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ABSTRACT

This thesis attempted to describe the phonological aspect of a variety of Louisiana French spoken in the Swords, St. Landry Parish, area. A generative approach was used in which the phonetic elements of the dialect were ascribed membership in underlying phonological classes, and phonological rules were postulated to relate the two levels. The phonetic and phonological elements and the rules were described in terms of articulatory distinctive features.
CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The goal of phonology is to study the properties of the sound systems internalized by speakers in order to communicate verbally. In order to do this, one must study not only the physical (articulatory and acoustic) properties of sounds, but also their grammatical properties (Hymes, 1975). Until recently, the phonological and grammatical aspects of language have generally been considered as two separate areas to be studied independently of one another. This reached its apex during the first half of the 20th century, when American descriptive linguistics was at its height. During this period, the mixing of levels was not an accepted methodology, for each level was felt to be explicable in terms of its own elements and their patterned distribution. This rationale was clearly set out by Hockett (1942), who, according to Joos, took on the task of codifying American phonemic theory (Joos, 1957, p. 96).

This theoretical base remained largely uncontested until the late 1950's when generative analysis, which is based on the assumption that components of a language are interrelated levels all necessary to explain the language, began to make advances. In terms of phonological theory, generative analysis has defined the phonological component of the language as the final logical continuation of the derivational processes of the utterance. In addition, generative analysis has further developed the two-level dichotomy of surface and underlying structures represented 1.
in phonemic theory. The following section traces briefly the most significant developments in phonemic theory and subsequently, generative phonology. This outline will indicate the theoretical background upon which this study is based.

The Development of Phonemic Theory

As is well known, the concept of something like the phoneme, or an underlying class of elements abstracted from the actual phonetic elements, is of great antiquity. Sanskrit scholars as early as the 2nd century B.C. had developed the concept of sphota, or the relationship of the sound form with respect to its semiotic value (Krásny, 1974). Sphota occurred at each linguistic level, corresponding to combinations of morphemes and to whole words. The lowest level of sphota, the varna-sphota, or the discrete "letter-sounds," was strictly distinguished from "speech-sounds" (dhvani) and other sounds or noises. Varna-sphota corresponds closely to the concept of the phoneme as it developed during the first half of the 20th century in American descriptive linguistics. The varna-sphota is the "constant, unvariable substratum of speech variations" (Krásny, 1974).

Greek philosophers in the classical age of Greece—5th and 4th centuries B.C.—also considered language to be divided into indivisible sound units, called "primary elements," capable of forming meaningful wholes but remaining themselves meaningless. According to Aristotle, these units were held to be meaningless in themselves, but combined to form larger meaningful units (Krásny, 1974). Plato saw language as imposing a coherent system of limited discrete elements on the vast incoherent continuum of sound. According to him, one cannot learn just a
few isolated elements of the system but must learn instead all of the elements of the system and their arrangement and relation to one another (Robins, 1972).

Medieval scholars largely disregarded the specific problems of phonology, except as they related to grammar, their major concern.

A rather incongruous phonological investigation is the *First Grammatical Treatise*, done by an unknown Icelandic scholar in the 12th Century. In this work, the First Grammarian, as the author is called, reduced the 36 vocalic elements of the Icelandic language of the period to 9 graphs with the use of diacritics which accurately indicated the contrastive pronunciations. He did not mark phonetic differences that were dependent upon environment. The First Grammarian arrived at these "phonemic" distinctions by using minimal pairs to indicate differences in meaning caused by the substitution of one sound for another (Robins, 1972).

It was during the 19th Century that the phonemic principle as we know it began to emerge (Krámsky, 1974). Numerous individuals working in different areas of linguistics approached the concept independently of one another. Perhaps the earliest individual in modern times to investigate the systematic correlations among sounds was the Polish career officer Jozef Mrozinski (1784-1839), who insisted that linguists must first discover the features that characterize the relationships between speech sounds and then establish classification of sounds based on these features. Mrozinski stressed the importance of basing this classification on relationships within the system and because of the system and not on external (historical or genetic) reasons. In this sense, he was a precursor of structuralism (Krámsky, 1974).
In 1876, Jost Winteler (1846-1929), a Swiss linguist, published a monograph in which he distinguished accidental features (variants) from distinctive properties (invariants) on the phonological level of language. Winteler used a process of minimal pair distinction to distinguish between the two types of contrasts.

