

**A PRELIMINARY SURVEY
OF THE REGIONAL ENGLISH
OF SASKATCHEWAN
BASED ON A STUDY
OF SOME ARCHIVAL DOCUMENTS**

A Thesis

Submitted to the College of Graduate Studies and Research

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the

Department of English

University of Saskatchewan

by

Soheil Ahmed

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

June 1989

**The author claims copyright. Use shall not be made of the material contained herein
without proper acknowledgement, as indicated on the copyright page.**

602000616850

COPYRIGHT

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Postgraduate degree from the University of Saskatchewan, I agree that the Libraries of this University may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor or professors who supervised my thesis, or in their absence, by the Head of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my thesis work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain is prohibited without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of Saskatchewan in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis. Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of material in this thesis in whole or in part should be addressed to:

Head of the Department of English

University of Saskatchewan

Saskatoon, Saskatchewan S7N 0W0

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. D.J. Parkinson for his support and encouragement; it was originally upon his suggestion that I undertook this study.

Thanks are also in order for the staff of the Saskatchewan Archives who were always on hand for useful advice.

I may also mention that without the help of my wife Mehreen, I could not have sustained the long and arduous vigil. Thanks also to Tanzih, my daughter, whose droll antics helped to relieve the tedium of academic life.

ABSTRACT

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

**A PRELIMINARY SURVEY
OF THE REGIONAL ENGLISH
OF SASKATCHEWAN
BASED ON A STUDY
OF SOME ARCHIVAL DOCUMENTS**

Student: Soheil Ahmed Supervisor: Dr. D.J. Parkinson
M.A. Thesis Presented to the College of Graduate Studies and Research

June 1989

ABSTRACT

The purpose of my research is to compile a list of words and expressions from a study of the Pioneer Folklore Questionnaire. Based on these findings I intend to demonstrate that a regional variety of English may exist in this province whose affiliations extend to other regional varieties of North American English. To establish this point, I have tried to evaluate Canadian English itself within the context of North American English.

In hypothesising the existence of a regional variety of English in this province, I have applied the continuum model to the analysis of this problem. This model serves as the theoretical premise for my work. The first chapter considers the concept of the dialect continuum and other related issues such as heteronomy and autonomy, showing how these may apply to a specific variety.

The second chapter describes the archival documents on which this work is based. It also gives an account of the methodology used; the linguistic analysis and description of the findings that follow are intended to suggest what their dialectal significance might be.

The final chapter consists mainly of the findings incorporated into a Word List and an Appendix, respectively. This chapter has an introductory section which further describes the archival documents used, and provides information on the informants themselves. This introduction also describes the criterion of selection of the items in the Word List.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents

COPYRIGHT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
1.	1
1.1. Theoretical Assumptions	1
1.2. Canadian English	6
1.3. Regional Varieties of Canadian English	11
2.	19
2.1. The Source	19
2.2. The Methodology	21
2.3. The Findings	23
3.	37
3.1. Introduction	37
3.2. Word List	40
3.3. Appendix	53
4. BIBLIOGRAPHY	55

1.

1.1. Theoretical Assumptions

The problem of distinguishing dialect from language is fraught with difficulties. One of the most common approaches to it has been to suggest that language is a collection of mutually intelligible dialects.¹ This criterion of mutual intelligibility, however, has many drawbacks that become obvious when we take into account the Scandinavian languages (Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian) and German. In the former case, the three Scandinavian languages are considered to be separate languages, although they are mutually intelligible. On the other hand, High and Low German (which together comprise German) are far from being mutually intelligible. If we were thus to adopt the criterion of mutual intelligibility, it would mean that the three Scandinavian languages were less than languages while German more than a language.

The criterion of mutual intelligibility also brings into play other problems, such as the degree of comprehension: Swedes understand Norwegians, but they understand other Swedes much better. Then there is the more vexing problem of intelligibility in the reverse direction: it has been remarked that Danes understand Norwegians better than the former understand the latter. Factors that also enter into consideration are the listener's degree of exposure, his level of education, and his inclination to understand the other language.²

From what we have discussed so far two important points emerge: first, the criterion of mutual intelligibility can help us only so far in resolving the distinction between language and dialect; second, language is not a very specific linguistic concept, after all. The second point needs a bit of elaboration here. In the case of the three Scandinavian languages and German, we may note that extra-linguistic elements (historical, cultural, political and sociological) influence one's perception of what is a language and what is a dialect. Despite the mutual intelligibility of Danish, Norwegian and Swedish, they are considered to be different languages because they belong to different nation states circumscribed by specific political boundaries. Apparently, each nation in this case lays claim to a separate language according to its respective political and cultural aspirations without taking into account the mutual intelligibility of these languages. The situation is somewhat comparable to Canadians claiming to speak Canadian English rather

than American English, despite the well-known mutual intelligibility between these two. The lack of mutual intelligibility between High and Low German does not, however, cause them to be considered as two separate languages, owing to the fact that speakers of German -- whether High or Low -- consider themselves to belong to the same cultural tradition. As an approach, the criterion of mutual intelligibility, therefore, has its drawbacks.

Another approach is to consider dialects as "different forms of the same language".³ This approach implies that all of us speak at least one dialect, even if it is a standard one. It disposes of the traditional opposition between language and dialect by levelling the privileged status of standard languages -- or dialects -- such as Southern British(SB). The deficiency in this approach, however, lies in its inability to specify what is meant by the different forms of a language, because within one form there may be other forms; and within these sub-forms there may be yet other sub-forms *ad infinitum*, until one reaches the individual speaker.⁴ This approach suggests that a form of language is based on the similarities of speech within a group, which is simultaneously distinguished from others by differences of speech. The important question is: What is the number of features we are taking into account, and how far are we focusing on them in order to differentiate between the various groups? In defining a dialect we therefore decide on a number of features that we are going to take into account and ignore the others. For instance, we may decide to distinguish one group from another by the length of their vowels, creating thus a group consisting of long vowel users and another of short vowel users. The long vowel users may be further differentiated from other long vowel users by the manner they realise them in words; the short vowel users, likewise, may be distinguished from other short vowel users by their manner of realisation. Beyond that, we could distinguish each of these groups by their realisation of a particular vowel in different words. In this manner, we can distinguish between an infinite number of groups until we reach the ultimate component of a group, the individual -- whose speech is called the idiolect.

At some point however, we must decide to shift our focus from differences to similarities if we want to define a group; or, to put it another way, similarities within a group must become more prominent than differences. This indicates that we can define a form by shifting our focus from the exterior to the interior of the group. The essential point about this approach is that it allows us to understand that dialect is a matter of an abstraction which is based on a number of features chosen in an arbitrary manner.⁵

From the preceding we note that both the approaches have their drawbacks which allow us neither to define dialect successfully nor to distinguish it from language. In order to resolve the issue more satisfactorily we may try to forge an approach in which we adopt a more rigorous terminology and simultaneously reassess the terms *language* and *dialect* that at present appear to be loose and somewhat arbitrary. One suggested term is

variety, which is considered to be more exact than *language* because it allows us to talk about any form of language -- standard, non-standard, or specialised -- that we wish to consider as a separate entity for a specific purpose.⁶ For instance, if our purpose is to talk about specific linguistic categories in terms of their geographic location, we could talk about, say, 'Yorkshire English' or 'Leeds English' as varieties. In other words, here our primary purpose is to consider the geographical dimension -- as opposed to the social dimension -- of linguistic variation. But if we wanted to take into consideration only the social dimension of linguistic variation, we could talk about 'middle class Leeds English' as a variety. In this sense, the term *variety* is more versatile and neutral.

The question then is: How does the term *variety* allow us to resolve the problem of language and dialect? First of all, we may note that we generally employ the term *language* in an ameliorative sense, while dialect is employed pejoratively. We tend to think of dialects as debased forms of a language while we think of languages as the *actual* form of these dialects. In reality, however, this is not the case: there is nothing intrinsically linguistic about what we call a language and what we call a dialect. These are labels which are established as such by convention. The term *variety* is in this sense neutral, as it does not assume the superiority of language over dialect. It makes this distinction by considering a language as a standard variety and a dialect as a non-standard variety. We may recall the second approach which levels the distinction between language and dialect by suggesting that all of us speak at least one dialect, even if it is a standard one. Both approaches, therefore, are similar in treating the distinction between language and dialect as one dictated by convention rather than by any legitimate linguistic criterion.

Implicit in this discussion of the term *variety* is the idea that a language may undergo two extreme processes, standardisation and dialectalization. These processes are subject to forces that are essentially extra-linguistic. Four notable examples of standardisation are English, French, Italian, and German.⁷ The establishment of Standard English has resulted from a number of factors that are historical, political and economic. Without elaborating too much upon all these forces, it may be said that what has become Standard English grew out of the amalgamation of dialects in London in the late 14th and 15th centuries.⁸ As London gained in supremacy over the other regions as a centre of commerce and administration, its English simultaneously emerged as dominant over the other competing forms, which were subsequently relegated to the position of provincial dialects. Provincial merchants, politicians, and in time all those who aspired to social advancement began to emulate this variety with considerable diligence. In course of time, i.e. towards the end of the 18th century, this variety spread and became the accepted form; what we call today Standard English -- or SB -- would therefore appear to be nothing more than the variety spoken by the upper-classes of London. (That is not to suggest, however, that it is still the accepted form everywhere in the world; this is owing to the

emergence of other standard varieties of English elsewhere in the English speaking world).⁹ The standardisation of SB thus followed from the combined effect of extra-linguistic factors resulting in the gradual adoption of a variety spoken by a dominant social class from a particular geographical location or cultural centre.

Likewise, standard French refers to the French adopted by the Parisian upper-classes; thus, in this manner the French make a distinction between French and what they call the dialects of French, which are varieties not spoken by the Parisian upper-classes. In the case of Italian we may find that standard Italian pertains to the variety spoken by the upper-classes in Florence. The standard variety of German, or Hochdeutsch, is similarly considered to be the variety spoken in and around Hanover; and most Germans recognise this variety as the standard variety.

The standardisation of a variety therefore is not an intrinsically linguistic process but rather an extra-linguistic one influenced by several forces as, noted above. The opposite of standardisation is dialectalization. From the preceding examples we may note that non-standard varieties -- dialects -- arise not as a result of the debasement of languages, but rather as a consequence of a number of forces that are as much historical as economic and sociological; thus, among a number of competing varieties, only one emerges as a standard variety which we call a language, while the others are considered dialects. To the forces that make for such linguistic variation we may also add the factors of physical geography, political boundaries, immigration and territorial conquest.¹⁰

Now that we have dealt with the distinction between language and dialect, we may take up a discussion of the geographical dimension of linguistic variation, leaving aside the question of social dialects altogether. In doing so, we will refer back to the issue of mutual intelligibility. So far we have seen that mutual intelligibility is an unreliable means of distinguishing language and dialect. The criterion of mutual intelligibility becomes even more unacceptable when we take into consideration what is called the geographic dialect continuum, which refers to a series of geographically contiguous dialects.¹¹ Each member of the series is mutually intelligible with the adjacent member; mutual intelligibility in such a continuum, however, progressively diminishes as we move away from one geographic location to another, until it becomes virtually non-existent at the extremities of such a continuum. Given a series A-B-C-D-E . . . Z of mutually intelligible dialects (varieties), we may find that, for instance, A may be more mutually intelligible with B and C than with G or H, and that perhaps the mutual intelligibility between A and Z will be altogether non-existent. The question is: Whether these mutually unintelligible varieties at the extremities of a geographic dialect continuum different languages or dialects? If we were to adopt the criterion of mutual intelligibility these varieties at the extremities would have to be considered as languages; but that, as we see, is not the case.

This may be illustrated by the example of the dialect continuum extending from Northern France to Southern Italy. The speakers of neighbouring dialects on the continuum understand each other, yet this mutual intelligibility diminishes as we move along farther away, until it ceases altogether at the extremities. The 'boundary' between the French and the Italian language is considered to exist somewhere along this geographic dialect continuum. But, not surprisingly, speakers across this boundary still understand each other despite the fact that they belong to different *languages*.

As well as showing us that the criterion of mutual intelligibility is not wholly functional, this example also brings to light that the 'boundaries' between *languages* are not discrete. In other words, this example tells us that the traditional model of language in which we had distinct boundaries needs to be replaced with the continuum model, which allows us to deal with examples such as the one above.¹²

The continuum model also necessitates a revulsion of the terms language and dialect, which we have up to this point defined as standard and non-standard varieties. This distinction between a standard and a non-standard variety may also be seen in terms of relative orientation on the dialect continuum. A standard variety, or *language*, may be seen to subsume other non-standard varieties, or *dialects*; and as such, a standard variety is considered to be autonomous while a non-standard variety is considered heteronomous.¹³ A *dialect*, therefore, is heteronomous with respect to a *language*.

Autonomy and heteronomy, however, are not absolute; they are subject to change, so that what we may call a standard variety may at some other time may be considered a non-standard variety. From our point of view it is important to note that North American English demonstrates a double or shared autonomy with British English. Once North American English was heteronomous with respect to British English; but now American and Canadian English are considered by some as 'legitimate' varieties.¹⁴ I shall take up the issue of Canadian English in the next section.

