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ABSTRACT

This work is inspired by the need of systematically presenting and discussing some of the neglected aspects of Louisiana French. It is comprised of seven chapters.

Chapter One is devoted to a historical overview of Louisiana French, divided into three phases: a) the introduction and expansion of the French language in this part of the New World during the Colonial Period (1699-1803); b) the infiltration of the English language in Louisiana after the Purchase and the subsequent decline of the French; and c) the recent attempts made by local organizations to renew an interest in the French heritage and to implement the use of the French language.

Chapter Two seeks to assess the various semantic configurations accumulated by the term creole in the State both diachronically and synchronically and to discuss in particular the linguistic hybridization which gave birth to the local creolized French.

The first purpose of Chapter Three was to review critically past studies which sought in various ways to give either an estimation on the size of the Gallic community or a geographical mapping of its territory, showing that the distinction between a French and a French-speaking person has not always been carefully drawn. The second major objective was to discuss the complex network of variables which need to be defined in order that an approximation and/or a territorial mapping of the Louisiana French population may be satisfactorily achieved.

Chapter Four outlines the history of the scholarly endeavors which attempted to provide an insight to the linguistic structure of the French spoken in Louisiana.

x
Chapter Five discusses some of the linguistic problems (e.g. lack of linguistic uniformity throughout the area, unusual free variation) which are peculiar to Louisiana French and which complicate any effort to describe and systematize the dialect.

Chapter Six involves a phonological sketch of Lafourche French. It includes a phonemic repertoire of the dialect and an inventory of some salient phonological rules.

Chapter Seven has two parts. The first examines the morphological composition of the various verbs forms found in Lafourche French. It was found that Louisiana French has, comparatively to Standard French, undergone a morphological leveling and a reduction in verb classes. The second part treats the various allomorphic forms of the personal pronouns.

There is an appendix containing figures on the French-speaking persons in Louisiana, a list of French radio broadcasting in the state and a bibliography.
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the present dissertation is to give a much needed description of Louisiana French. Here, the term Louisiana French is used generically to encompass the three varieties of French commonly recognized in the State—namely, Colonial-French, spoken by the descendants of the first settlers who came directly from the Continent; Acadian-French, the speech of those who were expelled from Nova Scotia in 1755 and settled thereafter in the prairie lands of southwest Louisiana; and finally, the Creole (i.e. Negro-French), spoken mainly, although not exclusively, by Blacks. Though the idea of three distinctive dialects forming what has been called here "Louisiana French" was current in the pioneering works in the field (e.g. Fortier's treatises on "Negro-French" in 1884, on the "Acadian dialect" in 1891 and his repeated praise about the "purity" of New Orleans French (to be discussed in Chapter 4) clearly confirm the fact), it was not until the 1930's, perhaps under the influence of the ongoing mapping of the Linguistic Atlas of the U. S. and Canada, officially started in 1932, that explicit statements were made about the three dialects in Louisiana. As far as it has been determined, a student of James Broussard, Sylvain R. Loupe, was first to indicate explicitly and systematically the three varieties of French spoken in Louisiana in a Louisiana State University Master's thesis, "Acadian Folklore of La Côte Française," 1932. These dialects are referred to in the literature by a variety of other apppellations (e.g. Louisiana Standard French, Cajun-French, Negro-French). The various nomenclatures as well as the historical contexts in which each of the three varieties has evolved will be discussed in some depth later.

xii
There is a controversy discussed in the literature on Pidgin and Creole languages on whether the creolized varieties such as Louisiana Creole are derivates, hence dialects, of the target (i.e. superstratum) languages from which they have derived at least their lexicon, or distinct languages. The creolists who subscribe to the latter view, base their argument on Weinreich's theory that dialects of the same language share grammatical structures and differ in their phonological and lexical make-ups. Thus, according to these creolists Louisiana Creole is a relexified lingua-franca of some sort. Throughout this work the creolized French variety spoken in Louisiana will be considered as a dialect of Louisiana French, not because the present author subscribes to one of the above views but simply because in Louisiana the Creole French or "Negro-French" is perceived as such.

It should be pointed out that in view of the social amalgamation or integration of the French-speaking ethnic groups and the current undeniable decline of the French language, it becomes difficult to distinguish clearly today the three dialectal varieties. In fact, several linguistic investigations (to be discussed in Section 5.1.) have indicated that the three dialects, once quite distinctive from each other, have converged to a single and unified French dialect. Whatever the French linguistic situation is at the present time, it is appropriate and convenient in the present volume, with its diachronic perspective, to maintain the traditional division of Louisiana French into the three varieties mentioned above.

Because of its colorful history and its unique multilingualism, Southern Louisiana is, as Professor William Van Riper of Louisiana State University puts it, "a gold mine" for linguistic research. For instance, it has been reported in local papers recently that there are still some
trilingual communities in St. Bernard Parish speaking Spanish, English and French. (For a detailed treatment on the bilingualism or trilingualism of the Isleños, see Raymond R. McCurdy, The Spanish Dialect in St. Bernard Parish, Louisiana, University of New Mexico Publication, 1950). Other workers in the field have also discovered the existence of Indian tribes speaking French and English in addition to their native tongue; and apparently there are still some "Creoles" of German descent with comparable trilingualism. An unexcelled laboratory for code-switching! Paradoxically the area is quite virgin, since from a sociolinguistic point of view at least, it has barely been touched (Dorice Tentchoff-Zelsel, "The Sociolinguistics of Cajun and Creole Speaking Communities," unpublished monograph, 1973). Actually, Louisiana French has only recently begun to attract the interest of language specialists which its peculiar linguistic situation would seem to merit.
1. A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE FRENCH LANGUAGE IN LOUISIANA

The present brief sketch on the evolution of the French language in the Bayou State does not follow strictly the chronological order of the various political, legal and social events which affected directly or indirectly the role and status of the language as is customary in historical treatises. Rather, it is comprised of three sections, each of which is devoted to a particular stage in the history of the French language. The first part outlines the early French explorations and the subsequent colonizations which introduced the Romance dialect to the territory. It contains in addition a discussion of the Acadians' deportation and the arrival of some of them in Louisiana, the importation of slaves and their adoption of French and finally the steady immigration of political refugees from France, all of which helped to strengthen, at least culturally, the French dominance in the territory. The second part is devoted to a discussion of the various political and legal setbacks suffered by the French vernacular, which led to its decline (e.g. the "Purchase" Civil War, Melting Pot philosophy). Finally, the last part concerns itself with a description of the current movement which is attempting to rejuvenate the French heritage and restore it to a prominent position.

1.1. The Introduction and Expansion of the French Language in the State

In their exploratory voyages into the New World, several Spanish "Conquistadores" had journeyed through the north shore of the Gulf in the first part of the sixteenth century. The successive expeditions led
by Ponce De Leon in 1513, Alonzo Alvarez de Pineda in 1519, Panfilo de Navarez in 1572 and Hernando De Soto in 1539 were not precisely recorded and it is not fully known who were the first to set foot on what is now Louisiana soil nor who were the first to discover the mouth of the Mississippi River. These pioneering ventures, inspired by the quest for the fountain of youth and the fabulous land of Eldorado, did not materialize in any temporary or permanent settlements in Louisiana; thus it is with the French settlements that the history of the State actually begins.

1.1.1. Early French Explorations

Nearly 150 years after De Soto's voyage, a Frenchman, Robert Cavalier de La Salle, organized an expedition in Canada and sailed down the Mississippi River, reaching its mouth in April 1682. He claimed all the lands drained by the Great River and its tributaries in the name of the King of France, Louis XIV, and named it "Louisiane" in his honor. Shortly after his glorious return to France, La Salle left the Continent with some four hundred persons in an attempt to reach the Mississippi from the Gulf of Mexico and further his previous explorations. His ships missed the mouth of the river and landed in Texas where misfortune seemed to hover over the entire expedition. La Salle's exploration came to an end when one of his followers, unhappy with his leadership, assassinated him.

Although La Salle's mission failed to found a colony, it opened the way to French fur traders, "coureurs de bois," and some missionaries who made frequent trips down the Mississippi shortly after.
Colonization of Louisiana began a few years after La Salles's tragic expedition when the French government, influenced by the mercantilist and expansionist ideas that dominated Western Europe in the late seventeenth century, sponsored another expedition with the purpose of founding a permanent colony on the north shore of the Gulf of Mexico. In 1698, Pierre le Moyne d'Iberville and his brother John Baptiste le Moyne de Bienville with two hundred colonists, their wives, and some soldiers sailed from Brest the 24th of October for Louisiana. On February 13 of the following year, they landed on the shore of the Gulf of Mexico near the present site of Biloxi. Soon after, they began their ascent of the Mississippi, making frequent exploratory trips and establishing a number of posts. On the 8th of April, 1699, construction began on Ft. Maurepas (Ocean Springs, Mississippi). Later the cities of Natchitoches and New Orleans were founded, in 1714 and 1718 respectively.

During its first half-century, the French settlement had not prospered to the government's expectation and was never economically self-sustaining. Thus, in 1712, with ever increasing expenses, the French government granted all trading rights in Louisiana to a rich banker, Antoine Crozat, for 15 years. But he, too, was unsuccessful at generating profitable commerce and in 1718 formally surrendered his rights in Louisiana back to the King. The exclusive monopoly for the commerce of Louisiana was then granted to John Law, a Scot resident in Paris who headed "La Compagnie de l'Ouest ou du Mississippi" which later was renamed "La Compagnie des Indes Occidentales." Law's promising idea of a paper currency and the sale of shares in Louisiana resources (known as the "Mississippi Bubble") both of which were intended to redeem the French domestic finances, collapsed in 1712. Law escaped soon after to Italy but the
Company managed to run the colony until its total bankruptcy in 1731. Another discouraging factor was the fact that the population growth, much needed to insure the claim to a permanent settlement of the vast and empty territory, remained extremely slow. The high mortality rate had almost exactly balanced births and immigration. According to a census taken in 1744, there were but 4,000 White and 2,020 Black persons dispersed in the vast wilderness of the Colony. Even some twenty years later, when another census was conducted in 1766, the number of Whites had only increased to 5,562 and Blacks were about as numerous. These figures had further been reduced as a terrible epidemic (possibly yellow fever) had struck the Colony in that same year. Aside from the economic disasters and the slow population increase outlined above, the first part of the eighteenth century was marked by other factors endangering the preservation of the French settlement, hence the French language, in this part of the New World. France had ceded to England, by the treaty of Paris negotiated in 1763, all of Canada and all of the French territory east of the Mississippi River and she gave away to Spain in 1762, by the secret treaty of Fontainebleau, all of the French territory west of the Mississippi. In addition to these political setbacks, non-French settlers began to arrive in Louisiana, jeopardizing the majority of the French element in the region. It was reported, for instance, by Hanno Deiler that an estimated 2,000 Germans disembarked on the shores of the territory in 1721 and were followed by later arrivals. The second part of the century witnessed on the other hand the arrival of sizable immigrations of Frenchmen (e.g. Acadians, political "émigrés") which helped to perpetuate culturally the French dominance in the territory and maintain the French vernacular in a functional status.
1.1.2. The Arrival of Acadian Refugees

During the struggle of the Seven Years' War between England and France, also known as the French and Indian War, France captured the settlement of Grand Pre in the province of "Acadie." But later the entire province (now Nova Scotia) was ceded to England by the treaty of Utrecht negotiated in 1731 with the stipulation that the Acadians might withdraw to French possessions if they chose. The British were fearful that the Acadians, who refused to swear allegiance to the King of England, might betray them in wartime, particularly against France. Such a fear led Governor Lawrence and his council to order the deportation of the French subjects. On the 8th of October, 1755, four ships were supplied for what was to be known as "le grand dérangement." Some of these exiled Acadians went to France, some to the Antilles, and some found refuge in Louisiana among folk of their own faith and speech. According to Charles Gayarré, "Between the 1st of January and the 13th of May, 1765, about 650 Acadians had arrived at New Orleans, and from that town had been sent to form settlements in Attakapas and Opelousas under the command of Audry."

The Acadians' immigration helped the expansion and later the preservation of the French language in Louisiana in at least two ways. First, their sizable number and their high rate of birth consolidated the majority of the French population against the threatening influx of "foreign" immigration such as the arrival of Germans in 1721, of Spanish "Islenos" from the Canary Islands in 1778, and of Anglo-Saxons from neighboring territories before and after the "Purchase." Second, their relative impermeability to the influence of other cultures and languages, due partially to their unexcelled love of and loyalty to France and partially to the geographical isolation of the predominantly rural area where they
settled, helped to preserve the specific cultural traits of their French background, particularly the language.

1.1.3. Blacks in Louisiana

Another element of the Louisiana population which, during the Colonial Period, contributed to the expansion of the French language in the Pelican State were the Blacks who (for reasons to be discussed in Section 3.3) adopted upon their arrival to this region of the New World, as their mother tongue, a French-based linguistic hybridization known in technical journals as "Creole" or "Negro-French." When the Louisiana territory was leased to Antoine Crozat in 1712, giving him the exclusive trade rights, included in the grant was the privilege of sending one ship annually to Africa for Black slaves. However, such privileges were never implemented and under Crozat's grant there were but a few Blacks in Louisiana, brought chiefly from the Caribbean Islands. The first importation of Blacks directly from Africa to Louisiana was not made until 1719 when, according to two documents from the French Archives, two French captains were commissioned to the Coast of Guinea to trade for "well-made and healthy Negroes" to be transported to Louisiana. According to Elizabeth Donnom's investigation, a contingent of 500 slaves arrived at Pensacola in 1719 at that time the French had possession of Pensacola and the seat of the government of the French territory was Fort Louis (Mobile).

While Negro slavery was casual under Crozat's occupancy, the number of Blacks began to increase rapidly after the "first cargo" of 1719, creating a situation which required legislation of "Le Code Noir" promulgated by Governor Bienville in 1724. Alton V. Moody reports, in his article "Slavery on the Louisiana Sugar Plantation," that in 1720 a "second cargo"
of 500 slaves arrived in Mobile; the following year an equal number disembarked in Biloxi; and in 1722 two separate arrivals added another contingent of 590. Thereafter, there was steady importation (but undoubtedly not all directly from Africa) until 1803, when Louisiana came under United States control and slave trade was forbidden. With the inception and rapid growth of the sugar industry in Louisiana, beginning in 1796, the number of Blacks, the majority of which were concentrated in the areas of large sugar and cotton plantations, increased rapidly during the antebellum period, as shown in the following table:

Table 1:

Population of Louisiana By Race: 1810 - 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>% Of Blacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>77,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>42,000</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td>74,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>216,000</td>
<td>89,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>353,411</td>
<td>158,457</td>
<td>193,954</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>518,000</td>
<td>255,000</td>
<td>262,000</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>708,000</td>
<td>338,000</td>
<td>357,000</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>727,000</td>
<td>362,000</td>
<td>364,000</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>939,946</td>
<td>454,954</td>
<td>483,655</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1,118,588</td>
<td>558,395</td>
<td>559,193</td>
<td>50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1,381,625</td>
<td>729,612</td>
<td>650,804</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1,656,388</td>
<td>941,086</td>
<td>713,874</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>2,101,593</td>
<td>1,096,611</td>
<td>700,257</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population of Louisiana By Race: 1810 - 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White Pop.</th>
<th>African Pop.</th>
<th>Creole Pop.</th>
<th>Total Pop.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>1,511,739</td>
<td>849,303</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,361,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1,796,683</td>
<td>882,428</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,679,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>2,211,715</td>
<td>1,045,307</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,257,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>2,552,572</td>
<td>1,099,734</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,652,306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since it was not until 1940 that the Bureau of Census directed its attention to the linguistic diversity in America by collecting data on mother tongue, and since it was not until 1970 that Blacks were included in such a survey, one can only speculate (on the basis of the figures in the above table, granted the inclusion of English-speaking Blacks in them) in order to assess the prevalence of the Creole (i.e. Negro French) dialect throughout the history of Louisiana. But it should be pointed out that the Creole speakers have contributed to the expansion and later the preservation of the French language in Louisiana not simply by their sizable proportion, but also by the prolific French literature they have produced (e.g. Les Cenelles, an anthology of poems published in 1845); the French newspapers and magazines they printed (e.g. L'Album Littéraire, Journal des Jeunes Gens, Amateurs de la Littérature, first issued in 1843, "La Tribune de la Nouvelle Orléans," first Black daily established in 1864); and above all the folk songs, tales, proverbs and the like, which provided literary material for numerous writers (e.g. George Cable, Lafcadio Hearn, Edward Tinker), and in which the Creole dialect has been best preserved. In fact, nowhere else in America, with the exception perhaps of Charleston, South Carolina, did the Blacks (particularly, the so-called "free people
of color") constitute culturally and otherwise so important an element in
the population as they did in Louisiana.19

1.1.4. Spanish Dominion

In November of 1762, Louis XV gave to his cousin, the King of Spain,
by the secret treaty of Fontainebleau, the part of the Louisiana territory
situated west of the Mississippi River and the Island of Orleans, an area
surrounded by a water-line formed by the Mississippi River, Iberville River,
Lake Maurepas, Lake Pontchartrain, Lake Borgue and the Gulf. This gener­
ous gift was deplored by the French colonists who revolted against the de­
signated Spanish governor, Don Antonio de Ulloa, in 1768. The rebellion,
which culminated in the expulsion of the Spanish governor, was quickly
suppressed by Spanish forces led by General Don Alexander O'Reilly and
the Spanish rule was reinstated. However, despite the Spanish administra­
tion (1762-1803), the French language was not seriously challenged by the
Castilian idiom. Conversely, it continued to be the language of the colony.
Two reasons help to explain this state of affairs. One, the new govern­
ment failed to populate the colony with its own people. The number of
Spanish immigrants from the Canary Islands, the Isleños, who were brought
at the Spanish King's expense to found settlements in Lafourche, St. Bernard
and Iberia parishes in 1778, was comparatively very small, even if
one adds the 2,600 Spanish troops who were stationed in the Territory.
Second, various testimonies written during the Spanish dominion in Louisiana
show that the French settlers remained firmly attached to their cultural
mold despite the "strenuous programs designed to stamp them with a Spanish
cultural heritage. For instance, the Spanish governor Unzaga wrote to his King in 1773, eleven years after Spain took control over the territory: "I cannot flatter his majesty so much as to say that the people have ceased to be French at heart." Later, toward the end of the occupation, the Spanish Bishop Perralvert wrote to the King in 1795: "His majesty possesses their bodies and not their souls."

Surprisingly, it is precisely under this foreign occupation that the French literature and the French press in Louisiana were born. Julien Poydras published in 1779 an epic poem in French, "La Prise du Morne du Bâton Rouge par Monseigneur de Galvez" praising, ironically, the heroic exploits of the Spanish governor; and the first French newspaper, Le Moniteur de la Louisiane, was established in 1794.

1.1.5. French "émigrés" in Louisiana

The political turmoil which marks the history of France on the Continent and overseas at the turn of the 18th century has directly and indirectly contributed to the expansion of the French language in Louisiana. Some of these political events have brought to this region of the New World a sizeable wave of French immigrants even under the Spanish and later American dominions. One of these political crises was the Blacks' insurrection of 1791 in Santo Domingo, during which many of the French speaking Whites, who were driven out of the island, made their way to Louisiana. Others took refuge in the neighboring island of Cuba only for a few years, since, when Napoleon's troops later marched into Madrid (March, 1808), the Spanish authorities showed an expected hostility toward the French subjects and issued proclamations for their deportation. On May 2, 1809, the Spanish
governor requested American help to transport the refugees from Cuba to Louisiana. Not too long after, the French exiles began to arrive in New Orleans in alarming numbers. In a letter from Claiborne to John Graham dated July 19th, 1809, the Governor states:

Since my last Official Dispatches to the Government, the number of the Fugitive French from Cuba has greatly augmented; they amount now, including whites, blacks and people of color to upwards of five thousand and several hundred more are said to be on the River.

By the end of August, 1809, a total of 6,060 refugees (1,887 whites, 2,060 free people of color and 2,113 slaves) had arrived in New Orleans from Cuba.

Much later, the French revolutions of 1830 and 1840 helped likewise to reinforce the French element in the State, since many young and educated politicians who escaped persecution took refuge in Louisiana.

These successive waves of political "émigrés" have greatly enhanced the chance for the language to survive and even prosper despite the threatening challenge from English. Aside from the fact that such immigration had increased numerically the size of the Gallic community, many of these "Frenchmen from France" (as they were called to differentiate them from the "Creoles" of White descent) were well educated and initiated cultural activities such as theater, opera and printed media for the first time in the Colony. It was, for instance, a French printer who had fled the slaves' uprising in Santo Domingo, Louis Duclot, who started the first known newspaper in the State, Le Moniteur de la Louisiane, in 1704. Edward Tinker, who is perhaps the most authoritative scholar on the history of the French press in Louisiana, summarizes the contribution.
of the French political turmoils on the local journalism, stating that
the sudden launching of nine newspapers by the year 1810 was due partially
to the advent of the wave of journalists who were driven from Santo Domingo by the Black uprising. He further adds that a second wave of French
journalists, who arrived in Louisiana after the Revolution of 1830, caused
the founding of fifteen papers in New Orleans and four in the Parishes;
and that another group, who came over as a result of Napoleon III's pro-
scriptions of 1848-51, was directly responsible for the appearance of the
first periodicals in the State devoted to literature, art and music.

1.2. The Decline of the French Language

Napoleon had regained the territory from Spain by the treaty of
Ildefonso in 1803, only to sell it two months later to the government of
the United States. The cession treaty between the American government
and the French Republic stipulates in its "Third Article" that the in-
habitants of the ceded territory "shall be maintained and protected in
the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and the religion which they
profess." This clause was, in the opinion of some scholars, supposed to
protect the preservation of the French vernacular as well. However, nine
years later, when Louisiana was admitted as the 18th state of the Union,
the status of the French language began to decline.

1.2.1. The Early American Days: French/English Competition

An attempt to determine the exact period in which the state of
Louisiana moved from a virtually French monolingualism into a practically
English monolingualism, via undoubtedly a bilingual or diaglossic stage, would be an extremely delicate undertaking. The difficulties stem from the lack of prior studies with such an assessment in mind. Actually, the first official census was not taken until 1810 and furthermore the Bureau of Census had not, as was stated before, directed its attention to the question of mother-tongue until 1940 (see footnote 17). With the lack of such valuable information which would have indicated more precisely the course of the bilingualism struggle waged between French and English during the first part of the eighteenth century, we are forced to turn our attention to other historical factors (e.g. Anglo-Saxon immigration, the legislative enactments outlawing the use of French in various domaines) which reflect, or should reflect, the linguistic change in the State.

1,2,1.1. Anglo-Saxon Immigration

The expansion of the city of New Orleans and its transatlantic commerce had attracted English-speaking merchants and traders long before the "Purchase." In a letter dated October, 1769, the Spanish governor, O'Reilly, wrote "I found the English in complete possession of the commerce of the colony. They had in this town their merchants and traders, with open stores and shops, and I can safely assert, that they pocketed nine-tenths of the money spent here." But with the on-and-off diplomatic disputes between Spain and the Colonies, American traders were occasionally denied free access to the port and were sometimes even driven out of the State. However, when the land deal was made between representatives of the French Republic and the government of the United States in 1803, English-speaking Americans were more than welcome to the newly acquired territory. Surprisingly, their
arrival was much slower than might have been expected. The fact that the population of the city of New Orleans had more than doubled between the cession and 1810, when the first official census was taken, does not reflect so large an influx of Americans as has been deduced in some publications. The French refugees from Cuba discussed earlier (a total of 6,060) account for part of the increase.

The minority of inhabitants whose language was not French or Spanish during the first American years is confirmed by the results of a census conducted in 1806 to compute the population of what was then known as the "Territory of Orleans." Accordingly, there were 52,998 people, of which 23,574 were slaves, and 3,355 free people of color, leaving a white population of 26,069; of these at least 13,500 are natives of Louisiana, for the most part descendants of the French; about 3,500 natives of the United States, and the residue, Europeans generally, including the native French, Spaniards, English, Germans and Irish. In 1809, the situation remained unchanged. In a letter (August 5, 1809) from the first governor of the State, Claiborne, to the Secretary of State in which the former replies to some charges made against him concerning his inclination to appoint mostly "Creoles" in his administration, the governor wrote: "The fact is, Sir, that my countrymen (with some few exceptions) who have emigrated here, although they don't exceed one-sixth of the population [emphasis added], would wish to govern the Territory to the exclusion of the ancient inhabitants...."

Whereas before 1810 the Anglo-Saxon immigration was comparatively slow, the following decade saw an astonishing influx of Americans, a fact which can be observed in the following table:
Table 2:
POPULATION GROWTH OF
LOUISIANA AND THE UNITED STATES, 1810-1850

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Louisiana</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Louisiana as a Percent of United States</th>
<th>Decade Rates of Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>76,556</td>
<td>7,239,881</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>153,407</td>
<td>9,638,453</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>100.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>215,739</td>
<td>12,866,020</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>353,411</td>
<td>17,069,453</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>517,762</td>
<td>23,191,876</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the absence of any sizable French immigration in the 1810's, one could reasonably conclude, from the phenomenal growth of 100.5% in the population of the State between 1810 and 1820, that by the year 1820 the French had lost their numerical superiority which, according to Claiborne's above statement, they had enjoyed before the Annexation. The Anglo-Saxons' influx and their subsequent numerical majority have, by means of legal ramifications, precipitated the decline of the Gallic vernacular and assured English a linguistic monopoly in the public, educational, commercial and political activities of the State.

1.2.1.2. French Language and the Law

The Enabling Act, which allowed "the people of the Territory of Orleans, to form a constitution and state government, and for the admission of such state into the Union, on an equal footing with the original states and for other purposes" (Act of Congress, February 10, 1811, c. 21, l, U. S. Stat. 641.), required that "...judicial and legislative written [emphasis added] proceedings shall be conducted in the language in which the laws and the
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judicial and legislative written proceedings of the United States are now published and conducted..." (Enabling Act, Section 3). It seems, therefore, that the use of the French language was not disallowed during the verbal debates on the floor of either the State Convention or the State Legislature. Actually, the French language was, and remained for a while, the dominant language during the delegates' discussion, despite the guidelines prescribed by the Enabling Act and the provisions of Article VI, Section 15, of the first State Constitution, adopted January 22, 1812, whereby judicial and legislative proceedings had to be "promulgated, preserved and conducted in the language in which the Constitution of the United States is written." Ironically, this clause was drafted first in French and translated later into English pursuant to the provisions outlined by the Enabling Act. The assumption that the French version of the above action, which goes as follows, "toutes les lois qui pourront être passées par la Législature devront être promulguées dans la langue dans laquelle la Constitution des États-Unis est écrite et les archives de cet État et les procédures judiciaires devront être rédigées et conservées dans la même langue," was first enacted and then translated into English is evidenced by the fact that the only copy of the first State Constitution signed by the delegates at the Convention in 1812, was the French one. In observance of the provisions of the Enabling Act, an English translation of the copy was made and sent to the U. S. Congress, it carried simply the signature of the Secretary of the Convention, Eligius Fromentin, attesting its authenticity.

The importance of the French idiom in the legislative proceedings of the State during the Ante-Bellum period is supported by Cecil Morgan's study, The First Constitution (Baton Rouge; LSU, 1975), from which he con-
cludes that "French was the first or only language of over half of the
delegates to the original state convention" (p. 6), pointing out that
"a survey of the delegates' surnames indicates that at least twenty-two
[out of the forty-three] delegates were Creoles or native-born Frenchmen"
(p. 7 — footnote 8). Furthermore, he states that "one may browse
through the journals of the proceedings of the early state legislature
and find them only in French" (p. 6). Likewise, Henry E. Chambers states
in his History of Louisiana (Chicago: The American Historical Society,
1925), I, 506, that members of the committee on election reported on
November 19, 1812, and submitted the names of forty-five men whom they
had found to be duly elected. Only forty-three were present and, of
those, seventeen were of American descent and twenty-six claimed French
ancestry.

The first constitution of 1812 lasted thirty-three years before a
new and less aristocratic one was adopted in 1845 respecting, among other
things, suffrage and popular election of the governor. In 1852, a third
constitution was drafted stressing even further the democratic principles
of the country. Later, after the Ordinance of Secession was accepted on
January 26, 1861, a new constitution was required to conform to the Con-
stitution of the Confederate States of America. Thus a revised constitu-
tion was adopted in March of the same year. The laws contained in these
first four constitutions (especially 1845, 1852, and 1861) have generally
respected the bilingual nature of the State and have given the Romance
dialect a prominent if not equally important function in the judicial and
legislative systems of the State.
1.2.2. The Post-War Period: English Supersedes French

In the aftermath of the Civil War, the need for a revision of the laws was imperative and the so-called Carpet Bag Constitution was submitted to the people and ratified on August 18, 1868. The changes brought about by the war were directly and indirectly damaging to the future of the French language in the State. One side effect of the war was the poverty into which the French-speaking population was driven. With the loss of their wealth, the "Creoles" had also lost their social and political prestige. They were forced to forego their annual visits to France and were loosening, henceforth, their traditional ties with the motherland. They also were unable to send their sons to universities in Paris. Instead, they enrolled them in the English public schools of New Orleans. Another detrimental effect of the War was the resulting political powerlessness experienced by the early inhabitants of the State. The Congress of the post-war period, overwhelmingly Republican and radical, favored a policy of punishment under the Congressional Reconstruction Acts whereby former rebels (which included the political elite of the French-speaking community) were excluded from political activities and denied the right to vote. Furthermore, the racism issue which engulfed American politics in the mid-nineteenth century had divided politically the Gallic community within the State as witnessed by the satirical attacks published in the weekly New Orleans magazine, Le Carillon, and addressed to the French-speaking Black office-holders. These sarcastic editorials, most of which are written in the Creole dialect, show that the French-speaking Whites and Blacks were not and could not be politically united to safeguard their linguistic heritage.
The political power enjoyed by the English-speaking Carpetbaggers during the first decade of the post-war period was heavily responsible for the anti-French laws adopted by the 1864 and 1868 Conventions whose delegates abolished the "bilingual" laws and insisted, uncompromisingly, that:

The laws, public records, and the judicial and legislative proceedings of the State, shall be promulgated and preserved in the English language; and no law shall require judicial process to be issued in any other than the English language. (Title VI, General Provisions, Art. 109, 1868).

and that

The general exercises in the public schools shall be conducted in the English language. (Title XI, Public Education, Art. 142, 1864 and Art. 138, 1868).

