj de usona influo estas la altmeza kaj intelekta klasoj, kiuj sentas fremdiĝon ne nur de sia ekonomio sed ankaŭ de sia socia individueco. La laboristaj klasoj, se ili protestas kontraŭ Usono, pli ofte kompromitas sin, ĉar ili ofte laboras ĉe usonaj firmoj kaj konsumas usonajn komercaĵojn, eĉ prefere al naciaj kanadaj produktaĵoj. Geografie, la kanada naciismo estas pli forta en Montrealo, Ontario, Alberto kaj Brita Kolumbio. Tie oni ofertas kursojn 'Kanadigu vian anglan'. Multaj kanadanoj, se ili parolas kun usonanoj, klopodas emfazi kanadajn (t.e. britajn) lingvajn formojn. Sed ili ofte reagas malámike, se oni atentigas pri tiu lingva variado. La plej interesa socilingvistika faktoro estas la konscia manipulado de la propra lingvo por politika nacieca celo. Daŭre mankas scienca esploro de ĉi tiu mal-facile difinebla kampo. Ĉi tie ni limigas nin al la *skriba* angla lingvo.

La kanada angla troviĝas inter la britaj kaj usonaj ortografiaj normoj. La fruaj kanadanoj en la tiama brita kolonio ne interesiĝis pri la tiama literuma reformo de la usonano Noah Webster. Tamen kelkaj britaj formoj jam frue malaperis, aŭ neniam estis uzitaj, en Kanado. Orkin rimarkigas, ke je 'oficiala' nivelo, la brita ortografio

estas deviga en Kanado. Tamen depost la infaneco la kanadanoj daŭre renkontas du normojn en legmaterialo. Kreiĝas granda konfuzo. Ĉe unuopuloj regas malkonsekvenceco kaj trokorektado. Ili uzas plurajn formojn de unusola vorto.

Ĉe multaj vortoj kaj la brita kaj la usona literumadoj estas 'akceptitaj'. Do la elekto de unu formo prefere al la alia povas servi kiel subtila nuanco. Pro la ĉiama usona influo, usona literumado estas ofte nerimarkita, dum elekto de brita, t.e. 'kanada' formo, povas indiki reziston al usona influo. Tamen ne ĉiuj britaj normoj ekzistas en Kanado, kaj inter la britaj, oni sentas kelkajn pli "britaj/kanadaj" ol aliajn. Krome, ofte oni imitas la britan modelon ne pro kanada naciismo, sed pro la socia moda prestiĝo de ĉio brita en Kanado.

La ĉefa variado rilatas al la substantiva finaĵo usona *-or*, brita/kanada *-our*. Tio estas la plej rekonata kanadismo. Kanadaj naciistoj kaj verkantoj pri la nacia rolo de Kanado senescepte uzas la formon en *-our*. Sed rilate al aliaj temoj oni ofte uzas *-or*.

Kompreneble, multaj kanadanoj lernis britan ortografion en la lernejo, kaj uzas ĝin ĉiam poste, sen koscia naciismo. Por emfazi la kanadan devenon de fabrikitaj komercaĵoj, fabrikejoj uzas la finaĵon *-our*. Sed kanadaj filialoj de usonaj firmaoj rapide ekimitis tiun uzon. La uzo de *-our* flanke de nespertuloj kompreneble kondukas al nekonsekvencaj rezultoj kaj al pseŭdobritaj formoj, nekonataj en Britujo.

En dua loko venas la finaĵo usona *-er*, brita *-re*. Tamen kun la escepto de *centre*, oni sentas la formojn en *-re* iom afektaj, kaj ili malkreskas. Same ŝajnas malaperi la uzo de *programme*. La uzo de verba finaĵo *-ise* anstataŭ *-ize* estas nekonsekvenca. La sola brita formo kiu centprocente establiĝis en Kanado estas *cheque*, tute anstataŭante la usonan *check*.

Traserĉo de la telefongvidilo unue atentis la vorton *colo(u)r*. Nur en la nacia ĉefurbo Otavo oni preferas la britan *colour*. Sur la centra ebenaĵo oni ekskluzive uzas la usonan *color*; aliloke pli ofte la usonan, malpli la kanadan.

En universitataj kalendaroj oni serĉis la literumadon de *hono(u)r*, *program(me)* kaj *behavio(u)r*. Tiuj kalendaroj ne respegulas ĝeneralan ortografian politikon, sed estas kompilitaj de unuopaj fakoj kaj eĉ opaj instruistoj. La britaj formoj iom pliofte troviĝas, sed estas intermiksado multloke. En leteroj al la redakcio de ĵurnaloj la kanadaj formoj okazis regule nur en Ontario kaj iom en Vancouver. Eĉ en Toronto kaj Otavo ili aperis multe malpli ol en la telefonlibroj kaj universitataj kalendaroj. Konklude oni notas la plioftan uzon de la britaj/kanadaj formoj en la orienta Kanado kaj Vancouver, zonoj de nun forta kanada naciismo kaj kontraŭusona sento. Ĝis nedifinebla grado la uzo de ortografia variado jes ŝajnas esti perilo de lingva naciismo en Kanado. Necesas daŭrigi la esploron en la kadro de la sociolingvistiko, kaj atenti ĝin en lingvoplanado.