Before quitting this section it is necessary to add a few more words about the continuum model. The genesis of the continuum model may be found in de Saussure's *Course in General Linguistics*: "It is impossible, even in our hypothetical examples, to set up boundaries between dialects. The same applies to related languages."¹⁵ He adds: "We would be unable to say where High German begins and Low German ends, and would find it just as hard to draw the dividing line between German and Dutch, or between French and Italian." Clearly, de Saussure's emphasis here is on the continuum nature of dialects. (In an earlier statement in the same section he rejects the "older notion" of dialects "bounded in all directions and covering distinct zones placed side by side on a map.")¹⁶ It is illuminating to note that although de Saussure does not himself use the term "continuum," he nevertheless points out that a distinct "zone of transition between two

languages" does not exist; an exact linguistic boundary is difficult to determine where gradually differentiated dialects cover the territory from one end to the other. Thus, de Saussure concludes that dialects are the "arbitrary sub-divisions of the total surface of language," and that the boundary between two languages is only a conventional one." Much later, Bloomfield takes up the idea of the continuum model in relation to his discussion of dialect geography¹⁷ and suggests that within a dialect area there are no real boundaries "but only gradual transitions."¹⁸

The departure of de Saussure and Bloomfield from the more traditional approaches of Wenker and Gilleron, in which isoglosses formed the discrete boundaries, is a crucial development. The notion that isoglosses cannot satisfactorily demarcate different zones has been even more rigorously examined by Uriel Weinreich who postulates the development of a structural dialectology.¹⁹ Weinreich compares the differentiation of two Yiddish dialects from the traditional point of view and from that of the structuralists. From the former point of view a simple isogloss can divide two zones A and B in which *shtul* means chair and easychair respectively. From the structuralist point of view this is not enough; it is now necessary to ask what chair means in zone B and easychair in zone A. This line of questioning may be extended until we have worked out the position of each term in their respective systems. Weinreich finds that traditional dialectology is deficient because it deals with "discrete" and "homogeneous" varieties at the expense of working out their structuralist implications individually and then comparing each system with the other. A structuralist dialectology would construct systems of a higher level, which Weinreich dubs "diasystems." In his words a "diasystem can be constructed by the linguistic analyst out of any two systems which have partial similarities.

1.2. Canadian English

In thinking that Canadian English(CE) one has to consider it simultaneously *vis a vis* British English and American English. This intricate relationship of CE with these two varieties has a historical basis; when the Loyalists migrated to Canada in 1783 in the wake of the American Revolutionary War they brought with them the English that had developed in the American colonies since the 1600s.²⁰ It may also be mentioned that most of the Loyalists came from the the states of New England, New York, and Pennsylvania, which now form the Northern speech area of the United States. Originally these Loyalists settled in the Maritimes, but gradually they began to spread inland into central Canada. Later still, settlers from the U.S. came in search of land, so that by 1813 about 80% of the population of Upper Canada was of American origin.

In the 1830s and the 1840s, settlers who came directly from the British Isles also contributed to the formation of Canadian English. Nevertheless, the foundation of CE had been laid by the Loyalists of the 1780s. Here it is important to mention that the com-

ing of the Loyalists to Canada marked the "second separation" of the English language on the North American continent; the first separation occurred with the advent of the English language into the American colonies in the 1600s, when as settlers from the British Isles came to North America on the Mayflower.²¹ The subsequent divergence of British English and what was later to become American English resulted from the physical separation of these pioneers from their homeland. This second separation brought about as a result of the advent of the Loyalists was analogous to the first, as it also involved a geographical separation leading to the formation of a further variety of North American English that we now call Canadian English.

Despite American and British influences, Canadian English has developed something of its own. Canadian English is thus composed of elements of both American and British English, and elements that it has developed independently, particularly in terms of vocabulary.²² However, we can see that Canadian English has mutual affiliations with American and British English, for which reason it has often been considered an offshoot of either American or British English.²³

Such an extreme position, one feels, results from confounding mutual affiliations with sameness. The underlying reason for this perhaps lies in adhering to the traditional model of language which holds that languages are bound by distinct boundaries. As we have seen in the previous section, such an assumption is untenable. This holds more particularly in the case of different varieties of the same language. The idea of a geographic dialect continuum that we discussed in the previous section seems nowhere more pertinent than in the case of Canadian English *vis a vis* American English; these, as we may note, are varieties not only of English but also varieties of North American English. To mistake one for the other seems easy since they are so inextricably linked.²⁴ Their mutual affiliations have been used as a rationale for not considering them separately. But when American English has been considered as an independent variety, Canadian English has not been considered so. If we try to reevaluate Canadian English *vis a vis* American English it may be shown that mutual affiliations can be an argument for separateness as well as for oneness. Clearly, the problem is one of accommodating separateness and oneness simultaneously -- something that the traditional approach does not do very well. The continuum model, however, can easily accommodate separateness and oneness in such a way as to suggest that they are the dual characteristics of two mutually affiliated varieties.

There is considerable advantage in adopting the continuum model, for it shows how Canadian English can remain mutually affiliated with American English without losing its distinctness, and it can also accommodate further varieties within Canadian English. We might say, therefore, that the problem facing us is twofold: that of demonstrating the mutual affiliations of Canadian and American English without compromising the identity

of the former; and that of accommodating further varieties within Canadian English. The second problem appears to derive from the first, since Canadian English itself is considered to be a mere extension of American English; further varieties within it seem either less important for consideration, or even altogether inconceivable.

In terms of the continuum model, no variety is ever a mere extension of another; every variety is in some manner independent of the adjacent members and yet connected to them. The situation of Canadian English in relation to American English may be analogous to the adjacent members of the major European dialect continua.²⁵ Consider for instance the dialect continuum that extends from Northern France to Southern Italy; the speakers of the various dialects along this continuum understand each other.²⁶ The 'boundary' between French and Italian is located somewhere along this continuum; dialects across this boundary are mutually intelligible so that the political boundary appears to be only an extra-linguistic element in the whole question. In regard to the close inter-relationship between Canadian and American English the very question has been raised by McDavid, who suggests that "it is necessary to judge to what extent the international political boundary is actually a linguistic boundary".²⁷

We might say that McDavid's analysis seems to anticipate the applicability of the continuum model to this particular problem. In fact, his analysis can also be linked to that of Avis, who points out that "Our present knowledge of Canadian English suggests that, by and large, Canada is an extension of the northern speech area of the United States".²⁸ This statement again suggests that Canadian English and American English form the continuum of North American English in which both varieties co-exist as inter-related varieties. Avis also conjectures that a detailed study of Canadian speech would perhaps reveal that a number of isoglosses run parallel to the political boundary, and though "too few, perhaps, to set Canada completely apart from the northern variety of American English (i.e., North American English), they may nevertheless be "enough to establish a speech area distinct from the principal area". Furthermore, the sum of these isoglosses, Avis says, would be equivalent to what is "distinctly Canadian" about the variety of North American English spoken in this country. Such a variety would share many features with the speech of English speakers elsewhere in Great Britain as well as with the non-northern speech areas of the U.S.²⁹

The implications of all these statements for the applicability of the continuum model to this linguistic situation seem obvious, even though they may not have been worked out altogether. To prove the point further, we may compare the situation here to the Scandinavian dialect continuum. Southern Sweden was a part of Denmark until 1658.³⁰ Until that time, those varieties spoken in Southern Sweden were considered to be varieties of Danish rather than of Swedish. When Southern Sweden was reincorporated into Sweden, those same varieties were considered to be varieties of Swedish. Similarly, before Nor-

way became an independent nation at the beginning of the 19th century, it was a part of Denmark; and consequently the varieties spoken there were considered to be varieties of Danish. But with the emergence of Norway as a nation, those varieties were considered to be varieties of Norwegian. We may note that in both cases the relative orientation of the respective varieties on the dialect continuum changed over time, so that what was once heteronomous with respect to Danish has now become heteronomous with respect to Swedish; and likewise, what was once heteronomous with respect to Danish has become heteronomous with respect to Norwegian. But in the final analysis no 'new' varieties have been created.

Likewise, if we were to move the political boundaries between the US and Canada this way or that, we would not be creating any 'new' varieties of either American or Canadian English; we would only be changing the relative orientation of varieties spoken in both countries with respect to the standard variety spoken in either country.³¹ The dialect continuum of North American English is therefore subject to extra-linguistic forces in a manner similar to that of the other dialect continua cited above.

We might say that these extra-linguistic factors also include the perception that Americans and the Canadians respectively have about themselves as independent nations. We may recall that American English was once heteronomous with respect to British English; American English was perceived to be an offshoot of British English, which was considered to have fledged a colonial version of itself. But with the emergence of the U.S. as an independent nation, this perception changed, and Americans felt that they spoke a variety of English which was different from British English. That is not to suggest, however, that the divergence between American English and British English is not to a considerable degree attributable to the geographical separation between England and her American colonies, and to the passage of time, during which British English changed considerably while American English followed its own course of development.³² These physical realities of time and space notwithstanding, notions of national identity have also influenced the emergence of American English as an independent variety. Although not a different language as Mencken professed, American English nevertheless forms a variety of English whose independence from British English is no longer in question.³³

A similar recognition of the independence of Canadian English from British English, however, has been late in coming. In fact, as has been often noted, Canadian English, when not considered an extension of British English, has been considered an extension of American English.³⁴ We may note that for obvious political and economic reasons America exerts a strong influence in the region, which is reflected in Canadian English and in the readiness among some scholars to assume that Canadian English is an off-shoot of American English. The classic blunder of mistaking North American English for American English is a matter of perception that stems from reasons that we relegate to

the domain of politics and culture. To prove this point further, we may also notice that while many insist that Canadian English is an off-shoot of American English, not many would for the same reasons insist that American English is an off-shoot of Canadian English. In other words, Canadian English is often considered to be heteronomous with respect to American English while American English is not considered to be so with respect to Canadian English.

In terms of heteronomy and autonomy Canadian English may be evidently perceived to be at that stage of development with respect to American English that the latter once was with respect to British English. But as we have discussed earlier, heteronomy and autonomy are relative and not absolute: their spatial orientation, so to say, is subject to extra-linguistic forces deriving from cultural and political factors; such being the case, there is very good reason for us to link the question of Canadian English to that of the national Canadian identity. For a considerable time now, Canadians have been aware of their distinctness from the Americans on the one hand, and the British on the other hand. The emergence of Canadian English as an independent variety is inextricably linked to this perception. Of course, one may try to dismiss the whole question of Canadian English as a matter of perception. But who can deny that perception is reality in such matters? That is not to suggest that there are no concrete evidences to support the distinctness of Canadian English; the production of the *DCEHP* has been based on the very notion that many characteristically Canadian words and expressions have not been acknowledged as such by existing lexicons of American English.³⁵

So far it has been my intention to apply the continuum model to the problem of Canadian English in order to establish its distinctness from both American and British English, and to show how Canadian English can remain mutually affiliated with both the latter varieties without losing its independence. The application of this model allows us to understand the problem of Canadian English better by placing it in a larger context, comparing it to similar linguistic situations elsewhere in the world, and showing us how the the questions of culture and politics appertain to the problem. And once we have established the independence of Canadian English by this means, it becomes easier to talk about further varieties within it, since the continuum model allows us to talk about any number of varieties. Thus, I may sum up this section by saying that just as Canadian English is a variety within North American English there are other regional varieties within it that deserve our attention; and that my ultimate purpose in the next section will be to discuss the regional English of Saskatchewan.

1.3. Regional Varieties of Canadian English

The starting point for the discussion of the regional varieties of Canadian English may be found in Scargill's statement: "The matter of uniformity of present-day Canadian English remains to be investigated too. It is unlikely that any significant and large varieties have developed -- although the speech of Victoria is not that of Toronto".³⁶ Clearly, Scargill's statement provides not only a starting point but also an assessment of the whole issue. We become aware of two extreme positions: first, that Canadian English is homogeneous, and second, that it is not.

This contradiction notwithstanding, it is perhaps possible to say that both positions are mutually compatible; if we adhere to the continuum model, then the regional varieties, however nascent, may be considered heteronomous with respect to General Canadian. In this manner, we can develop a composite picture of Canadian English in which both homogeneity and heterogeneity can co-exist. One might say that accommodating homogeneity with heterogeneity is another classic problem of Canadian English over which one may expect scholars in the field to be divided -- and there are good reasons for that.

This sense of dichotomy is summed up quite succinctly by Ian Pringle, who suggests that "If one wants to study Canadian English, however, one has no choice but to look not only at the strikingly odd, but also at the fully standard, and also everything in between: the proper field of study is the whole ecology of English in Canada".³⁷ Pringle then sums up his assessment by suggesting that Canadian English does not really exist, only because "it is still coming into existence"; or rather, as he says, "there are an undetermined number of Canadian Englishes -- perhaps thousands of them". Evidently, Pringle is referring to a linguistic situation here that is dynamic in a way for which the continuum model is an ideal interpretive tool,³⁸ for he mentions that these different varieties may be distinguished from each other "by the different accommodations and compromises they represent between what they started from and what they are becoming".