When the Afro-carpetbagger coalition began to fade in the 1870's, the delegates of subsequent conventions (1879, 1898, and 1913) attempted to restore some of the laws modified, to their displeasure, during the Reconstruction days. But, in spite of the extraordinary fertility rate among the native Catholic French-speaking population, the steady wave of the Anglo-Saxon immigrations coming from other states reduced numerically, hence politically, the strength of the "Creoles" who were only successful in making "the General Assembly provide for the publication of the laws in the French language..." (Art. 154, Constitution of 1879). The Creoles' lobbying and effort to perpetuate the use of their vernacular
was furthermore hindered by the popularization of the "Melting-Pot" concept which began to be explicitly articulated in the United States at the turn of the century.

1.2.3. "Melting-Pot" Concept: A Mortal Blow for French

Following the belief that a linguistic unification is a "sine qua non" of political unity, a doctrine popularized by Teddy Roosevelt's motto "one nation, one language," and perhaps inspired by the biblical story of the "Tower of Babel," Americans from diverse backgrounds were forced, through legislative enactments, to merge into a linguistically homogeneous culture. Though the expression "Melting-Pot" was not coined by Robert Ford until the last decade of the past century, the desire to unify the country by the process of cultural assimilation or perhaps through an Anglo-Saxon acculturation (linguistically and otherwise) had been voiced in Louisiana as soon as the U. S. government took possession of the territory. In a letter to President Madison dated May 16, 1806, Governor Claiborne writes:

> When our disputes with Spain are adjusted, and the Citizens induced to think that their political destiny is fixed; when the English language is generally spoken [emphasis added], and a knowledge of the principles of the American Government diffused, then I shall be disappointed, if the Louisianians should not be among the most zealous and virtuous members of our Republic. 33

However, during the First World War, as in any time of stress, loyalty
and nationalism were emphasized and "foreign" cultural traits (particularly German language) were considered un-American and even suspicious. It was then believed that the unification of the nation, comprised of an ethnically, culturally and linguistically heterogeneous population—a result of the constant wave of immigrations—could be maintained only through the complete sacrifice of the "foreign" traits on the part of the non-Anglo-Saxon components of the society.  

It is very difficult to ascertain that the "Melting-Pot" doctrine, which is not a body of law but was at the time a generally accepted view, is directly responsible for the decline of the French language in Louisiana. But such a cause and effect relationship becomes unavoidable when one realizes that at exactly the same time the above doctrine became prevalent in America, the State legislature had abolished the very last law favorable to the French language in Louisiana and the practice of punishing students who spoke French in schoolyards was initiated. In 1914, the Louisiana State Legislature passed an act (House Bill no. 31, Act. no. 24) requiring that judicial and legal notices no longer be published in French but were to be published henceforth in English only. This was indeed the mortal blow from which the French could never recover. It meant the end, for instance, of the last French newspaper in the State, L'Abeille, which published legal notices in French. The act had, as Edward Tinker puts it, "deprived the poor 'Bee' of its principal source of honey."  

Similarly, it was reported in various testimonies that the Anglicization in the schools of the State was implemented by corporal punishment, perhaps with the aim of unifying the State linguistically and culturally, or perhaps because of the educator's fear that bilingualism during the formative years was detrimental, a view which prevailed in
pedagogical text-books until the Saint-Lambert Experiment in Montreal.\textsuperscript{36} Revon Reed states in his colorful book, \textit{Lâche pas la patate, portrait des Acadiens de la Louisiane} (Québec: Parti pris, 1976), that:

 Ça qui a fait plus de mal à la langue acadienne française, c'était l'interdiction complète de cette langue dans les écoles publiques de la Louisiane. Cette interdiction est venue en effet autour de 1922. En ce temps-là, presque tous les enfants Cajuns [né] connaissaient qu'une langue, leur langue maternelle, la langue Cajun. Du commencement de cette "loi," les enfants étaient punis sévèrement quand les maîtres et maîtresses d'écoles les attrapaient à parler français sur les terres d'écoles (p. 29).

1,3, French Renaissance

With the recent civil rights victories, the "Melting-Pot" concept which engulfed the United States after the Civil War and particularly after World War I, is being swept away as more and more ethnic minorities assert their identity. The "Black is beautiful" phenomenon instigated a mild cultural revolution in the Cajun country, bringing about a drastic change in the attitudes toward the French heritage.\textsuperscript{37} Whereas thirty years ago many Acadians, ashamed of their linguistic heritage, avoided speaking French anywhere outside the confines of their homes, a self-depreciation generated from their cultural peculiarities, today, they take pride in using publicly their knowledge of the Romance idiom.

The drastic change in attitudes on the part of the French and Non-
French toward the Gallic culture in Louisiana has been demonstrated in these, and other, domains: (1) the election of a "Cajun" governor, Edwin Edwards, the first since the Civil War; (2) the unexpected 100% growth of the French-speaking population between 1940 and 1970 which represents, perhaps, a change in cultural affiliation rather than an increase in the usage of the French vernacular (see 4.3.2.); (3) the increase in the air time allotted to radio broadcasting in the French language; (4) the recent publications of local French or bilingual magazines (e.g. Acadiana Profile, Revue de Louisiane/Louisiana Review and La Tribune des Francophones established in 1969, 1972, and 1976 respectively); (5) the creation of bilingual schools where French and English are both used on equal footing (e.g. Alice Boucher Elementary school in Lafayette); and above all (6) the enactments of several laws, to be discussed below, aimed at preserving and utilizing the French language in Louisiana.

The rejuvenation of the French tongue and in general the revival of the French culture were highlighted by the creation, by unanimous vote of the Louisiana Legislature, of a state agency, the Council for the Development of French in Louisiana (or CODOFIL for short), whose purpose is "to do any and all things necessary to accomplish the development, utilization, and preservation of the French language as found in the State of Louisiana for the cultural, economic, and tourist benefit of the state" (House Bill no. 438, Act. no. 409, section 1). Under the leadership of its chairman, former U. S. Congressman (1940-1948) James Domengeaux, the Council convinced the State Legislature to pass by unanimous vote an act (House Bill no. 437, Act. no. 408) providing for an increased French curriculum in all public schools. The act requires that "the French lan-
language and the culture and history of the French populations in Louisiana
and elsewhere in America, shall be taught for a sequence of years in the
public and high school systems of the state...." However, the act also
provides that "any parish or city school board, upon request to the
State Board of Education, shall be excluded from this requirement,..."
Because of such exempting clauses, the Council is sponsoring local chap-
ters to encourage citizen involvement to insure the implementation of
these laws. Likewise, the Council was instrumental in the enactment of
State laws which (1) authorize the establishment of a non-profit French
language television broadcasting corporation (House Bill no. 650, Act.
o. 458, 1968); (2) require the State Board of Education and the Board
of Supervisors of Louisiana State University to direct institutions un-
der their control to offer teacher certification programs in elementary
schools in addition to teacher certification in high school French (Se-
nate Bill no. 374, Act. no. 257, 1968); (3) amend section 204 of Title
43 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950 and providing therefore
that all legal notices may be published in the French language supple-
mentary to the required English publication (Senate Bill no. 371, Act.
o. 256, 1968). The latter act permitted the town of Church Point,
Louisiana, to conduct its city council meeting entirely in French on
Tuesday, October 4, 1976. The Council is continuing its efforts to
achieve other pro-French legislative enactments.
NOTES

1 According to Albert Phelps, in Louisiana: A Record of Expansion (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1905), 3, Pineda had discovered the mouth of a great river which his map names Rio del Espiritu Santo and which may have been the mouth of the Mississippi.


4 Charles Gayarre, 1903: II, p. 133.

5 Ibid.


7 The first mention of the Acadians' arrival in Louisiana is found in a letter written by Commissaire Foucault, dated February 28, 1765, in which he states that previously several Acadian families numbering 193 persons had arrived from Santo Domingo (see Alcée Fortier, A History of Louisiana (New York: Goupil and Co., 1904), I, 152.)

8 According to Harry Griffin in an address delivered at a meeting of "France-Amérique de la Louisiane Acadienne" at the College of the Sacred Heart in Grand Coteau, Louisiana (Oct. 18, 1952), the Acadians numbered 2500 by 1780; 4000 by 1790 and between 40,000 and 50,000 by 1900. The
address entitled "A Brief History of the Acadians," reprinted in a little booklet, is available at most Louisiana libraries.

9 Harlan W. Gilmore concludes from his study, "Social Isolation of the French Speaking People of Rural Louisiana," Social Forces, XXII (October, 1933), that "the Acadians offer the best example of large-scale community isolation to be found in this country. It should be pointed out, also, as a result of this isolation they constitute probably the largest unassimilated nationality group in America" (p. 82). George Arceneaux has also reported, from his statistically based study, "The French Language in Southern Louisiana," Louisiana Schools, XV (October, 1937), 26, that French persists longer in rural communities where Acadians have generally settled than in urbanized districts such as Baton Rouge and New Orleans.

10 The 14th Article of Crozat's Grant reads as follows: "If for his operations and plantations Sr. Crozat judges it proper to have negroes in said country of Louisiana he may send each year a vessel to Guinea to do so..." (in Calendar of Original Documents, Publication of Louisiana Historical Society, IV (1908), 19).

11 According to Charles Bathelemy Rousseve in The Negro in Louisiana (New Orleans: The Xavier University Press, 1937), 20, there were only twenty-two black slaves in the territory in 1713. Alton V. Moody reports in his article "Slavery on the Louisiana Sugar Plantation," Louisiana Historical Quarterly, VII (1924), 206, about the same number (20) for the same year.


14 Alton V. Moody, 1924, p. 207.


17 While statistics on mother-tongue of foreign white stock (e.g. newcomers) was provided by previous census, data on the mother tongue of the native white of native parentage were collected for the first time in 1940 and their tabulations were published in a special publication, Sixteenth Census of the United States: 1940; Population; Nativity and the Parentage of the White Population; Mother Tongue by Nativity, Parentage, Country of Origins, and Age, for States and Large Cities (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1943). The 1970 Decennial Census (the second time statistics on mother tongue were collected) included all races. However the 1970 data were broken down into only two rubrics, whites and all other races, in a special publication by the Census Bureau, Detailed Characteristics (Washington: Department of Commerce, 1975), 431. Specific information on French-speaking Blacks (which were included in the rubric "all races") is not therefore available.

18 For a comprehensive treatment on the literary achievements of the French-speaking Black population in Louisiana see Charles B. Rousseve's The Negro in Louisiana, 1937.


Ibid.

Luis M. Perez, "French Refugees to New Orleans in 1809," *Southern History Association*, IX (September, 1905), 295.

The total number was computed from Claiborne's subsequent correspondence by Luis M. Perez, 1905, p. 295.


Cited in George E. Waring, Jr. (Comp.), 1970, I, p. 228.

In the letter of 1769 referred to above, O'Reilly states: "I drove off all the English traders and the other individuals of that nation whom I found in this town, and I shall admit here none of their vessels."


Cited in Louis M. Perez, 1905, p. 308.

Some of the reasons for the sudden increase are the admission of Louisiana as the 18th state of the Union in 1812 and the arrival of the first steamboat to the Crescent City in the same year, marking the beginning of a vast transportation network on the inland waterways.


Edward Larocque Tinker, 1933, p. 35.

Wallace Lambert and Elizabeth Peal have indicated in their article, "The Relation of Bilingualism to Intelligence," *Psychological Monographs*, (1963), 1-23, that the majority of the studies investigating the relation of bilingualism and intelligence, prior to 1960, have concluded that bilingualism has a detrimental effect. Only two empirical studies have shown that bilingualism may have favorable intellectual consequences. It should be noted, however, that since Lambert and Peal's study (1963), the majority of the investigations conducted on the subject indicate that the bilingual children achieve higher scores on intelligence tests than their monolingual peers.

George Lane, writing at the same time the above anti-French rule was in practice in schools, states in this article, "Notes on Louisiana French," *Language*, X (December, 1934), 324, that the "excuse given for the ruling
is that the use of the [French] dialect retards the child's English."

37 There are, for instance, bumper stickers and T-shirts carrying the motto "Cajun Power."

38 See the section on French radio broadcasting in Louisiana in the Appendix.

39 *Morning Advocate* [Baton Rouge], October 8, 1976.
2. USAGES OF THE TERM CREOLE IN LOUISIANA

Extensive literature has been written on both the etymology and the meaning of the word creole. Almost every dictionary published in Spanish, French, or English has attempted in one way or another to give its own concise and rigorous definition. Unfortunately, these attempts have not usually dispelled the confusion, misunderstanding and controversy associated with the usage of this term. Since its earliest recorded attestation at some time before 1590, the term has assumed a considerable number of meanings, making an assessment of its semantic range an extremely delicate undertaking.¹ A partial explanation of the semantic complexity of the term lies in the fact that it has in the course of time been specialized in meanings depending on 1) as Morris Goodman has observed, the geographical context in which it was used (e.g. Louisiana, Antilles),² 2) the particular group of persons (e.g. linguists, historians, laymen) using the term and 3) the historical setting (e.g. Colonial Period, present day) of the meaning.

An assessment of the semantic configurations, both diachronically and synchronically, of the lexical item has been attempted by James Hintze and myself in a forthcoming publication.³ For the purpose of this Chapter, an attempt will be made to outline briefly some of the most prevalent meanings described or prescribed by Louisiana lexicographers and to discuss in particular the various readings of the term used throughout the present work in hope that such a presentation will clear the air.
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of possible confusion and misunderstanding usually associated with the usages of this term.

The meanings of the term creole can be grouped, for the sake of a clear and convenient presentation, into two semantic domains—ethnic and linguistic.

2.1. The Ethnic Meaning:

This denotation of the term, as it is applied in Louisiana, is generally agreed upon to mean a person born and reared in the West Indies or Louisiana and having European lineage with some implication of high social status. This is somewhat the common denominator of most definitions proposed by glossary compilers and other interested writers. In fact, a bird's eye view of the literature would reveal irreconcilable contradictions in the various attempts seeking to define the ethnic meaning of the term. These contradictions usually center around information intended to specify the various parts of the above definition and stem partially from the polysemy of the word, and partially from the scholar's prescriptivism and persistence in singling out a simple and rigorous definition.

One source for such contradictions lies in the lexicographers' attempt to clarify the notion of "European blood." Whereas William Read implies from his definition that to qualify for the appellation "Creole," one must have either Spanish or French lineage, Minnie Kelley emphatically insists that "to lay claim to the appellation of Creole, one must have both Spanish and French blood in his veins" [emphasis added]. Captain Bossu, a French officer stationed in Louisiana during the 1750's, who published his observations about the State in Nouveaux Voyages aux Indes...
Occidentales, 1755, gives another interesting and chauvinistic version. Accordingly, one "calls Creoles those who are born of a Frenchman and a Frenchwoman or of a European woman." Other writers are less restrictive in their ethnic selection. Lafcadio Hearn, who wrote extensively about the life and customs of the "Creoles" in the columns of the New Orleans Times-Democrat in the latter part of the nineteenth century, believes that "...the Creoles of New Orleans and of Louisiana...are all those native-born who can trace back their ancestry to European immigrants or to European colonists of the state, whether those were English, Dutch, German, French, Spanish, Italian, Greek, Portuguese, Russian, or Sicilian." Hearn quickly added, however, that "the term is generally understood here [New Orleans] as applying to French residents, especially those belonging to old French families." George Cable contests on the other hand the inclusion of the Anglo-Saxons. According to the author of Creoles of Louisiana, "...there are no English, Scotch, Irish, Western, or 'Yankee' creoles, these all being included under the distinctive term 'American'."

A host of other writers has expanded the semantic range of the term and added "racially mixed hybrid" as another reading of the term. One of these is George Cable, who includes in his implicit as well as explicit definitions any French speaking persons of White and Black parentage. His expanded definition was met, as one may expect, by severe criticism from some white Creoles, such as Adrien Rouquette in Critical Dialogue Between Aboo and Caboo or a New Book or a Grandissime Ascension, (Mingo City [New Orleans]; Great Publishing House, 1880); Charles Gayarré in "The Creoles of History and the Creoles of Romance," a lecture presented at Tulane University, New Orleans (April 25, 1885) also as a reprint; and
Alcée Fortier in "A Few Words about the Creoles of Louisiana," a paper delivered to the Annual Convention of the Louisiana Educational Association, 1892. Incidentally it is for this reason, among others, that Edward Tinker wrote:

The two people most heartily hated by the Creoles of Louisiana were "bloody" O'Reilly, who, when governor, executed five of their compatriots for conspiring against Spanish rule, and George Washington Cable, who had the temerity to write of their race.10

It is noteworthy to mention, as some of the critics of French descent did (e.g. Adrien Rouquette, Alcée Fortier, Charles Gayarré), that Cable's works are primarily novels and should not be taken as serious etymological or lexical studies. Most of his definitions are indeed implicit from his characters' portraits. For instance, in the Grandissimes (1880), talking about one of his protagonists, Cable states that "his whole appearance was a dazzling contradiction that a creole is a person of mixed blood." However, in an historical sketch of the city of New Orleans prepared for the publication of the Tenth United States Census (1880), Cable gave the following "history" and meaning of the term:

The term creole is commonly applied in books to the native of a Spanish colony descended from European ancestors, while often the popular acceptation conveys the idea of an origin partly African. In fact, its meaning varies in different times and regions, and in Louisiana alone has, and has had, its close, its earlier and its later significance.
For instance, it did not here first belong to the descendants of Spanish, but of French settlers. But such a meaning implied a certain excellence of origin, and so came early to include any native of French or Spanish descent by either parent, whose pure non-mixture with the slave race entitled him to social rank. Much later the term was adopted by, not conceded to, the natives of European-African or creole-African blood, and is still so used among themselves. At length the spirit of commerce availed itself of the money-value of so honored a title, and broadened its meaning to take in any creature of thing, of variety or manufacture peculiar to Louisiana, that might become an object of sale, as creole ponies, chickens, cows, shoes, eggs, wagons, baskets, cabbages, etc.¹¹

With the anglicization of Louisiana and the subsequent decline in the use of Romance languages, a knowledge of the mother tongue, in addition to the ancestry requirements, seemed at last an appropriate and decisive eligibility test. According to the founder of the "Creole Association," a true Creole is "a native descendant of European parents speaking French or Spanish."¹²

Another controversial matter involves the "life span" of the term. William Read states that the term creole was applied only to descendants of French and Spanish settlers who lived during the Colonial Period, implying that the term was never used after the "Purchase" save for its historical sense.¹³ Likewise, Marc-Étienne Ficatier states very explicitly that "lorsqu'on parle des créoles, on est obligé de s'exprimer
au passé, car les créoles en tant que classe sociale n'existent plus."

This diachronic limitation is, of course, not shared by the nineteenth century "Creole" scholars such as Mercier or Fortier, nor by the present members of "L'Athénée Louisianais."

The disagreement over the diachronic limitation of the term creole can be alleviated somewhat if one systematizes various semantic configurations conveyed by its usage. For instance, James Hintze and Larbi Oukada have concluded in their paper "On Defining the Term Creole in Louisiana," that there are at least three possible readings of the term when it denotes certain classifications of people. These are (1) the historical meaning, referring to the early colonizers of, say, French or Spanish descent, (2) the descendancy meaning, which simply means that a person calls or perceives of himself as a Creole because it has been shown, after a genealogical survey, that his lineage goes back to the early settlers of, say, French or Spanish descent, and finally (3) the synchronic ethnic meaning, which would exist only if neighbors or friends, particularly those who do not perceive of themselves as Creoles, refer to a person as Creole on the basis of sociocultural characteristics (e.g. use of "ethnic" vernacular, food and dress habits) unique to the Creole community. Hintze and Oukada's findings indicate that the term creole is no longer conveying the synchronic ethnic meaning in Louisiana. It seems, therefore, that with the "Americanization" of the State, the intercultural (or even interracial) marriages, mobility, among other "melting" agents, the ethnicity feature, whatever it was originally, has ceased to function as a distinctive feature in the semantic configuration of the term. Consequently, it has, with respect to its synchronic meaning, lost its "raison d'être" in Louisiana. It is for this reason perhaps
that Dominique Lamoureux reports from her field-work that the term is hardly used today inside Louisiana. 16

There are obviously endless varieties and discrepancies one can mention concerning the old and current "ethnic" meanings of the term creole, but a complete inventory is indeed a matter which could not be satisfactorily treated within the compass of a single chapter. The preceeding comments on the use or misuse of the term are not intended to point out its "correct" usage, but merely to show the extent of its ill-defined polysemy and possibly clear the air of possible confusion and misunderstanding usually associated with the usage of this term in linguistic investigations dealing with Louisiana French. It has been shown above from various testimonies that Whites, Blacks, Mulattoes, Germans, Spaniards, Frenchmen, Englishman, etc...have all laid claim, at one time or another, to this enviable appellation.

2.2. Linguistic Meaning

Generally, the origin of the linguistic meaning of the term creole is thought of as an extension of the ethnic sense. 17 The term has been adjectivized in the expression creole languages which was in turn abbreviated to Creoles particularly in linguistic literature where the context makes its interpretation unambiguous. Thus, the adjectival form was re-nominalized with a new meaning.

Although Pidgin and Creole languages, as a linguistic group of some sort, are not recent innovations in the history of human language, 18 they were brought to the attention of language specialists only subsequent to the arrival of African slaves in the New World. 19 The latter, imported
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from multilingual communities and carefully selected by traders for preventive reasons to form linguistically heterogeneous groups, adopted their masters' languages, or a version of them, as lingue franche. Several decades after the establishment of slavery in the New World, workers in linguistics gradually discovered the striking similarities these newly developed languages share irrespective of the base languages (e.g. colonists' languages such as French, English, Spanish, Portuguese) from which they, at least with respect to the lexicon, derived. Thereafter, in mid-nineteenth century, academic publications began to appear describing the structure of these curious languages.

Since the pioneering works of J. J. Thomas, Theory and Practice of Creole Grammar (Port-of-Spain, 1869), and Hugo Schuchardt, Kreolische Studien (1883-1891), workers in the field have proposed several definitions of the linguistic meaning of the term only to have them criticized and rejected later as inadequate. The search for a satisfactory definition continues still today. Actually, the controversy over a rigorous and concise definition of the linguistic meaning is linked to the controversy over the genesis of Creole languages which attempts to answer the question: How did these languages acquire the structural similarities they share? Robert Hall proposed the following definitions of the three expressions, lingua franca, pidgin and creole,

A lingua franca is any tongue serving as a means of communication among groups that have no other languages in common; for example English in India and the Philippines. A pidgin language is a lingua franca that in the course of its adoption has become simplified and restructured. The reduced
language. Which results from this process is nobody's native language, but the languages of its speakers considerably influence its vocabulary and other features. Occasionally users of a pidgin language will cease to speak their native tongue and come to rely upon the pidgin entirely. In such a community children will grow up speaking pidgin as their sole language. When a pidgin is pressed into service as a native language its vocabulary must greatly expand to accommodate its users' everyday needs. A reduced language thus re-expanded is called a creolized language. 20

Hall's typological definition of pidginized languages, hence creolized languages, useful and practical as it may be, remains somewhat imprecise. It is not very clear what are the exact rules of "simplification" and "reduction" operating during the formation of these languages. Furthermore, the "reduction process," seen by some as a refined version of the "baby talk" theory, does not seem to account for the predictably common features among Creoles of various bases nor the reported complexity in some levels (e.g. verbal aspects) of these languages. To overcome these difficulties, other scholars proposed the so-called historical definitions. Accordingly, a Pidgin, hence a Creole, language can evolve only in an historical setting involving the learning of a target language (e.g. the European colonists' idiom, or superstratum) by a community composed of no fewer than two groups speaking mutually unintelligible languages (or substratum). The requirement of a multi-lingual substratum, which disqualifies other linguistic hybridization (e.g. Old French) as Creoles, was introduced by
Keith Whinnom who states that "...a pidgin always arises...from a situation involving a target language and two or more substrate languages..." Whinnom proposed a general formula schematizing the hybridization of Pidgin and Creole languages:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Target language} \\
\text{substrate languages A x B (x C,..)}
\end{array}
\]

This representation, possibly sound in theory, is not practical in most Creole descriptions because, as Whinnom himself pointed out, "the subordinate or substrate languages can rarely be designated so precisely or so economically..." Indeed, it is almost impossible to enumerate the "denominator" of Louisiana Creole. There is, in addition, disagreement among scholars concerning the minimum requirement of the substrate. J. L. Dillard, for instance, requires a minimum of four mutually unintelligible substrate in order that a given linguistic hybridization result in a Creole language. The number four is apparently derived from the fact that, among the Creole languages (structurally defined!) well documented, the one with the smallest "denominator" has four substrate. According to Hall, a critical requirement in any creolization is the relatively short duration of the linguistic hybridization. Thus, the multilingual substratum is not the "creolizing" agent, but it simply accelerates the hybridization (Hall, informal talk at the Louisiana State University, May, 1976).

In Louisiana, the scholarly nomenclature of Creole describing the "linguistic hybridization" discussed above was not welcomed for various reasons. First, since the term has been used in the State with different meanings, an additional meaning would lead to confusion and misunderstanding. Second, as Edward Tinker reports, "the proud, sensitive Creoles disliked..."
the appellation—Creole dialect—given it by scholars. They resented
the association of Creole with a Black's man baragouin, for they did not
want anyone to mistake the dialect as theirs. 

Alcée Fortier, for instance, did not accept such a labeling and referred to the dialect in
his publications as "Negro-French." This onomastic invention was severely
critized by an admirer of Creole studies, Lafcadio Hearn. In a re-
view of Fortier's paper, "The French Language and the Negro-French Dia-
lect" (1884), Hearn states:

It seems to us, however, a slight affectation to apply
to this patois the term "Negro-French," as Mr. Fortier
has done—probably for the mere purpose of saving hyper-
sensitiveness; and we think so because the only reason
why the patois has a great philological interest is just
because it is not Negro-French. Negro-French exists,
but it is something quite different; and so long as
philology the world over applies to such dialects as
that now under consideration the term "Creole," there
is no necessity for any euphemisms. The original ex-
pression is admirably significative,—as implying not
only a form of language, but also the special conditions
which gave the language existence.

Other writers continued to avoid the already ambiguous term and coin-
ed a variety of designations to refer to the French language spoken pri-
marily by Blacks. Tinker, for instance, insists on the African word
"Gombo," French scholars usually prefer "patois," or "petit nègre;" still
other use, maliciously perhaps, such terms as "courivini" or one of its
derivatives, "courimovini," "mo couri to vini," etc.... More recently the term "Black French" has been used. 26
NOTES

1 According to Morris Goodman, in his A Comparative Study of Creole French Dialect (The Hague: Mouton, 1964), "the earliest citation of the form [of the word Creole] found in any of these dictionaries...is Spanish, namely in J. P. de Acosta's Historia natural y moral de las Indias (1590), Bk. IV, Ch. XXV" (p. 10).


4 William A. Read, Louisiana French (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1931), 32. Read's definition is as follows: "A white descendant of the French or Spanish settlers in Louisiana during the Colonial Period (1699-1803)."


8 Ibid.

9 George Cable, "New Orleans" in Report of Social Statistics of Cities, ed. George E. Waring, Jr. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1887), 218. This is a contradiction to an earlier statement made by Cable in a
letter to an editor in Boston (May 31, 1875) in which he states: "I am a Creole myself, living today in sight of the house where I was born" [the letter is in the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library].

10 Edward L. Tinker, "Cable and the Creole," American Literature, V (January, 1934), 313.

11 George Cable, 1887, p. 218.


13 See footnote 4.


15 With the mixed marriages between the various ethnic groups it becomes rather difficult to define the word in terms of a "pure" blood. In a recent article in the Times-Picayune of New Orleans (February 1, 1976, section 4: p. 1-2), an offspring of the first Anglo-Saxon governor of the State, Claiborne, was claimed by the author of the feature, Lilly Jackson, as a true "Creole" gentleman. To justify such an appellation, the author defined "Creoles" as follows: "They are Caucasian descendants of either French or Spanish ancestors, or both, and a sometimes alliance with the members of the gentry from the Colonies, as in the case of Mr. [William Charles Cole Claiborne] Perrilliat whose own bloodlines are a fusion of all three" (p. 2).

16 Dominique M. Lamoureux, "The Struggle for Survival, the Uniqueness of the French Creoles in Louisiana" (Master's thesis, Ohio State University, 1975), 16.


19 Franklin Southworth in "Detecting Prior Creolization: An Analysis of the Historical Origins of Marathi," eds. Hymes and Gumperz, 1971, points out that though "linguists often suspect that the same thing [the process of pigginization and creolization] may have happened on other occasions in the more distant past [than within the last 400 years], such suspicions must remain pure speculation unless supported by historical documentation—or unless it is possible to establish a set of criteria which would prove the likelihood of pigginization having occurred at an earlier period in history" (p. 255). However, he concludes his article suggesting that Marathi had a pidgin in its past and that its "pigginization took place throughout the Indo-Aryan area" (p. 270).


22 Ibid., p. 107.

23 Personal communication, November 1975.


25 *New Orleans Times-Democrat*, October 17, 1886. In later publications, (e.g. *Louisiana Studies*, 1894), Fortier did adopt the appellations "creole dialect" (p. 134) and "creole patois" (p. 184).
26. William J. Thomas, "Louisiana Creole French, Black or White?"

3. THE TERRITORY AND POPULATION OF THE FRENCH-SPEAKING LOUISIANANS*

Scholars describing various aspects of French Louisiana have attempted, usually on the basis of sheer impressionistic observations or sometimes by means of ingenious and perhaps scientific procedures, to establish the borderline of the present day French territory and, further, to give an estimation of its French-speaking population. Their conclusive statements are, however, characterized, on the one hand by an unusual degree of controversy and inconsistency and, on the other hand, by a lack of justification for their selected, hence determining, variables in identifying the French population or area. This chapter represents an attempt to discuss some of the problematic issues confronting those whose purpose is either to make a demographic assessment of the "French" element in the southern part of the State or to map the territory where the "French" culture predominates. With such a goal in mind, the following presentation will be devoted to (1) a review of previous studies which have attempted in various ways to give either a synchronic definition of the French community, an estimation on the size of its population, or a geographical mapping of its territory and (2) an analysis of the complex network of variables which need to be defined in order that an approximation and/or a territorial mapping of the French population may be satisfactorily achieved.