Separately, but during the same time period, Henry Sweet, in England, and Paul Passy in France, arrived at the fundamental importance of distinguishing significant from insignificant differences. They later worked together with the Association Internationale Phonétique (founded in 1886), adopting as a fundamental rule in the creation of the International Phonetic Alphabet that "a distinct letter must correspond to each distinctive sound, that is each sound that can change the meaning of a word if used in the place of another" (Krámsky, 1974 p. 19). Although none of these scholars, nor others, such as Otto Jespersen, actually used the term phoneme, it becomes increasingly obvious that in fact this was the concept to which they referred.

The first individual actually to use the term phoneme was A. Dufriche-Desgenettes, a French linguist, in the meeting of the Société de Linguistique de Paris, on May 24, 1873 (Krámsky, 1974 p. 21). According to Krámsky, it was next used by Louis Havet, from whom it was borrowed by Ferdinand de Saussure, who used it in a strictly historical sense as a "hypothetical uniform and distinct common prototype of each of the regular phonetic correspondances shown by morphological units of common origin in cognate languages and reflected in the parent language" (Krámsky, p. 22). These items were distinctive from other elements of the same level of analysis, regardless of their precise articulation.

It is the scholars of the Kazan school in South Russia who are
generally considered to have made most prominent the concept of the phoneme (Krámsky, 1974). The two major figures of this school were Jan Baudouin de Courtenay and his student and co-worker Nikolaj Habdek Kruszewski. In an 1881 publication, Kruszewski explicitly distinguished phoneme from sound (the anthropophonic, i.e., the physical unit). Kruszewski further stated that every linguistic unit occurs in different environments, and changes form accordingly (Krámsky, 1974). His closest collaborator, Jan Baudouin de Courtenay, is credited with first defining the term phoneme (Krámsky, 1974 p. 23). His theory of the phoneme was published in 1894, though he had probably arrived at it earlier, about the same time as Sweet (Robins, 1972).

American Phonemics

It is with Edward Sapir's "Sound Patterns in Language" (1925) that we date the beginning of American investigation of the phonemic principle. Although Sapir did not use the term phoneme as it was later used, he talked of variations in a sound "dependent on the phonetic conditions" in which it occurs. These variations were not significant in terms of the "inner structure of the phonetic pattern" (Sapir, 1925). At this point, Sapir was dealing specifically with what could be called the allophones of a phoneme.

By 1933 when both Sapir's "The Psychological Reality of Phonemes" and Leonard Bloomfield's Language appeared, it was obvious that the concept of the phoneme had been adopted in American linguistics and was being actively investigated.

Sapir's approach to the phoneme was a psychological one. He viewed the phoneme as having not only physical but also psychological reality.
In contrast to this "intuitive" interpretation was Bloomfield's reliance on strictly scientific, objective observation and the elimination of all psychological, i.e., unobservable, considerations in positing phonemic classes. "We have no right to guess at the workings of the inaccessible mind" (Bloomfield, 1933). Bloomfield represented an initial break from the mentalist approach to language, and marked the beginnings of the behaviorist trend in American descriptive linguistics which was to prevail essentially uncontested until the late 1950's (Bach, 1965).

Sapir's and Bloomfield's work marked the beginning of a period of lively exchange among linguists when phonological investigation, in particular on the concept of the phoneme, was to assume the major role in linguistic research. Although there was dissent among the various scholars at work, this period, which extended from about 1933-1957, can be viewed as a unit. During those 25 years, American linguists concentrated on formal analysis by means of objectively describable operations and concepts. They were interested primarily in descriptions of the system exclusively in terms of its elements, their distribution, and their interrelationships. Different aspects of phonological theory were aired and contested by various linguists as a generally acceptable phonemic concept was evolved.