The distance in time between Scargill and Pringle is twenty-six years. Yet within this time investigation into the regional varieties of Canadian English has come only this far. Although some research has been carried out in this field, it is yet to produce a coherent statement about the many regional varieties of Canadian English. Admittedly, regional varieties in Canada have not been studied as extensively as they have been in the U.S.

Nevertheless, in her study *Our Own Voice*, McConnell points out the wide diversity of the regional varieties of Canadian English, stretching from Newfoundland to British

Columbia.³⁹ In this regard it is interesting to note that, according to McConnell, "The most common regional differences in Canadian English lie in vocabulary, and this is still the area in which the results of research are most valuable".⁴⁰ This statement can be taken to be true for the different regions of Canada, but more particularly so for Newfoundland.

In fact, we may say that in any discussion of the regional varieties of Canadian English, Newfoundland will always occupy a special position, for it is one of the most linguistically diversified areas of Canada. Its importance as a linguistic region distinct from the rest of Canada may be attested to by the publication of the *Dictionary of Newfoundland English (DNE)*.⁴¹ A brief look at Newfoundland English would be sufficient to convey the linguistic complexity of the region. For instance, the speech of Newfoundland is sub-divided into the dialects of North Shoreline, South Shoreline, Bay Roberts, and St. John's. These sub-dialects which together comprise Newfoundland English arose from the internal isolation of the different speech communities.⁴²

Although the population of Newfoundland derives from a wide range of the European countries -- such as France, the Basque provinces, Portugal, and Scandinavia -- it is the influence of the British Isles that has proven to be the most predominant. Newfoundland English abounds in many relics of the English language -- such as *angishore*, *bautom*, *bavin*, *dean*, *rote*, *seche*, and *yesses* -- which are attributable to the settlement history of the region.⁴³

This outline survey of Newfoundland English is by no means exhaustive -- and is perhaps a bit oversimplified. But neither is it my intention to dwell upon the subject at great length here. It is meant only to serve as a necessary preamble to the next stage, which is the discussion of the regional English of Saskatchewan. The distance from Newfoundland to the prairies is indeed great; and I am deliberately overlooking the many regional varieties in between in order to move towards my ultimate objective. It is necessary to make this compromise since it would not be expedient to spend more time on topics that may prove to be only of peripheral interest to my present study.

To begin with, the principal English-speaking stock in the prairie regions came from eastern Canada.⁴⁴ In fact, McConnell says that, "In one sense western Canada was a colony of central Canada".⁴⁵ She even goes far enough to suggest that, owing to the constant traffic of immigrants from the east, the prairie regions were deprived of the isolation that is a general precondition for dialectal differences: thus the "remarkable homogeneity of Canadian speech from Ontario west-ward".⁴⁶

These facts notwithstanding, McConnell devotes an entire section on the regional vocabulary of the prairie regions, in which she traces to Saskatchewan terms such as *grid*

*system, burgess, and clamper.*⁴⁷ There are also other terms such as *pothole, pothole easement, pothole meadow* and several others which McConnell attributes to the prairie regions in general. A more specialised vocabulary in the region has developed around the railroad; thus the occurrence of such terms as *railhead, end of steel town, and jumping-off place*. Evidently, a considerable number of terms occur as compounds, and it is significant to note that McConnell alludes to many more beginning with *prairie, plains, buffalo, portage, and Hudson's Bay*. From the point of view of my present study this is particularly significant, since a large number of my findings consist of compounds -- some in fact, with terms such as, *prairie* and *buffalo* -- which have been discussed at some length in the next chapter.

Similarly, in Allen's study of Canadian-American differences along the middle border, which is based partially on findings in Saskatchewan and Manitoba he cites a number examples which are also compounds.⁴⁸ Consider the following:

Canadian

hatching hen

corn rick

pig stable

American

setting hen

corn crib

hogpen, hoghouse,

pigpen, pigsty

Without putting too fine a point on it, it may be said that compounding plays a significant role in word formation, as becomes evident from the lexical items in the Word List; therefore, any statement about regional dialects in the area will have to take that into account.

It must be pointed out, however, that what we know about the regional English of Saskatchewan is characterised by paucity of evidence and tentativeness of interpretation. Only passing mention has been made here and there about the speech of Saskatchewan. For instance, Avis refers to *grid road, nuisance grounds* and *saskatoon berry* in reference to Canadianisms deriving from Saskatchewan.⁴⁹ It is also Avis who points out that "The word *bluff* means one thing to a native of Saskatchewan, quite another to a native of Ontario".⁵⁰ The word *bluff* which means a clump of trees has also been found by Allen to occur in Saskatchewan, thus lending credence to Avis's pioneering efforts in the field. In itself this corroboration does little more than demonstrate the occurrence of a lexical item in Saskatchewan; beyond that it does little to dispel our lack of knowledge about the regional English of Saskatchewan.

Needless to say that there is ample opportunity for research in this particular area. Such research will ultimately have to assume the nature of field work, but even before

that we should make use of available resources such as archival documents and other related materials in order to establish a body of information that can be tested in the field.

In this context, it is germane to ask ourselves what results we may expect to derive from this kind of research. It would be reasonable to say that we may expect to find many lexical items relating to agriculture, the weather, and topographical features of the land, as we may surmise from the information available to us in the Word List. Perhaps not a few of the terms will also refer to the legal arrangements appertaining to the distribution and settlement of land, which is an integral part of the history of this province.⁵¹ Further, it would be interesting to find out if such terms as we already know -- for instance, *pre-emption*, *grazing lease* and *concession*, to name but a few -- are still in use, since the era of settlement is long over. And if indeed they are in use, it would be necessary to find out how they are being used now. If we allow ourselves to speculate from what can be learned from the analysis of the findings in the next chapter, then perhaps we could expect to encounter some semantic shifts and generalisations of old pioneer terms occurring in this region. Hopefully, these speculations will lead to further questions and open up fresh avenues of inquiry; I consider the present study to be a pioneering effort that will draw attention to the rich possibilities of research in this area. I also hope that my work will make some contribution to the study of the regional English in Saskatchewan.

The evidence produced in the next chapter is based on concrete findings, which are subjected to established linguistic procedures. Finally, it must be said here that it is not my intention to suggest that this evidence proves that the speech of Saskatchewan will register a discrete break from that of the adjacent regions, for that would be contrary to my effort to apply the continuum model to this linguistic situation. My purpose has been to suggest that the speech of Saskatchewan is a regional variety situated more specifically on the dialect continuum of Canadian English and generally on the dialect continuum of North American English itself; and that, as such, its affiliations may stretch in many directions.

Notes: Chapter 1

¹ J.K. Chambers and Peter Trudgill, *Dialectology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 3-5.

² Chambers and Trudgill, 4.

³ K.M. Petyt, *The Study of Dialect: An Introduction to Dialectology* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview, 1980), 11.

⁴ Petyt, 11-12.

⁵ Petyt, 12.

⁶ Chambers and Trudgill, 5.

See also:

John M. Kirk *The Heteronomy of Scots With Standard English*, in *The Nuttis Schell: Essays on the Scots Language*, ed. Caroline Macafee and Iseabail Macleod, 166-181.

⁷ Lawrence M. Davis, *English Dialectology: An Introduction* (Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1983), 5-7.

⁸ A.C. Baugh *A History of the English Language*, ed. Thomas Cable, 3rd. edn. (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1978), 191-195.

⁹ Baugh, 315.

¹⁰ Davis, 3-5.

¹¹ Petyt, 14.

¹² Chambers and Trudgill, 10-12.

¹³ Chambers and Trudgill, 11-12.

¹⁴ Chambers and Trudgill, 12.

¹⁵ Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics*, ed. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, trans. Wade Baskin (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959), 201-205.

¹⁶ de Saussure, 201.

¹⁷ Leonard Bloomfield, *Language* (New York: Holt, 1933), 321-345.

¹⁸ Bloomfield, 341.

¹⁹ Uriel Weinreich, *Is A Structural Dialectology Possible?*, in *Readings in American Dialectology*, ed. Harold B. Allen and Gary N. Underwood, (New York: Appleton, 1971), 300-313.

²⁰ R.E. McConnell, *Our Own Voice* (Toronto: Gage, 1978), 8.

²¹ Albert H. Marckwardt, *American English*, ed. J.L. Dillard (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 11.

²² Walter S. Avis, *Problems in the Study of Canadian English*, in *Walter S. Avis: Essays and Articles*, ed. Thomas Vincent, George Parker, and Stephen Bonnycastle (Kingston, Ontario: The Royal Military College, 1978), 5.

²³ M.H. Scargill, *The Sources of Canadian English*, in *Canadian English: Origins and Structures*, ed. J.K. Chambers (Toronto: Methuen, 1975), 14.

²⁴ Walter S. Avis, *Preface, The Dictionary of Canadian English on Historical Principles* ed. Walter S. Avis *et al.*, (Toronto: Gage, 1967), xii.

²⁵ Chambers and Trudgill, 6-8.

²⁶ Petyt, 14.

²⁷ Raven I. McDavid Jr., *Midland and Canadian Words in Upstate New York*, in *Dialects in Culture: Essays in General Dialectology by Raven I. McDavid Jr.*, ed. William A. Kretschmer Jr. (Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1979), 232.

²⁸ Walter S. Avis, *Speech Differences along the Ontario-U.S. Border* in *Canadian English: Origins and Structures* ed. J.K. Chambers (Toronto: Methuen, 1975), 68.

²⁹ Here it must be pointed out that isoglosses and dialect continua are not always

compatible, since the former denotes discrete breaks and the latter a dynamic process in which one dialect merges gradually into another. On the contrary, in another sense isoglosses and dialect continua, as in this case, can be compatible. It is noted by Chambers and Trudgill that "in moving from a region one side of a bundle of isoglosses to another one would have the impression of a continuum, since at first one feature, then another, and then yet another would vary" (127).

See also:

Bloomfield, 325-328.

³⁰ Chambers and Trudgill, 11.

³¹ General American in the U.S. and General Canadian in Canada. For the latter see Avis's footnote to the following:

Walter S. Avis, *The Phonemic Segments of an Edmonton Idiolect*, in *Canadian English: Its Origins and Structure* (Toronto: Methuen 1975), ed. J.K. Chambers, 118.

³² Marckwardt, 11.

³³ H.L. Mencken, *The American Language: An Inquiry into the Development of English of the United States* (London: Kegan, 1936).

³⁴ Scargill, 14.

³⁵ *DCEHP*, xii.

See also:

C.J. Lovell, *A Sampling of Materials for a Dictionary of Canadian English Based on Historical Principles*, in *The Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 4(1958), 7-33.

³⁶ Scargill, 15.

³⁷ Ian Pringle, *The Concept of Dialect and the Study of Canadian English*, in *Dialect and Language Variation* ed. Harold B. Allen and Michael D. Linn (Florida: Academic Press, 1986), 234.

³⁸ Chambers and Trudgill, 127.

³⁹ McConnell, 141-218.

⁴⁰ McConnell, 144.

⁴¹ See also:

The Dictionary of Prince Edward Island English (Toronto: University Toronto Press, 1988) ed. T.K. Pratt.

⁴² McConell, 153-155.

⁴³ McConell, 150-151.

⁴⁴ Allen notes that "Both southern Manitoba and southern Saskatchewan have a population derived in large part from eastern Canada, but there is also a considerable segment, about twelve percent, from England and Scotland, and another segment, about ten percent, from non-English-speaking continental Europe(103)."

See: Harold B. Allen *Canadian-American Differences Along the Middle Border*, in *Canadian English: Origins and Structures* ed. J.K. Chambers (Toronto: Methuen, 1975) 102-108.

⁴⁵ McConnell, 176-190.

⁴⁶ McConnell, 199.

⁴⁷ McConnell, 202-204.

⁴⁸ Allen, 106.

⁴⁹ Avis, 5.

⁵⁰ Avis, 17.

⁵¹ Chester Martin, "*Dominion Lands*" *Policy* ed. Lewis H. Thomas (Toronto: McClelland, 1973), 157-174.

2.

2.1. The Source

The source in question consists of the Pioneer Folklore Questionnaire, hereafter referred to simply as the PFQ. This questionnaire is 7th in a series which was compiled in 1950-51 by the archives for the *Saskatchewan History Magazine*. Other questionnaires in this series deal with diverse aspects of pioneer life.¹ The PFQ deals more specifically with folklore, and generally with the other aspects of pioneer life surveyed by the other questionnaires. The Saskatchewan Archives has a total of 320 copies of the PFQ, which it sent out to people who settled in the province between 1880 and 1928.² Each copy of the PFQ consists of twelve pages of 8 x 14 sheets with a total of 46 questions printed on only one side of the paper.