*I should like to acknowledge appreciation to Lydia Candy Bell for her assistance in the preparation of this chapter; to Professors Fred Kniffen and Milton Newton for their comments and suggestions; and to Phillip Larimore for drafting the computerized maps.
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3.1. Who Are the French?

Prior to giving a demographic assessment of the French community and to mapping the geographic confines of its territory, it is perhaps appropriate to begin with a search for a concise and rigorous definition of the so-called "French" of Louisiana.

3.1.1. Historical Perspective

During the Colonial Period, the French population was comprised of three distinctive elements: (1) the "Creoles," or the descendants of the early settlers who came directly from France, sometimes via short sojourns in the Antilles, (2) the Acadians, who after "le grand dérangement" of 1755 took refuge in Louisiana and (3) the Blacks (at least linguistically French) who adopted French upon their arrival in this part of the New World. While this division was once readily obvious, the social amalgamation, the transcultural (and even transracial) marriages, the decline in the use of the French language, the partial or total Anglo-Saxon acculturation of each of the above groups, among other unifying factors, have blurred whatever clear boundaries existed originally among them. Thus, it is no longer possible to delineate each of the above sub-groups individually without increasing difficulties. Here, the expression "French"\(^1\) is used to refer to whatever unified "culture" into which the Creoles and Acadians (at least)\(^2\) have merged. This alleged cultural unification is best illustrated in the "dialect leveling" of the distinctive varieties of French once spoken in Louisiana. Such dialect leveling, which has been reported by numerous studies,\(^3\) is summarized by Alexander
Hull in the following words: "Louisiana French, traditionally divided into three groups (Colonial, Acadian, and Negro), seems to show today a pattern of fundamental unity, although with multiple variation in detail. It is impossible to trace in the present state of Louisiana French a clear boundary between dialects which once were 'Acadian' and those which were 'Colonial French,' and even the Creole dialect (i.e. Negro 'French') is less distinct than formerly."

A genealogical division of Acadians versus Creoles is no longer maintainable since, as Alvin Bertrand and Calvin Beale have pointed out, "the distinctions within the French population faded with the passing of time. 'Cajun' and 'Creole' are now used more as descriptions of attitude and ways of life than actual identifications of ancestry, for lines of descent have often become mixed and forgotten." The composition of this resultant culture is further complicated by the inclusion of other non-French ethnic groups of Louisiana (e.g. German, Spanish) who have been, in the course of time, "Frenchified."

A host of writers deny the cultural fusion referred to above and insist that even today the French community is composed of distinctive subcultures. While acknowledging that an atomization of such a population into smaller groups (e.g. Acadians or "Cajuns," Creoles) is not an impossible task, it certainly would multiply the difficulties already inherent in a treatment of the broadest form of the French culture. Such additional difficulties are reflected in an attempt made by Jon Gibson and Stephen Del Sesto at defining the "Cajun" subculture. Accordingly, "a Cajun is most emphatically identifiable as an individual who is typically Roman Catholic, is rural or of rural extraction, emphasizes kinship relations over those of non-kin-based associations, and who speaks or un-
derstands both English and Louisiana French languages or has close relatives who do so.\textsuperscript{6} Though the above definition has a considerable heuristic value, it becomes extremely imprecise when it is implemented for the purpose of a demographic assessment. It is not clear, for instance, how far back in time one should go to satisfy the "rural extraction" requirement, how close the French-speaking relatives (maternal or paternal?) should be to meet the linguistic requirement, how a demographer would implement the notion "typically," or how the emphasis on kinship relations can be measured, to enumerate only a few problems. Furthermore, Gibson and Del Sesto's selected "Cajunisms" would identify French-speaking Blacks (since no physical or racial features were given) and Creole farmers as well (unless one would deny the existence of farmers among Creoles). It must be pointed out that Gibson and Del Sesto, using Frederick Barth's notion of ascription and self-ascription, also stated that "Indians, Blacks, Germans, Italians, Spaniards, French Nationals, French Canadians, and Anglo-Saxons are all Cajuns if they perceive of themselves and are so perceived by others."\textsuperscript{7} Though such a definition has been praised by Dorice Tencchoff as "more useful than others,...simple ...direct and...does more justice to socio-cultural reality,"\textsuperscript{8} it seems to eschew the entire question of rendering explicit the notion or concept "Cajun" and is therefore unrevealing and of little use in qualifying and quantifying the French or even the Cajun population.

3.1.2. Contemporary Definitions

Synchronically, the French community has been defined in terms of its "cultural" traits (e.g. Gibson and Del Sesto's above definition), its
"sociological" characteristics, its "linguistic" repertoire, or a combination of the three. The terms "cultural," "social," and even "linguistic," though their meanings can be made precise, are usually used, particularly in the literature on the Louisiana French population, loosely and ambiguously. In the following review of previous attempts which sought to qualify the French population, these overlapping criteria, used to set apart the French community as a distinct group of some sort, will hereinafter be referred to as "socio-cultural" features, and no attempt will be made to separate "cultural" from "social" idiosyncracies.

3.1.2.1. Socio-cultural Definition

Anthropologists and sociologists have traditionally defined the French community in Louisiana by listing a bundle of distinctive features which are not shared in their totality by other ethnic groups in the State. Since the majority of these studies deal mainly with the socio-cultural characteristics of the "Cajun" subculture, it will be pointed out throughout the discussion that to restrict the scope in such a way, particularly when the Acadian subculture is ill-defined, is to raise more unanswered questions. Some of the salient and frequently mentioned socio-cultural features of the French community are, aside from the use of the French language which will be discussed in some detail later, as follows.

3.1.2.1.1. Roman Catholic Religion

Louisianans of French descent have maintained on the whole the religious faith of their forefathers, a significant factor in the persis-
tence of their culture, which distinguishes them today from the pre-
dominantly Anglo-Saxon Protestants in North Louisiana. Such an undeni-
able characteristic led Lynn Smith and Homer Hitt, authors of The
People of Louisiana (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1952),
to use the data on religious affiliations (from Census of Religious
Bodies, 1930) in the State as supportive evidence for their proposal
that the French-speaking parishes form a triangle which is more or less
the same as the one formed by the distribution of parishes which are pre-
dominantly (over 2/3) Catholic and (2) to incorporate the number of Cath-
olics in the State in deducing their estimation of the French population
(see below). It should be pointed out that the French/Catholic correla-
tion is adulterated by the presence in Southern Louisiana of non-French
Catholics; that is, Spanish, Italians, Irish, Hungarian, etc... and by
the recent conversion of some French Catholics into Baptism and Pente-
costilism as indicated, for instance, by the many "Baptist Hours" broad-
casted in French over several radio stations in Louisiana (see Appendix
for the various religious broadcasting in French).

3.1.2.1.2. Cultural Impermeability

Harlan Gilmore, as well as others, has called Acadians "the largest
unassimilated nationality group in America." Indeed, the Acadians'
socio-cultural tenacity has been evidenced historically by their stubborn
refusal to swear allegiance to the King of England, which led subsequent-
ly to their deportation from Nova Scotia, and by their resistance to the
cultural assimilation instigated by the "Melting-Pot" philosophy whereby
Americans from diverse backgrounds were forced (e.g. through legislative
enactments) to merge into a culturally cohesive society. The current use of the French language, however casual it may be, is strong evidence for such relative immunity to total absorption by the dominant or "mainstream" culture. It is difficult, however, to ascertain that the "tenacity feature" is peculiar to the Acadian subculture alone. Would the "Creoles" of New Orleans have perpetuated their Colonial French to a greater degree had they settled in as geographically isolated area as the Acadians did? Unfortunately, the answer to this question is beyond the scope of the present chapter. But, it should be pointed out that the "Creoles" have demonstrated beyond all doubt a vigorous loyalty to their heritage. André Lafargue reports, for instance, on the Creoles' lobbying to prevent the anti-French laws passed by the State Legislature (e.g. the House Bill no. 31, Act. no. 24, of 1914, terminating the judicial and legal notices in the French language). The Creoles' loyalty is likewise reflected in the militant writings of Alfred Mercier and Alcée Fortier and other Creole scholars whose lifetime goal was, among other things, "de perpétuer la langue française en Louisiane."

3.1.2.1.3. Cultural Absorbability

In addition to their unique resistance to a "foreign" acculturation, the French who have settled in Louisiana have demonstrated, in the opinion of several scholars, a unique "power" of absorbing their non-French neighbors. Hanno Deiler has reported in his study on the "Creoles" of German descent in Louisiana that a number of them had been totally assimilated into the persistent cultural mold of the French shortly after their immigration in 1721, pointing out that, by the third generation,
the German language was virtually unused. His pioneering study on the French cultural absorbability was later expanded by Lynn Smith and Vernon Parenton, who state that:

the French assimilated the Germans while both were under Spanish rule and both subject to strenuous programs designed to stamp them with a Spanish cultural heritage. But the virile French culture was not content with this, and even made a beginning at swallowing the politically dominant Spaniards themselves, a beginning which had been practically consummated during the American period while both were enveloped in the so-called melting pot which was heralded as bringing about Americanization.

3.1.2.1.4. Other Socio-cultural Features

It is needless to stress that the above repertoire is but a partial listing of socio-cultural traits which have been treated in the literature as "typically" French. Lynn Smith and Lauren Post report on a unique "Cajunism," the "outstanding co-operative institution still maintained by the Acadians of southwest Louisiana," the country butchery ("la boucherie de compagne"). Allen Begnaud and Jon Gibson claim that "one of the distinctive features of Cajun culture is its unique complex of folk occupations," naming, among others, moss gathering, fur trapping, crawfishing, frogging, crabbing and turtle catching. Other scholars have characterized, hence distinguished, the French population by their "joie de vivre," the folkloric motifs in popular tales, their voting
behavior, their rural or urban organizations, their housetypes, their distinctive food habits, to mention just a few.

3.1.2.2, Weakness of the Socio-cultural Definition

The socio-cultural traits, important as they are to other social scientists, are of little use in approximating the number of French-speaking Louisianians and thereby measuring the present viability of the French language in the State or defining the current contour of the so-called "French Louisiana." Their relatively weak reliability stems at least from two points: (1) the impalpability of the socio-cultural features outlined above (e.g. cultural permeability and absorbability) and (2) the sometimes indirect relationship between heritage and linguistic competence since, at least according to Gibson and Del Sesto's above statement, a "Cajun" is not necessarily a person who speaks or understands French as long as he has relatives who do so. It should be noted as William Knipmeyer has pointed out in his doctoral work, that there are, in addition to the non-material aspects of the culture (e.g. language, religion, customs) some material, hence palpable, items (e.g. dwellings, outbuildings, boats, fences and systems of field and lot enclosure) "which distinguish that part of Louisiana inhabited by the descendants of French colonists." Such landscape forms might prove useful for the mapping of French Louisiana, unless modernization and mobility among other factors detrimental to the preservation of culture have altered considerably the French folkways.
Since "French" is a title which has been assigned by historians, anthropologists, sociologists, and other workers in the field to anyone whose life style encompasses the above socio-cultural features and/or whose (pure?) lineage goes back to some early French explorer or later "émigré," among other reasons, it becomes necessary for the present study, aimed at assessing the role and status of the language by the number of its speakers, to restrict the term "French-speaking" to only those residents, French and non-French (e.g. German and Spanish that have been linguistically acculturated), who have a linguistic competence in the French language.\textsuperscript{27} The French/French-speaking distinction becomes more evident when one finds a Broussard or a Guillot who cannot speak French, but can find a Lauren Post, author of \textit{Cajun Sketches} (Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 1962), who in his own words "can scarcely qualify as a Cajun because \[his\] father and mother were of Anglo-Saxon stock from Mississippi and New York, respectively, \[but who\] became fairly proficient in speaking Cajun French" (p.v).

Though the awareness of the French/French-speaking distinction was current in most of the works dealing with the French population, it has never been emphasized in terms of linguistic competence, as opposed to historical or cultural background. For instance, Kollmorgen and Harrison made the distinction simply because "the linguistic designation is the most convenient and the least misleading."\textsuperscript{28} The relative negligence of such a distinction helps to explain the monumental discrepancies which characterize the various estimations of the French population proposed by several writers (see Table 3).
Table 3:
Selected Estimations on the French Population
Made in the Twentieth Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date for which each estimation was projected</th>
<th>Estimations given under the term of the population used by the author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Griffin (1952)</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>40,000-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauvrière (1924)</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith &amp; Hitt (1952)</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>565,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith &amp; Hitt (1952)</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roumagnac (1948)</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>565,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roumagnac (1948)</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>660,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kollmorgen &amp; Harrison (1946)</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post (1962)</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips (1968)</td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acadiana Profile (1970)</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1,468,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millerand-Planer and Planer (1976)</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1,100,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The authors give the following breakdown: 900,000 Acadians and 200,000 French-speaking Blacks.
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3.1.2.4, Smith and Hitt's Study

A particular case which needs to be examined in some detail and which illustrates the importance of the above dichotomy is the Smith and Hitt study. These two writers have worked out an ingenious statistical device in their *The People of Louisiana* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1952) to approximate the proportion of what they termed "French population," meaning persons of French descent. Their mode of making the estimation was as follows:

For each parish in the state the number of French and non-French were first estimated and these results combined to get the total for the State. As a basis for dividing the population of a given parish into French and non-French, the following data were used: (1) the percentage of Catholics in the population; (2) the percentage of Negroes in the population; (3) the presence or absence of towns and cities; (4) the presence or absence of other Catholic populations, such as Italians; (5) personal data furnished by students at Louisiana State University at the time of registration; and (6) facts gained on numerous field trips to the various parishes of the state. Each parish was considered in turn, in the light of these data, and through an informal technique, estimates were made of the relative importance of the French and non-French populations. After these estimates were combined, the number of Louisiana French was placed at approximately 565,000,
or 44 per cent of the state's native white population. While there may have been important errors for any particular parish, it is believed that this represent a fairly reliable estimate for the state as a whole (p. 49).

Smith and Hitt's study, which has the merit of being the only "scientifically" acceptable attempt seeking to measure the proportion of persons of French descent, is unsatisfactory on many counts. One, it is not conceivably easy to compute the other Catholic communities in the State (e.g. Spanish and Italian Americans who were born in this country) since their assessment would represent the same difficulties as in the case of the French. Second, the authors did not wish to make clear what were "the personal data" in number (5) or what were "the facts gained on numerous field trips" in number (6), rendering their study unduplicatable, to say the least. But the crucial remark which should be made about Smith and Hitt's attempt is that the French community which they defined in terms of lineage (or heritage) increases in number as the rate of growth in the State population continues to rise. In fact, they projected an increase of the French population from 1930 to 1940 by stating:

By 1940 the total number would be raised to about 660,000 [accordingly, the French population was 565,000 in 1930], for the proportion of persons of French descent in the state probably increased slightly during the 1930's (p. 49).

The linguistically defined community, that is the Louisiana population which uses the French vernacular in their daily communication has, however, been considerably declining.
The slow abandonment of the French language in Louisiana, particularly during the twentieth century, can hardly be questioned. Some studies have showed empirical evidence for the decline. One of these studies was conducted by Bertrand and Beale who reported from their field work in Pointe Coupee and Evangeline Parishes that "68 percent of the heads [of the families interviewed] who had French as their childhood language or who learned it along with English as children continued to use it most always or more than English in the home as adults."39 Another attempt was made by Donna Darden, who sought to diagnose the disappearance of the French vernacular by the shift away from traditional French baptismal naming practices.40 A more recent study was made by Jerah Johnson who reported in a paper, entitled "the History of the French in Louisiana," read at the Conference on Louisiana French held at the campus of the University of New Orleans (March, 1976), that if the decline continues at its present rate, the French language would be extinct by the year 2010. Johnson derived his conclusion from a comparison of Bertrand and Beale's above findings and the data on the mother tongue from the 1970 Census.

The undeniable decline in the use of the French language evidence in the above studies indicates beyond any doubt that the continually increasing population computed by Smith and Hitt does not and cannot represent the linguistically defined community and that therefore the dichotomy of French versus French-speaking should be stressed in the task we set out to accomplish in the present chapter, namely a quantification of the French-speaking Louisianians.

3.2. Population of the French Speaking Louisianians
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There are, as far as has been determined and aside from the impressionistic estimations and the secondary source information, two reliable sources which provide statistical data on the French-speaking population. These are the data collected on the mother tongue by the Census Bureau in 1940 and in 1970 (see Tables 5-8 in the Appendix). Unfortunately, the data from the census are not problem-free, particularly in view of the diaglossic nature of the use of French and the ambiguous concept of mother tongue in Louisiana.

3.2.1. French/English Diaglossia

The bilingualism in Southern Louisiana varies in several ways from that found in Canada or in Belgium. For instance, due to the comparatively insignificant French radio broadcasting in the State, the Gallic community tunes in to English programs to hear local and national news. Likewise, since the extinction of L'Abeille of New Orleans in 1923, there has not been a single daily newspaper printed in French. But, most of all, before the recent creation of a few bilingual schools (e.g. Alice Boucher Elementary School in Lafayette) there were no public schools using French as the language of instruction.

The use of the French language is therefore restricted to specific settings (e.g. social conversations among members of a family or friends). Business, educational, religious and political activities are all conducted in English. This diaglossic situation further complicates the demographic assessment of the French-speaking population, since it implies that any French-speaker is by necessity competent in English as well, and that therefore a demographer, whose task is to compute the
number of French-speaking Louisianans, needs to measure the degree of
the individual's bilingualism and decide subsequently upon his dominant
language. Otherwise, this study should more appropriately be entitled
"The Population and Territory of the French/English Bilinguals in
Louisiana."

3.2.2, The Census of 1940 and 1970 and the Notion of
Mother Tongue

While the concept of mother tongue is relatively unambiguous in cul-
turally, hence linguistically, cohesive societies, it is very complex and
even misleading in the case of the Louisiana population. Its ambiguity
stems from (1) the heterogeneity of the ethnic elements which populated
the State and (2) the subsequent cultural "melting" which took place
particularly at the turn of the century. During the Colonial Period and
even in the nineteenth century, Louisiana embraced an exceptionally heter-
ogeneous population. There were, for instance, aside from the dominant
French and Anglo-Saxon cultures and the native Indians, Spanish Americans
(Isleños) who were brought at the Spanish King's expense in 1778; Germans
who arrived in the territory in 1721 and subsequently; Italians who
settled in Tangipahoa and other parishes; Yugoslav communities in
Plaquemines Parish; and so on. With the expansion of the highway sys-
tem, the subsequent mobility, the migration to large cities and the inter-
cultural marriages, the various cultural "islands" of Louisiana have
modified their way of life and merged (or are still merging in some cases)
in the direction of the so-called "mainstream" culture. For instance,
with few exceptions, each group speaks English in addition to its native
vernacular. The ethnic, hence linguistic, purity has, in course of
time, become obsolete after the cultural "merger." The question to ask
at this point, in our continuing effort to assess the French-speaking
population, is the following: What is the mother tongue of someone whose
father spoke French and whose mother spoke English?

When the Census Bureau collected data on the mother tongue (of the
native whites of native parents) in 1940, it defined mother tongue "as
the principal language spoken in the home of the person in his child-
hood." Since our immediate purpose is the number of the French-speaking
Louisianans as an indicator of the functionality of the French lan-
guage, the Census definition has some shortcomings. First, as the Cen-
sus Bureau has pointed out "the data on mother tongue may not reflect a
person's current language skills since the vast majority of persons re-
porting a mother tongue other than English have learned to speak English"
during or after their childhood, "and many of them have even so far for-
gotten the mother tongue which they learned in childhood as to be unable
to use it with facility now." Second, the informant's answer to the
census taker concerning the mother tongue does not necessarily represent
his or her linguistic competence in the declared language during the for-
mative years, but might simply represent a cultural affiliation or denial.
Such "practice" helps to explain the surprising differences between the
data of 1940 and those collected in 1970. Whereas the 1940 census in-
dicates that a total of 298,420 White Louisianans reported that their
mother tongue was French, the 1970 census shows a total of 487,626
(whites only). Anyone who is familiar with the history of the French
language in Louisiana would expect a sharp decline in the 1970 census
(even when allowance is made for the somewhat high fertility rate among
the French). The unexpected increase in the 1970 census can be explained partially by the change in attitudes toward the French heritage. A generation ago French-speaking Louisianians were often ashamed of their culture and did not speak their idiom outside their homes. Today the French ethnicity has become a source of renewed pride.

3.3. Contours of French Louisiana

The delimitation of the area where the French culture prevails, impressionistically at least, constitutes another unsettled matter. Its contour varies almost from one map to another. Such differences in mapping are mainly the results of (1) the difficulties discussed above in distinguishing the French population; (2) the lack of prior studies devoted primarily to a mapping of the area; (3) the confusing nomenclature used by interested writers to designate the area (e.g. "French-Louisiana," "French-speaking Parishes," "South Louisiana," and even "Heart of Acadiana" in the Louisiana House Concurrent Resolution no. 496, 1971, among others); (4) the variety of criteria used to determine the contour; (5) the intuitive approach used in plotting some of the maps; (6) the fact that the border-line abstracted on maps as a thin line is in reality a zone of some width; and (7) the diachronic regression of the area (culturally delineated), which is shrinking slowly as the Anglo-Saxons continue to pour into the French territory and the linguistic "anglicization" in schools, radio and television broadcasting, official documents, and in other important domaines persists.

The variety of maps drafted by different researchers in the field can be divided, for the sake of a clear and convenient presentation, into
five broad categories; (1) maps delineated by simplified straight lines; (2) Ad-hoc maps intuitively plotted on the basis of the researcher's knowledge of the area; (3) maps using natural geographic contours as boundaries; (4) maps drafted on the basis of the distribution of one or more cultural traits attributable to the French population; and (5) maps using parish boundaries as contours (e.g., a selected number of parishes). There are a considerable number of studies which concern themselves solely with an areal assessment of the so-called "Acadiana." Though the descendants of the Acadian exiles are "the largest unassimilated group in America" and represent today the major French sub-group in Louisiana, such studies are ignored in the present review of past attempts at mapping the area of the entire French population.

3.3.1. Straight-line (or Triangle) Maps

Since an adequate plotting of cultural maps should involve the consideration of a multiplicity, if not an infinity of traits, the task becomes therefore an extremely delicate one, to say the least. To eschew such difficulties, some researchers have simplified the matter greatly by adopting straight-line contours and plotting "French Louisiana" as a triangle having the Louisiana coast as its base and the point where the Red River meets the Mississippi River as its summit (see Map 1).

3.3.2. Physical Maps

It is perhaps necessary to stress at this point that the maps of "French Louisiana" under review are solely cultural. However, since physical or
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geographic (in the popular sense) "points de repere" (e.g. lakes, rivers, and hills) are relevant factors in the preservation of cultural and linguistic remnants, some workers in the field have adopted these landscape facts to delineate the area. For instance, Minnie Kelley follows the Mermentau River, the thirtieth parallel, the Atchafalaya River and the Gulf Coast to mark respectively the eastern, northern, western and southern borders of the cultural region known as "Acadiana."52

3.3.3. Ad-hoc Maps

A number of cultural maps of "French Louisiana" are based solely on the intuitive knowledge of the researcher. Such practice is justified by William Knipmeyer who states that for "the reasons that an exact boundary does not exist and is not of primary concern, a generalized line based on a sound knowledge of the area is the most desirable and satisfactory solution."53 As may be expected, researchers have different "knowledge of the area" and their maps have therefore conflicting contours (see Map 2).

3.3.4. Cultural Criteria Based Maps

As far as it has been determined by the present investigation, only two cultural maps of French Louisiana were plotted on the basis of a number of cultural criteria which were empirically measured.54 The first was Peveril Meigs' study (1941) which uses the frequency and distribution of French surnames in telephone directories throughout the State to delimit the contour of French Louisiana.55 Though Meigs' work is admittedly
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a pioneering attempt to find and apply a quantitative, hence non-ad-hoc, basis for plotting the area, his findings cannot be easily accepted as giving "an accurate estimate of the proportion of French in the various communities." Such scepticism stems from the following. First, it is not conceivably possible for Meigs to distinguish, in the written language of the directories, such cognate names as the French Richard, phonemically transcribed as /riːʃər/ and the English counterpart, /riːʃərd/, as well as other ambiguous names such as Bernard. Second, Meigs' study, which by its nature is restricted to such French names as have been transmitted through generations by the male sex only, has neglected an important sociological characteristic of Louisiana French families, namely, the often repeated fact that French women are on the whole, as Clyde Collard puts it, "the mainstay and preserver of the French culture." Smith and Parenton and Lauren Post, among other social scientists, have reported that in intercultural marriages, it is likely that the French woman would acculturate her German, Spanish or even English husband. Incidentally, the "first" Frenchman of the State (Governor Edwin Edwards) is the offspring of such an acculturation. Third, the absence of an explanation of the sampling procedure raises some questions. How did Meigs decide the ten most common names in each directory, or how could he compare the proportion of French names to the entire population if he avoided "the necessity of tabulating all the names in the directories" (p. 243)?

Additional criticism could be made of Meigs' study, but it would obscure perhaps his important contribution in recognizing first in print the "blurry" contour of French Louisiana and his ingenious idea to plot the area on the basis of an empirically measured criterion.
A second cultural-criteria based map was outlined by Milton Newton (1975), who considered a large number of variables in his mapping attempt. His direct concern was, however, to draw what he calls the "North-South borderline." He did not direct his attention primarily to the area where the French culture predominates. But, his procedures in considering a multiplicity of cultural items (e.g. voting patterns, diffusion of variant lexemes as done in linguistic atlases, distribution of religious affiliations, and a host of other distinctive features) would best summarize (if applied strictly to French Louisiana) the different contours outlined thus far, particularly since all of them were based on the distribution of a single cultural item. It should be noted that Newton had previously indicated, in his Atlas of Louisiana (Baton Rouge, School of Geoscience, 1970), 87, the unusually wide discrepancies in the plotting attempts of French Louisiana by showing on a single map the different contours proposed by several workers in the field. He, likewise, contributed to the present territorial question by discussing at length the difficulties inherent in the plotting of a cultural map of Louisiana (e.g. recent migrations, the partial or total anglicization of certain communities and the religious conversions).

3.3.5. French-speaking Parishes

In linguistic literature particularly, though not exclusively, the "French" area is referred to as an number of French (or French-speaking) parishes. Since the administrative sectioning of the State into parishes (the equivalent of counties) was not based on linguistic or cultural considerations, the plotting of French Louisiana along the political...
boundaries of parishes is convenient, perhaps, but highly inaccurate. In addition to their imprecise contour, these maps are characteristically different. The value assigned to $x$ varies from one writer to another one. For instance, Edwin Stephens, Marilyn Conwell and Alphonse Juilland, Lynn Smith and Homer Hitt, John Guilbeau each believe that Louisiana French is comprised of 27, 26, 25, and 24 parishes, respectively (see Table 8). 64

An official deliniation of the French territory was attempted by the State Legislature which passed a Concurrent Resolution (originated in the House of Representatives in 1971, number 496) enumerating the French parishes which form what the sponsors of the bill call "The Heart of Acadiana." Such a delineation is, however, of little help in the present quest of defining the territory where the French culture prevails, since it is restricted to the area of one subcomponent of the Gallic community, namely the Acadians or "Cajuns," and does not deal with the entire French territory. Furthermore, the Resolution is not specific on the number and distribution of the selected parishes nor on the criteria used to determine the contour as indicated in the following excerpts of the Resolution:

...the Legislature of Louisiana designate the cultural region known as The Heart of Acadiana within the state of Louisiana consisting of, but not exclusively [emphasis added] the following parishes: Acadia, Avoyelles, Ascension, Assumption, Calcasieu, Cameron, Evangeline, Iberia, Iberville, Jefferson Davis, Lafayette, Lafourche, Point Coupee, St. Charles, St. James, St. John, St. Landry, St.
Table 8:

NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE FRENCH-SPEAKING PARISHES PROPOSED BY VARIOUS WRITERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acadia</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayouelles</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauregard</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcasieu</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangeline</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberia</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberville</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Davis</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafourche</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleans</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaquemines</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointe Coupee</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John the Baptist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Landry</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish</td>
<td>St. Mary</td>
<td>Terrebonne</td>
<td>Vermilion</td>
<td>West Baton Rouge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The authors did not show the distribution of their selected parishes.
Martin, St. Mary, Terrebonne, Vermilion, West Baton Rouge, and other parishes of similar cultural environment [emphasis added].

4.3.6. Linguistic Maps

Utilizing the data on the mother tongue from the 1970 Decennial Census, the following maps (Maps 3-6) have been drawn to show the concentration and distribution of the French-speaking residents of Louisiana. Map 3 shows the number of French-speaking persons per parish stratified into the following five levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute value range applied to each level</td>
<td>min. 0.0 1843.16 5529.48 12902.12 27647.41</td>
<td>max. 1843.16 5529.48 12902.12 27647.41 57138.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbols

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Number of parishes in each level

| 34 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 9 |

Map 4 shows the percent of French-speaking persons per parish. The parishes are stratified into 8 levels as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute value range applied to each level</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Symbols

Number of parishes in each level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>38</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
MAP 5
CONCENTRATION AND DISTRIBUTION
OF FRENCH-SPEAKING PERSONS
IN LOUISIANA

0 - 10%
10 - 20%
20 - 30%
30 - 40%
40 - 50%
50 - 60%
60 - 70%
70 - 80%
Map 5 is a contour (or isoline or isopleth) map which consists of lines connecting all locations with the same data value. Through a "mapping" or "contour" device, the data outlined in Map 4 (percent of French-speaking persons per parish) was interpolated to give contours with eight different intervening locations. Each location (level) has a specified value as was indicated for Map 4. For instance level 1 (dotted regions) consists of areas with 0-10% of French-speaking persons; level 2, 10-20%; level 3, 30-40%; and so forth.