The 46 questions in the PFQ are grouped into seven major categories: (I) Introduction; (II) Settlement; (III) Supporting Oneself after Settlement; (IV) Family or Group Gatherings in the Pioneer Community; (V) Life-cycle in the Pioneer community; (VI) Good and Bad luck; and (VII) Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases. The introduction elicits responses about the informant's provenance, occupation, and his language.³ It was mainly the other categories from which I derived my material. Each of these categories is divided into a number of topics which are then further sub-divided into a series of smaller questions. For instance, the second category deals with such topics as: The land and its features (questions 1-2); The climate (questions 3-7); Celestial bodies (questions 8-10); Supernatural beings (question 11); Human beings (question 12); and Animals (question 13). Likewise, the other six sections (questions 14 through 46) are also arranged in this manner. The bulk of the material which appears in my Word List has been collected from a careful reading of all these questions. The material for the Appendix comes mainly from two sections in the PFQ: (II) Settlement (question 4) and (VII) Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases (question 46).

It was necessary to put the collected material into a Word List and an Appendix for presenting them in their order of importance. My principal concern here has been to collect lexical items in the form of individual words, compounds -- and also idiomatic phrases -- for their potential dialectal value. However, I found that not all the material can be arranged in this manner because they are not easily amenable to such categorisation.

In the process of reading through the PFQ I encountered a good number of proverbial comparisons that appeared to have some dialectal significance, and yet did not seem to merit inclusion in the main Word List; in fact, I felt that their inclusion in the Word List would disrupt the arrangement of the more important lexical items that I wanted to highlight. Since it was my intention to collect material however peripheral it may seem, I felt it necessary to err on the side of inclusion, and consequently created an Appendix in order to include them in this study.⁴

As a source, the PFQ falls neither entirely within the printed or the unprinted category. This is owing to the fact that although its compilers prepared it with a particular aim in mind (that of collecting material for the study of folklore) the informants generated their responses without any particular editorial aim or structure in mind. As a result, the PFQ consists of much that may appear to be impromptu, often providing material that goes beyond the intended purpose of the questionnaire as the informants expand upon their experiences in a manner not unlike that of a personal memoir. It is this aspect of the PFQ that makes it useful for my purpose, which is to collect samples of speech that may have dialectal significance. In its present form, it may be considered a manuscript source, since it has not been hitherto edited into the form of a printed text; however, that is not to suggest that in the present study I am going to render it into a printed text, as such. What I mean to suggest, however, is that in the process of the present work it will undergo some editorial processes that may subsequently bring it more into the realm of the printed source than it is at present.

The validity of the PFQ as a source for linguistic data lies in the fact that as a manuscript source it lies closer to the spoken language of the informants than the conventional printed source.⁵ The informants provide us with verbal accounts of their pioneer experiences with scant regard for the conventions of the written language, because the PFQ was designed expressly for the purpose of eliciting responses about folklore and not language. If we try to place the problem in a wider context, it would seem that since the manuscript source is less subject to the conventions of the written language, it lies closer to the oral language; and thus, in the transition from manuscript to print much that is idiosyncratic in the speech of the author (using the word in its broadest sense) is often lost.⁶ In that sense, the PFQ provides us with a source that is as representative of the speech of the informants as a transitional source of this nature can be.

Historical lexicography however, is much dependent on the printed source; and thus, it will be found that the *OED* makes it a practice to incorporate dated entries from printed sources only. Similarly, in editing the *DCEHP*, Avis follows the example of the *OED* -- as well as those of the *DAE* and the *DARE* -- in adhering to rigorous "historical principles in that every term entered is supported by dated evidences from printed sources".⁷ Following this procedure no doubt imposes restrictions, which, as Avis notes,

“precludes the entering of terms for which there is only oral evidence and of others for which the printed evidence is fragmentary or otherwise inadequate”. As a consequence, Avis points out that many interesting items await a “fuller substantiation in print”.

Although historical lexicography is dependent on the printed source, dialectology is not. Thus, it will be seen that Joseph Wright’s *EDD* was compiled from oral sources, and that it was compiled with the help of specially designed questionnaires. In fact, we might note that not even all dictionaries are totally dependent on the printed source. For instance, in the *DNE* only 42% of the sources are printed; the remaining non-printed sources, among other things, also consist of manuscripts and questionnaires -- some specifically designed to elicit lexical items for the dictionary. The *DNE* also uses the work of former glossarists of local words who, it notes, “were almost exclusively collectors from oral sources”.⁸ However, the *DNE* does not attribute to them either more or less authority over the other non-printed sources “simply because they achieved print”. Not only does this show us the usefulness of the non-printed source, but it also blurs the distinction between the printed and the non-printed. The limit to which we can push our sole dependence on the printed source can be understood very well if we take into account Burchfield’s introduction to the *SOED* wherein he mentions that “A great many words and senses can be traced to their first appearance in print. We have studiously endeavoured to trace all such ‘first uses’”.⁹ However, he notes that the “earliest examples printed here for some words and senses must necessarily represent the *first appearance* of such words in the printed sources read for the *Supplement*”. (The italics are mine).

From the preceding it would appear that the non-printed source -- whether it is a questionnaire, or a manuscript, or simply an archival source -- can be a valid source for this kind of work, which is primarily concerned with the collection of potentially dialectal expressions. In assessing the validity of the PFQ as a source, we may also take into account the fact that questionnaires were the primary tools of research since the inception of dialectology and have continued to be so in its subsequent periods of development.¹⁰ The fact that the PFQ was not designed for linguistic research does not detract from its validity as a source, since the empirical evidences derived from it have potentially dialectal significance.

2.2. The Methodology

The methodology that I have used here consists of reading through each of the 320 copies of the PFQ, and noting down the significant information on 4x6 index cards. In doing so, I have tried to follow the principle of recording words and expressions that appear to deviate from the norms of Standard English.¹¹ It may be noted that following this procedure also involves adherence to some of the cardinal principles adopted by the *OED* for selecting words and expressions.¹² More particularly, I have adopted from the

OED the practice of placing words within their respective contexts, without which their significance may not be clear; and thus the entries are presented in the form of dated quotations. The principle of selecting words has also been governed by the idea that many quotidian words may have a significance not readily apparent.¹³

In order to ascertain the validity of my findings I have cross-checked them with the following reference sources: the *OED*, the *SOED*, the *DAE*, the *DARE*, and the *DCEHP*. These reference sources have provided the basis for isolating or identifying what may be of potential dialectal significance. (Also useful for my purposes has been Joseph Wright's *EDD*, which helped to elucidate such terms as *milt* and *lambsquarters*). For this purpose, the *DCEHP* has been of particular use, since it allowed me to find out if the word already existed in the Canadian lexicon. Altogether these dictionaries were also useful in checking out variants, of which a few occur. These are as follows:

<i>homestead shack</i>	<i>claim shack (DAE)</i>
<i>hay lease</i>	<i>hay privilege (DCEHP)</i>
<i>sodded-up</i>	<i>sodded (DAE, DCEHP)</i>
<i>slough grass</i>	<i>slough hay (DCEHP)</i>
<i>squaw beans</i>	<i>squaw berries (DCEHP)</i>
<i>wolf onion</i>	<i>wild onion (DCEHP)</i>

To place my methodology within a larger context it may be necessary to compare it to that of Orton and Kurath. The methodologies adopted by them essentially involve the collection of dialect expressions through the use of specially prepared questionnaires. Also it may be noted that their methodologies, especially that of Kurath, consist of statistical operations that test the distribution of dialectal terms over geographical regions. The data so obtained has been used to derive isoglosses, which define dialect boundaries. Fundamentally, the aim both for Orton and Kurath has been the compilation of dialect atlases through the application of this methodology. Needless to say, this empirical methodology is much dependent on actual field work.

The methodology that I have adopted here shares its empirical principle with the preceding; however, as mentioned earlier, my work does not involve field-work. Rather, I am using a previously compiled archival source -- which itself happens to be a questionnaire -- for collecting my evidences. (It may be necessary to reiterate here that this questionnaire, unlike the ones used by Orton and Kurath was not compiled for a linguistic survey). My intention here has been to compile a list of terms; however, I am not concerned with testing their distribution at this stage. Clearly, my emphasis is on collecting

evidences rather than on subjecting them to the rigorous statistical procedures adopted by Kurath and Orton. It would not serve my purpose to try test the distribution of terms from the study of such a limited number of archival documents. (Moreover, the testing of these terms may itself require the preparation of questionnaires).

Beyond this, the methodology extends to the evaluation of my findings. This fairly extended evaluation is intended to describe the findings as fully as possible, and embraces a wide variety of the lexical items in the glossary. It also involves the application of a number of procedures that may be seen in the subsequent section.

2.3. The Findings

In discussing the findings I will primarily take into consideration the three aspects of word formation: grammatical, morphological and semantic. These forces, it will be seen, do not always operate in isolation; often we find examples in which they operate simultaneously. This applies to both single words and compound words. However, it may be noted that the majority of the examples occur in the form of compounds; and therefore it would seem reasonable to try to trace these three processes of word formation primarily in compounding, although individual words will also be given due consideration.

Without expanding too elaborately upon the theories concerning compounding we may note that a compound is a combination of two words which function as a single unit. More importantly, the new word so formed has a meaning distinct from its constituents; or, to put it in a slightly more technical manner, a compound has both a different grammatical and semantic value from its constituents.¹⁴

The classification of compounds may be done on the basis of form, grammatical function within the sentence, and the inter-relationship of the constituents. Of this, the last is the most technically specialised and does not entirely serve my purposes here; and therefore I will concentrate mainly on the first two. That is not to say, however, that I will not be required to apply the third procedure.

First, let us consider the different forms of the compounds. It will be readily seen that most of the compounds are of the open form, although the other two types of compounds -- the hyphenated and the solid -- also occur. The following examples from the glossary serve to illustrate the point:

Hyphenated

cribbed-up

Solid

backset

Open

bunk house

<i>pot-holes</i>	<i>broadaxing</i>	<i>slough hay</i>
<i>prairie-wise</i>	<i>fireguard</i>	<i>treaty woman</i>

If we now apply the second procedure of classifying compounds on the basis of grammatical category or function, we may find that the most common variety is that of the noun compounds; but other varieties such as verb compounds and adjective compounds may also be found though never in such abundance as in the first category. The following are some examples:

Noun	Adjective	Verb
<i>chip fire</i>	<i>prairie-wise</i>	<i>backset</i>
<i>bush trail</i>	<i>cribbed-up</i>	<i>sodded-up</i>
<i>hay meadows</i>		

From the above list, we may perceive that there is a predominance of hyphenated and solid forms in the adjective and verb compounds, whereas the noun compounds are mostly of the open form. The two compounds *cribbed-up* and *sodded-up*, however, present some special problems. I have classified them as adjective and verb compound respectively on the basis of their contexts. But such a classification cannot be maintained rigidly since they appear to have the potential for functional shift as well. This may be demonstrated by applying them in specific sentences, thus:

I cribbed-up the well.(adjective compound to verb compound)

The shack was sodded-up.(verb compound to adjective compound)

Another interesting feature of these compounds is their composition: both contain a past participle in the first term--making them morphologically similar--and the preposition *up* in the second term.

The third procedure for classifying compounds on the basis of the inter-relationship of the constituents allows us to look at the first term as the modifier and the second term as the head. This, however, does not apply uniformly; exceptions to this principle are the closely bound up verbal idioms that we have just considered. But the rule seems to apply generally to all the other classes of compounds, and more particularly to the noun compounds.

In considering the interrelationship of the constituents of a compound, we may also note that certain compounds have a fixed first term and a variable second term; and, conversely, in certain compounds, the second term remains constant while the first varies. In both cases the inter-relationship of the two terms remains essentially as described, so that the first term modifies the second. We may consider the following, in which the first term remains constant while the second term varies:

bush country/trail

prairie tea/wool/fire

threshing gang/outfit

In a movement in the opposite direction however, we have compounds where it is the second term that remains constant while the first term varies:

walking plough

disc plough

breaker plough

Here we notice that the constituent *plough* combines with other constituents to give rise to various compounds.

In a considerable number of the noun compounds -- especially those that we have considered so far -- the constituents themselves also are nouns on most occasions: *bush country* (noun₁+noun₂). We may notice, however, that not all noun compounds are composed thus. Consider, for instance, *threshing gang*, *breaker plough*, *broadaxing*, and *weather breeder*, which have other constituents, although the compound as a single unit still functions as a noun. If we reconsider some of our examples in terms of their constituents, we may find them as follows:

broadaxing (adjective + verbal noun)

breaker plough (agental noun in *-er* + noun)

threshing outfit (verbal noun + noun)

threshing gang (verbal noun + noun)

walking plough (verbal noun + noun)

<i>weather breeder</i>	(noun + agental noun in <i>-er</i>)
<i>fireguard</i>	(noun + deverbal noun)

The nature of these compounds is such that they show morphological changes within their constituents, particularly in the first term. Thus in *break + er* *plough*, (*thresh + ing*) *gang*, (*thresh + ing*) *outfit*, and (*walk + ing*) *plough* we find different suffixes. (Notice that in the case of *threshing outfit*, the second term is itself an institutionalised compound). In *weather breeder*, however, the morphological change occurs in the second term.