The contours or isolines drafted on Map 5 are submitted to illustrate the closest approximation of the current dispersion and distribution of French-speaking persons in Louisiana and at the same time to give the synchronic representation of French Louisiana based on the following: First, the data are taken from the U. S. Census Bureau using comparatively sophisticated and reliable statistical procedures. Second, since, as Bertrand and Beale put it, "the use of the French language...is surely the key factor in the continuing meaningful identity of the French as a distinctive group...", the linguistic isolines outlined on Map 5, reflect more accurately the French territory than the distribution of French surnames in telephone directories, the prevalence of French house or boat types, etc.... Third, as it has been discussed, the cultural map of French Louisiana is in a constant state of flux due to the ongoing Anglicization of the area, Map 5 is therefore a synchronic representation (with a specific time reference-1970-) of the ever changing French boundaries. A comparison of Map 5 with further maps drafted from the data of the coming Decennial Census should capture succinctly the dynamism of French Louisiana contours. Finally, since a cultural boundary may not be a thin line or even a zone of some width, Map 5 shows the concept of cultural continuum
in a bicultural community; that is the gradual and smooth transition from the completely Anglo-Saxon areas of the State (e.g. Caddo Parish with its 0% of French-speaking persons) to densely concentrated districts in the heart of Acadiana (e.g. Saint Martin, Vermilion, Evangeline and Lafourche parishes).

3.4. Conclusion

The primary aim of the preceding discussion was to review exhaustively the works of scholars and writers who have come to grips with the problem of either proposing tentative statements concerning the size of the French-speaking population in Louisiana or demarcating a thin line showing the frontier of the Gallic community. The discussion was not intended to draw decisive conclusions from these studies but to raise some interesting questions which would aid in the realization of the complexity involved in such demographic and territorial assessments. Actually, it was demonstrated throughout the section that to accept any simple, conclusive answer to such an intricate and many faceted problem is merely a symptom of myopia. It was also discussed that differing frames of theoretical reference (anthropological, sociological, linguistic, etc...), and the resulting variation in criteria used to identify the so-called French of Louisiana partly account for the variance which characterize the proposals and attempts reviewed above. But the overriding factor and chief cause for the above discrepancies lies in the fact that a comprehensive, interdisciplinary study devoted to these questions has not appeared as yet.
Walter Kollmorgen and Robert Harrison object to such an appellation in their article, "French-Speaking Farmers of Southern Louisiana," Economic Geography, XXII (July, 1946), stating that "it is both misleading and incorrect to refer to the French-speaking people of Louisiana as "French," and propose to use specifically the expression "French-speaking people" since, accordingly, "the linguistic designation is the most convenient and the least misleading." Kollmorgen and Harrison's statements would be correct only if the so-called "French" are defined strictly on the basis of linguistic criteria. As we will see, this is not the case even in Kollmorgen and Harrison's paper. Therefore, reference to the population under study as "French" will be continued for the moment.

The French-speaking Blacks could be included in the resultant "French" culture. However, their inclusion would open up other interesting questions beyond the scope of this chapter.


7 Ibid.


10 Walter M. Kollmorgen and Robert W. Harrisson, 1946.


12 Harlan W. Gilmore, 1933, p. 82.

13 The "Melting-Pot" doctrine, which was carried out somewhat implicitly, was reflected in Louisiana by (1) the abolition of any law favorable to the French language (e.g. whereas the State Constitution of 1845 prescribed that the "laws of this State shall be promulgated in the English and French languages" (Title VI, Art. 132), the so-called Carpet-bag Con-
vention of 1868 insisted categorically that "no law shall require judicial process to be issued in any other language than the English language" (Title VI, Art. 109); and (2) the corporal punishment administered to students who spoke French in the schoolyard.


15 This statement is printed on the cover page of each issue of Compte-rendus de l'Athénée Louisianais, an interdisciplinary magazine established in 1871 under the auspices of the Creole organization, "L'Athénée Louisianais." Alfred Mercier was the perpetual secretary of the organization from its creation in 1876 until his death in 1894 and Alcée Fortier was its president for a period of twenty-two years (1892-1914).


Charles Crenier and Perry H. Howard, "The Edwards Victory," *Revue de Louisiane/Louisiana Review*, I (Summer, 1972). While the immediate concern of the authors was not to delineate the cultural map of French Louisiana, the article attempts in part to empirically support intuitive understanding of the contours on the basis of voting behavior, stating for instance, that "Edwards was supported in these [Cajun] parishes by approximately 75 per cent [of the gubernatorial vote]" (p. 41). Since the authors never explained which parishes, say in South Louisiana, were Cajun and which were not, their implied correlation, Cajuns/Edwards supporters, is in a way stating that those parishes in Southern Louisiana which supported Edwards with approximately 75% of the vote are Cajun.


Clinton Louis Folse, "Form of Settlement as a Factor in Social Solidarity, with Special Reference to Southern Louisiana," Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1935.
Fred B. Kniffen states, for instance, in his article, "Louisiana House Types," printed in the *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, XXVI (December, 1963), that house types are, in the case of Louisiana, "an element of culture possessing great diagnostic value in regional differentiation (p. 179).

Patricia Harris writes in her article, "Cuisine in Acadiana," in Stephen L. Del Sesto and Jon L. Gibson, eds., 1975, that "patterns of food and drink are as important in defining an ethnic subculture as family patterns, religious beliefs, language, and modes of dress (p. 79).


The author acknowledges that the "viability," "functionality" or "liveliness" of a language cannot be measured solely on the basis of the number of its speakers. Other factors, such as social prestige, political power of its users, among others, are equally important. The concern before us here is the size of the French-speaking population, a figure which, should we decide on one, may or may not be used as an index of the French language "viability" in the State.

Walter M. Kollmorgen and Robert W. Jarrisson, 1946, p. 5. See also footnote 1.

Harry Griffin, "A Brief History of the Acadians," an address delivered at a meeting of the "France-Amérique de la Louisiane Acadienne" at the College of Sacred Heart, Grand Coteau, Louisiana (October 8, 1952),


38 As far as it has been determined, there were no other "scientifically" acceptable surveys. Bertrand and Beale's study, 1965 (see footnote 5) was restricted to only two parishes (Evangeline and Pointe Coupee), and the anonymous author of the survey published in the March, 1970, issue of the *Acadiana Profile* (see footnote 36) did not reveal his sampling procedures.


For an historical sketch on French broadcasting in the State, see Beth Norwood's article, "French Radio Broadcasting" in *Southern Speech Journal*, XXX (Fall, 1964), 46-54. Norwood listed the various stations which had at some time since 1934 engaged in French broadcasting. For a history and inventory of the French newspapers and magazines, see Edward Larocque Tinker's, *Bibliography of the French Newspapers and Periodicals of Louisiana* (Worcester, Mass.: American Antiquarian Society, 1933) and Douglas McMurturie, "The French Press of Louisiana" in *The Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XVIII (October, 1935), 1-19.

The State Constitution of 1864 had required that the "general exercises in the public schools were to be henceforth conducted in the English language" (Title VII, Art. 142). Another clause was added, however, in the 1879 Constitution stating that the "elementary branches may be also taught in the French language in those parishes in the State or localities in said parishes where the French language predominates, if no additional expense is incurred thereby" (General Provisions, Art. 226). This additional clause was removed from the Constitution of 1921 (Public Education, Art. 12, Section 12).

For a comprehensive description of the various cultural "islands" in Louisiana, see Alvin Bertrand's *The Many Louisiana* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin, no. 496, 1955). Blacks were not mentioned as one of the ethnic groups in Louisiana, because linguistically speaking, they are either French or English.

*Official Census of 1940: Population: Nativity and Parentage of the White Population; Mother Tongue etc...* (Washington: United States
The Census Bureau reported a total of 572,262 persons who declared in 1970 that French was their mother tongue. In a later publication (Detailed Characteristics—Louisiana 20, p. 431, Table 142), the above figure was broken down by race giving 487,626 for Whites and 2,869 for all other races combined. The "White" figure is then best comparable with the 1940 data, since in that year only Whites were interviewed for the question.

There are, as far as it has been determined, only two articles devoted solely to a mapping of the French area in Louisiana. These are Peveril Meigs' "an Ethno-Telephonic Survey of French Louisiana" Annals of the Association of American Geographers, XXXI (December, 1941), 243-250, and Milton Newton's "Blurring the North-South Contrast," eds. Stephen L. Sesto and Jon L. Gibson, 1975, pp. , both of which will be discussed later in some detail.


Lynn T. Smith, The Population of Louisiana: Its Composition and Changes. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin, no. 293, 1937). It's worth noting that Smith has verbally drafted the contours of French Louisiana stating that it "resembles a large triangle whose base begins at the Gulf of Mexico, one side is bounded by a straight line running from the south-western tip of the angle to the junction of the Red and the Mississippi
rivers, and the other side is connected by a straight line running from the latter point through the city of New Orleans to the Gulf of Mexico" (p. 7).

50 Fred B. Kniffen, Louisiana: Its People and Land (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1968), 5.


52 Minnie Kelley, 1934, p. 82.


54 There are several maps which indicate the distribution of one or more cultural items attributable to the Gallic community (e.g. the distribution of house-types in Fred B. Kniffen's "Louisiana House Types," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, XXVI (1935), 179-193, and various types of boats in William B. Knipmeyer's doctoral work referred to above. These maps do not make the claim of drafting the comprehensive "culturographic" contours of French Louisiana.

55 See footnote 47.


58 Peveril Meigs, 1941, p. 247.


Ibid.

See footnote 47.


John Guilbeau, "Louisiana French" a paper delivered at the American Association of Teachers of French held in New Orleans, December 1975.

Incidently, Conwell and Juillard (1963, p. 19), paraphrasing a demographic estimation proposed by Smith and Hitt (1952, p. 49), state that according to "the 1930 census there are more than 565,000 persons of Acadian or French origin in the twenty-six French-speaking parishes (i.e. counties) in Southwestern Louisiana" [emphasis added]. Conwell and Juillard's use of the definite article (the) as a modifier of the expression "twenty-six French-speaking parishes" implies that the number 26 is (1) common knowledge and (2) generally agreed upon by interested writers. The present investigation (see Table 11) shows that such is not the case. Furthermore, one cannot find 26 parishes (French-speaking or otherwise) in Southwestern Louisiana, unless the later term is used as a synonym of Southern Louisiana.

A somewhat similar map based on the data on the mother tongue collected by the Census Bureau in 1970, was drafted by Alvin Bertrand and
published in *LSU Alumni News* (April, 1976), 16; and in Karen W. Paterson, Joel L. Lindsey and Alvin L. Bertrand, *The Human Dimension of Coastal Zone Development* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin No. 679, June 1974), 27. The map was, however, stratified into the following five levels: 0–16%; 16–32%; 32–48%; 48–63%; 63–80%.

For an understanding of the derivation process of a Contour (or Isoline) map, see Arthur H. Robinson and Randall D. Sale, *Elements of Cartography* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1969) or James A. Doug-

It should be noted that the contours (or isolines) proposed in Map 5 were interpolated though a mapping device simply because census data on mother tongue are not available for areas smaller than parishes. They are available for certain census tracts but, unfortunately, the division of the State into census tracts is not compatible with the present territorial task, since an urban district (e.g. Baton Rouge), areally insignificant, may be divided into several tracts while an entire parish may be a single one.

4. BIBLIOGRAPHICAL OUTLINE OF LINGUISTIC STUDIES ON LOUISIANA FRENCH

A comprehensive bibliography of works dealing directly or indirectly with the linguistic aspect of Louisiana French has been compiled by the present author in an forthcoming volume entitled Louisiana French: An Annotated Linguistic Bibliography. The primary aim of this chapter is not to duplicate the content of the above work but to outline briefly the history of the scholarly endeavors which attempted to give us an insight to the linguistic structures of the French spoken in this region of the New World. For convenience's sake, this section is divided into three parts, each one devoted to one of the three major French dialects discussed in the Introduction.

4,1, Creole (i.e., Negro-French) Studies

The first published attempt to describe the Creole dialect of Louisiana, as far as has been determined, was made by Claude César Robin in his Voyages dans l'Intérieur de la Louisiane, etc... (Paris: F. Buisson, 1807), 185-180. His pioneering "compte-rendu" is, as one may expect, characterized by romantic exoticism and is linguistically superficial. Much later, in 1859, the first published specimen of the Louisiana Creole (or perhaps, a pseudo-Creole), a short poem entitled "La Caze du nègre," was printed in Le Meschacbé, a weekly bilingual paper established in 1853 in St. John the Baptist Parish, without, however, any comments on the structure of the dialect. The first language specialist to write about the creolized
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French in the State was Addisson Yan Name, who made mention of some salient grammatical features of the dialect in his comparative study, "Contribution to Créole Grammar," Transactions of the American Philological Association, I (1869), 123-167. In the aftermath of the Civil War, the White editors of Le Carillon, a weekly French periodical, printed in 1873 and subsequently several satirical attacks directed against Blacks who held political office during the Reconstruction period. Soon after, in 1876, a New Orleans physician and a true Renaissance man, Alfred Mercier,² published under the pseudonym of Viè Jack, Creole folk-tales (written in conventional orthography) in the columns of Le Meschacébé. However, it is not until 1880 that we find an entire treatise on the grammar of Louisiana Creole. Dr. Mercier published in Comptes-rendus de L'Athénée Louisianais the first article devoted solely to a description of the Louisiana Creole, "Etude sur la langue créole en Louisiane" (1880).

At the turn of the century, Creole "curiosa" continued to appear in periodicals and newspapers, varying in quality and authenticity. Alcée Fortier, then professor of Romance languages at Tulane University, is perhaps the most productive "Creolist" of this period. His publications are, however, as Edward Tinker puts it, "an amplification of Dr. Mercier's little treatise."³ Fortier's major contribution to Louisiana Creole studies is at least twofold. First, he collected and edited many folkloric tales recorded in the indigenous Creole dialect which would otherwise have been lost forever, and second, he conducted a continuing campaign, especially effective from his offices as president of the American Folklore Society and of the Modern Language Association, to further interest in the State's linguistic peculiarities.⁴

Other popular writers, such as George Cable, Lafcadio Hearn and Ed-
ward Tinker, were interested in the Creole dialect not as a linguistic system, but as a source for exotic and picturesque folkloric or literary material. Most of them were linguistically naive and made grossly erroneous claims in their treatment of the dialect. For instance, Tinker, speculating about the phonological characteristics of Black French, wrote (in the same year Leonard Bloomfield published *Language*) that "the thickness of their [Blacks'] lips and tongues made it impossible for them to pronounce certain vowels... They could not roll the r, so it was entirely eliminated." But in spite of these misconceptions, highly indicative of the patronizing knowledge and attitudes of nineteenth and early twentieth century intellectuals, they contributed considerably to Creole studies by publishing hitherto unwritten Creole literature. Furthermore the exotic and romantic "French Louisiana" popularized by their works and George Cable's novels in particular stimulated a sudden interest in the study of the "Creole" subject and precipitated the creation of Franco-American novels having, as a device to recreate "la couleur locale," a considerable portion of their texts written in the indigenous creolized French.

Lafcadio Hearn, a "Jack of all trades," wrote on almost every subject in the columns of New Orleans newspapers. The Creole dialect and its literature were no exception. In his linguistic articles, he urged local scholars to take an academic interest in the Creole dialect, for, Hearn says, it has a scientific value to the study of linguistic behavior in particular and to the epistymological progress in general. As a newspaperman he had an amazing appreciation of an insight into the subject, He was well acquainted with the pioneering works on the Creole of the Antilles (e.g. J. J. Thomas' and Hugo Schuchard's publications) and re-
peatedly stated that "it is strange that so little has been written in regard to the curiosities of the Creole grammar, and the poetical adaptation of the dialect [in Louisiana]." He himself gathered Creole proverbs and began to inform his readers about the curious structure of these newly developed languages.


Only three twentieth century linguists, George Lane, James Broussard and Raleigh Morgan, Jr., have explored, relatively speaking, technical treatises the French dialect spoken primarily by Blacks in Louisiana. George Lane published two articles in Language. The first, which appeared in 1934, gives a general description of each of the varieties of French found in Louisiana, outlining some of their salient linguistic as well as extra-linguistic characteristics. In his second article which appeared the following year, Lane analyzes, in some depth, the phonology and morphology of the French based Creole spoken in St. Martinville. His description includes a discussion on the various aspects of the Creole verb system and a phonetic transcription of a "Bouki-Lapin" tale.

Some years later, James Broussard published the first and only book
entirely devoted to the subject, *Louisiana Creole Dialect* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1942), after directing no fewer than twelve Master's theses at Louisiana State University, describing all levels of the dialect—phonology, morphology, syntax, and lexicon—in several parishes.11

More recently Raleigh Morgan, Jr, published several articles describing various aspects of the St. Martinville Creole and how the data he collected contributed to some theoretical issues pertaining to Creole studies in general. Morgan's findings, valuable as they are, cannot be accepted as conclusive and definitive, as he himself admits in his writings, for his studies are restricted to a single locality, St. Martin Parish.

4.2, Acadian (i.e, Cajun) French Studies

Little has been written with regard to the linguistic peculiarities of Acadian speech in comparison to the relative abundance of material available on the Creole grammar and the collation of legends, superstitions and curious customs of the French-speaking Blacks. There are several reasons which explain this state of affairs. First, the French spoken by Blacks and its association with the scenes of voodooism and warlockery prevalent in the Crescent City and in Louisiana in general, caught the fancy of Northerners who saw it as a "soft, suave tongue, saturated with the exotic lure of the tropics."12 Such fascination stimulated the creation of Cable's and Hearn's (among others) novels and short essays describing the life, superstitions, dances, proverbs, and language of the French-speaking Blacks. Second, whereas Black
French was considered an exceptional case of communal learning of a second language, with interesting if not revealing psycholinguistic observations to be made, as is implied from one of Lafcadio Hearn's editorial titles, "The Scientific Value of Creole Studies," (in the New Orleans Times-Democrat, June 14, 1886), the Acadian speech was, on the other hand, seen by some scholars as a "corrupted" variation of French on the part of illiterate folk people and therefore not worthy of their attention. Third, most of the scholarly work at the turn of the century, when treatises on the study of language began to appear locally, was dominated by either philological studies investigating the older form of languages, or by the compilation of glossaries, largely prescriptive.

The study of geographical and social dialectology which concerns itself with actual language usage is, relatively speaking, a recent addition to the academic enterprise. It should be noted, however, that while studies on the Creole outnumber quantitatively, according to my research, the Acadian French studies, the latter have been treated comparatively in more elaborate and sophisticated treatises, particularly in the doctoral dissertation written by John Guilbeau in 1950 (to be discussed later) and Conwell and Juillard's book, Louisiana French Grammar (The Hague: Mouton, 1963).

The earliest description of the Acadian dialect is to be found in Fortier's article, "The Acadians of Louisiana and Their Dialect," Publications of the Modern Language Association, VI (1891), 64-94. Although his diary-like article is embellished with poetical and patriotic narration, it contains a considerable amount of information on the history of the Acadians' tragic deportation, a discussion of the tenacity of the French language in its struggle for survival, a list of lexical and
phonetic "peculiarities" of the Acadian French and a sample of the dialect written in conventional orthography. Later, in 1901, an anonymous scholar wrote the first comprehensive work on the dialect, Les Acadiens Louisianais et leur parler. The work was not published, however, until 1932 when Professor Jay Ditchy of Tulane University discovered its existence in the Louisiana State Museum and edited it for publication.

The 1930's were perhaps the most productive years for Acadian linguistic studies. William Read published his etymological study, Louisiana French (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1931); Professors Hoguet Major and Wyatt Pickens, inspired perhaps by the ongoing mapping of linguistic atlases here and abroad, directed at the Louisiana State University a large number of Master's theses comparing phonetically, morphologically and lexically the French dialect spoken in Southern Louisiana against a background of Standard French. The same decade saw publication of the first doctoral dissertation (1936) in the field, written by Hosea Phillips under the direction of Charles Bruneau at the University of Paris. After World War II, Acadian studies declined in number. Whereas for the 1930's my bibliographical research (referred to above) shows a total of 28 strictly linguistic Master's theses, in the 1940's the number suddenly fell to 7, in the 1950's only 5 were written and in the 1960's there were only 4.

The most extensive and reliable sources available on the Acadian dialect are two doctoral dissertations based on tape-recorded data collected from field work, and not on secondary sources as is frequently the case in Louisiana French studies. One, written by John Guilbeau in 1950 at the University of North Carolina under the direction of Urban
T. Holmes, describes the various levels of the French spoken in the author's native parish, Lafourche. Given the state of knowledge in linguistics at that time, the work, especially Chapter II which consists of an analysis of the phonology, and Chapter III which is devoted to a description of the morphology and the syntax "presented according to the traditional divisions of the eight parts of speech," is indeed well documented and presents a carefully drawn analysis. In 1961, Marilyn Conwell completed a doctoral work at the University of Pennsylvania outlining the phonology of the Acadian dialect spoken in an area comprised of Lafayette, St. Landry and St. Martin parishes. Unlike previous studies, her work was limited to a single level of the language, phonology. She was therefore capable of investigating more in depth the phonological structure of the dialect than had been done previously (e.g. the prosodic, or suprasegmental, features of the dialect). Conwell, with the collaboration of her dissertation director, Alphonse Juilland, later expanded her work to include morphology and syntax and published it in 1963 under the title, *Louisiana French Grammar*. The volume, which has been criticized for some of its doubtful and unfounded claims, remains the most (and perhaps the best) comprehensive reference work for the Acadian dialect. It includes a description of the prosodic and phonemic entities of the dialect with their distribution and restrictions, a section on morphology describing the various parts of speech, and a shorter chapter on the syntactic aspects of the dialect. An additional volume, in which the authors planned to publish "a substantial sample of representative texts," has not yet appeared.

In addition to the works mentioned above there are numerous articles scattered in a variety of books and magazines. The majority of them are,
however, non-technical and discuss in the main some extra-linguistic aspects of the dialect (e.g. Acadians' tenacity and perseverance in preserving their idiom, the anti-French attitudes on the part of Anglo-Saxons). Furthermore, the strictly "linguistic" descriptions found in articles are generally uninformative since most active workers in the field (e.g. Phillips, Guilbeau, Brandon, Claudel) have but summarized and sometimes slightly expanded in them the information already available in their doctoral dissertations.

Some folklorists (e.g. Claudel, Saucier, Brandon, Whitfield) interested in the collation and study of the Acadians' tales, devinettes, proverbs, songs, and other folkloric items have in the course of their studies provided the linguist with texts of the indigenous dialect, sometimes in phonetic transcription and with some discussion of the grammatical structure of the dialect.

The current Renaissance, promoted by the Council for the Development of the French Language in Louisiana (CODOFIL) since its creation in 1968, has stimulated the publication of bilingual magazines (e.g. The Acadiana Profile, Revue de Louisiane/Louisiana Review and La Tribune des Francophones, created in 1969, 1972 and 1976 respectively), the creation of bilingual elementary schools (e.g. Alice Boucher Elementary School in Lafayette) and a revival of "Cajun" music as indicated for instance by the recently created annual event in Lafayette, entitled "Hommage à la Musique Acadienne." But no material describing the various linguistic aspects of Louisiana French has appeared, either under the auspices of the Council or otherwise. There are at least two reasons which explain this state of affairs. First, the leadership of CODOFIL has repeatedly stated that a revival of French must start at the earliest grades of the
elementary school. Consequently, the Council has directed its efforts almost totally to elementary education (e.g., the creation of bilingual institutes where French is taught on an equal basis with English in the first four grades). Second, as Dorice Tentchoff has pointed out, efforts are being made to standardize "à la parisienne" Louisiana French in order to broaden internationally its potential usefulness (e.g., commercial, cultural). It is therefore implicit in such a philosophy that linguistic descriptions of the indigenous speech are not matters of first priority.

4.3, Colonial Louisiana French Studies

The term "Colonial French" is used here and in some of the works listed in the bibliography to refer to a provincial variety spoken by descendants of the early settlers and the sizable immigration which kept coming from France throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, chiefly for economic and political reasons. This variety of Louisiana French has been termed by some writers as "The Creoles' French;" "Creole-French of New Orleans and Baton Rouge," "Standard Louisiana-French," "Planta-
tion French," or simply as "Louisiana French."

Some of the chief characteristics of this linguistic community which contributed to its dialectal distinctiveness, qualified subjectively by many writers as "du bon français," are as follows: 1) The Colonial French speakers came into the area directly from the motherland, sometimes after short sojourns in the Antilles, as opposed to the Acadians whose long stay in Nova Scotia, where they had been settled for some 150 years, had undoubtedly modified or regionalized their speech; 2) a considerable portion of the "Creole" population migrated from "L'Ile de France" or its
surrounding areas such as the old provinces of Orleanais and Touraine, whereas the Acadians' homelands were scattered along the Atlantic coast of France, where French (compared to the prestigious, hence the standard, Parisian variety) had been spoken with noticeable differences; the fact that "Creoles," who were generally wealthy, used to send their sons to universities in Paris where they were exposed to Standard Parisian French. Acadians, on the other hand, were in the main agricultural people, very often with no formal education.

Though the "Creole" scholars such as Alfred Mercier and Alcée Fortier have frequently boasted about the purity of their beloved idiom, we know from the present knowledge in areal linguistics that Colonial French could not have been homogeneous in the strict sense. Conversely, one would expect remarkable dialectal "variants" as a result of the following factors: 1) even though a great proportion of the Creole population was from the Central region of France, the area of Paris, it included settlers coming from various corners of France; 2) not all the Creoles were educated and hence able to comply with the norms prescribed by "L'Académie," and 3) the isolation from the motherland after the "Purchase" and the subsequent contact with the English language are more likely to have a negative influence on the "purity" of the local French. Nonetheless, the dialectal differences were not salient enough in the eyes of local scholars to merit detailed investigation. Thus, one cannot find studies describing the grammatical structure of even the phonetic or morphological "variants" of Colonial French, but simply scattered observations, usually in the form of praise about its "purity." Alcée Fortier, for instance, states that "the French immigrants, meaning the early settlers and not the subsequent political "émigrés" with few ex-
ceptions, belonged to a good class of society, and the language spoken by
them was pure and elegant." Later, in another publication, Fortier
was even more specific, saying that the Creoles (i.e., Colonial French
speakers) "speak very good French, and their pronunciation is remarkably
free from any provincial accent." Even non-Creole scholars have praised
the "purity" of Colonial Louisiana French. Edward Tinker, talking
about the French dialects in Louisiana, distinguished three varieties:
The Creole dialect spoken by Blacks, the Acadian dialect, and "the best
French spoken by the best Creole families...." Tinker did, however,
mention a few regionalism, chiefly lexical, in the Creoles' speech.

Some of the regional variants within the Colonial French can be
observed in literary fiction, such as George Cable's "Jean-ah
Poquelin," Scribner's Monthly, VII (April, 1874), 739-747 [also in Old
Creole Days], which contains sporadic French words or phrases written in
a conventional orthography but showing (by modification of the usual
Standard spelling) some of the dialectal differences. The only linguistic
discussion made of the Colonial French, to my knowledge, is Lane's ar-
ticle, 1934 (discussed earlier) in which he lists some peculiarities of
what he called "the Standard St, Martin-ville French."
1 Alfred Mercier was born in McDonogh, a suburb of New Orleans on June 3, 1816. At the age of fourteen, he was sent to France to study at the "Collège Louis-le-Grand." After a few unsuccessful literary adventures, he enrolled in the "Faculté de Médecine de Paris" where he received his Medical Degree in 1855, writing a thesis entitled "De la fièvre typhoïde dans ses rapports avec la phtisie aigué." He then returned to New Orleans to practice his profession, and despite the busy schedule of a family doctor, Mercier found time to pursue and accomplish his literary dreams, publishing novels (e.g. L'Habitation Saint-Ybars, 1881 and Johnelle, 1891), novelettes (e.g. Lidia, 1887), plays (e.g. Fortunia, 1888), poetry (e.g. "Les Soleils," 1889), and various philological and scientific works. Alfred Mercier was the central figure in the creation in 1876 of "L'Athénée Louisianais," a Creole association whose purpose was to preserve the French cultural and linguistic heritage. Mercier was its perpetual secretary until his death in 1894.


4 Alcée Fortier was born in St. James Parish, Louisiana, on June 5, 1856. He studied law at the University of Virginia, became clerk at a bank and later entered the teaching profession. He taught French at the Boys' High School of New Orleans, then joined in 1880 the University
of Louisiana (to be later renamed Tulane) as a teacher and then principal of the preparatory department and in 1913 was made dean of the graduate school. From 1880 to 1896 he was a member of the State Board of Education.

Fortier was a tireless and devoted scholar, publishing successively *Le Château de Chambord*, 1884; *Sept Grands Auteurs du XIXᵉ siècle*, 1889; *Histoire de la littérature française*, 1893; *Central America and Mexico*, 1907. His great interest was however in the cultural heritage of his native state and his contribution to the field includes *Louisiana Studies*, 1894; *Louisiana Folktales*, 1895; and his ambitious work, *A History of Louisiana*, 1904. Outside of publishing, he presided for twenty-two years (1892-1914) over the Creole association, "L'Athénée Louisianais," directed the Louisiana Historical Society for eighteen years (1894-1913) and served as curator for the Louisiana State Museum. On a national level he was president of the American Folklore Society (1894), the Modern Language Association and the "Fédération de l'Alliance Française."


6 Beside the Creole songs, collected and published in the essays "The Dance in Place Congo," 1836 and "Creole Slave Songs," 1836, Cabel's fictional works occasionally contain words and phrases from the creolized French which add a local flavor to the account (e.g. Père Jérôme and his companions in "Madame Delphine" speak the Creole dialect).

7 Cincinnati Commercial, December 27, 1887. Also in Lafcadio Hearn, *Occidental Gleanings: Sketches and Essays Now First Collected by*

8 This should not be taken as a contradiction to footnote 19 of Chapter 2. Creole languages as a typological type of some sort are not newly developed, but the ones spoken in the New World primarily by Blacks are, relatively speaking, recent innovations.

9 George S. Lane, "Notes on Louisiana French," Language, X (December, 1934), 323-333.


11 Broussard's book was published a few months after his death in 1942.


13 Although an awareness of dialect differences among various localities within the same speech community was current for a good many years, and though American studies of some depth go back to about the last decade of the 19th century, linguistic descriptions of provincial dialects became prevalent when the project for a linguistic atlas of the U. S. got underway in 1932.

14 The sample consists of two letters sent to the author by a "Cajun" person.


It bears pointing out that while there has been a paucity of linguistic investigations on Louisiana French, the cultural Renaissance has precipitated the prolific appearance of works of a more general and colloquial nature. For instance, the year 1976 saw the appearance of Revon Reed's Lâche pas la patate, portrait des Acadiens de la Louisiane (Québec: Partis Pris, 1976); Myron Tauzin's Nous Sommes les Acadiens/We Are the Acadiens (Gretna: Pelican Publishing Co., 1976), an album


26 Aside from the new geographical environment where Acadians had settled for some 150 years before their deportation and subsequent arrival in Louisiana, Alexander Hull has suggested in his article, "Evidence for the Original Unity of North American French Dialect," *Revue de Louisiana/Louisiana Review*, III (Summer, 1974), 59-70, that a "Maritime French which might have been spoken on board ships in the Atlantic trade and in the Atlantic coastal ports during the 17th and 18th centuries" underlies perhaps the dialectal differences found in overseas French when compared with the Continental Standard French. This view is supported
by the abundance of nautical words in the Acadian dialect (e.g. "amarer," "haler," "virer," "les vaches sont au large").


28 For lack of reliable documents it is difficult to pinpoint precisely the origin of the Acadian settlers. However, most historians


29 Alcée Fortier, 1894, p. 2.


5. SOME LINGUISTIC PROBLEMS PECULIAR TO LOUISIANA FRENCH

5.1. The Current Dialect-Leveling and the Problem of Labeling

One of the major problems facing a dialectologist investigating the varieties of French spoken in Louisiana is the labeling of the speech community he delineated either on the basis of areal, geneological or socio-cultural criteria. Such a nomenclature difficulty stems from the convergence of the once distinctive French dialects brought to Louisiana by, linguistically speaking, three different waves of French-speaking immigrants. These are 1) the early colonizers who, lured by the expansionist and mercantalist ideas of the eighteenth century, left France to make Louisiana their permanent home, and their compatriots who colonized other territories in the West Indies but were later, for political reasons, driven out and transported to Louisiana; 2) the Acadian exiles who took refuge in Louisiana after their tragic deportation from the modern province of Nova Scotia in 1755; and 3) the Blacks who adopted a creolized French as their "first" language upon their arrival to this part of the New World. The historical events which led these waves of immigrants to set foot on the soil of Louisiana has been discussed in some depth in section 1.1 and the causes for their dialectal idiosyncracies have been outlined in section 2.2 (for the Creole), 4.2 (for the Acadian) and 4.3 (for the Colonial).

The important thing to stress at this point is not the obvious fact that these different groups have, because of their provenance, brought
to Louisiana different French dialects, but that for socio-economic and even legal reasons these groups have not socially amalgamated during the Colonial Period in order to homogenize and standardize their vernaculars. On the contrary they retained for a long period of time the distinctiveness of their dialects. The "Code Noir," for instance, promulgated by Bienville in 1724 in addition to the social, economic and cultural differences has kept, relatively speaking, the Black Creole speakers apart from the White speakers of Acadian and Colonial French. Similarly, the Acadians, who were in the main agricultural folks, often with no formal education and living mostly in rural areas of what is known in geographic literature as the Bayou Settlement, did not mix with the Creoles of French descent who were, comparatively, a wealthy urban population, the majority of which settled and lived in and around the Crescent City. Thus, regional as well as social and legal factors perpetuated the dialectal idiosyncrasies of these three groups for an extended period of time.

During the Post-Civil War period this linguistic situation began to change, however, as a result of socio-economic "leveling," mobility and other factors discussed in previous chapters which brought the various French-speaking groups to a more socially amalgamated co-existence. The latter terminus would, by virtue of language contact, bring about a "dialect leveling" of some kind. This still ongoing linguistic merging reported by several researchers in the field can be best observed in the investigations conducted by Alcée Fortier, George Lane and Raleigh Morgan on the French spoken in the little town of St. Martinville (St. Martin Parish).

In his "compte-rendu" of a short visit he made to St. Martinville
in 1890, Alcée Fortier reports that "French is essentially the language of the inhabitants and it is well spoken by the educated class. The latter speak English also, but the lower class speak the Acadian French mixed with the Creole patois [emphasis added] and a little English."² Some decades later, George Lane, writing about the French spoken in the same town, states that "Standard-French (= Colonial French) here, as elsewhere in Louisiana, has been subject to Acadian influence, especially with regards to vocabulary."³ In 1970, Raleigh Morgan concluded from his field-work in the same area that the three French dialects namely Colonial, Acadian and Creole, have achieved a certain unity.⁴

The social amalgamation and the subsequent dialect leveling discussed above have, therefore, made it impossible to find a community which speaks, say, a pure Creole variety devoid of features which historically can be traced and identified as "Acadianisms," and conversely. It is for this reason that Morgan calls the speech of the French-speaking Blacks he interviewed in St. Martinville a "decreolized or a "Cajunized" Black French; and it is for the same reason that the present author will be hesitant to label the language of his selected "texts" Acadian French despite the fact that some steps (to be discussed later) were taken to insure, as far as possible, an authentic representation of the dialect.

5.2 Linguistic Diversity and Some Problems Facing a "Generativist"

The linguistic goals set up by generativists, namely that of extrapolating the psychologically "internalized" rules or principles of a speech community (i.e. a linguistic system) which account for language-
users' knowledge of their language, are not easily attainable in the case of Louisiana French for the following reasons: 1) the somewhat stressed dialectal differences which prevail are really in the State, and 2) the unusual amount of free variation found within and across idiolects.

5.2.1. Regional Variation

The relatively great regional diversity that characterizes Louisiana French has been witnessed in the very earliest works in the field. Felix Voorhies, the author of Acadian Reminiscences, told Alcée Fortier in 1890:

Each locality has its peculiar patois, thus at the upper limit of our parish, one uses expressions which are never heard at the lower limit. The dialect in Lafourche differs essentially from that which is in use in St. Martin, at Avoyelles or on the Vermilion Parish.5

William Read also reports in his etymological dictionary, Louisiana-French (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1931), that "the speech of the Louisiana Acadians varies considerably in different localities, the dialect of Pointe Coupee containing, for instance, some words and expressions not heard at French Settlement or in Houma" (p. xix).

A linguistic unification of Louisiana French has been negatively conditioned, particularly in the twentieth century, by 1) the absence of a prolific French literature, meaningful and state-wide radio and television French programings, daily French newspapers, among other unifying means of communication, and 2) a network of linguistic facts, such as the restricted usage of the French language and its subsequent declining nature, which will be discussed in some depth later.
It should be pointed out here that some questions regarding the underlying representation of various dialects of the same speech community have been raised but not yet fully answered. Some of these questions are: Do dialects of the same language share the same underlying representation? Do they differ in their transformational rules at all levels of analysis (e.g. phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics)? Are there two types of rules: core and extential? Do dialects differ only in the latter?

Chomsky and Halle attempted to answer some of these when they stated that "very different dialects may [emphasis added] have the same underlying representation," adding that "underlying representations are fairly resistant to historical change."6 This view (referred to as the Identity Hypothesis) explains according to some scholars the inter-dialect communication.7 However, since as we have read from the above testimonies, the regional variation in Louisiana can render a dialogue between residents of various French-speaking parishes unintelligible, the generativist who subscribes to the Identity Hypothesis is faced with additional difficulties in his attempt to structuralize and extrapolate the underlying representation of the local French. His polylectal grammar could be satisfactorily drawn only after 1) assuring that the varieties dispersed spatially are mutually intelligible and 2) that such an intelligibility is the product of what Bailey, for instance, calls the language-users' internalization of certain algorithms according to which related regional systems are mixed.8

5.2.2. Free Variation (i.e. Idiolect Variation)
A structural analysis of Louisiana French shows an unusual amount of linguistic diversity within the speech of a single person. This fact has been noted by almost every researcher in the field. Marilyn Conwell and Alphonse Juillard report, for instance, that "Louisiana French phonology is characterized by an unusual amount of free variation."\(^9\) Raleigh Morgan also states that "for any concept or for any grammatical form there are usually two or more allomorphs either for sociolinguistic diversity or for no reasons at all."\(^10\) Back in 1942, Walter von Wartburg, the great Swiss lexicographer came to the U. S. and participated in a conference on French in the New World and on the possibilities of extending the European Linguistic Atlas concept to the New World. He wrote an article entitled "To What Extent Is an Atlas of Louisiana French Possible and Desirable?"\(^11\) His conclusion was essentially that the linguistic facts of Louisiana French were such that they could not be put into an atlas in the way one would do it in Europe and arrive at meaningful or revealing isoglosses demarcating the regional variation in usage clearly between the various French-speaking parishes. Wartburg's conclusions are based on 1) the absence of what he calls "an essential lexical uniformity" across the Gallic community and 2) the presence of two conflicting lexical items describing a single concept within the dialects rather than across a geographical area. Wartburg cited the following pair of examples as evidence for the lexical free variation in Louisiana French: The lexemes toit (= "roof") and bucane (= "smoke") conflict with couverture and fumée respectively.\(^12\)

Some of the factors responsible for the considerable regional variation set forth above are likewise responsible for the unusual free variation. In addition, there are other linguistic facts peculiar to Louisiana French which contribute heavily to this linguistic diversity. These are
1) the restricted function of the local French and 2), a somewhat consequential fact, its declining nature.

The absence of French in schools, television, judicial and legislative activities, among other important domains, has restricted the use of the French language to certain limited functions, such as social conversations among members of the same family or intimate friends. This diglossic situation was noted as early as 1914 when Alcée Fortier reported that French was, "la langue du foyer, des réunions et du culte." Because of the restricted function of French, Louisiana offers a rather unique case of bilingualism. As was discussed in section 3.2., Louisianans of French descent are, by necessity, competent in the English language and, to a greater extent, the "dominant" language of most of them is no longer their ancestral or even their "first" language.

The English contact, from within the outside the Gallic community, is very evident in the anglicization of Louisiana French vocabulary, for instance, and is certainly a major source for the variation in structural patterns of the local French at all levels of analysis. The present author encountered, for instance, an informant in Port Allen, Louisiana, (age 81) whose first language was French but during our interview spoke mostly English while apologizing about the fact that he had forgotten most of his native tongue. When interviewed about the conjugation paradigm of certain verbs, he paused a few minutes trying to recall how he used to say it. This kind of linguistic hesitation, or speaking by memory phenomenon, is rather widespread in Louisiana and is yet another source for the free variation or for what appears to be on the surface an unsystematic behavior of the language. Such a phenomenon, which characterizes the speech
of some Louisianians of French descent, stems obviously from the declining nature of French, since the speaker produces, say, in the case of a forgotten word, an invented substitute often borrowed from English with a "Frenchified" pronunciation. This "unprincipled" linguistic behavior is implied in the phonological study made by Conwell and Juillard on the French spoken in the area surrounding the town of Lafayette. The two authors found all kinds of phonological rules operating on vowels, for instance; such as nasalization (p. 116) denasalization (p. 117); fronting (p. 115) backing (p. 110); raising (p. 113) and lowering (p. 114), to mention just a few. Their analysis suggests that Louisiana French is a parole without langue, to use Saussurian terms.

It should be pointed out that Conwell and Juillard have included as part of their data prayers which would add to the linguistic diversity both along the sociolinguistic continuum (e.g. basilect/acrolect) and the diachronic evolution of the language. In addition, as Albert Valdman pointed out in his review of Conwell and Juillard's treatment of Louisiana French, the investigators have failed "to distinguish between alternations that have structural significance and those which are merely idiosyncracies." 15

It is worth stressing here that the variation discussed above is not the kind of variation common to all languages, such as the non-identicalness of any two pronunciations of the same word, the variation motivated by social or stylistic factors, etc.... It is rather a behavior unique to Louisiana French, stemming principally from the recessive nature of the language. It is interesting to reflect in passing that if the syntactic and phonological rules of a language system are acquired (i.e. internalized) by children during the developmental or formative stage,
what happens to the internalization of rules in the case of dying languages? Does the restricted and minimal usage of the language help reduce (or externalize) the language user's competence? Does the learning of English (and its rules) interfere with the French system? These questions, interesting as they are, must be set aside and not treated in the present volume since they merit discussion in their own right.

In view of what has been said, it becomes evident that a transformationalist, whose primary concern is to abstract the predictable, hence psychologically valid, set of rules which explain the speaker's competence of the language, is faced with a serious problem, namely that of discerning between the random deviations (e.g. performance errors) and the patterned variation, whether it is motivated by intersytlisic or sociolinguistic factors, or whether it is due to Louisiana French speakers' adoption and usage of English.

5.3. Scope and Limitation of the Linguistic Outline Attempted in the Present Work

The following linguistic description of the "Acadian" dialect is based on data collected intermittently from the Summer of 1975 to the Spring of 1977. The "Acadian" variety is defined here, operationally, as the French spoken today in Southwest Louisiana by persons who satisfy the requirements to be discussed below. The problems inherent in the delineation of such a linguistic community, hence a linguistic system, have been discussed in Section 3.2. In light of the preceding discussion some steps were taken to insure, on the one hand, authentic
representations of the dialect and, on the other hand, to minimize exterior factors which are usually the source of unexplainable free variation.

These guidelines were as follows: 1) The informants were selected purposely from a single parish, that of Lafourche, to minimize, as far as possible, the flux of variation which prevails within the Gallic community, particularly since the criterion of mutual intelligibility between two varieties dispersed spatially is questionable. Thus, no claim is made here to give an overall comprehensive description of the French spoken today in Southwest Louisiana.

2) Although many French-speaking Blacks speak Acadian French in addition to a creolized variety, they were not interviewed for the present study. Such a step was taken to eliminate possible injection of "creolisms," otherwise not inherent parts of the "Acadian" dialect, particularly since both the creole and the Acadian varieties have co-existed in the same community. 16

3) Only Louisianians who, culturally, perceive of themselves as Cajuns (and not Creoles-speakers of Colonial French) were selected for the study. 17

4) Persons satisfying the above requirements but who have an understanding of the learned or Standard French were not included in the interview.

5) Given the not-so-completely functional status of the French language in Louisiana (discussed above) and the prevalence of many Acadians who have forgotten most of their French, only informants with, relatively speaking, "natural" fluency were selected for the study.
NOTES


3 George S. Lane, "Notes on Louisiana French," Language, X (December, 1934), 323-333.

4 Raleigh Morgan, Jr., 1970.

5 Cited in Alcée Fortier, 1891, p. 84.


7 For a discussion on the Identity Hypothesis and dissenting views see Robert B. Hausmann, "Underlying Representations in Dialectology," XXXV Lingua (1975), 61-71.


Raleigh Morgan, Jr., 1970, p. 52.


The orthography of Louisiana French is gallicized here for ease of presentation. The spelling does not represent the actual phonetic rendering of the words.

Cited in Raleigh Morgan, Jr., 1970, p. 57.

It should be pointed out that the present author had talked to several "Cajuns" who spoke during our interview entirely in French (with the exception of some English loan-words which are part of the present day French dialect).


Lafourche parish had a considerable Black population (most of which spoke French during the Antebellum Period) since the early years of settlement. Helen M. Bowe reports, for instance, on pp. 21-22 of her Louisiana State University thesis, "Bayou Lafourche" (1935), that by 1850 there were more Blacks than Whites in the whole Lafourche region.

Though Lafourche parish was settled first by the early French colonizers or for our purpose by the speakers of Colonial French, at
least as far south as the present town of Thibodaux (see Alcée Fortier (ed.), Louisiana, Comprising Sketches of Parishes, etc... (New Orleans: Century Historical Association, 1914), 25-26), the Acadian population played a predominant part in the establishment of a French culture in the region both because of their number and their unique socio-cultural characteristics discussed in chapter 3. In his History of Louisiana from the Earliest Period (New Orleans: A. T. Peuniman and Co., 1829), 76-77 and 99, François-Xavier Martin infers from the census taken in 1785 and 1788, that the last large immigration of Acadians to Louisiana, which occurred in 1785, had more than doubled the population of Lafourche.
6. PHONOLOGY OF LAFOURCHE FRENCH

The present phonological outline of the French spoken in Lafourche Parish will be organized as follows. First, a review of past works which treat directly or indirectly the phonological aspect of Louisiana French will be outlined. Second, a comparative analysis of the various treatises on the phonology of Louisiana French will be discussed, pointing out, among other things, some discrepancies. Finally, a phonological sketch based on the author's own field-work will be presented. This latter part will include a "phonemic" repertoire of the dialect spoken in Lafourche Parish and an inventory of some salient phonological rules justifying in part the phonemic selection.

6.1. Review of Previous Works on the Phonology of Louisiana French

The phonetic analyses of Louisiana French can be divided into two groups: Those written prior to 1950, when such key phonological concepts as phoneme, allophone, pitch, etc...were not yet well defined in America and particularly in the literature on Louisiana French, and those written subsequently. Though the history of modern phonetics goes back to the turn of the century with the writings of such pioneering phoneticians as Henry Sweet in England, Paul Passy in France, and Jan Baudouin de Courtenay in Russia, the concept of, say, the phoneme as a class of sounds which share phonetic similarities and which do not occur in the same linguistic environment (i.e. they are in complementary distribution) was
not well defined and applied until about the middle of the century. For instance, it was not until 1941, that George Trager and Bernard Bloch used in their landmark article, "The Syllabic Phonemes of English," *Language*, XVII (1941), 223-246, slant lines / / to distinguish very explicitly phonemes from their allophonic distributions. Incidentally, "the term 'allophone' was first used in print in the above article and in Bloch's simultaneously published 'Phonemic Overlapping' [American Speech, XVI (1941), 278-284]." Likewise, it was not until 1945 that Rulon S. Wells attempted to systematically describe pitch as phonemic in his article "The Pitch Phonemes of English," *Language*, XXI (1945), 27-39.

The state of the art in phonemics, prior to 1950, explains why it is not clear in Hosea Phillips' article, "Vowels of Louisiana 'Cajun' French," *French Review*, XVIII (1945), 159-162, if the front-mid vowels, which he transcribes within brackets as [ɛ] and [ɛ], are two separate phonemes or two allophones of the same phoneme. This confusion also can be observed in the notational modifications adopted by John Guilbeau in his latest writings. In his detailed doctoral dissertation, "The French Spoken in Lafourche Parish" (University of North Carolina, 1950), Guilbeau uses strictly slant lines for his phonetic and phonemic transcriptions and refers to his selected vocalic "phonemes" as "vowels." In a later publication, "La Phonologie et les études des parlers francolouisianais," *Comptes-rendus de l'Athénée Louisianais*, (mars, 1958), 28-39, Guilbeau describes the sound pattern of the French dialect spoken in Lafourche Parish, this time more precisely, using slant lines for his proposed phonemic matrix and brackets for the phonetic transcriptions provided to exemplify and support his phonemic selection.
The pre-1950 phonetic studies were furthermore comparative in their methodological approach, outlining and discussing for the most part the phonetic "peculiarities" which vary from the sound pattern of the standard (i.e. Parisian) variety. They have not dealt with Louisiana French as an autonomous system but as a variant variety, or an imperfect representation, of Standard French. This is not to say that the post-1950 studies have all rectified such shortcomings and utilized the descriptive devices made available to them by the contemporary theoretical linguist. The latest and most comprehensive studies on Louisiana French remain inadequate in, at least, the phoneme/allophone dichotomy. In their Louisiana French Grammar (The Hague: Mouton, 1963), Conwell and Juillard, using strictly slant lines in their entire transcription (e.g. illustrative examples), state that "there are eight vowels in Louisiana French: /i/, /E/, /A/, /O/, /u/, /a/, /y/, /OE/" and add that four of them "have allophones in complementary distribution: i.e. /E/: /e/, /ɛ/; /A/: /a/, /ɑ/; /O/: /o/, /ɔ/ and /OE/: /ø/, /œ/" (p. 41). It seems that the notational system adopted to distinguish phonemes and allophones, namely capital vs. small letters, applies only to those segments which have in Standard French a contrastive variation. Though the authors rectify the situation in so many words, the absence of a consistent notation which applies to all segments, shows a weak grasp of the concept of the phoneme and casts therefore some doubts on the interpretation of their data.

6.1.1. Pre-1950 Phonetic Studies
The very first published document to make mention of the phonetic characteristics of the Acadian (i.e. Cajun) dialect, spoken in Southwest Louisiana, as far as the present investigator has been able to find out, was Alcée Fortier's diary-like article, "The Acadians of Louisiana and Their Dialect," Publications of the Modern Language Association, VI (1891), 64-94. The history section of the article discussing the Acadians' settlement in the modern province of Nova Scotia, their deportation, their arrival in Louisiana, etc..., overshadows the linguistic one. A less than one page section, entitled "Phonetics," describes some salient variants of the local pronunciation. Fortier states, for instance, that "E often becomes a: chare for chère, alle for elle" (p. 88). On the whole, the few "peculiarities" or variants from Standard French reported by Fortier are supported by the most recent investigations. Fortier repeated, perhaps revised, the linguistic information given in his 1891 article in a number of subsequent publications.4

Continuing chronologically, the second work to treat the phonological aspect of the progeny of the French exiles is les Acadiens louisianais et leur parler (written in 1909 by an anonymous writer, edited by Karl Ditchy and published in 1932 by Librairie E. Droz, Paris). The book devotes only two pages to the pronunciation of the dialect, pointing out mostly some consonantal variants from Standard French. The anonymous author states, for instance, that "D devant i devient j, Dieu, dijer; diable, diabler" (p. 20).

As was stated in Chapter 4, the 1930's were prolific years in the study of the French vernaculars in Louisiana. James Broussard and Hoguet Major, two Louisiana State University professors, conducted some twenty
Master's theses during this decade. Broussard's interest was restricted mostly to the Creole variety and Major directed his students to compile glossaries of lexical items found in Acadian dialect which differ either in meaning or pronunciation from their Standard French counterparts. In Major's supervised theses, the students have followed a similar procedure in compiling their lexicon. This method calls for 1) writing the term in conventional spelling, 2) transcribing it phonetically, 3) translating it into English, 4) exemplifying it by using illustrative sentences, 5) giving its Standard French equivalent and 6) listing the region in which the word is used. Not all the theses have followed faithfully the above six steps, but Bernard (1933), Coco (1933), Daigle (1934), DeBlanc (1935), Dugas (1935), Phillips (1935), Pirkle (1935), Viator (1935), Guilbeau (1936), Hurst (1937), Olivier (1937), Granier (1938) and Jeansonne (1938) have all transcribed their lexical entries into phonetic symbols and their data can, therefore, be used as "texts" for phonetic studies.  

In addition to the above Louisiana State University Master's theses, other works dealing with the phonological aspect of the Acadian French appeared in the 1930's. George Lane published two articles on Louisiana French in Language in 1934 and 1935, but discussed the linguistic "peculiarities" of the Colonial and Creole varieties only. Irène Whitfield (1935) wrote a thesis on the Louisiana French folksongs, a massive work, published by the Louisiana State University Press in 1939 and by Dover Publications in 1969, which remains even today the most authoritative source on the subject. The 102 songs collected by Whitfield, of which 31 are classified as "Louisiana French" (i.e. Colonial,
42 as Acadian (i.e. Cajun) and 24 as Creole (i.e. Negro-French), are
given in phonetic symbols and provide therefore valuable data on the
phonetics of the three French dialects spoken (or once spoken) in Louisiana.
Eveline Pellerin also completed a Master's thesis at McGill University in
1936 in which she gives a list of "Déformations" of the local pronunciation. 7
Finally, Hosea Phillips submitted a doctoral dissertation to the
University of Paris in 1936, written under the supervision of Ferdinand
Brunot on the Acadian French spoken in Evangeline Parish. 8 His disserta-
tion, published by Librairie Droz (Paris) in the same year, remains the
only work in which acoustic devices (e.g. spectrograms) were used to
analyse the local French.

In the 1940's, Louisiana French studies began to decline numerically.
Hickman (1940), Parr (1940), Trappey (1940), LaHaye (1946), Montgomery
(1946), Voorhies (1949) have continued Huguet Major's project of compiling
a comprehensive glossary of Louisiana French and gathered in their
Louisiana State University Master's theses lexical variants (transcribed phonetically) found in the French spoken in Jefferson, Terrebonne, Iberia,
St. Landry, Vermilion and St. Martin parishes respectively. 9 The only other
works that have dealt with the phonetics of the Acadian dialect are Calvin
Claudel's doctoral dissertation (1947) at the University of North Carolina,
in which he devotes a small section to a linguistic analysis of the French
spoken in Avoyelles Parishes 10 and Hosea Phillips' article "The Vowels of
Louisiana 'Cajun' French" (1945) in which he concludes that the "law of
position," whereby a vocalic segment receives the feature [+ open] in a
closed syllable and [- open] in an open syllable, is stricter in Acadian
French than in Standard French.
6.1.2. Post-1950 Studies

The Post-1950 studies have seriously departed from derivative analyses and have attempted on the whole to give our language in question an autonomous description. There are in particular two doctoral dissertations in which the phonetic aspect of the dialect has been treated in some depth. The first was written by John Guilbeau in 1950 at the University of North Carolina under the direction of Urban T. Holmes and the other by Marilyn Conwell in 1961 at the University of Pennsylvania under the direction of Alphonse Juillard. Both of these works have been discussed in section 4.2, and will be referred to in the following presentation of the sound pattern of Lafourche French.

6.2. Phonological Sketch of Lafourche French

The present description of Louisiana French follows the notational devices used in generative phonology. However there is no claim that the present analysis has a "generative power," or that it has a psychological validity. For instance, the rules, though they are numbered for reference sake, are not ordered and, thus, there is no claim made (or implied) of the diachronic parallelism. Conversely, the presentation is only a brief outline intended to 1) posit the phonological matrices of the vowels, consonants, semi-vowels (or glides) and liquids operating in the dialect, 2) discuss the allophonic distribution of certain segments, and 3) summarize and discuss some salient phonological rules.

The four major feature classes, vowels, consonants, semi-vowels and liquids, which will be treated separately, are differentiated from each
other by the features [vocalic] and [consonantal], hereinafter abbreviated as [voc] [cons].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels</th>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Semi-vowels</th>
<th>Liquids</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voc</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cons</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.1. Vowels

A narrow transcription of some conversations conducted with the French-speaking persons of Lafourche Parish shows the following vocalic realizations:

Phonetic Output of the Oral Vowels

[Diagram showing vowel sounds in front, central, and back areas with high, mid, and low positions]
Phonetic Output of the Nasalized Vowels

A few remarks should be made about the above selection of vocalic phones: 1) the localization of the phones in the various regions of the physiological chart (i.e. the point of articulation) is based on the author's perception and is therefore approximate; 2) the space between the selected phones is not necessarily proportional to acoustic differences (e.g. while the space between [e] and [I] is closer on the chart than the space between [i] and [I], the acoustic difference between the first set is clearly more perceptible than between the second); and 3) since the phones listed on the chart are not discrete entities but represent rather a range of phonetically similar sounds, the selection is therefore arbitrary (another investigator may very well hear two distinctive /y/'s, say, a close one and an open one).
The above physiological charts (of the oral and nasal vowels) can be reorganized to accommodate the "distinctive features" model on which the present description will be based, by assigning "pluses" to those vocalic segments possessing the specific properties or features and "minuses" to those which do not. These features will have (for the present study) their foundation in articulatory phonetics. Thus, they are (with minor adjustments) the same as the ones listed for the above physiological chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>i</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>ç</th>
<th>ɛ</th>
<th>ø</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>æ</th>
<th>æ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>front</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rounded</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>open</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.1.1. Vocalic Units

A close examination of the sound pattern of the dialect suggests that the above list of vocalic phones could be, on the basis of the following three sets of considerations, abstracted into 8 oral and 3 nasal units. The traditional concept of phoneme has been replaced here by the concept "phonological unit" simply to eschew some problems associated with the way the concept phoneme has been formulated in the literature (e.g. the validity of the statement: "once a phoneme is always a phoneme," the issue of phonemic overlapping) all of which are not of direct concern to us here.

1) Any two phones may be grouped into a single class of phones (i.e. unit) if they share phonetic similarities, or in other words if they are adjacent to each other on the physiological chart.

2) Any two phonetically similar phones would be grouped in the same class of phones if they are in complementary distribution. In other words, the occurrence of either one of them is predictable on the basis of the linguistic environment.

3) Any two phonetically similar phones will not share the membership of a single class if they have a contrastive function. The minimal pairs test will be used in this connection.
### Oral Vocalic Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>unrounded</th>
<th>rounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>front</td>
<td>central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nasalized Vocalic Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>unrounded</th>
<th>rounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>front</td>
<td>central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>ɛ̃</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>ɑ̃</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The selection of the above vocalic units is supported partially by the following list of contrastive minimal pairs and partially by the complementary distribution (to be discussed later) of the members of
each selected phonological unit. The illustrative contrast is restricted only to the sounds adjacent to each other on the physiological chart (i.e. differentiated from each other by few features). Each illustrative word is given in its narrow phonetic transcription, with its Standard French cognate (for ease of presentation) and its English equivalent.

Oral Vowels:

/i/ --------------- /e/

[si] si "if"       [se] c’est "it is"
[i] il "he"       [e] et "and"
[di] dit "says"   [de] des "some"
[il] ile "island" [e] elle "she"

/i/ --------------- /y/

[ri] ri "laugh"   [ry] rue "street"
[si] si "if"      [sy] sur "on"

/y/ --------------- /u/

[ry] rue "street" [ru] roue "wheel"
[sy] sur "on"    [su] sous "under"
[byt] but "goal"  [but] bout "bouts"

/e/ --------------- /ø/

[de] des "some"   [ðø] deux "two"
The phonemic differentiation between oral and nasal vowels sharing the same point of articulation is very much in evidence in the dialect, as can be shown from the following contrastive pairs:
The rounding feature, to be examined later, is not strongly marked in the case of the front vowels in the dialect. The article *un* is frequently pronounced [ən] or [e] in normal conversation. Thus, in Lafourche lated and careful pronunciation does one hear [ən]. Thus, in Lafourche dialect there is generally no functional contrast between [e] and [a].