What is noteworthy here is that in some cases, such as *broadaxing*, morphological change, which incidentally occurs again in the second term, is predictive of further productivity. Thus, from *broadaxing* we may predict *broadax* (through back formation), or *broadaxed* (by further suffixation). As a compound, *broadaxing* serves as verbal noun, or what we call a gerund. It may be formed through a morphological change that occurs from the addition of the suffix *-ing* to the base form of *broadax* which itself is a noun compound.

Likewise, *fireguard*, which incidentally shows no morphological changes in either the first or the second term, also has the same potential for productivity as the previous example. This noun compound may be turned into a verbal noun by simply adding the suffix *-ing* to the base form. It may be noted that the base form *fireguard* also shows a functional shift. Both the *DCEHP* and the *DAE* cite *fireguard* as a verb. Similarly, the *DAE* also provides an example of *fire-guarded*, clearly showing a change into past participle by the addition of the suffix *-ed*, in a manner not unlike our predicted form *fireguarding*.

The citations from the dictionary provide a valid basis for such predictions, which demonstrate the potential of the language to form new words. Such productivity is not an uncommon feature of dialects, involving the inventiveness of the individual speaker. Based on these assumptions one may reasonably predict a back formation, such as *sod-bust* from *sod-buster*.

Dictionary citations notwithstanding, the productivity of the language may also be determined from concrete examples from the glossary itself. For instance, note the formations *witching* and *witched* which obtain from *witch rod*, through shortening and the appropriate morphological changes indicated by their suffixes. But in these examples we notice a further development not hitherto encountered. Here we arrive at the generation of single words from a compound. Since a compound functions as a single word itself and is therefore a lexicalization in its own right, it becomes even more productive when it generates derivatives that are in turn lexicalizations. Thus, we may write as follows:

witch rod --> witching --> witched

To make this point clear we may try to distinguish between such single word derivatives of a compound and those which are themselves compounds. Take, for instance, *sun dogs*, which seems to generate *moondogs* and *moon pups* by analogy. Although these derivatives themselves are lexicalizations by virtue of being compounds, they are different from the derivatives of *witch rod*, which are single words.

The productivity of compounds does not depend solely on their ability to produce lexicalized derivatives but also on their potential for semantic ramifications. In this glossary we have examples of compounds which perform in a particularly idiomatic manner. It may be enlightening to know that these compounds resemble what has called the *Bahuvrihi* compound. The function of such a compound is to characterise an entity either literally or figuratively; consider, for instance, the compound *highbrow*, which, as Quirk points out, is based "on the facetious claim that people of intellectual and cultivated tastes are likely to have a lofty expanse of forehead".¹⁵ It is a characteristic of the *Bahuvrihi* compound that neither term refers to the entity so named, but together the whole refers to it in a manner that Quirk calls a lateral semantic movement. Although the idiomatic compounds in this Word List share some of these semantic properties of the *Bahuvrihi* compound, they differ from it in one important characteristic in that at least one of the terms refers to the entity so named. Some of the following may be considered as examples:

dust devils

sun dogs

moon dogs

moon pups

witch rod

In the above examples we may notice that while one of the constituents refers to the entity directly (*dust*, *sun*, *moon*, *rod*), the other one does not; and in fact it is this remaining constituent (*devils*, *dogs*, *pups*, *witch*) which does not correspond to the referent, and imparts the figurative quality to the whole compound. We may notice that with *sun dogs* and its analogical derivatives *moon dogs* and *moon pups* we have another level of complexity added to a process that is also semantic; thus, while corresponding formally to *sun dogs*, the derivatives *moon dogs* and *moon pups* are also examples of idiomatic compounds in their own right. These compounds are idiosyncratic, and impart distinctiveness to a lexicon.

These idiomatic compounds, as we note, resemble the *Bahuvrihi* compound only partially. There are, however, examples such as *returned empties*, which corresponds to the *Bahuvrihi* more exactly. It is a highly idiosyncratic compound, which refers to clouds that do not bring any rain: *If the returning clouds bring no further precipitation they are usually termed "returned empties"*. In this compound neither term refers to the referent. It is a figurative expression displaying all the characteristics of inventiveness associated with dialectal varieties as the informant applies it to an entirely new situation. Semantically it seems to be an extension of the familiar expression referring to deposit bottles. A closely related compound *dry rains* displays semantic properties similar to the above example.

A more problematic example which deserves treatment here is the compound *cowlick*, because it is difficult to recover its true meaning from the context: *A cowlick in hair meant business dealings in more than one country (Or was it a double cowlick?)*. From this reference, it is not possible to disambiguate the term *cowlick*, since we cannot ascertain whether it is the word or the thing which has the signification. But if the word were to have the signification, then the compound would form an example of the *Bahuvrihi*, since neither constituent would have any reference to the business.

From the preceding we discover three important characteristics of compounding: first, compounds are themselves lexicalizations; second, they are productive; and third, they are idiosyncratic. These three characteristics, we may note, link them very closely to individual lexical items which are themselves formed on similar principles. Like a compound, a word is a lexicalization of a concept; when a function or activity becomes sufficiently familiar to us as to render the fuller description too clumsy, lexicalization follows. Also, lexicalization follows from the inherent productivity of language; thus, by analogy we can form *mullacracy*--as *Time* called the reign of the Islamic clergy in certain countries--from the preceding examples of *democracy*, *autocracy*, or *plutocracy*. Whereas grammatical units such as sentences, clauses, and phrases are to a considerable degree bound by rules, word formation is not.¹⁶ Word formation also shares with compounding the characteristic of idiosyncrasy. The analogy between a compound and a word is further illustrated by the fact that within a sentential, clausal, or phrasal context a compound behaves as a word or a word-equivalent.

Taking these three characteristics into account, it may now be possible for us to trace them in word formation. At the same time, we may also apply, wherever appropriate, to such an analysis the criteria of semantic, morphological, and functional changes that we hitherto also applied to compounds. To begin with, we may take the following examples:

chinked

freighted

teamed

Superficially, these formations occur through morphological changes in their base forms such that

chink + ed --> chinked

freight + ed --> freighted

team + ed --> teamed

At the same time, we may notice that such formations are also lexicalizations of particular activities. These lexicalizations follow from the fact that their sentential equivalents become too unwieldy for repetitive use; or that familiarization renders the sentential equivalent redundant. To elucidate these lexicalizations further, we may submit them to an explication of their sentential equivalents:

I closed the chinks in the house. --> I chinked the house.

*I took home the freight of provisions. --> I freighted home
the provisions.*

I drove the team into town. --> I teamed into town.

This method of analysis allows us to understand the underlying principles of lexicalization on the one hand, and on the other us to also predict possible formations to a certain degree. However, owing to the idiosyncratic nature of word formation that we alluded to above not all formations will take place in this manner. Nonetheless, some predictions may still be made on the basis of concrete evidences that we have at hand.

To illustrate the point, we may consider the deverbal noun *breaking* in relation to what appears to be its phrasal equivalent *breaking sod*. Their interrelationship is such that the former becomes a lexicalization of the latter. In a single entry we have two examples of *breaking* as a deverbal noun: *In 1906 Mr. Beckner squatted and did a little breaking. In 1907 it was found that his house was on one quarter section and his breaking on another.* In another example this deverbal noun seems to be replaced by its phrasal equivalent as the informant tells us that, *In the spring of 1892...my husband was out breaking sod....* Compare the previous example of *breaking* to the latter example of *breaking sod*. The phrasal equivalent *breaking* seems to take the place of *breaking sod* in the first example, the resulting lexicalization being a shortening. At the same time, we may also notice that the phrasal equivalent of *breaking sod* has an idiomatic value.

We may compare *breaking sod* to the phrase *pitching sheaves*, which also appears to be equally idiomatic. However, *pitching sheaves* does not appear to have a lexical equivalent as the former example does. Nevertheless, we may be able to predict its lexicalization in either one of the following ways:

I was pitching sheaves. --> **I was pitching./ *I was sheaving.*

In the first case we have lexicalization by shortening-- analogous to the previous example-- and in the second case one by the formation of an entirely new deverbal noun. Although at present there do not appear to be any such examples, we may note that the *DCEHP* provides such closely linked examples as the compound *stook pitcher* and the deverbal noun *stooking*. Both these examples are themselves lexicalizations, and as such lend credence to our predictions. (Compare the lexicalizations of *forker* and *stacker* as noted by Orton in his questionnaires).¹⁷ The first is a compound with an agential noun in the second term, and the second a deverbal noun. An analysis of these two examples may provide an insight into their respective lexicalizations:

I pitch stooks. --> *I am a stook pitcher.*

I am making stooks. --> *I am stooking.*

If we now compare these lexicalizations to our previous predictions *pitching* and *sheaving* we may note that they are very similar in terms of their generation; and considering the close proximity of the terms *pitching sheaves*, *stook pitcher* and *stooking* in meaning and idiomatic value it is not entirely inconceivable that they may be generatively interlinked. Such hypothetical reasoning may be a valid methodological approach to the analysis of the findings.

Other lexicalizations in the glossary seem to follow different routes. Consider, for instance, the well-established idiomatic formation *norther*, referring to the north wind: *The usual feature of the Cypress Hills weather is the way it can change from mild to a real norther in winter time.* This is an agential noun formed by morphological change in the base form *north* (*north* + *-er*). It is closely allied to the formation *northerly* which is also formed from the same base form by the appropriate suffixation. (In this the *OED* also makes references to the analogous forms *easterly* and *westerly* in this context).

Another interesting example is the deverbal noun *batching*, which appears to be a lexicalization that may be explicated as follows:

I was living as a bachelor --> *I was batching.*

Apart from the lexicalization we may find two other noteworthy features here: the form, and the variant orthography. First, the form suggests the addition of the suffix *-ing* to a base form *batch*, obtained by the shortening of *bachelor*. Second, the orthography of the word has a distinct element of folk etymology. It appears to have been formed by a mistaken notion of the standard orthography of the word *bachelor*; such errors often result in the substitution of a less familiar word by another more familiar to the speaker. In this case the substituted word seems to be the more familiar verb *batch*, which appears to lend itself naturally to the formation of the verbal noun *batching*. For proof we may examine the evidence in the *DARE*, which cites *batchelder* as a non-standard form of *bachelor*; and although it cites *batch* and the participle *batching* it does not offer any example of *batching* as such. The *DARE* also cites the compound *batched up* and the phrase *to batch it* which further corroborate our description above of the lexicalization of *batching*. We may note that the participle *batching* can also generate the verb *batch* through back-formation.

From what we have discussed so far about all these findings -- both compounds and individual words -- it would appear that their chief characteristic is productivity, which gives rise to new lexical items; and simultaneously enables us to predict newer formations from existing ones. Our method of analysing words in terms of their sentential equivalents reveals the underlying processes of their generation, which we call lexicalization. This has been particularly helpful in understanding the formation of such verbs as *chinked*, *freighted*, and *teamed*. These formations are lexicalized out of their respective sentential equivalents.

Lexicalization is also accompanied by some morphological changes, as well; thus, we may find that the verbs referred to above have *-ed* suffixes as an integral part of their composition, enabling them to change from one class function(noun) to another(verb). These suffixes draw our attention to their innovative application as verbs by their respective users. Apart from the *-ed* suffix, we also have the *-ing* suffix that has given rise to the formation of a number of verbal nouns such as *broadaxing*, *batching*, and *witching*. Likewise, we find that the agential suffix *-er* also plays a significant role in the generation of such a word as *norther*. In the hypothetical formations **pitching* and **sheaving*, we may find that it is suffixation which allows their lexicalization. Morphological changes occur in compounds as well; but compounds do not change their class function as words do. But in the case of compounds, these morphological changes occur within the constituents, giving rise to a complex interrelationship between them which modifies the entire compound. It would be unnecessary to repeat the analysis of the constituents here again; but we may note that the different suffixes(*-er*, *-ed*, *-ing*) discussed in relation to the formation of words also occur in compounds such as *weather breeder*, *cribbed-up*, and *walking plough*.

The formation of compounds attests to the productivity of the language since they are themselves lexicalizations and arise out of the speaker's necessity to render a larger description more wieldy, which we notice also in the case of individual words. Also, in the case of idiomatic compounds we have noticed that they add a semantic dimension to the productivity of the language. This idiomatic movement of the language is even more perceptible in such lexical items as *traded work*. Another example is *run strong to beef*, which implies a hearty appetite for beef. The three word compound *million dollar rain* is a colourful reference to a much desired rain, apparently in the dry season.

The verbal inventiveness of such idiomatic expressions is even more prolific in the case of the proverbial comparisons and other folk linguistic items, which I have relegated to the Appendix.¹⁸ Take for instance the expression *not brain enough to take meat to a bear and bring the dish back*. In its expressiveness and wit it displays the typical characteristics of folk speech, and can perhaps be matched only by *Raining pitch forks and shovels [and] Sawlogs for handles*. A noticeable characteristic of the proverbial comparisons in this section is variation. Proverbial comparisons of such common conditions as cold, heat, and dryness abound; these expressions are often variations on older models that have been handed down by tradition.

Such lexical items as *stone keel* appear to be enigmatic. The pertinent question then is: What is the dialectal significance of these findings? First, the significance of these findings may be considered potentially dialectal. This may be gauged from their productivity which leads to the formation of new words and compounds. The dialectal potential of these findings may not be sufficiently regional to distinguish the speech of Saskatchewan from that of, say, Ontario. Though they may not be entirely regional in character, that does not detract from their validity as findings, much less from the probability of their indicating the existence a variety. It is always possible to assert that there may be an infinite number of varieties distinct from each other. The regional question notwithstanding, these findings therefore comprise a variety of some significance, which may be apparent from their level of idiomatic specialisation and also from the underlying processes of their generation.

Second, it may be necessary to repeat that compounding, which we have discussed at some length up to this point, is one of the most common forms of word-formation that allow newer elements to enter the language.¹⁹ Their dialectal significance cannot be over-emphasized since we find that in a number of well known surveys such as those by Kurath and Orton show that compounds form a significant part of the speech of the local communities.²⁰ In his study of American English, Marckwardt notes that "American English in particular has demonstrated a fondness for compound formations, one which not only goes back to its earliest beginnings but which frequently seems to have the earmarks of an indigenous style".²¹

Marckwardt then goes on to discuss the formation of compounds in terms of the different domains of their generation, embracing a wide variety of sources that are listed under the general rubric of physical conditions which includes the nomenclature of the flora and fauna, farming and features of the land encountered by the pioneers.²² In this study, it will be found, are also many compounds relating to both flora (*cactus berries*, *senneca root*, *wolf onion*) and physical features of the land (*alkaline flat*, *bush country*, *hay meadows*). Likewise, Marckwardt also mentions the development of "institutions and practices peculiar" to the U.S. that have given rise to a number of compounds; we may compare the situation here to the legal arrangements pertaining to the land that have given rise to such compounds as *grazing lease*, *hay lease*, and *road allowance* recorded in my Word List.²³ Farming implements, too, often occur in the form of compounds, such as *disc ploughs*, *mould boards*, and *walking ploughs*.

I have now made an assessment of my findings in terms of their potential dialectal importance. It is important to ask how these findings can be of further use, since one's task of assessing the regionalization of speech in Saskatchewan does not end, but rather begins with their presentation here. This study may raise further questions and provide possible directions for future studies in this area. In particular, these findings may provide the basis for the compilation of questionnaires (in the manner of Kurath and Orton) that will not only test their distribution but also elicit more items that are not already available to us at present; and in regard to items already available to us -- such as *stone keel* -- it may lead to a resolution of their enigmatic status.

Notes: Chapter 2

¹ The Pioneer Questionnaires, topicwise are as follows:

No. 1 Pioneer Diet

No 2 General (mainly biographical)

No. 3 Pioneer Schools

No. 4 Pioneer Churches

No. 5 Pioneer Recreation and Social Life

No. 6 Pioneer Farming Experiences

No. 7 Pioneer Folklore

No. 8 Pioneer Health

No. 9 Pioneer Housing

No. 10 Local Government

² The significance of the year 1880 lies in the fact that it is the year in which settlement in this province is deemed to have begun in a recognisably organised manner. Although it is not an official date for the commencement of settlement, it has nevertheless, come to be accepted as such. The year was chosen by the compilers of the questionnaires as a convenient date for establishing the beginning of the pioneer era. The year 1928, on the other hand, is considered to be the end of the pioneer era because it is officially designated as the beginning of the Depression era.

³ The majority of the respondents who have been cited here are of English-speaking background. For a more elaborate account of the linguistic background of the respondents see the Introduction (3:1) to Chapter 3 of this study.

⁴ Morris Palmer Tilley *Introduction, A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England* ed. Hereward T. Price (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1966) vi.

⁵ G.M. Story, *Introduction, The Dictionary of Newfoundland English* (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1982), p.xxii. In using the printed sources for the *DNE* the editors note that they have "exercised a necessary caution in distinguishing between their own (the authors') use of the language and their attribution, implied or overt, of regional use. Of course the dialogue composed by these accomplished writers should not be trusted as much as the grammatical evidence in the Dictionary's quotations taken from taped speech.

⁶ H.J. Chaytor, *From Script to Print* (Cambridge: Heffer, 1945), 1.

⁷ Walter S. Avis, *Preface The Dictionary of Canadian English on Historical Principles* (Toronto: W.J. Gage, 1967), xii.

⁸ *DNE*, xii-xxiii.

⁹ R.W. Burchfield, *Preface, The Supplement to the Oxford English Dictionary* (London: The Oxford University Press, 1968), xv.

¹⁰ For a detailed account of the use of the questionnaire in dialect study from Wenker to Kurath, see: Petyt, 40-44.

¹¹ Randolph Quirk *et al*, *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* (New York: Longman, 1985), 18.

¹² These principles are given as follows:

"Make a quotation for *every* word that strikes you as rare, obsolete, old-fashioned, new, peculiar, or used in a peculiar way.

Take special note of the passages which show or imply that a word is either new and tentative, or needing explanation as obsolete, and which thus help to fix the date of its introduction or disuse.

Make *as many* quotations *as you can* for ordinary words, especially when they are used significantly, and tend by their context to explain or suggest their own meaning."

James A.H. Murray *et al*, *Preface, The Oxford English Dictionary* (London: The Oxford University Press, 1961), xv.

¹³ C.J. Lovell notes that "it is in the process of checking up on various lesser words, also unnoticed by lexicographers, that the volunteer will learn the chief lesson of collect-

ing: that the meaning of many words are not readily apparent until several examples are at hand."

C.J. Lovell, *Lexicographic Challenges of Canadian English*, in *The Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 1:1 (1955), 2-32.

¹⁴ Quirk, 1567.

¹⁵ Quirk, 1576.

¹⁶ Quirk, 1518.

¹⁷ Orton's questions and respective responses elicited are as follows: Q: Who is this on the wagon? A: **Forker**.

Q: Who is this? A: **Stacker**.

Harold Orton and Eugen Dieth, *Survey of English Dialects* (Leeds: Arnold, 1962), 55.

¹⁸ D.R. Preston, *Proverbial Comparisons from Southern Indiana*, in *Orbis* 24:2(1975), 73-114.

¹⁹ Quirk, 1535.

²⁰ Hans Kurath, *A Word Geography of the Eastern United States* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1966) 50-80.

See also:

Orton and Dieth, 49-50.

²¹ Albert H. Marckwardt, *American English*. ed. J.L. Dillard, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980), 96.

²² Marckwardt, 97-98.

²³ Marckwardt, 98.

3.

3.1. Introduction

The Word List contains a list of lexical items -- both individual words, compounds, and phrases--while the Appendix contains only proverbial comparisons. The entries in the Appendix, as also in the Word List, are arranged alphabetically so that the head word, say, **cold**, appears boldfaced, and serves as a key to the entry.

In the Word List each boldfaced entry is followed by a quotation in normal script which illustrates its meaning. The grammatical function of each entry denoted by a boldfaced abbreviation -- **n** noun, **v** verb, and **adj.** adjective -- is placed within parenthesis. Where these parenthetical notations do not appear, e.g., **run**, it indicates a descriptive phrase such as **run strong to beef**.

In order to keep as close as possible to the original source, I have in most cases transcribed the entries as they appear in the original files. However, in certain cases it has been necessary to make minor editorial adaptations for the sake of organised presentation. Therefore, it will be noticed that certain quotations -- e.g. **alkali**, **trade work** -- contain dots which indicate they have been shortened to highlight the relevant lexical item and make for a readable presentation. In others -- e.g. **remittance man**, **witched** -- square brackets have been used along with dots. Within these square brackets I have inserted words which are implicit; this editorial device will hopefully clarify the meaning of the relevant lexical item. Quotation marks that appear within a quotation are those of the informant.

Below and to the right of each entry appears the name of the informant along with a date. The name and date indicate the file from which the entry has been derived. In this regard the files in the Saskatchewan Archives are arranged by date in 7 numbered boxes as follows:

Box No.	Year	No.of files
I	1880-1888	40
II	1889-1899	32
III	1900-1904	55

IV	1905-1906	52
V	1906-1907	28
VI	1908-1910	50
VII	1911-1928	32

The last box (1911-1928) contains a total of 32 files of which 18 are listed under a sub-file titled "7. Christmas Supplement." Hence, entries containing this notation refer to this sub-file.

Among the total of 320 files not all were useful for my purposes. After a thorough reading of all the files I chose 69 of them. In most cases each informant supplied more than one entry. Of the 69 informants 25 were female and 44 male.

The majority of the informants were found to be of English-speaking background. This includes 36 Canadians -- mostly from Ontario; 12 Americans -- mostly from North Dakota; 15 Englishmen -- of which 4 have a Scottish background; 1 Frenchman; 1 Norwegian; 1 Danish; 1 German; 1 Ukrainian; and 1 whose linguistic background is not indicated, but who appears to be English-speaking.

In regard to the findings I would like to mention that I have attempted to reduce the overlap between standard and non-standard expressions by checking them out against a number of standard reference sources mentioned earlier in 1.2. It will nevertheless be found that not a few of the expressions recorded in the Word List -- e.g. *bunk house*, *bush country*, *stook*-- have a much wider distribution. I have decided to retain them because in this enterprise I would expect to find the regional variety affiliated with other regional varieties. Also, the recording of such terms is dictated by the necessity to keep on file information that may later prove to be helpful in making broader assessments of the regional English of Saskatchewan. The recording of these terms would help us to understand how widespread the affiliations of such a regional variety might be.

The linguistic background of the informants also enters into consideration here, as one would expect these informants to import some expressions from their original place of residence. A case in point is the the employment of the term *bawbees* by the informant whose background is Scottish.

Whether or not these terms enter into the composition of a regional variety is a moot point. For the present time, however, it is only important to collect as much information as can possibly be done from a study of the early residents of this province. Ultimately,

this consideration has served as a criterion for retaining many items -- e.g. *stoneboat* -- that would be found over a much wider range than Saskatchewan.

3.2. Word List

airtight stove(n): On a trip to Osler in 1906(winter) a blizzard overtook husband and his brother near Dana. They erected a tent and took two horses in. The airtight stove set the quilts afire.

D. Koob, 1908.

alkali(n): There is a remarkable spring . . . which is surrounded by a bed of alkali. Animals were gradually sucked down and swallowed in the alkali.

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

alkaline flat(n): We had an alkaline flat several miles long that homesteaders had to cross, but that was no joke. There was an alkaline flat on the road to the grounds.

R.B. Lloyd, 1909.

alkaline trap(n): It was no joke to cross the Big Muddy, the little creek was an alkali trap and many settlers lost their teams in the crossing . . . We live close to what is known as the Big Muddy wide valley with a flat alkali bottom about one mile wide.

G. Prescott, 1906.

backset(v): Built a sod barn sufficiently to house a cow and a team and "backset" the thirty acres.

J. Evans, 1892.

batching(v): When I started farming on my own which was in the spring of 1897, batching with my partner in the same settlement we were always asked out for x-mas day as we were all batchelors in the settlement.

A. Hewlet, 1894 (7.Christmas Supplement).

bawbees(n): . . . the few bawbees(pennies) we were saving wasn't worth it.

J.Barrie, 1906.

binder(n): I had experience of farming in Scotland but had to learn to run the binder.

J. Barrie, 1906.

bluckley(n): . . . bluckley broke out in their herds and very nearly cleaned them up.

A.J. Riley, 1904.

bluffs(n): The "million dollar" June rains were a regular thing then and the drastic change in the climate now is very definitely due to the clearing away of the bluffs (trees) and the ploughing up of many sloughs, with their accompanying bushes which caught the snow, which in spring filled the sloughs (rhymes with "pews"), which in turn caused enough evaporation to give good spring rains.

E.S. Campbell, 1905.

bone trail(n): The bone trail went through our home.

C.A. Moxley, 1907.

The "Old Bone Trail" angled gently up over the ridge in Q1, and on out to Strawberry Valley and Patience Lake. (Both of those I think were named after we came-1905.) Bone was the name of an English family out in one of those districts.

E.S. Campbell, 1905.

breaking(v): In 1906 Mr. Breckner squatted and did a little breaking. In 1907 after the land had been surveyed it was found that his house was one quarter section and his breaking on another.

S.M. Johnson, 1909.

breaker plough(n): Bought a breaker plow and broke thirty acres.

J. Evans, 1892.

breaking sod: In the spring of 1892 when Leslie Brown, my husband, was out breaking sod there was a large bull moose come along.

L. Brown, 1884.

broadaxing(v): McCulloch was the wonder of wonderful lumber jacks. He had just finished broadaxing his 500th tie that day.

C. Davis, 1905.

buffalo camps(n): I remember him casually remarking to a group of listeners of how if a man died out in a buffalo camp you would "Gut 'em and salt 'em to bring in the body."

G. Shepherd, 1908.

buffalo chips(n): I've used buffalo chips to boil my tea pail.