The system of nasal vowels is therefore reduced to three segments where [e] and [a] are two variants of /e/.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/a/</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>/a/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[tə]</td>
<td>temps</td>
<td>&quot;time&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[va]</td>
<td>vend</td>
<td>&quot;sells&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ba]</td>
<td>banc</td>
<td>&quot;bench&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[o]</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>&quot;we&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bo]</td>
<td>bon</td>
<td>&quot;good&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>&quot;one&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>/a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ba]</td>
<td>&quot;a lot&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[va]</td>
<td>&quot;goes&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ba]</td>
<td>&quot;low&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[o]</td>
<td>&quot;water&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[bo]</td>
<td>&quot;handsome&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>&quot;and&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/æ/</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>/æ/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[bɛ]</td>
<td>bain</td>
<td>&quot;bash&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>&quot;one&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/ɔ/</th>
<th>---</th>
<th>/ɔ/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[tɔ]</td>
<td>temps</td>
<td>&quot;time&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[sɔ]</td>
<td>cent</td>
<td>&quot;hundred&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɔ/</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>/ɔ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tɔ]</td>
<td>ton</td>
<td>&quot;your&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[sɔ]</td>
<td>son</td>
<td>&quot;his/her&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Despite the operation of the unusual variation found in the local French, whether it stems from casual performance errors (e.g. slip of the tongue phenomena), from the ongoing dialect-leveling, from code-switching, or from other sources discussed in chapter 5, a close examination of the dialect shows discernible patterns mostly of a statistical nature. For instance, the open front-mid vowel \[æ\] occurs more often in a closed syllable than in an open syllable. Since the immediate purpose here is to outline briefly the sound pattern of the local French, the selected phonological rules will be drawn on the basis of majority occurrence. The unpredictable output of these rules (i.e. variation) will be at best mentioned here. The analysis of variation, aimed at finding out if it is random or rule-governed, will be left to the care of other researchers.

One of the most productively "predictable" allophonic distributions of the vowels is the so-called "law of position," whereby a vowel receives the feature \([+ \text{ open}]\) (i.e. lowered) when it is checked by a consonant. This law is stricter in Louisiana French than it has been reported for the Parisian variety. This relative strictness has been observed and reported by Lane, Phillips and Guilbeau, among other researchers in the
field. On the basis of the transcription of my data and a verification of it in subsequent field-trips, the law of position is most perceptible in all mid-vowels and in the front-high /i/, as in the examples below:

Mid-Vowels:

**Mid-Front Unrounded Vowel**

\[ R_1 \ /e/ \rightarrow [ɛ] / \ - \ $ \{ \text{where } $ \text{ is a syllable boundary} \} \]

Examples:

- [ɛtɛ] éte "summer"
- [fɛ] fait "done"
- [bebe] bébé "baby"
- [eta] état "state"

\[ R_2 \ /e/ \rightarrow [ɛ] / \ - \ ɔ$ \]

Condition: \( C \neq r \)

Examples:

- [ɛtɛ] fête "holiday"
- [mɛm] même "even"
- [prɛt] prêté "ready"
- [ˈnɛɡrɛ] nègre "negro"
- [lɛd] laid "ugly"
- [sɛt] sept "seven"
- [bek] bec "beak"
- [ˈbɛlɛ] belle "pretty"
A few remarks should be made about the allophonic distribution of /e/. First, the above rules are not consistently predictable. The free variation discussed in section 5.2, however it is motivated, is manifested in the allophonic distribution of /e/ as shown in the following recorded alternations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[ɛ̃]} & \sim \text{[ɛ]} \\
\text{[sɛrvjet]} & \sim \text{[sɛrvjet]} \\
\text{[pɛrdy]} & \sim \text{[pɛrdy]} \quad \text{etc...}
\end{align*}
\]

Second, several investigators (e.g. Conwell and Juillard, 1968, p. 44) have implied that /e/ is lowered to /ɛ/ before /l/, but give as evidence
the widely reported example [al] for elle (= "she"). Though the present data show various phonetic realizations for the third person feminine singular personal pronoun, among them [al],\(^{16}\) statistically speaking, one occurrence is not enough evidence to rewrite Rule (3) as follows:

\[
R_4 \quad /e/ \rightarrow \begin{array}{c} [\mathbf{e}_V] \\ + \text{cons} \end{array} + \text{voc} \]

particularly since the rendering [al] for "she" has been reported in various Continental French dialects. It seems therefore that the alternation of [al] and [al] is a lexical one stemming undoubtedly from the merging of the separate French dialects which have co-existed in the region during the last 200 years. Finally, the openness of /e/ before /r/ is greater in the speech of some informants than in others. In some instances it approaches an [a] and is characterized by a relatively longer duration. It is this variable degree of openness of /e/ before /r/ that led the present author to classify the vowel of [mar] (which some other researchers have transcribed as [mar] or [mar]) as an allophone of /e/.

Though there may be, in this instance, a phonemic overlapping, the vowel of /mer/ even when it is heard as [mar], remains, because of its predictability and its alternation with [e], an allophone of /e/.\(^{17}\)

Mid-Front Rounded Vowel

\[
R_5 \quad /\empty/ \rightarrow [\mathbf{e}_V] \quad -c^S
\]

Examples

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{[sæl]} & \text{seul} \quad "\text{alone}" \\
\text{[poœr]} & \text{peur} \quad "\text{fear}" \\
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[œr]} & \quad \text{sœur} & \quad \text{"sister"} \\
\text{[dœmœr]} & \quad \text{demeure} & \quad \text{"stay"} \\
\text{[nœf]} & \quad \text{neuf} & \quad \text{"nine"} \\
\text{[œs]} & \quad \text{eux} & \quad \text{"them"} \\
\text{[œv]} & \quad \text{veuve} & \quad \text{"widow"}
\end{align*}
\]

\[R_6 \quad \text{/ø/} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{[ø]} \quad \\
\text{Examples} \\
\text{[dœ]} & \quad \text{deux} & \quad \text{"two"} \\
\text{[vœ]} & \quad \text{veut} & \quad \text{"ants"} \\
\text{[pœ]} & \quad \text{peu} & \quad \text{"little"}
\]

**Mid-Back Rounded Vowel**

\[R_7 \quad \text{/o/} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{[ɔ]} \quad \\
\text{Examples} \\
\text{[fɔr]} & \quad \text{faute} & \quad \text{"error"} \\
\text{[parɔl]} & \quad \text{parole} & \quad \text{"word"}
\]

\[R_8 \quad \text{/o/} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{[ɔ]} \quad \\
\text{Examples} \\
\text{[fɔ]} & \quad \text{faux} & \quad \text{"wrong"} \\
\text{[mo]} & \quad \text{mot} & \quad \text{"word"}
\]

**High Front Unrounded Vowel**

\[R_9 \quad \text{/i/} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{[i]} \quad \\
\text{Examples} \\
\text{[dIr]} & \quad \text{dire} & \quad \text{"to say"}
\]
The low vowel /a/ has two main allophones [a] and [α:]. The latter, which is back and rounded, was noticed only after the semi-vowel /w/; whereas the former occurs in all the other linguistic environments. No significant differences were noticed between the checked and unchecked /a/.

Examples

\[R_{11}\] /a/ \rightarrow [α:] \leftarrow \ w$

Examples

{savoi$] savoir "to know"
{bwoo$] bois "wood"

\[R_{12}\] /a/ \rightarrow [a] \leftarrow \ X \rightarrow \ Y \{\text{where } X \text{ is anything but } /w/; \text{ where } Y \text{ is anything}\}$

Examples

{paro$] parole "word"
{ba$] bas "below"
{papa$] papa "daddy"
It is possible to argue that the complementation discussed above applies to all vocalic segments and that for physiological, hence acoustic, reasons the perceptible difference due to the openness vs. closeness of the vowel is greater for some vowels than for others. Rules of the following sort could be drawn to capture this complementation.

\[
\begin{align*}
R_{13} & \quad [\text{open}] \rightarrow [+ \text{open}] \quad \rightarrow C(C)^{\$} \\
R_{14} & \quad [\text{open}] \rightarrow [- \text{open}] \quad \rightarrow \$ 
\end{align*}
\]

Supporting evidence for this generalization comes from the fact that the vowels /i e o o/, for which the "law of position" applies, according to my data do not form a natural feature class. The vowels /e o o/ share the features \{-high\} \{-low\}, whereas /i e/ share the features \{+front\} \{-low\} \{-round\}. There is no way of grouping /i e o o/ under the same set of features. Rules (13) and (14) have to be rewritten in four rules in order to capture this complementation as reflected in my data:

\[
\begin{align*}
R_{15(a)} & \quad \begin{bmatrix} + \text{front} \\ + \text{high} \\ - \text{round} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} + \text{front} \\ + \text{high} \\ - \text{round} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow C(C)^{\$} \\
R_{15(b)} & \quad \begin{bmatrix} - \text{high} \\ - \text{low} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} - \text{high} \\ - \text{low} \\ + \text{open} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow C(C)^{\$} \\
R_{16(a)} & \quad \begin{bmatrix} + \text{front} \\ + \text{high} \\ - \text{round} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} + \text{front} \\ + \text{high} \\ - \text{open} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \$ 
\end{align*}
\]
6.2.1.3. Some Selected Vocalic Rules

6.2.1.3.1. Nasalization

The nasality feature is problematic in a description of Louisiana French. Its manifestation is not easily perceptible since segments range from strongly nasalized to very slightly nasalized. In order to specify the degree of nasality brought about by assimilation or otherwise, the numbers 1, 2 and 3 will be added to the top of nasalized segments. Number 1 will signify that the segment is slightly nasalized, 2 moderately nasalized and 3 strongly nasalized. The nasal vowels and consonants will be indexed with number 3 if they are pronounced with the same degree of nasality as in Standard French in, say, the expressions on, en, un or the like.

The most noticeable effect of the nasal vowels is the occurrence of a nasal consonant after a preceding nasal vowel as shown in the following rule:

\[ R_{17} [ + \text{voc} ] [ - \text{cons} ] [ + \text{nasal} ] \rightarrow [ + \text{voc} ] [ - \text{cons} ] [ + \text{nasal} ] \]

This generated nasal consonant is [m] if the segment following the nasal vowel is a bilabial stop. We therefore need to make more specific the linguistic environment for this rule:

\[ R_{16(b)} [ - \text{high} ] [ - \text{low} ] + \text{nasal} ] \rightarrow [ - \text{high} ] [ - \text{low} ] [ - \text{open} ] \]
Rule (18) states that a nasal vowel generates a nasal consonant which would agree in the feature [bilabial] with the following segment. It also states that the nasal vowel does not require a following consonant to generate the nasal consonant. For instance, when the nasal vowel is in word final position it generates an [n] since the following segment is zero and & is consequently [− bilabial]. Conwell and Juillard have given the phonetic transcription [täm] for the lexical item temps "time," but this author had heard only [ta] or [tan]. Since p in the spelling of temps is silent, the appearance of Conwell and Juillard's [n] is not easily explainable. We still need another rule stating that the generated nasal consonant is optional in word-final position. Since in Louisiana French as well as in Standard French, there is no lexical item having in its phonemic composition a nasal vowel checked by a nasal consonant, the rule can simply state that in word-final position a nasal consonant is optionally deleted when it follows a nasal vowel:

\[
R_{19} \begin{bmatrix}
  + \text{cons} \\
  - \text{voc} \\
  + \text{nasal}
\end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{cases}
  + \text{cons} \\
  - \text{voc} \\
  + \text{nasal}
\end{cases} \\
\begin{cases}
  + \text{voc} \\
  - \text{cons} \\
  + \text{nasal}
\end{cases}
\]
A second noticeable effect (= assimilation) due to the presence of a nasalized segment is the nasalization of a vowel preceding a nasalized consonant. The degree of nasality seems to depend on whether the vowel is unchecked or checked by the following nasal consonant:

\[
R_{20} \begin{bmatrix} + \text{voc} \\ - \text{cons} \\ - \text{nasal} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \& \text{nasal}^1 \end{bmatrix} / \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} - \text{voc} \\ + \text{cons} \\ \& \text{nasal} \end{bmatrix}
\]

Examples
\[
[\text{swød}^1 \text{pe}] \sim [\text{sw}^3 \text{pe}] \quad \text{soigner} \quad \text{"to cure"}
\]
\[
[\text{kómöse}] \quad \text{commencer} \quad \text{"to begin"}
\]

\[
R_{21} \begin{bmatrix} + \text{voc} \\ - \text{cons} \\ - \text{nasal} \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \& \text{nasal}^2 \end{bmatrix} / \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} - \text{voc} \\ + \text{cons} \\ \& \text{nasal} \end{bmatrix}
\]

Examples
\[
[\text{kôn}] \quad \text{canne} \quad \text{"cane"}
\]
\[
[\text{pöm}] \quad \text{pomme} \quad \text{"apple"}
\]

It should be stressed here that the assertion that the vowel of \([kôn]\), for instance, is originally a \([-\text{nasal}]\) vowel which underwent nasalization by assimilation does not come from a comparison with the standard cognate but rather from the presence of fluctuations of the sort \([kô]\) and \([kôn]\). The Standard form is only a supplementary piece of evidence.

6.2.1.3.2. The Unrounding of the Front Vowels
The rounding of the front vowels is rather unstable in this dialect. Fluctuations between front rounded vowels and their neighboring unrounded vowels are very frequent.

\[ [\text{ty}] \sim [\text{ti}] \]
\[ [\text{k\c{c}yuj}] \sim [\text{k\c{c}yuj}] \]
\[ [\text{\v{z}en}] \sim [\text{\v{z}en}] \]
\[ [\text{br\v{e}}] \sim [\text{br\v{e}}] \]

In addition to the above examples, there are occurrences in certain expressions of rounded vowels which are unrounded in the standard cognates:

\[ [\text{ra\lizj}] \sim [\text{ra\lizj}] \]
\[ [\text{ni...ni}] \sim [\text{ny...ny}] \]

To ascertain the direction of the evolutionary trend suggested by this sort of fluctuation, the informants who uttered some of these variant forms (e.g. \[ [\text{ti}] \] for \( tu \)) were asked in subsequent fieldtrips to repeat the same expressions very carefully. On the basis of their careful rendering and the frequency and direction of the alternation (e.g. the difference between the rapid speech variant and the carefully uttered variant) the trend seems to be that of unrounding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front Vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( i )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( e )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \varepsilon )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \v{e} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.2. Semi-Vowels (Glides)

Lafourche dialect has three phonetic realizations of the class of phones referred to as semi-vowels or glides. These are \([j]\), \([y]\) and
[w] and their points of articulation correspond to the ones of the front vowels /i y u/. [j] occurs both prevocally and postvocally while [y] and [w] occur only prevocally.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
  j & u & w \\
  \text{voc} & - & - \\
  \text{cons} & - & - \\
  \text{high} & + & + \\
  \text{front} & + & + \\
  \text{round} & - & + \\
\end{array}
\]

[y] and [w] are in complementary distribution in this dialect. [y] is found only before /i/, whereas [w] occurs before all vowels except /i/. Such a complementation allows us to group [y] and [w] in a common class, /w/, and write the following rules:

R\textsubscript{22} /w/ \rightarrow [y] / [ + voc - cons + front + high ]

Examples

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
  [\text{lui}] & \text{lui} & "\text{him}" \\
  [\text{huile}] & \text{huile} & "\text{oil}" \\
  [\text{suvivant}] & \text{suvivant} & "\text{following}" \\
\end{array}
\]

R\textsubscript{23} /w/ \rightarrow [w] / [ + voc - cons - front - high ]

Examples

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
  [\text{savoir}] & \text{savoir} & "\text{to know}" \\
  [\text{bois}] & \text{bois} & "\text{wood}" \\
  [\text{moins}] & \text{moins} & "\text{less}" \\
\end{array}
\]
We posited earlier (Rule (11)) that the vowel /a/ is realized [a'], that is, backed and rounded, following [v]. It was also noted that the presence of the semi-vowel /w/, following an initial consonant cluster formed of a velar stop plus a liquid, entails sometimes the realization of the high-back vowel /u/.

\[ R_{23} \quad /w/ \rightarrow [(u)w] \]

Examples

[kruwæje] \sim [krwæje]

Somewhat the reverse of Rule (23) occurs. [w] is generated when the high-back vowel /u/ is preceded by a consonant cluster and followed by a vowel. The exact linguistic environment is formulated as follows:

\[ R_{24} \quad /u/ \rightarrow [uw] \]

Examples

[kluwe] \quad [klu]

"to nail" \quad "nail"

6.2.3. Liquids
The liquids /l, r/ are differentiated from each other by the feature \([\text{anterior}]\). /r/ is a tongue-tip flap produced in the alveolar-palatal region and having therefore the feature \([-\text{anterior}]\), whereas /l/ is a lingua-dental lateral, having the feature \([+\text{anterior}]\). Both /r/ and /l/ are \([+\text{coronal}]\) since the articulator in the production of both segments is the blade of the tongue.

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{r} & \text{l} \\
\text{voc} & + & + \\
\text{cons} & + & + \\
\text{coronal} & + & + \\
\text{anterior} & - & + \\
\end{array}
\]

The most salient phonological rule attributable to a liquid is the lowering of vowels checked by /r/. We have examined the lowering of /e/ to \([\xi]\) in a pre-/r/ position (Rule (3)), a lowering which is greater than the one activated by a consonant in syllable final position. Some instance of r lowering were recorded for vowels for which the "law of position" did not seem to operate, at least perceptibly, as shown in the following alternations:

\[
\begin{align*}
[p yr] & \sim [p\phi r] & \text{pure} & \text{"pure"} \\
[d yr] & \sim [d\phi r] & \text{dur} & \text{"hard"}
\end{align*}
\]
6.2.4. Consonants

The phonetic output of the consonantal segments in Lafourche dialect \([-\text{voc}] \,+\, \text{cons}\) are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner of Articulation</th>
<th>Point of Articulation</th>
<th>Bilbil</th>
<th>Labio-dental</th>
<th>Lingua-dental</th>
<th>Palato-Alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[- continuant]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasals</td>
<td>[+] nasal</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fricative</td>
<td>[+] continuant</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>(#)</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affricates</td>
<td>[+ delayed release]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(#)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The constriction is at the \([+\text{coronal}]\) extreme forward region of the oral cavity.\(^{21}\) The articulator is the blade of the tongue.\(^{22}\)
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In terms of distinctive features, the phonological matrix of the Lafourche French consonants looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>v</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>ñ</th>
<th>ñ</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>continuant</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>anterior</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>coronal</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>nasal</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delayed release</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>voiced</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsidiary features such as [glottalized], [strident], etc... could be included in the matrix. Their inclusion will certainly give a finer description for each segment. However, for our purpose, the additional features will be redundant since the segments of our dialect are distinguishable in terms of the above selected features.

6.2.4.1. Allophonic Distribution of the Consonants

The [+ continuant] [+ coronal] [+ voice] consonants, [z] and [ñ], seem to alternate sometimes "freely" with [h]. The latter is more frequent in intervocalic position where both vowels have the feature [+ back]. We can then draw a rule, statistically motivated (i.e. not
exceptionless), stating that /z/ or /ð/ change intervocally into [h] when both vowels have the feature [+ back]:

\[
R_{25} \begin{bmatrix}
+ \text{cont} \\
- \text{anterior} \\
+ \text{coronal} \\
+ \text{voice}
\end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix}
+ \text{cont} \\
- \text{ant} \\
+ \text{coronal} \\
& \text{coronal}
\end{bmatrix} / \begin{bmatrix}
+ \text{voc} \\
- \text{cons} \\
+ \text{back}
\end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix}
+ \text{voc} \\
- \text{cons} \\
+ \text{back}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The sign ^ is used to indicate the optionality of Rule (25). If ^ is replaced by the minus sign, the derived segment is [h]; if, on the other hand, ^ is replaced by a plus sign the segment would be either /z/ or /ð/ as the case might be.

Examples

/ˈtuːzʊr/ \(\rightarrow\) [tuːhʊr] \(\sim\) [tuːzʊr]

/ˈnʊzɔt/ \(\rightarrow\) [nuhoʊt] \(\sim\) [nuzɔt]

In other linguistic environments, this glottization occurs but it is very infrequent:

[ˈruːz] \(\sim\) [ruh]

[ˈʒyska] \(\sim\) [hyska]

The occurrence of the voiceless glottal fricative /h/, as an underlying phonological unit and not as a phonetic variant derived from /z/ or /ð/ by assimilation (e.g. Rule (25)) seems to be restricted to word-initial position and to pre-back or pre-low vowel position as shown in the following examples:

\([hɔnt]\) honte "shame"

\([hale]\) haler "to pull"

\([ho]\) haut "above"

On the basis of these examples we draw the following rule:

\[R_{26} /h/ \rightarrow \emptyset \quad \# \# \quad X \quad \text{where} \quad X \not\in \{/ə/, /o/\}\]
Since /h/ can occur only initially and prevocally, the rule can be stated simply as follows:

$$R_{27} \quad /h/ \rightarrow \emptyset / -X \quad \text{where} \quad X \notin \{/a/, /o/, /o/\}$$

In the order of application of the rules, Rule (27) has to come before Rule (25), otherwise it will be too inclusive and destroy the occurrences of such expressions as [tuhur], [nuhot], etc... generated by Rule (25).

The voiced velar stop /g/ has two main allophones [ŋ], as in the English word thinking, and [g]. The former, which is perhaps an influence of the English contact, occurs after nasal vowels and only in word-final position, while the latter occurs in the other linguistic environments:

$$R_{28} \quad /g/ \rightarrow [ŋ] / +\text{voc} -\text{cons} +\text{nasal}$$

$$R_{29} \quad /g/ \rightarrow [g] / -\text{nasal}$$

Examples

[lanj] langue "tongue"

[gato] gateau "cake"

Then occurrence of the affricated consonants /ʃ y/ is seemingly predictable on the basis of the following set of considerations: 1) The two segments co-occur in free variation with, physiologically speaking, neighboring consonants namely /t/, /d/, /k/ and /g/, which have adjacent points of articulation to [ʃ] and [ŋ], as indicated in the following pairs of recorded alternations:

$$[ty] \sim [ʃy]$$
$$[gæl] \sim [ʃæl]$$
and 2) their occurrence is restricted to pre-front vowel position. We can therefore write the following rule stating that the voiceless stops /t/ and /k/ become [d] and the voiced stops /d/ and /g/ become [j] before front vowels:

\[ R_{30}^{23} \begin{array}{c}
\text{cont.} \\
\text{bilabial} \\
\text{voice}
\end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
\text{delayed} \\
\text{release} \\
\text{voice}
\end{array} \frac{\#}{\text{cons}} \begin{array}{c}
\text{voc} \\
\text{front}
\end{array} \]

where \(\#\) stands for either the + or - sign and it is consistently the same on both side of the arrow.
The notion of phoneme is currently controversial but for several reasons. Does the notion "phoneme" have a psychological reality? Does the abstract concept of "phoneme" as a class of "physical" sounds help us to understand the language behavior better? These and other questions have been raised but have not been fully or conclusively answered (see Morris Halle, "Phonology in Generative Grammar," *Word*, XVIII (1962), 54-72). The distinction between phoneme and allophone is, with minor unsettled issues, clearly established, however.


2Guilbeau writes in a footnote (p. 43) that "the transcription in the general alphabet [emphasis added] is placed between oblique lines //," showing thereby the then ill-defined dichotomy of phoneme/allophone.


5Anna T. Daigle, "Folklore and Etymological Glossary of the Variants from Standard French in Jefferson Davis Parish" (Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1934).


Marie N. Pirkle, "Variants from Standard French Common to the Dialects of Lafayette Parish and Canada" (Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1935).


Marie LaHaye, "French Folk Material from St. Landry Parish" (Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1946).


As has been outlined, for instance, in Sanford Shane's French Phonology and Morphology (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1968) and Generative Phonology (Englewood, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1973).
The initial part of the field-work consisted of taping conversations entirely in French. To maintain, as far as possible, a natural social context (and not an interview-like context), the sessions were done around a dinner table with several interlocutors taking part in an improvised conversation at the same time. However, such a procedure proved lengthy and unsuitable for phonetic studies since the utterances of one speaker were sometimes "jammed" by the speech of another person.

The latter part of the field-work consisted mostly of long monologues or answers to specific questions intended to verify certain rules.

The fluctuation between [ɛ] and [ɛ] has been recorded recently even in the speech of educated (i.e. intellectual) Parisians, by André Martinet and Henriette Walter, in Dictionnaire de la prononciation française dans son usage réel (Paris: France-Expansion, 1974). The two authors recorded for the word lundi, 9 pronunciations with [ɛ] and 8 with [ɛ]. The unrounding of [ɛ] > [ɛ] signals then one of the evolutionary trends of the sound system of Louisiana French which is seemingly taking place in Continental French as well.

In word-final position the nasal consonant [n] usually follows the nasal vowels. The occurrence of [n] is very frequent in the pronunciation of isolated, hence stressed, words where the nasal vowel is word-final. It is less frequent however, when the nasal vowel is /ə/.

George S. Lane, 1934; Hosea Phillips, 1936; John Guilbeau, 1950.

The other phonetic realization of /el/ are [e], [æ], [e] and [æ]. The dropping of the /l/ will be discussed in Chapter 7 in conjunction with the elision rule.
17 The comparative method of using the Standard French cognate [mär] can be used here as supplementary evidence for the fact that the underlying vowel of [mar] is /e/.

18 Though the word parole is used frequently in the local French as the equivalent of the English word, one hears the expression [mo] conveying the same meaning. This is the type of lexical duplication von Wartburg discussed in his article, "To What Extent is a Linguistic Atlas of Louisiana French Possible and Desirable?"

19 Marilyn Conwell and Alphonse Juillard, 1963, p. 44.

20 The statement that in Louisiana French does not contain syllabic constructions where a nasal vowel is checked by a nasal consonant applies only to segments having a nasal quality indexed 3. It does not apply, for instance, to oral vowels nasalized by the presence of a neighboring nasal consonant.

21 Sanford S. Shane, 1973, p. 29.

22 Ibid.

23 The feature [- bilabial] is included here to single out the stops /t d k g/ in a single feature class.
7. MORPHOLOGY OF LAFOURCHE FRENCH

It was decided that instead of outlining superficially the entire morphology of the French spoken in Lafourche parish, it is perhaps useful to cover in certain depth a few areas. Two areas will be discussed in this chapter: verb forms and personal pronouns.

7.1. Verb Morphology of Lafourche French

In what follows, an attempt will be made to classify and systematize the various verb forms found in Lafourche French. Since the verb form varies usually according to tense, number and person and since Lafourche dialect, as we will see in more detail later, has three persons, two numbers and five tenses, there are potentially 30 possible variant forms for each verb. In addition, each verb has three non-finite forms, an infinitive and two participles, yielding the possibility of 33 forms. However, Louisiana French, compared to the Standard variety, has undergone a great reduction in the verb paradigm both by maintaining generally a single stem and in having fewer endings throughout a given conjugation. Thus, the Lafourche French verbs, including those with suppletive forms, have far fewer variant forms than the possible 33.\(^1\)

Previous workers in the field of Louisiana French have analysed the verb forms in different ways. Conwell and Juilland followed the
traditional way of categorizing conjugation patterns on the basis of the
spelling of infinitive endings. They listed four classes, three of which
are, with minor exceptions, the cognates of Standard ER, IR and RE verbs.
The fourth class includes the cognates of Standard IR verbs whose past
participles are marked by a final ert (e.g. souffrir, ouvrir, offrir),
and which form their infinitive accordingly by adding /ar/ to the stem.
Conwell and Juillard's comparative procedure was modeled too closely on
the Standard French model, disallowing them to capture a more economic,
hence systematic, description of Louisiana French, particularly since
the conjugation of the Louisiana French verb is characterized by a rela-
tively simplified morphology. Conwell and Juillard's contribution
amounts to showing 1) that certain "irregular" verbs in Standard French
have been regularized in Louisiana French and 2) that the IR verbs,
such as offrir and ouvrir, form their infinite in /ar/.

Guilbeau has attempted a more systematic analysis of Louisiana
French verb forms by considering the alternation of verb forms across
tenses. He selected five classes based "on the manner of the formation
of the infinitive on the root of the verb."2 Accordingly, the root "is
that part of the verb preceding the final /e/ of the imperfect tense."3
Guilbeau's five classes are 1) verbs whose infinitive is formed by adding
/e/ to the root (e.g. /don-/  ➔  /done/); 2) verbs with infinitive
formed by adding /r/ to the root with final consonant dropped (e.g.
/finis/  ➔  /finir/); 3) verbs with infinitive identical with the root,
both ending in /t, /d/, or /n/ (e.g. /bat-/  ➔  /bat/); 4) verbs with
infinitive formed by adding /r/ to the root plus /i/ (e.g. /part-/  ➔  
/partir/); and 5) verbs with infinitive formed by adding /war/ to the
root (e.g. /ςεςων-/  ➔  /ςεςωωχα/).
In the following analysis of Lafourche French verbs, both Guilbeau's and Conwell and Juillard's treatments will be re-examined and an attempt will be made to deduce a more economical description. An "economical" description means here one which accounts for the various verb forms in fewer conjugation classes or paradigms. Each verb will be divided into a root carrying the semantic content, and an ending. The concept "root" is used here, tentatively, to mean the part of a verb conjugated in the synthetic future tense minus the future ending /ra/. It is possible to subdivide morphologically the root into a stem plus a thematic vowel. However, such a decomposition is of no interest to the present analysis for now. The morphological composition of the verb can be formulated in terms of rules as follows:  

\[
R_1 \quad \text{verb} \rightarrow \text{root} + \text{ending}
\]

\[
R_2 \quad \text{ending} \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
\text{tense} + \text{person/number} \\
\text{non-conjugated}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
R_3 \quad \text{tense} \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
\text{present} \\
\text{imperfect} \\
\text{future} \\
\text{conditional} \\
\text{present subjunctive}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
R_4 \quad \text{person/number} \rightarrow \begin{cases} 
1 \text{ singular} \\
2 \text{ singular} \\
3 \text{ singular} \\
1 \text{ plural} \\
2 \text{ plural} \\
3 \text{ plural}
\end{cases}
\]
Rule (4) combines both the concepts "person" and "number" since the two must exist conjointly.

\[ R_5 \text{ non-conjugated } \rightarrow \begin{cases} \text{infinitive} \\ \text{present participle} \\ \text{past participle} \end{cases} \]

7.1.1. Verbs of the First Class

As most workers on Louisiana French have noted, the so-called first conjugation, that is, those verbs whose infinitive and past participle are marked by a final /e/, is the only productive class\(^5\) in the local French. Table 1 and Table 2 show the variant forms of two of these verbs, /parler/ and /don/. It should be pointed out that the conjugated verb forms in Tables 1 and 2 are transcribed phonetically.\(^6\) They should not be taken as the underlying representation of these forms.