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

bunk house(n): The men slept in a bunk house, but otherwise as members of our family.

D. Koob, 1908.

bush country(n): This is flat bush country, some creeks. Have lived on this land only and no one lived on it before we did.

G. Stratford, 1910.

bush partridge(n): Yet in north east Saskatoon one could hunt for deer and moose. Plenty of prairie chickens and bush partridges.

O. Antoniuk, 1910.

bush trail(n): I cut 1100,000 ft. of saw logs, did my own cooking, packed all my supplies on my back uphill on a bush trail and finished this undertaking at 69. Still got my own teeth and have no glasses.

H.R. Carson, 1905.

cactus berries(n): See squaw beans(n).

G. Tucker, 1905.

chinked(v): All the men on the east side of the river in the Saskatoon settlement in 1892 came one day and built the house . . . which I chinked and plastered.

J. Evans, 1892.

chinook arch(n): A chinook arch in the western sky was always a sign of clear fine weather.

J. McCallum, 1900.

chinook wind(n): An arch of cloud from the southeast to the northwest of the western horizon, especially in the evening, is a sign of a chinook wind.

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

chip fire(n): Two ingenious lads, Eddie Hyland and Gordie Sloan bringing a load of coal from Alsask, were seen with a chip fire on top of the load frying sausages in a "scoop shovel".

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

choke cherries(n): I knew how to make use of raspberries, blueberries, strawberries, choke cherries, cranberries.

T. Lanegraff, 1906.

claim(n): . . . and I hear the hungry wolf as he sneaks up through the grass. In the little low log shanty on my claim.

W.A. Harrison, 1906.

codack(n): I am enclosing my card and a codack of the good wife and I taken at the ranch in '46.

E.P. St. John, 1908.

coil(v): She could chop wood, coil, cut and stack hay. But I done all or most of the cutting and her boys rolled and we all coiled and stacked using a roughland stacker.

T. Lanegraff, 1906.

concession(n): That was before the railway news was organized and the train had the concession.

R.B. Lloyd, 1909.

corduroy(n): See wet pass(n).

L. Demay, 1906.

corner stake(n): I got my directions from a corner stake there, got two stars and made my way home in the dark.

J.A. Ludlow, 1905.

cowlick(n): A cowlick in hair meant business dealings in more than one country (or was it a double cowlick?).

H.H. Kajewski, 1899.

crib(n): One storm he mentioned blew his well clean out of the ground and stood it up along side of the barn. He got an auger and bored a hole in the side of the crib and put in a piece of pipe and sprocket and he had all the water he wanted.

D.H. Maginnes, 1906.

cribbed-up(adj.): They had a great deal of difficulty getting the stone out, but when it was removed there was another well all cribbed-up down there.

H.J. Abrams, 1905.

cribbing(n): . . . one noon hour we were watering our teams, a young fellow was holding his, and a horse from behind bit one of his, and it swung around and its two hindlegs broke the cribbing and it slid down the well...we started to dig a trench about 40 feet away, 3 feet wide, then broke the cribbing in and Mr. horse walked out.

A.J. Riley, 1904.

cutter(n): On a snowy night going from the cutter in the twilight . . . I kept walking back and fortunately -- Providentially -- found the cutter.

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

disc plows(n): See mould boards(n).

J. Barrie, 1906.

disk(n): There was a tornado that lifted up a disk and carried it into another field.

L. Fletcher, 1907.

dove-tail notch(n): In the north country instead of the dove-tail notch used in the corners of the buildings the saddle-notch was used. Not so neat, but more weather-proof.

R.J. Shaw, 1905.

dry rains(n): After the crops burnt up in 1911 we were naturally anxious to see the rain the following spring. Promising clouds would come up giving "dry rains," and we would make bets whether it would be enough to roll off the roof.

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

dug out(n): On the farm I'm living on now there are still old dug outs of a squatter who lived here by the name of Mackenzie.

J.F. Laycock, 1902.

The town built a shanty for a rather old man who was not very bright. He could have the shanty for nothing and it was right in the town. He refused to move in and built a terrible old dug out on the the outskirts of town, right on the road allowance; he said he wanted to live on the King's own land and not in the town.

T.T. Lake, 1883.

The meeting was called to decide whether or not a community (municipal) "dug out" should be built. I listened with all ears thinking a dug out was some sort of shelter from the terrific winds I had heard about and was wondering what good such a shelter would be for us several miles away.

J.M. Telford, 1910.

A pail of water from the "dug out" would be on hand, or if I remember ice or snow had to be melted for drinking and for all washing purposes in winter.

M. Anderson, 1883.

dust devils(n): Southwest winds and little dust devils, of whirlwinds mean dry weather.

E. Otterson, 1906.

fireguard(n): Ploughed fireguard for thirty-six hours during a fire south of Rosemary.

C.R. Dahl, 1910.

freighted(v): . . . before the rail road came, freighted sixty miles from Swift current for neighbours.

R.B. Lloyd, 1909.

Lee Shipley of Mentario was one of the men who freighted the munitions.

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

A.G. Kelly, 1903.

grazing lease(n): The spot in mind is about a mile in length and upto one hundred feet in width. It is on a grazing lease and should be preserved as an historic site.

G. Shepherd, 1908.

green Englishman(n): I worked out as a green Englishman at Brandon in 1908 at \$10 a month and then got gyped even out of that.

G. Shepherd, 1908.

gyped(v): See **green Englishman(n)**.

G. Shepherd, 1908.

half-way house(n): Again there was the case of the man on the trail near lake Johnson -- stopping at a half-way house, poorly constructed on a windy night.

R.E. Ludlow, 1907.

hay lease(n): I got a hay lease and good house. I guess I am the only white man that have willed everything to the Indians.

T. Lanegraff, 1906.

hay meadows(n): These lakes, or most, are dry now used as hay meadows or broken up for farming.

J. Barrie, 1906.

headed out(v): See **teamed(v)**.

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

hiproofed barn(n): In 1923 we had a cyclonic storm which levelled out many of the farm buildings in the district . . . New houses and hip-roofed barns were blown and levelled during the storm.

C. Rasmussen, 1906.

homesteaded(v): See **teamed(v)**.

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

homestead shack(n): I bought the lumber and my father helped me build my homestead shack and stable.

S.M. Johnson, 1909.

horse wrangler(n): In the days before settlement there was some horse raising ranches in that locality and it is said that by riding up on to Horse Butte the horse wranglers had a great view of all the surrounding country for many miles.

A.E. Elderton, 1909.

Indian bread(n): The only wild plant was something like a parsnip in colour and size . . . we called it Indian bread.

F.M. Kusch, 1883.

jumper(n): At about eleven o'clock the neighbours would think of going home; the horses would be brought out of the pole and straw stable, hitched to the bob-sleigh, or jumper and away they would go through the frosty night.

C.C. Bray, 1883 (7.Christmas Supplement).

kingpost(n): I watched with interest how he saddled his logs for speedy erection. These notches are laid upside down, so that rain will run free, squaring small logs for window frames and door jambs, stringing the roof rafters, pegging the tie beams to support the king post to brace the center of the ridge pole.

C. Davis, 1905.

laid up against: Everything was laid up against them as they were the most in the lime light.

R.B. Lloyd, 1909.

lambsquarters(n): Best of all was Lamb's Quarters for boiled greens -- we called it pig weed.

F.W. Humphrey, 1906.

make hay: One chap wanted to make hay on the Water Hen.

F.P.V. Belliveau, 1902.

million dollar rain(n): A heavy rain was called a million dollar rain.

R.J. Day, 1909.

See also **bluffs(n)**

E.S. Campbell, 1905.

milt(n): A few had the belief that it could be told by the length and shape of a milt from a pig killed in the fall what the length and severity of the winter would be.

A.E. Elderton, 1909.

mineral rights(n): Do you know I got the surprise of my life for she (the palmist) described my family even to the little girls we had adopted each one and told of the wonderful wife and all the things she could turn her hand to, even to our mineral rights of even 3000 acres we have on the ranch.

E.P. St. John, 1908.

mixed ranch(n): When I came to Canada I was very busy on a large mixed ranch and have raised some seasons as high as 500 hogs . . . as a side line beside a bunch of cattle and horses.

E.P. St. John, 1908.

moon dogs(n): I remember a very violent storm in winter which was preceded by a circle around the moon, another circle cutting through the upper part of it and across above that . . . moondogs on either side.

A.G. Kelly, 1903.

moon pups(n): When we see sundogs we look for cold weather and when we see them at night we call them moon pups.

H.L. Martyn, 1913.

mould boards(n): It is gumbo clay around Pense and the ordinary plough cannot be used as the the mould boards won't scour. Disc ploughs are used.

J. Barrie, 1906.

muskeg tea(n): We mix muskeg tea with blue Ribbon.

T. Lanegraff, 1906.

nitchie(n): Making a summary of our losses, I was startled when Syd yelled, and danced around like a war whooping nitchie . . . to console him I said "Syd we've lots of crude carbolic".

C. Davis, 1905.

norther(n): The usual feature of the Cypress Hills weather is the way it can change from mild to a real norther in the winter time.

G. Shepherd, 1908.

peavine(n): With abundance of wild peavine and grass it was easy to raise a fine herd of cattle.

G.B. Jameson, 1903.

pin cherries(n): See **wolf onion(n)**.

C. Davis, 1905.

pitch sheaves: A man named Bill . . . could neither read nor write, but could pitch sheaves.

H. Johnson, 1908.

pot-holes(n): . . . in early spring there was a lot of small pot-holes; we called them slews.

S. Heacock, 1910.

prairie broncho(n): Men farmed with the prairie broncho and oxen.

E.F. Fennel, 1896.

prairie chicken(n): Prairie chickens plentiful and wonderful meat.

E.F. Fennell, 1896.

See also, **bush partridge(n)**.

O. Antoniuk, 1910.

prairie fire(n): In 1909 after a prairie fire when we had one ox burnt.

R.J. Day, 1909.

Prairie fires were a hazard to property and human life, as well as animals.

E.F. Fennell, 1896.

prairie tea(n): Prairie tea was often used in the Pelly district during the Depression.

J.M. Telford, 1910.

prairie-wise(adj.): Before ranching I rode with some of the last "cowboys" and Indian trackers and got "prairie-wise" . . . You never get lonesome on the open spaces if you are "prairie-wise," because there is life all around you and you read signs of what happened there previously.

C.C. Bray, 1883.

prairie wool(n): The prairie wool had been thick and matted, but the walk back was over inches deep black char.

E.S. Campbell, 1905.

pre-emption(n): The next ridge three quarter mile east is on our pre-emption.

E.S. Campbell, 1905.

The old-timers wise-crack about this gumbo . . . they had a homestead on one foot and a pre-emption on the other.

R.J. Day, 1909.

primed(v): I heard that it was so cold one winter that the cows had to be thawed out before you could milk, and the next summer it was so dry that they had to be primed for the same the reason.

R.J. Day, 1909.

raining: Raining pitchforks and shovels. [And] Sawlogs for handles.

T. Goldsmith, 1884.

reeve(n): This hunting adventure I am going to relate is about myself. I was reeve of the municipality myself and three councillors agreed to go moose hunting on the 13th of March, 1925.

J.D. Tulloch, 1897.

remittance men(n): We had just about everything -- scions of the nobility . . . relatives of great statesman, bishops, admirals generals . . . [and], Remittance men -- professional men who had slipt . . . and had come to the last best west for a second chance where no character references were ever asked for...

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

returned empties(n): If the returning clouds bring no further precipitation they are usually termed "returned empties".

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

ridge pole(n): See **kingpost(n)**.

E.S. Campbell, 1905.

road allowance(n): The old Battleford Trail originally passed through this district, but has disappeared on account of the most of the land being broken up and regular road allowance utilized by the L.I.D. and the Municipality.

A.E. Elderton, 1909.

See also **dug out(n)**.

T.T. Lake, 1883.

road boss(n): A road boss went to sleep under a wagon and when he awoke his arms and legs were tied to the wheels.

R.W. Jewitt, 1907.

roughland stacker(n): See **coil(v)**.

T. Lanegraff, 1906.

run: Dad had been a butcher and we ran strong to beef.

G. Shepherd, 1908.

saddle notch(n): See **kingpost(n)**.

R.J. Shaw, 1905.

See also **king post(n)**.

C. Davis, 1905.

saskatoon(n): Saskatoons were used raw and preserved for winter use.

J.W. Barberee, 1905.

The saskatoon and choke cherry were the only things found here -- had the choke cherry in Dakota, also sakatoons, but they were called June berry there.

J.E. Olmstead, 1910.

scoop shovel(n): See **chipfire(n)**.

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

section house(n): While we lived at Yellow Grass for three years there was a section house five miles away.

R. Miles, 1886.

senneca root(n): This district was dotted with numerous small lakes when the first settlers located here and the Indians had many camping sites here and there used when trapping muskrats and digging senneca root and other herbs.

J. Barrie, 1906.

settlers(n): When the settlers went into Maple Creek country the ranchers didn't like it-- and with good reason.

G. Shepherd, 1908.

W.S. Rattray, 1887(7. Christmas Supplement).

sky pilot(n): Always had a sky pilot . . . lots of them down this way.

C. Davis, 1905.

sloughs(n): See **bluffs(n)**.

E.S. Campbell, 1905.

slough hay(n): I broke 6 acres that season. Then went to the hills south of Caron with my brother-in-law where we put up a large amount of slough hay.

D.L. Campbell, 1892.

smudge(n): One old-timer tells of plowing with oxen. The mosquitoes were so bad that he built a smudge at the end of the field. The oxen soon got wise and travelled twice as fast going that way. So the farmer built a smudge at the other end of the field.

T. McCosh, 1907.

soap kettle(n): As a weather observer, I recorded at one time a fifty mile wind for forty hours. It blew a neighbour's shack clear across the road and he came over and said that it had blown everything off the farm, but the mortgage. Another said that the wind had blown his iron soap kettle inside out.

R.B. Lloyd, 1909.

A.E. Elderton, 1909.

sod-buster(n): Before the advent of the sod-buster when this was all ranch country, it was used to disinfect the herds of cattle of the big ranchers.

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

sod-shanty(n): "The Old Sod Shanty on the Claim" was commonly believed [to have] originated in the States.

G. Prescott, 1906.

sodded-up(v): [I] sodded-up [building of frame lumber] . . . learned from other settlers.

J.T. Lee, 1904.

squatted(v): In 1906 Mrs. Beckner squatted and did a little bit of breaking.

S.M. Johnson, 1909.

squaw beans(n): We had Saskatoon berries in the States. Mushrooms, squaw beans, wild onions, cactus berries.

G. Tucker, 1905.

stock(n): One of our mules could open the pasture gate as good as anyone, so the rest of the stock got out occasionally.

H. Johnson, 1908.

stone boat(n): We had a Lithuanian working here in about 1928 who lifted a hayrack full of hay, by taking hold (back against load) and lifting it foot high. He pulled a stone boat full of manure uphill about twenty yards single handed.

D. Koob, 1908.

The only way we had of going from one place to another was with an ox and stoneboat.

R. Force, 1909.

stone keel(n): The Indians put a piece of soft yellow, or red stone in their mouth and then put stripes on the bow with their tongues. We kids called them stone keels. I do not find the word in the dictionary. It may have been merely a localism.

R.B. Lloyd, 1909.

stook(n): The only toe game I ever played was with a man I caught sleeping in a stook I had put up in the field . . .

E.P. St. John, 1908.

summer complaints(n): Fred developed cramps in his stomach. Jack and I diagnosed Fred's troubles as summer complaints.

J. Barrie, 1906.

sun dogs(n): My own belief is that sun dogs indicate the state of the atmosphere and weather as it is now, not what it is going to be . . .

F. Clack, 1906.

Sun dogs in springtime often foretell colder weather, and frost can be expected during the night; in the summer time it often precedes showery, or unsettled weather . . .

C. Davis, 1905.

tatting(v): Played the piano and organ, and did a lot of tatting.

E.S. Campbell, 1905.

teamed(v): In 1910, a very dry year, the old lumberjack who teamed munitions over the old Battleford trail and then later homesteaded here informed me that on his farm that year the oats already came headed out.

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

To avoid winter travel all our groceries were teamed in before severe weather set in.

C.C. Bray, 1883 (7. Christmas Supplement).

the hungry thirties: The ranch is close to the timber reserve, and in the hungry thirties many from the west as far as Fillmore and Griffin came for wood as they had no money to buy coal.

E.P. St. John, 1908.

I never asked for credit any place in my life but once at a bank in the hungry thirties when I was refused.

E.P. St. John, 1908.

the National Hook-up: When I passed my 66th birthday I took to writing poetry and have had some given over the National Hook-up.

W.S. Rattray, 1887 (7. Christmas Supplement).

threshing gang(n): The threshing gang rushed in, sat around the table wearing caps and overcoats (deerskin jackets).

M. Anderson, 1883.

threshing outfit(n): While working on one of our neighbour's threshing outfit he felt ill and bilious.

H. Johnson, 1908.

One day I and my small daughter started out to locate the threshing outfit we were expecting.

R. Force, 1909.

timber reserve(n): See the hungry thirties.

E.P. St. John, 1908.

traded work: . . . traded work with neighbours frequently.

J. Evans, 1892.

treaty woman(n): For housework, I had a widow with three sons and a daughter after my wife left. This was very good as this woman was a good worker. She could hunt and trap like a man. She was a treaty woman.

T. Lanegraff, 1906.

turkey(n): We used "turkeys" for a pillow -- a white cotton sack containing a change of underclothing.

J. Barrie, 1906.

weather breeder(n): A blizzard follows a warm sunny weather, [which is] often called a "weather breeder".

J.M. Telford, 1910.

Wentigo(n): One morning we saw the "Wentigo", the Indian devil that had been going around in the neighbourhood killing cows. (See also **Wentigo**).

T. Goldsmith, 1884.

wet pass(n): The dandy who went with his best horse to see his girl friend crossed a "wet pass" had to dismount, walked on the corduroy, slipped, fell on his length . . .

L. Demay, 1906.

Wintigo(n): The Indians declare that Wintigo, or Wendigo still roams the bush as they have seen his tracks, but never the Wintigo himself. Wintigo means cannibal I am told.

P. Fraser, 1891.

witched(v): Results from digging wells where water was witched on my own farm have not given faith in the willow, but I know that water has been found in good supply in many locations that have been witched.

C.E. Sargent, 1911.

[Used] A divining rod of willow usually to find water. We had one well witched [and] found water at fifty feet.

G. Stratford, 1910.

witching(v): Witching for water was common in the olden days. A willow crotch was usually used.

J.L. Turnquist, 1910.

witch rod(n): A divining rod of willow was used to try to find where there was good water.

M. Anderson, 1883.

wolf onion(n): Wolf onion, wild carrot, bush fern root, bush or wild plum, choke cherry . . . Most of these foods and fruits were made use of. But the domesticated vegetables are superior.

C. Davis, 1905.

3.3. Appendix

- acceptable:** As acceptable as a ham sandwich at a Jewish festival.
R.E. Ludlow, 1907.
- awkward:** Awkward as a pig on ice.
A.E. Elderton, 1909.
- black:** Black as the ace of spades.
G.H. Bigham, 1906.
- brain:** Not brain enough to take meat to a bear and bring the dish back.
R.A. Hill, 1904.
- cold:** As cold as a brass monkey sitting on North Pole.
C. Davis, 1905.
- cold:** As cold as would freeze a brass nigger.
J. A. Stewart, 1904.
- cold:** As cold as a Russian Hell.
A. Simonson, 1909.
- cold:** As cold as a stepmother's breath.
F.J. Huber, 1903.
- cold:** Cold enough to freeze the hair off from a brass monkey.
T.G. Lanegraff, 1906.
- cold:** Cold enough to freeze the horns off a brass monkey.
R.A. Hill, 1904.
- cold:** Cold enough to freeze the ears off a brass monkey.
E.S. Potter, 1894.
- cold:** Cold enough to freeze the nose off a brass monkey.
H. M. Stuek, 1886.
- cold:** Cold enough to freeze the nuts of a steel bridge.
F.J. Huber, 1903.
- cold:** Cold enough to freeze off a wood-pecker's beak.
J.S. Entwistle, 1904.
- cute:** As cute as a bug's ear.
R.E. Ludlow, 1907.
- dry:** As dry as the bones of Arabia.
T. Goldsmith, 1884.

- dry:** As dry as a leaky faucet in an illicit still.
C. Davis, 1905.
- dry:** As dry as lime burner's wig.
R.E. Purdy, 1883 (7. Christmas Supplement).
- dry:** As dry as a wooden god in Hades.
C. Davis, 1905.
- dry:** As dry as an undertaker's eye.
F. Clack, 1906.
- dry:** So dry even a camel would leave in disgust.
J.S. Entwistle, 1904.
- exlographic:** As exlographic as a modern tombstone.
C.E. Sargent, 1911.
- fine:** As fine as frog's hair.
R.E. Ludlow, 1907.
- graceful:** As graceful as a duck climbing a ladder.
A.E. Elderton, 1909.
- harder:** Harder than the hobs of hell.
G.B. Hare, 1906.
- hot:** Hot enough to melt a brass monkey.
T. Goldsmith, 1884.
- juicy:** As juicy as a leg-show at the Gaiety theatre.
C.E. Sargent, 1911.
- scarcer:** Scarcer than icebergs in hell.
C.E. Sargent, 1911.
- slow:** As slow as molasses in January.
W. Brunyee, 1907.
G.H. Bigham, 1906.
- strong:** As strong as a skunk or Lipton's tea.
R.E. Ludlow, 1907.
- ugly:** As ugly as a hedge fence.
R.J. Day, 1909.
- warm:** Warm as crow's breath.
A. Simonson, 1909.

4. BIBLIOGRAPHY

List of Abbreviations Used:

- DAE** The Dictionary of American English
- DARE** The Dictionary of American Regional English
- DCEHP** The Dictionary Canadian English on Historical English
- DNE** The Dictionary of Newfoundland English
- DPEIE** The Dictionary of Prince Edward Island English
- EDD** The English Dialect Dictionary
- SOED** A Supplement to the Oxford English Dictionary
- UP** University Press

-
- Allen, Harold B. *Canadian-American Differences Along the Middle Border. Canadian English: Origins and Structures.* Ed. J.K. Chambers. Toronto: Methuen, 1975, 102-108.
 - Avis, Walter S. *Speech Differences along the Ontario-U.S. Border.* Ed. J.K. Chambers. Toronto: Methuen, 1975, 67-77.
 - ----- *The Phonemic Segments of an Edmonton Idiolect* 118-128.
 - ----- *Problems in the Study of Canadian English.*
 - *Walter S. Avis: Essays and Articles.* Ed. Thomas Vincent, George Parker, and Stephen Bonnycastle. Kingston, Ontario: The Royal Military College, 1978, 3-12.
 - ----- *A Lexicographer Looks at Language.* 13-18.
 - Baugh, A.C. *A History of the English Language.* Ed. Thomas Cable 3rd edn. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

- Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language*. New York: Holt, 1933.
- Burchfield, R.W. *SOED*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1933.
- Cassidy, Fredric G. *DARE*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap, 1985.
- Chambers, J.K. and Peter Trudgill. *Dialectology* Cambridge UP: Cambridge UP, 1980.
- Chaytor, H.J. *From Script to Print*. Cambridge: Heffer, 1945.
- Craigie, Sir William A. and James R. Hulbert *DAE*. London: Oxford UP, 1944.
- Davis, Lawrence M. *English Dialectology: An Introduction*. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1983.
- De Saussure, Ferdinand. *Course in General Linguistics*. Ed. Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye, trans. Wade Baskin. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959.
- Kirk, John M. *The Heteronomy of Scots with Standard English. The Nutt's Schell: Essays on the Scots Language*. Ed. Caroline Macafee and Iseabail Macleod. Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP, 1988.
- Kurath, Hans. *A Word Geography of the Eastern United States*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1966.
- Lovell, C.J. *Lexicographic Challenges of Canadian English. The Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association*. 1:1(1955), 2-32.
- Martin, Chester. *"Dominion Lands" Policy*. Ed. Lewis H. Thomas. Toronto: McClelland, 1973.
- Marckwardt, Albert H. *American English*. Ed. J.L. Dillard 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1980.
- McDavid, Raven I. *Midland and Canadian Words in Upstate New York. Dialects in Culture: Essays in General Dialectology by Raven I. McDavid*. Ed. William Kretzschmer Jr. Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1979, 232-237.
- Mencken, H.L. *The American Language: An Inquiry into the Development of English of the United States*. London: Kegan, 1936.
- Murray, A.H. James. *OED*. London: The Oxford UP, 1961.
- Orton, Harold and Eugen Dieth. *Survey of English Dialects*. 3 vols. Leeds: Arnold, 1962.
- Petyt, K.M. *The Study of Dialect: An Introduction to Dialectology*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview, 1980.
- Preston, D.R. *Proverbial Comparisons from Southern Indiana. Orbis*. 24:2(1975) 73-114.
- Pratt, T.K. *DPEIE*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1988.

- Pringle, Ian. *The Concept of Dialect and the Study of Canadian English. Dialect and Language Variation*. Ed. Harold B. Allen and Michael D. Linn. Florida: Academic Press, 1986. 217-236.
- Quirk, Randolph *et al.* *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman, 1985.
- Scargill, M.H. *The Sources of Canadian English. Canadian English: Origins and Structures*. Ed. J.K. Chambers. Toronto: Methuen, 1975.
- Story, G.M. *DNE*. Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1982.
- Tilley, Morris Palmer. *A Dictionary of the Proverbs in England*. Ed. Hereward T. Price. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966.
- Weinreich, Uriel. *Is A Structural Dialectology Possible? Readings in American Dialectology*. Ed. Harold B. Allen and Garry N. Underwood. New York: Appleton, 1971. 300-13.
- Wright, Joseph. *EDD*. London: Times, 1905.