Table 1: The Conjugated Forms of parler

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
<th>Present Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>parl</td>
<td>parle</td>
<td>parl(e)ra(^7)</td>
<td>parl(e)re</td>
<td>parl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>parl</td>
<td>parle</td>
<td>parl(e)ra</td>
<td>parl(e)re</td>
<td>parl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>parl</td>
<td>parle</td>
<td>parl(e)re</td>
<td>parl(e)re</td>
<td>parl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Singular

| 1      | parl    | parle     | parl(e)ra\(^7\) | parl(e)re | parl |
| 2      | parl    | parle     | parl(e)re | parl(e)re | parl |
| 3      | parl    | parle     | parl(e)ra\(^8\) | parl(e)re | parl |

Plural
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Table 2: The Conjugated Forms of donner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
<th>Present Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>don</td>
<td>done</td>
<td>don(a)ra</td>
<td>don(a)re</td>
<td>don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>don</td>
<td>done</td>
<td>don(a)ra</td>
<td>don(a)re</td>
<td>don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>don</td>
<td>done</td>
<td>don(a)ra</td>
<td>don(a)re</td>
<td>don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>don</td>
<td>done</td>
<td>don(a)ra</td>
<td>don(a)re</td>
<td>don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>done</td>
<td>done</td>
<td>don(a)ra</td>
<td>don(a)re</td>
<td>done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>don</td>
<td>done</td>
<td>don(a)ra</td>
<td>don(a)re</td>
<td>don</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of the forms listed in Tables 1 and 2 and the "operation-al" definition of the concept "root" stated above we can deduce the following endings (i.e. inflections) of the first conjugation. The phonological modification occurring in root (e.g. the deletion of /ə/) will be discussed later.

Table 3: Endings of the First Conjugation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
<th>Present Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>re</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>re</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>re</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>re</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>re</td>
<td>re</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ra</td>
<td>re</td>
<td>ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the basis of the endings listed in Table 2 we can posit some tentative rules generating the various markers of each tense and each person/number combination. A marker can consist of one or more phonological segments.

- **R₆** Present → Ø
- **R₇** Imperfect → /e/
- **R₈** Future → /ra/
- **R₉** Conditional → /re/
- **R₁₀** Subjunctive → Ø

The compound tenses, such as *le passé-composé*, *le plus-que-parfait*, etc... and *l'imperatif* do not exhibit different verb forms and are therefore ignored throughout the present analysis of verb forms. Now, we need various rules describing the morphological derivation of each possible combination of the three persons and the two numbers.

- **R₁₁** 1st Person Singular (hereinafter 1 sg) → Ø
- **R₁₂** 2 sg → Ø
- **R₁₃** 3 sg → Ø
- **R₁₄** 1 pl → Ø
- **R₁₅** 2 pl → e
- **R₁₆** 3 pl → Ø
It should be pointed out here that the combinatory notion of "person" and "number" can be ambiguous. Its ambiguity stems from the fact that two different types of "person/number" come to play in the conjugation of the local French verbs. For instance, in the following sentence (in broad transcription):

1) /nuzot ɔ parl frase tu l tâ/

nous-autres, on parle français tout le temps,

the pronoun /ɔ/ is the "speaker" pronoun and not the "spoken to" or the "spoken of/about" pronoun. In other words, the pronoun /ɔ/ is 1st person plural. However, in the treatment of Standard French pronouns, on (even when it is the equivalent of nous) is analysed as a 3rd person singular pronoun since it governs the verb in such a way. Indeed, it is possible to say that on (when used as the equivalent of nous) has a semantic person/number (= 1st person plural) and a syntactic person/number (= 3rd person singular). The former is derived on the basis that the speaker(s) is (are) present during the linguistic exchange and that the verbal message reflects the speaker(s)'s action; the latter can be derived by stating that the phonological shape of the subject pronoun on carries to the verb the information 3rd person singular. In the case of Lafourche French, the pronoun /ɔ/ has replaced totally the pronoun nous in subject position and should therefore be analysed (as well as the verb it governs) as 1st person plural.

Another situation where a similar problem arises is the substitution of the polite form vous for the singular pronoun tu. Since the usage of vous as a "spoken to" pronoun when addressing a single person under certain pragmatic conditions is not prevalent enough in Louisiana French,
and since the morphological behavior of a verb governed by the polite (singular) vous is similar to that of a verb governed by the 2nd person plural pronoun, vous-autres, it is not necessary for the present purpose to add a column of verb forms governed by the polite vous.

The morphological composition of the verbs of the first class was pointed out in Rules (1) and (2) as follows:

by $R_1$ we have:

$$\text{Verb} \rightarrow \text{root} + \text{ending}$$

by $R_2$:

$$\text{Verb} \rightarrow \text{root} + \text{tense} + \text{person} + \text{number}$$

The root of the verb was defined as the future tense form minus the future ending. Thus, the morphological derivation of the 1st person singular form of the present tense of parler, for instance, is:

by $R_6$ and $R_{12}$

$$\# \text{parl} + \emptyset + \emptyset \# \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\text{where } + \text{ is a morpheme boundary} \\
\# \text{parl} \#
\end{array} \right.$$ 

The phonetic transcription in Table 1 does not show a final shwa. Though the occurrence of a shwa in the synthetic future is rare and weakly pronounced, we must posit it in the root of the verb and formulate a rule for its deletion in order to be consistent with our definition of the concept "root." Since the data we are examining is restricted to verb forms, the shwa deletion rule should apply only to verbs. Indeed, as we will see in section 7.2., a shwa can occur finally in the case of personal pronouns.

$$R_{17} /\varepsilon/ \rightarrow \emptyset / \left[ \begin{array}{l}
\text{verb} \\
\_ \\
\_ \\
\_ \\
\end{array} \right]$$
The shwa is likewise deleted in prevocalic position. For instance, when it comes in contact with the morpheme /e/ marking the imperfect tense or the 2nd person plural:

\[ R_{18} \quad /a/ \rightarrow \emptyset / \rightarrow [\emptyset] + [\text{e}]^{15} \]

Since the shwa is optional in the future and conditional tenses we need still another rule:

\[ R_{19} \quad /a/ \rightarrow ([\text{a}]) / \rightarrow \text{rv} \]

Now, we need an additional rule to arrive at the second person plural form of the imperfect, future and conditional tenses. This rule will eliminate the first of two vowels succeeding each other across a morpheme boundary. The deleted vowel has to be part of the tense marker:

\[ R_{20} \quad V \rightarrow \emptyset / \rightarrow \text{e}^{#} \]

Rule (20) does not have the same linguistic environment as Rule (18). In the latter, the vowel shwa is deleted when it occurs in root final position; whereas in the former, the deleted vowel belongs to a tense marker. Rules (18) and (20) are illustrated in the following derivation of the second person plural of the imperfect tense of the verb parler.

\[ \# \text{parl}e + e + e \# \]

by \( R_{20} \quad \# \text{parl}e + e \# \]

by \( R_{18} \quad \# \text{parl} \# e \]

\[ \# \text{parle} \]
Similarly, for the 2nd person plural of the future we have:

\[
\text{# parlə + ra + e #}
\]

by \( R_{20} \)

\[
\text{# parlə + r + e #}
\]

by \( R_{19} \)

\[
\text{# parl(ə) + r + e #}
\]

\[
\text{# parlre # or # parləre #}
\]

The verbs of this class show characteristically a single stem throughout a given conjugation; or in other words their roots don't have variant forms across tenses. There are however, verbs which, on the basis of their morphological composition (e.g. having an /e/ as the marker for the infinitive and the past participle forms), qualify to be members of this class, but which show phonemic alternations in their various conjugated forms. This is, as it will be seen, the product of some phonological rules operating on the output of the morphological derivation.

One class of these verbs includes verbs with roots ending in high rounded vowels, /y/ or /u/ and a shwa, such as tuer, jouer, etc.... The root is subject to two successive phonological rules when the following morpheme begins with a vowel: 1) Rule (18) whereby the root final shwa is deleted and 2) Rule (21) which changes the preceding high-rounded vowel into the rounded glide /w/.

\[
R_{21} \begin{cases} /y/ \\ /u/ \end{cases} \rightarrow /w/ + e
\]
Since the concept "root" has been defined here as the future form minus the future ending, the derivation of the imperfect tense form of tuer, the future of which is [tyəра] "he will kill," is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\# & \quad ty + e + \emptyset  \\
\text{by } R_{18} & \quad ty + e \\
\text{by } R_{21} & \quad twe \\
\end{align*}
\]

Another distinctive group of verbs sharing similar morphological characteristics is that with root ending in /iə/. They undergo a palatization rule, in terms of which the vowel preceding the shwa becomes a fronted glide, /j/, after the deletion of shwa (Rule 18) in a prevocalic position: 15

\[
R_{22} \quad /i/ \rightarrow [j] \quad / \quad + e
\]

One of these verbs is étudier. Its root is /etydər/- since its future form is /etudiəra/. The derivation of its imperfect tense form in the 3rd person singular is:

\[
\begin{align*}
\# & \quad etydiə + e + \emptyset  \\
\text{by } R_{18} & \quad etudiə + e \\
\text{by } R_{22} & \quad etudj + e \\
\end{align*}
\]
Another group of verbs of the first conjugation which undergo phonological change after the output of the morphological derivation contains verbs whose roots end in a voiced stop, /b, d, g/. Their final consonant becomes a homorganic nasal when it checks a nasal vowel:

\[
R_{23} \begin{bmatrix} /b/ \\ /d/ \\ /g/ \end{bmatrix} \Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} /m/ \\ /n/ \\ /ŋ/ \end{bmatrix} \quad \tilde{\nu}--\#
\]

The future of demander, tomber and étrangler are /dəmādre/, /təbrə/, /etraglre/ respectively. Their roots are therefore /dəmad-/ /təb-/ and /etragl-/ and the derivation of their 3rd person singular forms of the present tense are:

\# dəmād + ə + ə #
\# dəmād #
by \( R_{23} \) \# dəmān #
\# təb + ə + ə #
\# təb #
by \( R_{23} \) \# təm #
\# etragl + ə + ə #
\# etragl #
by consonant deletion rule (Rule 26) to be discussed below:
\# etrag #
by \( R_{23} \) \# etran #
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The verbs of this class as well as other verbs with root ending in a voiceless stop (e.g. rester), which share morphological characteristics of the "first" conjugation, do not exhibit a shwa in the future or conditional tenses even in careful pronunciation. In such a case we are faced with two possible analyses. On the one hand we could state that these verbs do not have a shwa in their underlying representation and thus are not subject to the shwa deletion rules outlined above; or we could posit a final shwa in the root, though it is never realized phonetically, and add a rule which will delete it obligatorily in an inter-consonantal position where the first consonant is a stop:

\[
R_{24} \quad /e/ \rightarrow \emptyset \left[ \begin{array}{c} + \text{cons} \\ + \text{stop} \end{array} \right] \rightarrow r
\]

The latter analysis is more desirable since it conforms to the overall system of the morphological derivation of the first conjugation.

Certain verbs such as appeler, amener, éléver, semer, etc... are characterized in the phonemic composition of their roots by a final closed syllable where the front-mid vowel /e/ is checked by a consonant. Their future forms are /apelere/, amenara/, /élévara/ and /sémara/ respectively. However, their imperfect tense forms, as well as the infinitive and 2nd person plural of the present tense forms, show the following alternations: /apèl/, /amèn/, /élèv/ and /sèm/. We need a rule which explains the alternation of /e/ into /ə/ when the front-mid vowel is in an open syllable and followed by another open syllable having as its vowel /e/:

\[
R_{25} \quad /e/ \rightarrow /ə/ \left[ \begin{array}{c} \$Ce \# \end{array} \right]
\]
The derivation of the verb *appele*, for instance, conjugated in the second person plural of the present tense will be:

\[
\# \text{apele} + \emptyset + e \#
\]

\[
\# \text{apele} + e \#
\]

by \(R_{18}\)

\[
\# \text{apele} \#
\]

by \(R_{25}\)

\[
\# \text{apele} \#
\]

Another rule operating at the phonological level (e.g. after the morphological derivation) is the deletion of the final segment of a consonant cluster in word final position, particularly when the second member of the cluster is a liquid. The rule can be formulated as follows:

\[
R_{26} \quad C \rightarrow \emptyset / C
\]

Rule (26) helps to explain the stem change in some verbs such as *acoster*, *troubler*, and *trembler*, etc...:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitive forms</th>
<th>3rd person singular of the present tense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[\text{trâble}]</td>
<td>[\text{trâm}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[\text{truble}]</td>
<td>[\text{trub}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[\text{akôste}]</td>
<td>[\text{akôs}]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These verbs, marked by an /e/ in their infinitive forms, have as their roots /\text{trâbl}/, /\text{trubl}/ and /\text{akôst}/. Their 3rd person singular form of the present tense should be phonemically the same since both the present tense and the 3rd person singular markers are realized phonetically as
zero. But, because of Rule (26) (the deletion of the final segment of a final consonantal cluster), the verbs trembler, troubler and acoster are realized as [trä̃], [trub] and [akos]. The transformation of the final /b/ into [m] in the case of the verb trembler is accounted for by the nasalization rule discussed above (Rule 23), whereby /b/, /d/ or /g/ become respectively /m/, /n/ or /ŋ/ in word final position following a nasal vowel.

7.1.2. Verbs of the Second Class

Let us now consider another group of verbs such as finir and choisir which both Guilbeau and Conwell and Juillard selected as their second group. These verbs are characterized by two stems in the present tense, one for the singular forms and one for the plural forms, as shown in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
<th>Present Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>fini</td>
<td>finise</td>
<td>fini ra</td>
<td>finire</td>
<td>fini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>fini</td>
<td>finise</td>
<td>fini ra</td>
<td>finire</td>
<td>fini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>fini</td>
<td>finise</td>
<td>fini ra</td>
<td>finire</td>
<td>fini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>fini</td>
<td>finise</td>
<td>fini ra</td>
<td>finire</td>
<td>fini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>finise</td>
<td>finise</td>
<td>fini re</td>
<td>finire</td>
<td>fini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>fini</td>
<td>finise</td>
<td>fini ra</td>
<td>finire</td>
<td>fini</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beni</td>
<td>benise</td>
<td>benira</td>
<td>benire</td>
<td>beni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>beni</td>
<td>benise</td>
<td>benira</td>
<td>benire</td>
<td>beni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>beni</td>
<td>benise</td>
<td>benira</td>
<td>benire</td>
<td>beni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>beni</td>
<td>benise</td>
<td>benira</td>
<td>benire</td>
<td>beni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beni</td>
<td>benise</td>
<td>benira</td>
<td>benire</td>
<td>beni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>benise</td>
<td>benise</td>
<td>benire</td>
<td>benire</td>
<td>benise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>beni</td>
<td>benise</td>
<td>benira</td>
<td>benire</td>
<td>benise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A close examination of Tables 4 and 5 shows that such verbs can be grouped with the first class listed in Tables 1 and 2 on the basis of their morphological derivation if a rule, stating that root final /I/ becomes [is] in a prívocalic position, is added.

\[ R_{27} \quad /l/ \rightarrow [is] \quad / \rightarrow [e] + [g^16] \]

The second person form of the present of finir for instance will be:

\# fini + e #

by \( R_{27} \)

\# fini + s + e #

\# finisc #

However, for the conditional, \( R_{27} \) cannot operate:

\# fini + re + e #

by \( R_{20} \)

\# fini + r + e #

\# finire #
Rule (27) seems to conflict with Rule (22) whereby /i/ becomes /j/ in a similar linguistic environment (i.e. prevocalic position). The two rules must be differentiated by additional specifications. Since Rule (22) operates only after shwa deletion (Rule 18), it could be rewritten as follows:

\[
\text{Rule (22) revised } \quad /i/ \rightarrow [j] / \quad X + e
\]

where \(X\) is phonetically null but phonologically it signals the position of a deleted shwa.

Rule (27) is a morphological rule operating during the morphological derivation, whereas Rule (22) is a phonological rule operating on the morphological output. Indeed, it is the presence of a shwa at the morphological level which blocks Rule (27) in the case of étudier, marier, rier, etc....

### 7.1.3. The So-Called RE Verbs

Another class of verbs which are examined in this section are the cognates of RE verbs in Standard French. Some of the representative verbs are descendre, perdre, répondre, vendre, batre, etc.... Their conjugation is outlined in Tables 6 and 7:

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
<th>Present Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>~vā 18</td>
<td>vāde</td>
<td>vādra</td>
<td>vādre</td>
<td>vā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>vā</td>
<td>vāde</td>
<td>vādra</td>
<td>vādre</td>
<td>vā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>vā</td>
<td>vāde</td>
<td>vādra</td>
<td>vādre</td>
<td>vā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plural 1</td>
<td>Plural 2</td>
<td>Plural 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowel</td>
<td>vā</td>
<td>vāde</td>
<td>vāde</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowel</td>
<td>vādre</td>
<td>vādre</td>
<td>vādre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowel</td>
<td>vā</td>
<td>vāde</td>
<td>vā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

Infinitive /batr/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Present Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>bate</td>
<td>batra</td>
<td>batre</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>bate</td>
<td>batra</td>
<td>batre</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ba</td>
<td>bate</td>
<td>batra</td>
<td>batre</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can incorporate such a class of verbs into the same morphological systems outlined in Tables 1, 2, 4 and 5 for the first and second classes by adding a rule which will drop the final dental stop of a verb:

$$R_{28} \begin{cases} /t/ \\ /d/ \end{cases} \rightarrow \emptyset / / \ #$$

Rule (28) is however too powerful since it destroys all word-final /t/’s and /d/’s, a fact which conflicts with the presence of such lexical items as /isit/ (= here), /byt/ (= goal), /led/ (= ugly). Rule (28) could be rewritten to state that either segment /t/ or /d/ are deleted before a morpheme boundary. In other words, the rule is a morphophonemic one and
it operates before the final phonological shape of the conjugated verb form under the following conditions:

\[ R_{28a} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} /t/ \\ or \\ /d/ \end{array} \right\} \rightarrow \emptyset / + \emptyset + \emptyset # \]

The future form of batre is /batre/. Its root is therefore /bat-/. Its 3rd person singular form of the present tense will be derived as follows:

\[ \# bat + \emptyset + \emptyset # \]
by \( R_{28a} \)

\[ \# ba # + \emptyset + \emptyset # \]
\[ \# ba # \]

If we compare the derivation of these verbs with such a verb as rester we find that the deletion of shwa in the case of rester operates in different environments as shown below:

\[ \# restə + \emptyset + \emptyset # \] for the 3rd person singular

The shwa is deleted by Rule (17) only in word-final position. Thus the pre-shwa /t/ of rester cannot be dropped after the deletion of /ə/ since the environment changes from morpheme boundary plus zero plus zero into word-final position.

In the derivation of the future form of the second person plural of the verb batre for instance Rule (28a) is not applicable:

\[ \# bat + re + e # \]
by \( R_{20} \)

\[ \# bat + r + e # \]
\[ \# batre # \]
7.1.4. The Partir-like Verbs

A fourth class of verbs which share morphological similarities are the IR verbs such as partir, sortir, servir, dormir, sentir, etc....

These verbs lack the root final vowel /i/ in certain forms, as shown in Table 8.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>par</td>
<td>parte</td>
<td>partire</td>
<td>partire</td>
<td>par</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>par</td>
<td>parte</td>
<td>partira</td>
<td>partore</td>
<td>par</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>par</td>
<td>parte</td>
<td>partira</td>
<td>partire</td>
<td>par</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of these verbs is relatively small. Among the 8,000 Standard French verbs listed by Bescherelle in his L'art de conjuguer: Dictionnaire des huit mille verbes usuels (Paris: Hatier, 1973), Gerther (1973, p. 44) found only twenty-two that share a conjugation paradigm similar to partir. Furthermore, most of the twenty-two verbs are the compounded forms of the ones listed above (e.g. sentir, consentir, pressentir, ressentir). To distinguish these verbs from the group of verbs we examined such as finir, bénir, etc..., we need to rewrite the rule generating an /s/ in the case of verbs with root ending in /i/.
This rule will have to block the occurrence of /s/ in the case of partiir, sortir, servir, etc.... Given the small number of these verbs and given the fact that these verbs show either a /t/ or /m/ or /v/ in the position preceding the theme vowel we can rewrite Rule (27) as follows:

\[ R_{27}^{\text{revised}} \quad /i/ \rightarrow [is] \quad \text{where } Y \text{ is anything but } /m/ \]

A few things must be said about Rule (27-revised) which simply translates an observable fact: 1) it is unlikely to be a sound phonological rule since /m/, /t/ and /v/ are not to my knowledge a natural class of phones and 2) though my data on Lafourche French lacks occurrences of various forms of batir and bouillir, these two verbs are exceptions to Rule (29), at least in Standard French. Batir does generate an /s/ in the plural forms of the present tense despite the presence of /t/ in pre-theme vowel position and bouillir does not generate an /s/ despite the absence of /m/, /v/ or /t/ in the same position.

We could incorporate the partiir-like verbs into the overall system outlined in Rules (1-17) by adding the following rules:

\[ R_{30} \quad C_l \rightarrow \emptyset \quad \text{where } C = /m/ /t/ /v/ \]

\[ R_{31} \quad /i/ \rightarrow \emptyset \quad C \rightarrow [e] + [e] \quad \text{where } C = /m/ /t/ /v/ \]

Rule (30) states that, after the morphological derivation, a verb form containing either /ti/, /mi/ or /vi/ in final position, undergoes the phonological deletion of these segments. Rule (30) explains therefore the present tense forms of these verbs. Rule (31) states that the
pre-thematic vowel consonant-/-t/, /m/ or /v/- is not deleted in the presence of a following vowel. Thus, the derivation of the 3rd person singular form of the verb *partir* in the present tense is:

\[
#\text{parti } + \emptyset + \emptyset # \\
\text{by } R_{30} \quad #\text{par } #
\]

The derivation of the imperfect tense form in the second person plural is:

\[
#\text{parti } + e + e # \\
\text{by } R_{17} \quad #\text{parti } + . + e # \\
\text{by } R_{31} \quad #\text{part } + e # \\
#\text{parte } #
\]

In the future and conditional forms both Rules (30) and (31) are not applicable.

Because of the comparatively simplified verb morphology of Lafourche French, it was possible to incorporate the various conjugations (e.g. ER, IR, RE verbs) into a single class. This required us to formulate several phonological rules accounting for the variety of forms and alternations these verbs have. It should be stressed, however, that we did not deal with the so-called "irregular" verbs or, even more, with the ones which have suppletive forms such as *aller*, *avoir* and *être*.

7.2. The Morphology of the Personal Pronouns

The Lafourche French shows the following forms of personal pronouns:
Table 9: Underlying Representation of the Personal Pronouns Found in Lafourche French

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic Considerations</th>
<th>Syntactic Distribution</th>
<th>clitics</th>
<th>non-clitics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2₂₁</td>
<td>mₐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ty</td>
<td>tₐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1₁-1</td>
<td>l₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1₁</td>
<td>l₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>1²</td>
<td>1₂-n</td>
<td>1₂-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>vuzot</td>
<td>vuzot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>{1₁-z</td>
<td>le-z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>{œs-z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular Polite</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>vuzot</td>
<td>vuzot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2²₂</td>
<td>sa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the sentences illustrating the usages of the above pronouns are given below in phonetic transcription and in a gallicized orthography. The gallicized spelling is given for ease of presentation and not necessarily for comparative purposes. It does not necessarily confirm with the prescribed norms of Continental French orthography.
I. The allomorphs of the first person singular personal pronoun:

1a) [ éléments frasse tu l tâ]  
je parle français tout le temps

1b) [eux ma di]  
eux (= ils) m'a (= ont) dit

1c) [i m dân le ko]  
il me donne les couteaux

1d) [z m raz]  
je me rase

1e) [mâf z parl avk le vâje]  
moi, je parle avec les voisins

II. The allomorphs of the second person singular personal pronoun

2a) [i m dite fol]  
il me dit "tu es folle"

2b) [ô va tâ ramne]  
on va te ramener

2c) [twâ ty tâ raze]  
toi, tu t'a (= es) rase

2d) [vje wûr pur twâ mân]  
viens voir pour toi-même

III. The allomorphs of the 3rd person singular-masculine.

3a) [i lave mân d la vân]  
il avait mangé de la viande
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(3b) \[ \begin{align*} &\{z \text{ la amn\^e}\} \quad \text{(where 1 = him)} \\
&\text{je 1'a(1) amn\^e} \end{align*} \]

(3c) \[ \begin{align*} &\{\text{el ale 1 done 1 le}\} \\
&\text{elle allait lui donner le lait} \end{align*} \]

(3d) \[ \begin{align*} &\{i \text{ vule s marje}\} \\
&\text{il voulait se marier} \end{align*} \]

(3e) \[ \begin{align*} &\{i \text{ lat\^ade sa luî}\} \\
&\text{il entendait ça, lui} \end{align*} \]

IV. The allomorphs of the 3rd person singular—Feminine

(4a) \[ \begin{align*} &\{\text{ma f\^ am e vudra m k\^ om\^ ade}\} \\
&\text{ma femme, elle voudra me commander} \end{align*} \]

(4b) \[ \begin{align*} &\{z \text{ va la pr\^ an}\} \\
&\text{je va(is) la prendre} \end{align*} \]

(4c) \[ \begin{align*} &\{z \text{ lui parl}\} \\
&\text{je lui parle} \end{align*} \]

(4d) \[ \begin{align*} &\{\text{el va s marje}\} \\
&\text{elle va se marier} \end{align*} \]

(4e) \[ \begin{align*} &\{\text{al a tuje se z\^ sof a el}\} \\
&\text{elle a tué ses enfants à elle} \end{align*} \]

V. The allomorphs of the first person plural personal pronoun

(5a) \[ \begin{align*} &\{\text{5 p\^ o pa k\^ opIt av\^ ek o nuz\^ ot}\} \\
&\text{on (ne) peut pas "compete" avec eux nous-autres} \end{align*} \]
(5b) [i la ete nu zamne labe]  
    il a été nous amener là-bas

(5c) [e nu za done dy lze pur nu șaze]  
    elle nous a donné du linge pour nous changer

(5d) [3 va tu sêje a se sove]  
    on va tou(s) essayer à (= de) se sauver

(5e) [nuzot 3 par1 frans tu 1 te]  
    nous-autres, on parle français tout le temps

VI. The allomorphs of the 2nd person plural personal pronoun

(6a) [vuzot pura mét]  
    vous-autres pourra (ez) monter

(6b) [i va vu done le cuto]  
    il va vous donner les couteaux

(6c) [3 va vu prân e vu ramn]  
    on va vous prendre et vous ramener

(6d₁) [vuzot vu rase]  
    vous-autres vous rasez

(6d₂) [vuzot le se prepare]  
    vous -autres (al) lez se préparer

(6e) [prepare vuzot]  
    préparez-vous -autres

VII. The allomorphs of the 3rd person plural personal pronoun
(7a) \[ \text{o\'es s a mi a m\'ar\'se] } \\
\text{eux s'a (se sont) mis \'a marcher } \\
\[ i z\text{\'e vu l\'ôm] } \\
\text{ils ont vu l\'homme }

(7b) \[ \text{\'s nete k\'et\'a d le w\'är bâk] } \\
on \text{\'était content de les voir "back" }

(7c) \[ \text{l\'e za done le kuto] } \\
\text{je les a(i) donn\'e les couteaux}

(7d) \[ \text{l\'e z\'af\'a sa mi a pl\'øre] } \\
\text{les enfants s'a(ont) mis \'a pleurer}

(7e) \[ i s\'a na rturne bâk se o\'es ] \\
\text{il s'en a(est) retourn\'e "back" chez eux }

Elison and Liaison Between Personal Pronouns and Verbs

The phonological adjustment between words, known as elision\textsuperscript{23} and liaison,\textsuperscript{24} has been treated elegantly for the Standard French by Sanford Shane in his Phonology and Morphology of French (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1968). Shane had argued initially that these two phonological manifestations are actually the product of a single process and could be treated in a single rule which he called a "truncation rule." However, he rejected this idea later in an article entitled appropriately "There is no Truncation Rule"\textsuperscript{25} and posited the following two rules to account for elision and liaison:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\begin{cases}
- \text{cons} \\
+ \text{voc}
\end{cases} \\
\rightarrow & \emptyset \\
\rightarrow & \begin{cases}
- \text{seg} \\
- \text{cons}
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]
(b) \[
\left[ \begin{array}{c}
+ \text{cons} \\
- \text{voc}
\end{array} \right] \rightarrow \emptyset \quad / \quad \rightarrow \left[ \begin{array}{c}
- \text{seg} \\
+ \text{cons}
\end{array} \right]
\]

Rule (a) states that a vowel is deleted if the following morpheme or word (the rule applies between morphemes as well as between words) begins with a glide or a vowel. Similarly Rule (b) states that a consonant is deleted before a morpheme or a word beginning with a consonant or a liquid.

Liaison in Lafourche French

In Lafourche French, we notice that certain pronouns supply a voiced consonant to a following verb if it begins with a vowel. In sentence (5b) for instance, the verb /amne/ is pronounced [\text{zamn}] following the pronoun [\text{nu}], whereas in sentence (3b), [\text{amn}], which is not preceded by [\text{nu}], is transcribed without an initial [\text{z}]. Analogous examples led us to postulate that the direct object pronoun [\text{nu}] must have an underlying form which includes the segment /z/ and is subject to two separate rules: 1) a rule which transposes the final /z/ of the pronoun to the initial position of the following verb if it begins with a vowel and 2) a rule which deletes the segment /z/ if the following verb begins with a consonant. These rules can be formulated as follows:

\[
R_{32} \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Pron} \\
X, C
\end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{verb} \\
Y Y
\end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Pron} \\
X
\end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{verb} \\
C V Y
\end{array} \right] \quad \text{(where } X \text{ is anything)}
\]

\[
R_{33} - C \rightarrow \emptyset \quad / \quad \rightarrow \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\# \\
- \text{cons} \\
+ \text{cons}
\end{array} \right]
\]
Thus, if we posit that the underlying representation of the allomorph of
the 1st person plural pronoun direct object is /nu-z/, Rules (32) and (33)
explain the absence of the final segment in sentence (5c) and the addition
of an initial [z] to the verb /amne/ in sentence (5b). Since the added
segment /z/ is never realized phonetically with the pronoun, having say
the rendering *[nuz], a hyphen (-) is used to indicate such a character-
istic of the segment. Its presence explains why Rule (33) can not apply
in the case of sentence (5c), where the final segment of [1fz] is not
deleted before the word [pur].

All the plural pronouns (in their various allomorphic shapes) supply
a /z/ to a following verb beginning with a vowel and must therefore have
such a segment in their underlying representations. The non-clitic (or
disjunctive) pronouns /nuzot/, /vuzot/ and /ouzot/ not occurring in pre-
verbal position are not subject to Rules (32) and (33). However, one
would expect that the second person plural pronoun /vuzot/, when it is
used pre-verbally in a subject position, should supply to a following verb
beginning with a vowel a voiced consonant, a /z/ or a /d/. The follow-
ing sentence, as well as other, shows that it does not:

(8) [vuzot a pa vy d 3aw1]

vouz-autres (n')a (= avez) pas vu de cha Bouis

On possible explanation lies in the fact that the usage of the disjunctive
pronoun vous-au' in subject position is not totally established, hence
not integrated in the linguistic system of Lafourche French. This is sup-
ported in part by the occurrences of such sentences as:

(9) [vuzot $n parl dy bu franse]27

vouz-autures, on parle du bon français
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The first person plural subject pronoun, realized phonetically as [ɔ] or [ɔʷ] displays a final /n/ and not a /s/ in its underlying representations (see sentence (7b)). Such an irregularity stems undoubtedly from the fact that /ɔₙ/ is derived historically from a nominal, the Latin homo.²⁸

The third person plural /ɔs/ has two variant forms [ɔs] and [ɔ]. Since the liaison rules, (32) and (33), do not allow the final segment to be realized phonetically with the pronoun because it must be either deleted before a consonant or transposed to the following verb if it begins with a vowel, we have therefore the presence of two lexical items /ɔz/ and /ɔz-z/.²⁹ This is not surprising since, as it was shown in Chapter 5, there is an unusual amount of lexical duplication (e.g. two or more words conveying a single concept) stemming from the convergence of the various French dialects.

In the singular columns we notice that the only clitic pronoun subject to liaison is the third person-masculine, /i-1/. There are, however, occurrences of the final [l] in a pre-consonant position. Thus, one can posit two subject forms of the third person singular-masculine pronoun, /i-1/ and /il-1/. The feminine third person, /e/, does not undergo liaison, though phonetically the final /l/ is deleted sometimes. Here, the situation is perhaps analogous to Standard French where liaison is prohibited in the case of the third person singular pronoun (e.g. i/a gagné). The reason given by most scholars is that the allowance of liaison is such a case would create homophony, hence ambiguity, with sentences having a singular direct object pronoun (e.g. il l'a gagné).
Elision in Lafourche French

The deletion of the final shwa is consistent in a prevocalic position. We therefore can write the following elision rule:

\[
R^{34} \quad /\varepsilon/ \rightarrow \emptyset \quad \text{[Pron]} \quad \text{[- cons]}
\]

In a preconsonantal position the final shwa is likewise deleted as shown in sentences (1a), (1d) and (1e), where the first person pronoun is rendered as [ə]. Since a final shwa must be posited in the underlying form to explain, particularly in a careful pronunciation, its occurrence, we therefore need to write an additional rule making optional the final shwa in a preconsonantal position.

\[
R^{35} \quad /\varepsilon/ \rightarrow ([ə]) \quad \text{[Pron]} \quad \text{[+ cons]}
\]

Elision operates, as we have seen above, consistently when the pronoun ends with a shwa. It seems to work also on the final /y/ of the second person pronoun /ty/ as indicated from the following sentence:

(10) \([i \ m \ di \ te \ fa\] \)
    il me dit: "tu es folle

There are, however, instances where the final /y/ is not deleted:

(11) \([ty \ a \ ete \ war \ 1a]\)
    tu a été voir là

Since the latter instances are rare we can rewrite the elision rule to include all vowels:

\[
R^{36} \quad V \rightarrow \emptyset \quad \text{[Pron]} \quad \text{[- cons]}
\]
NOTES

1 There are certain forms which are clearly in usage while others are rarely used (e.g. the analytic future of aller + infinitive is more predominant than the synthetic form). To ascertain the presence of most forms, even the ones which are not frequent, informants were asked to complete unfinished sentences and sometimes to translate from English into the local French.


3 Ibid.


5 The "first" class is qualified productive because newly created or borrowed words follow the conjugation pattern of this class.

6 The narrowness of the transcription is relative. Certain segments have been phonemicized (= abstracted to a higher level) when their finest transcription is not relevant to the discussion.

7 The future form of the first person singular shows sporadically as [parlre]. However, this occurrence is very rare and therefore has been, for reasons discussed in Chapters 5 and 6 (e.g. the majority of occurrence principle), ignored.

8 The future form of the third person plural has also a variant form, [parlr3].
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As was discussed in the previous chapter, the nasality feature is variable and varies from slightly nasalized to strongly nasalized. It was noted for instance that vowels checked by a nasal consonant are moderately nasalized (Index 2), whereas vowels in syllable final position followed by a nasal consonant are slightly nasalized (Index 1). The phonetic transcription of /don/ is therefore \( \frac{2}{d\ddot{on}} \), whereas the phonetic transcription of /done/ is \( \frac{1}{d\ddot{on}} \). Since such phonetic specifications are not relevant to the morphological analysis of the verb, they have been omitted from Table 2.

The non-conjugated verb forms, namely the infinitive and the past and present participles, are not treated in the present analysis.

This is the reason, for instance, that in a pronominalization rule there is no need for a preceding antecedent noun to account for the occurrence of the first and second person pronouns. The speaker is himself the trigger (= antecedent). In the case of the derivation of a third person pronoun, a co-referential noun must be stated before the pronoun, as indicated from the grammaticality or ungrammaticality of the following sentences:

(a) Nous parlons français

(b) les étudiants sont là. Ils veulent vous voir.

but not:

(c) *Ils sont là. les étudiants veulent vous voir

The usage of vous as a substitute of tu is restricted in Lafourche French to situations where the speaker is addressing a much older person. As an informant (age 88) told me jokingly: "I am the third oldest person in the parish. There are only two persons to whom I can use vous!"
As will be shown later (section 7.2.) the pronoun vous-autres is used consistently in subject position when the speaker is addressing more than one speaker. The pronoun vous is used when the speaker is addressing a single person under the pragmatic conditions which elicit it instead of tu.

Shwa occurs in final position only with monosyllabic pronouns (e.g. [ʃ ma raz]) suggesting that perhaps secondary or tertiary stress (since /a/ is never strongly stressed) is a factor in the retention of final shwa in the case of personal pronouns, a speculation which needs further investigation.

The vowel /e/ in Rule (18) could be substituted by the more inclusive symbol V, since at least in the present participle, the vowel triggering the deletion of /ə/ is /a/. However, in the present analysis the non-conjugated forms are excluded, and /e/ is kept instead of V. It is the only vowel that comes into play on the basis of the forms listed in Tables 1 and 2.

The presence of two morpheme boundaries on the right side of the vowel position in Rule (27), indicates that /i/ has to be in root final position. Otherwise the rule would conflict with Rule (20) whereby the vowel of a tense marker is deleted in prevocalic position.

This is in line with the "trace theory" in syntactic transformations.

Another variant form is [vən]. The occurrence of a nasal consonant after a nasal vowel has been discussed in the previous chapter.

The subjunctive forms were not recorded.
Rule (31) and Rule (18), whereby a root final shwa is deleted in a similar linguistic environment (e.g. /restə + e/ → /reste/), could be, perhaps, generalized into a single rule. Further investigation is needed to confirm such a step.

The phonetic realization of /ə/ shows sometimes a prothetic shwa.

The pronoun /sa/ has both, a definite and indefinite usage in the dialect. In its definite usage the pronoun /sa/ is used as a substitute of each of the third person pronouns, as shown in the following sentences:

a) [sa travaj dɔʁ sɛt pov ʃam]
   çà travaille dur cette pauvre femme
   where /sa/ = 3rd person singular feminine

b) [sa bɛni tu le bato]
   çà bénit tous les bateaux
   where /sa/ = 3rd person singular masculine

c) [sa di ʒ və rvənir]
   çà dit: "on veut revenir"
   where /sa/ = 3rd person plural

Elision is the deletion of a final vowel before a word beginning with a vowel.

Liaison is transposition of a final consonant to the initial position of the following word when it begins with a vowel.


Diachronic considerations (and/or a comparison with Standard French) suggest that the final segment in the underlying representations of the
plural pronouns is an /s/. In this case, Rule (32) should carry the additional information that the transposed consonant receives the feature [+ voice].

27 The presence of /n/ in sentence (9) where the speaker is addressing more than one hearer (= 2nd person plural) is not surprising. In Continental French on is used as a substitute of tu or vous in such sentences as:

on est beau aujourd'hui!

28 The usages of on are rather complex to describe and systematize. For instance, in Standard French on functions both as an indefinite pronoun and as a definite pronoun. In its definite function on can be used as a substitute for any other personal pronoun. For a discussion on on and its "unique" morphological behavior see René Lagane, "On pronom indéfini ou pronoun personnel?" Le Français dans le Monde, XXI (1963), 39-40.

29 The usage of the stressed form eux in subject position is not a unique feature of Lafourche French. Richard Kayne has recorded in his French Syntax (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1975), the following acceptable sentence:

Eux n'auraient pas fait ça (p. 67).
8. CONCLUSION

The content of the present work deals with a topic which is relatively virginal, despite the twelve page bibliography listed in the Appendix, at least with respect to sophisticated descriptions of the local French. Such a scarcity of reliable works imposes on any investigator, however narrow his topic of interest might be, the necessity to re-examine and study the various phases of the French language in the State. For instance, a syntactician would need to investigate the phonology and morphology of the dialect before he could proceed to a meaningful syntactic study. These prerequisites explain in part the broad scope of the present work.

The first chapter traces the history of the French language in Louisiana, pointing out, among other things, the ancestral dialects which gave birth to the present day local French. The amalgamation of the Colonial, Acadian and Creole varieties which co-existed in this part of the New World helps to explain the unusual free variation found in all levels of analysis. The study of the lexical item *creole* discussed in the second chapter shows a case of what von Wartburg called the "absence of a lexical unity" that characterizes Louisiana French vocabulary and which stems, in the present author's view, from the on-going dialect-leveling. The chapter on the population and territory of the French-speaking persons in Louisiana raised, in light of the preceding
discussions on the convergence of the various French dialects, on the diaglossic usages of the French and English languages and on the slow but perceptible decline of the French language, some still answered questions: Who are the Acadian Speakers today? The Colonial French speakers? The Creole speakers? Or, to put it differently, how can a field-worker proceed to interview an authentic Acadian, Colonial or Creole speaker? Though these questions were not fully answered, their discussion has thrown some light on some of the problems that a language specialist must face in his attempt to achieve insight into the structure of the local French. With an awareness of such problems a summary of the sound pattern of Lafourche dialect was attempted in the sixth chapter, showing the fluctuating nature of the dialect stemming likewise from the convergence of distinctive dialects, the restricted usage of the language, the English contact, among other factors discussed in the fifth chapter. The frequency and direction of alternate phonological forms indicate evolutionary trends, some of which confirm those reported as taking place in other French areas. The treatment of verb forms and personal pronouns indicated that Louisiana French has, comparatively to Continental French (since both are derived ultimately from a single source), undergone a morphological leveling and a reduction in verb classes. This relative simplification which may enhance complications in other levels of analysis (e.g. verb aspects) signals perhaps the structural "drifts" of languages that, like Louisiana French, are struggling for survival.

With the quickening interest in local French shown in the recent years, it is hoped that the collection of linguistic information gathered in the present study will stimulate interest in the pursuit of more studies needed to refine and expand our understanding of Louisiana French.
Table 4

Nativity and Parentage of the Total White Population, 1940, and of the Foreign-Born White, 1930, by Mother Tongue, for Louisiana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area and Mother Tongue</th>
<th>Native White, 1940</th>
<th>Foreign or mixed parentage White, 1940</th>
<th>Foreign White, 1940</th>
<th>Total 1940</th>
<th>Foreign-born White, 1930</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,560</td>
<td>83,680</td>
<td>1,403,700</td>
<td>35,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1,125,200</td>
<td>3,820</td>
<td>47,620</td>
<td>1,073,760</td>
<td>4,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemish</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>298,420</td>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>6,780</td>
<td>289,760</td>
<td>3,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>9,820</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>5,640</td>
<td>1,320</td>
<td>4,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magyar (Hungarian)</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4: Nativity and Parentage of the Total White Population, 1940 and of the Foreign-Born White, 1930, by Mother Tongue, for Louisiana (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Nativity</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
<th>Nativity</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
<th>Nativity</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rumanian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiddish</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Southern Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Nativity</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
<th>Nativity</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>31,940</td>
<td>9,080</td>
<td>18,460</td>
<td>4,400</td>
<td>13,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>5,640</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>2,520</td>
<td>3,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Nativity</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
<th>Nativity</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
<th>Parentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>32,120</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>30,960</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

Nativity and Parentage of the Urban and Rural White Population, 1940, and Foreign-Born White, 1930, by Mother Tongue, for Louisiana

#### Urban

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area and Mother Tongue</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Foreign-Born White, 1940</th>
<th>Native White, 1940 or mixed parentage</th>
<th>Foreign White, 1940 Foreign-Born White, or mixed parentage 1930</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>544,380</td>
<td>2,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37,900</td>
<td>503,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62,480</td>
<td>584,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>544,380</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,900</td>
<td>503,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,960</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,666</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>64,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>7,740</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,160</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>19,980</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,460</td>
<td>2,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,343</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td></td>
<td>760</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other and</td>
<td>19,060</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>12,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>4,380</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>665,420</td>
<td></td>
<td>62,480</td>
<td>584,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rural-Nonfarm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>376,460</th>
<th>3,700</th>
<th>11,520</th>
<th>361,240</th>
<th>4,848</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>270,440</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>6,420</td>
<td>263,560</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>88,580</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>87,280</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>4,980</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>2,740</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other and</td>
<td>9,860</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>8,420</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>9,860</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>8,420</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
Nativity and Parentage of the Urban and Rural White Population, 1940, and Foreign-Born White, 1930, by Mother Tongue, for Louisiana (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rural-Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>471,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>310,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>138,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>6,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other and Not Reported</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
MOTHER TONGUE FOR SELECTED GROUPS PER PARISH
FOR LOUISIANA, 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARISHES</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>FRENCH</th>
<th>GERMAN</th>
<th>SPANISH</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acadia</td>
<td>52,109</td>
<td>20,811</td>
<td>27,845</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>3,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>20,794</td>
<td>14,676</td>
<td>4,949</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td>37,086</td>
<td>26,982</td>
<td>7,001</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption</td>
<td>19,654</td>
<td>9,839</td>
<td>8,876</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoyelles</td>
<td>37,751</td>
<td>15,890</td>
<td>19,898</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauregard</td>
<td>22,872</td>
<td>20,685</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bienville</td>
<td>16,024</td>
<td>15,083</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossier</td>
<td>63,703</td>
<td>57,221</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>4,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caddo</td>
<td>230,184</td>
<td>212,094</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>14,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcasieu</td>
<td>143,415</td>
<td>101,749</td>
<td>34,607</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>7,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>9,354</td>
<td>8,837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>8,194</td>
<td>4,415</td>
<td>3,478</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catahoula</td>
<td>11,769</td>
<td>11,311</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claiborne</td>
<td>17,024</td>
<td>16,250</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia</td>
<td>22,578</td>
<td>21,395</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Soto</td>
<td>22,764</td>
<td>21,512</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Baton Rouge</td>
<td>285,142</td>
<td>237,047</td>
<td>16,313</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>2,425</td>
<td>27,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Carroll</td>
<td>12,884</td>
<td>11,661</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Feliciana</td>
<td>17,657</td>
<td>15,182</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangeline</td>
<td>31,932</td>
<td>6,394</td>
<td>24,222</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>23,946</td>
<td>22,951</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>13,671</td>
<td>12,702</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberia</td>
<td>57,397</td>
<td>27,849</td>
<td>25,216</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>3,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iberville</td>
<td>30,743</td>
<td>23,982</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>15,963</td>
<td>14,795</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>337,568</td>
<td>255,908</td>
<td>45,760</td>
<td>3,287</td>
<td>7,466</td>
<td>25,138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 6

MOTHER TONGUE FOR SELECTED GROUPS PER PARISH
FOR LOUISIANA (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Total M</th>
<th>Male M</th>
<th>Female M</th>
<th>Total F</th>
<th>Male F</th>
<th>Female F</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Davis</td>
<td>29,554</td>
<td>14,320</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>109,716</td>
<td>46,557</td>
<td>57,138</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>4,982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafourche</td>
<td>68,941</td>
<td>22,784</td>
<td>43,101</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Salle</td>
<td>13,295</td>
<td>12,544</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>33,800</td>
<td>31,115</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2,457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>36,511</td>
<td>31,681</td>
<td>4,468</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>15,065</td>
<td>14,086</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehouse</td>
<td>32,463</td>
<td>31,172</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natchitaches</td>
<td>35,219</td>
<td>31,969</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1,491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orleans</td>
<td>593,467</td>
<td>466,723</td>
<td>42,796</td>
<td>5,662</td>
<td>18,748</td>
<td>59,538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouachita</td>
<td>115,387</td>
<td>105,449</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>8,176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaquemines</td>
<td>25,225</td>
<td>18,522</td>
<td>4,736</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointe Coupee</td>
<td>22,002</td>
<td>15,921</td>
<td>4,468</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,767</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapides</td>
<td>118,078</td>
<td>104,209</td>
<td>6,431</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>6,197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red River</td>
<td>9,226</td>
<td>8,107</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>21,774</td>
<td>20,634</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabine</td>
<td>18,638</td>
<td>17,206</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernard</td>
<td>51,185</td>
<td>38,815</td>
<td>5,453</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>4,305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Charles</td>
<td>29,550</td>
<td>20,784</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena</td>
<td>9,937</td>
<td>9,263</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James</td>
<td>19,733</td>
<td>13,268</td>
<td>5,686</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John the Baptist</td>
<td>23,813</td>
<td>16,962</td>
<td>5,265</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Landry</td>
<td>80,364</td>
<td>36,681</td>
<td>38,550</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>4,820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Martin</td>
<td>32,453</td>
<td>4,979</td>
<td>25,655</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary</td>
<td>60,752</td>
<td>43,088</td>
<td>13,279</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>3,789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Tammanay</td>
<td>63,585</td>
<td>55,223</td>
<td>3,187</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangipahoa</td>
<td>65,875</td>
<td>57,252</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>6,759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tensas</td>
<td>9,732</td>
<td>9,263</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrebonne</td>
<td>76,049</td>
<td>38,930</td>
<td>29,953</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>6,551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>18,447</td>
<td>17,654</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Born in US</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Other N T G</th>
<th>N T G</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vermilion</td>
<td>43,071</td>
<td>11,513</td>
<td>29,843</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>53,794</td>
<td>45,565</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>4,695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>41,987</td>
<td>39,111</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2,381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>39,939</td>
<td>37,960</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Baton Rouge</td>
<td>16,864</td>
<td>13,593</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Carroll</td>
<td>13,028</td>
<td>12,325</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Feliciana</td>
<td>11,376</td>
<td>9,306</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winn</td>
<td>16,369</td>
<td>15,808</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

Percentage of French-Speaking Persons Per Parish,
For Louisiana, 1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parishes</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Mother Tongue French</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>3,640,442</td>
<td>572,262</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. St. Martin</td>
<td>32,932</td>
<td>25,655</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evangeline</td>
<td>31,932</td>
<td>24,222</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vermilion</td>
<td>43,071</td>
<td>29,843</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lafourche</td>
<td>68,041</td>
<td>43,101</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Acadia</td>
<td>52,109</td>
<td>27,845</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Avoyelles</td>
<td>37,751</td>
<td>19,898</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lafayette</td>
<td>109,716</td>
<td>57,138</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. St. Landry</td>
<td>80,364</td>
<td>38,550</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Jefferson Davis</td>
<td>29,554</td>
<td>14,049</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Assumption</td>
<td>19,654</td>
<td>8,876</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Iberia</td>
<td>57,397</td>
<td>25,216</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cameron</td>
<td>8,194</td>
<td>3,478</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Terrebonne</td>
<td>76,049</td>
<td>29,953</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. St. James</td>
<td>19,733</td>
<td>5,686</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Calcasieu</td>
<td>145,415</td>
<td>34,607</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Allen</td>
<td>20,794</td>
<td>4,949</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. St. Charles</td>
<td>29,550</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. St. John</td>
<td>23,813</td>
<td>5,265</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. St. Mary</td>
<td>60,752</td>
<td>13,279</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Pointe Coupee</td>
<td>22,002</td>
<td>4,468</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Ascension</td>
<td>37,086</td>
<td>7,001</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Plaquemine</td>
<td>25,225</td>
<td>4,736</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Jefferson</td>
<td>337,568</td>
<td>45,769</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Iberville</td>
<td>30,743</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 7

**Percentage of French-Speaking Persons Per Parish,**

**For Louisiana, 1970 (cont.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>French-Speaking</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. West Baton Rouge</td>
<td>16,864</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Orleans</td>
<td>593,467</td>
<td>42,796</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Livingston</td>
<td>36,511</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. East Baton Rouge</td>
<td>285,142</td>
<td>16,313</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Rapides</td>
<td>118,078</td>
<td>64,311</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. St. Tammany</td>
<td>63,585</td>
<td>3,187</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Natchitoches</td>
<td>35,219</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Beauregard</td>
<td>22,872</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Vernon</td>
<td>53,794</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Tangipohoa</td>
<td>65,875</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. East Feliciana</td>
<td>17,657</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. West Feliciana</td>
<td>11,376</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Lincoln</td>
<td>33,800</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Grant</td>
<td>13,671</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Tensas</td>
<td>9,732</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Bossier</td>
<td>63,703</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Ouachita</td>
<td>115,387</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Caddo</td>
<td>230,184</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Washington</td>
<td>41,987</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. St. Helena</td>
<td>9,937</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Concordia</td>
<td>22,578</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Sabina</td>
<td>18,638</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Winn</td>
<td>16,369</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Bienville</td>
<td>16,024</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Catahoula</td>
<td>11,769</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Webster</td>
<td>39,939</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Red River</td>
<td>9,226</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Franklin</td>
<td>23,946</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Percentage of French-Speaking Persons Per Parish,
For Louisiana, 1970 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parish</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>French-Speaking %</th>
<th>French-Speaking % of Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54. Jackson</td>
<td>15,963</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. La Salle</td>
<td>13,295</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. De Soto</td>
<td>22,764</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Richland</td>
<td>21,774</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. West Carroll</td>
<td>13,028</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Morehouse</td>
<td>32,463</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Union</td>
<td>18,447</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Clairbourne</td>
<td>17,024</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Madison</td>
<td>15,065</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. East Carroll</td>
<td>12,884</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Caldwell</td>
<td>9,354</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FRENCH RADIO BROADCASTING IN LOUISIANA

In her article entitled "French Radio Broadcasting in Louisiana," Southern Speech Journal, XXX (Fall, 1964), 46-54, Beth Norwood reported that French language programs had been broadcasted in the State since 1934 and that, prior to her survey in 1958, a total of 21 radio stations had been broadcasting such programs. At the time of the 1958 survey only 18 stations carried French programs. To test the hypothesis that French programming would undergo a swift decline, she conducted another survey in 1964. The results proved contrary to the prediction. Fourteen of the original 18 stations plus two new stations were found to be broadcasting in French. While there were fewer stations, the total hours broadcasted in French had increased from 90 hours, 40 minutes in 1958 to 98 hours, 30 minutes in 1964.

The French language in Louisiana has been largely an oral tradition. This helps to explain the survival of its usage through the audio media versus the written word. Faced with an audience predominantly illiterate in written French, newspapers, such as L'Abeille, which ceased publication in 1923, could not flourish and subsequently folded. Even with the advent of television, radio has remained the prime media for French communication. This is in light of the fact that radio broadcasts are the most local form of spoken mass communication in a small community and can more easily reflect and respond to the cultural peculiarities of the population.
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A survey of Louisiana radio stations was conducted by the present author in the summer of 1976, the purpose being to ascertain how many stations broadcasted programs in French. A total of 146 stations were polled, with 82 responding. Of the respondents, thirty-one indicated that they do air programs in French. The complete results of the survey are outlined below. It should be noted that those stations which did not respond were assumed to not be carrying French programs. Also, a list compiled by the Council for the Development of French in Louisiana (CODOFIL) of radio stations which broadcast in French was used to supplement the present survey.

The renaissance of French in Louisiana, which has been alluded to previously, is furthered evidenced by the increase in total hours of French air time since the Norwood survey in 1964.

It should be pointed out that there are some radio stations in East Texas (e.g. in Beaumont, Port Arthur, Orange) which broadcast French programs for the Gallic community in Texas and Louisiana alike. These stations have not been included in the survey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call letters</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Name of the program</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>French dialect used</th>
<th>Total hrs. per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbeville</td>
<td>KROF*</td>
<td>960 (104.9FM)</td>
<td>Religious Prog.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>M-Sat. Sun.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td>WYNK</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>Cadjin a la Capitale</td>
<td>7:35 a</td>
<td>Sat.</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowley</td>
<td>KAJN</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>French Show</td>
<td>1-8:30p 6-11a</td>
<td>Sat. Sun.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crowley</td>
<td>KSIG</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>Camey Doucet Show</td>
<td>5-6p</td>
<td>T-F Sat.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French Bapt. Hr.</td>
<td>7-7:30a</td>
<td>Sun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice</td>
<td>KEUN</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>French Catholic Hour</td>
<td>7:30-8a</td>
<td>Sun.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French Bapt. Hr.</td>
<td>12:30-1p 8-12a</td>
<td>Sun. Sat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cajun Music</td>
<td>5-6p</td>
<td>Sat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>KFRA</td>
<td>1390 (95.3FM)</td>
<td>French Catholic Hour</td>
<td>6:45-7a</td>
<td>Sun.</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>45 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French Bapt. Hr.</td>
<td>7-7:30a</td>
<td>Sun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garyville</td>
<td>WKQT</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FRENCH RADIO BROADCASTING IN LOUISIANA
### AM STATIONS (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call letters</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Name of the program</th>
<th>Nature of the program</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>French dialect used</th>
<th>Total hrs. per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golden Meadow</td>
<td>KLEB</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>Cajun Music, French Catholic Hour</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>6-8 a M-Sat.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10-10:30 a Sun.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houma</td>
<td>KSIN</td>
<td>107.1</td>
<td>French Bapt. Hr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9:30-10a Sun.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>30 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennings</td>
<td>KJEF</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>Allons Danser, Va dac voir d'ou tu viens,</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>8a-1p Th-Sat.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>15½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(92.7FM)</td>
<td>Catholic prayer, Bapt. Hr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12:30-1p Sun.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11:30-12 Mon.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11:30-12 a Tue.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>KPEL</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>Le Petit Dejeuner, This Week's French Phrases*</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>9-10 a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1 hr. 45 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Le Quart d'heure du CODOFIL*</td>
<td>X 6x1 min</td>
<td>M-F</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X 6:20-6:35 p</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>KVOL</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>French Catholic Hour, French Bapt. Hr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7:15-8a Sun.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>News &amp; Interviews**</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7:05-7:15 a Sun.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>Call Letters</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Name of the program</td>
<td>Nature of the program</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>French dialect used</td>
<td>Total hrs. per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>KXXW</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>A Micro Ouvert**</td>
<td></td>
<td>X 12:12-</td>
<td>Tue.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:30a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Charles</td>
<td>KLCL</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>Cajun Hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X 6:30-10</td>
<td>Sat.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3½ h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks-ville</td>
<td>KAPB*</td>
<td>1370 (97.7FM)</td>
<td>Weather Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>X 6:15-</td>
<td>Sun-M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4½ h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Weather Report</td>
<td></td>
<td>6:20 a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>News in French</td>
<td></td>
<td>X 5:05-</td>
<td>Sun-M</td>
<td>Acadian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-5:05 p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:45 p</td>
<td>Mon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:45 p</td>
<td>Mon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:06 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Iberia</td>
<td>KANE</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>&quot;Bonjour Louisianne&quot;**</td>
<td></td>
<td>X 3:06-</td>
<td>Sun.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>24 min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8:30 a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>WNPS</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>John Scott Show</td>
<td></td>
<td>9:30 a</td>
<td>Sun.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3½ h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>WSHO</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Cajun Hr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X 10-12 a</td>
<td>Sun.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# French Radio Broadcasting in Louisiana

## AM Stations (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call Letters</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Name of the Program</th>
<th>Nature of the Program</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>French Dialect Used</th>
<th>Total Hrs. per Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>WVOG</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Roads</td>
<td>KWRG</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>French Music Jubilee</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>6-9 a</td>
<td>Sat.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opelousas</td>
<td>KSLO</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>Cajun Frolics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French News</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shreveport</td>
<td>SJOE</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thibodaux</td>
<td>KTIB</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>French Bapt. Hr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1-5 p</td>
<td>Sat-Sun</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>French music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ville Platte</td>
<td>KVPI</td>
<td>1050 (FM)</td>
<td>Cajun Rendez-vous</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Le Beau dimanche</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>News</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table provides information about the frequency, name of the program, nature of the program, time, day, and French dialect used by various AM stations in Louisiana.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Call letters</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Name of the program</th>
<th>Nature of the program</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>French dialect used</th>
<th>Total hrs. per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houma</td>
<td>KHOM</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>Rod Rodrigue Cajun Show</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4:30-6 a</td>
<td>M-Sat.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laplace</td>
<td>WCKW</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks-ville</td>
<td>KAPB</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>Bapt. French Hr CODOFIL program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7:30-8 a</td>
<td>Sat.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>45 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Iberia</td>
<td>KDEA</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>&quot;Rendezvous a la Nouvelle Iberie&quot; French Catholic Hour</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10:30-11 a</td>
<td>Sun.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>45 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thibodaux</td>
<td>KXOR</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>Commercials</td>
<td>Random</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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