Morris Swadesh's "The Phonemic Principle" (1934), contains the first complete and concise statement of the principles and methods of the phonological analysis practiced by most scholars of the time. The terms "complementary distribution" and "substitution" were first used with their present meanings in this article. To Swadesh, phonemes were "perceptive units;" they were "the smallest potential unit of difference between similar words recognizable as different to the native." Swadesh
was here making reference to minimal pairs. Although he did not discuss directly the psychological reality of phonemes, it was at least implied.

W. F. Twaddell's monograph "On Defining the Phoneme" (1935) criticized both the mentalist and the strictly functional views of the phoneme. To Twaddell the phoneme was an "abstract fictitious unit" to which the various phonetic forms correspond. This view was severely criticized by Swadesh in his "Twaddell on Defining the Phoneme," to which Twaddell made a reply the following year in his article "On Various Phonemes."

The question of alternation among phonemes was explored in Bloomfield's "Menomini Morphophonemics" (1939). Bloomfield posited a theoretical basic form for each phoneme and then listed each of the different surface forms that occurred together with the motivating environment. This was strictly a taxonomic description, with no attempt at systematizing or analyzing the information.

Bernard Bloch's "Phonemic Overlapping" (1941) investigated the ramifications of phonemic overlapping or intersection. Bloch distinguished two types of intersection: partial, when an element was included in two separate phonemes but different environments, and complete, when under the same conditions the element in question occurred unpredictably as a member of one phoneme or of another.

Bloch's "The Syllabic Phonemes of English" (1941) was a landmark article in that it was the first time slanted lines // were used to indicate phonemic description. It was also the first time the term "allophone" was used in print (simultaneously in Bloch's other 1941 article), though it was reportedly coined by Whorf earlier. The American linguists' concern with the use of distribution as a theoretical foundation for phonemic analysis was demonstrated in Bloch's "A Set of Postulates
for Phonemic Analysis" (1948). Other tangents of phonemic theory were explored during this period, for example Pike's work on English Diphthongs (1947).

Meanwhile in Europe, different schools of thought were emerging. While American descriptive linguistics emphasized the distribution of phonemes and their allophonic variants, the Prague School, a group of scholars doctrinally centered around Prince Nikolai Trubetzkoy, was more concerned with stating the features that distinguish one phoneme from another (Makkai, 1972). This interest in "breaking up" a phoneme into the separate features that define it opened up a whole new analytical approach, in which generalizations could be revealed that were not obvious in the complex phonemic element (Hyman, 1975). This trend was developed in particular by Roman Jakobson, who as early as 1928 was thinking of phonemic differences in terms of binary oppositions (Hyman, 1975).

In 1939, Jakobson presented the first systematic attempt to define phonemes strictly in terms of an exhaustive set of distinctive features, which were acoustic instead of articulatory. Jakobson, Fant and Halle's Preliminaries to Speech Analysis (1952) provided the first full scale account of the acoustic properties of distinctive features (Makkai, 1972). The proposed binary features were designed to capture the phonological oppositions found in all languages. They were not meant to account for phonetic detail. A major motivation for this new approach was to reduce the descriptive means for all types of sounds (vocalic, consonantal, semivowels, etc.) to one set basic enough to take care of all of the forms.
Generative Phonology

The period of American Linguistics considered above as a unit, began a steep decline with the rapid rise of transformational-generative studies. This trend can be dated from the 1957 publication of Noam Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures*. Subsequently, interest in phonology began to give way to interest in syntactic studies. Published in the same year as *Syntactic Structures* was Chomsky's review of Jakobson and Halle's *Fundamentals of Language* (1956). Distinctive feature theory was already beginning to interest transformationalists, though it was not until Morris Halle's *Analysis of the Sound Pattern of Russian* (1959), that a marriage of the two methodologies was attempted.

Since the early 1960's, generative phonology had counted distinctive feature theory among its parts. Halle in "On The Bases of Phonology" (1964) discussed how the traditional phoneme could be eliminated, as morphemes in a generative grammar are represented directly by distinctive features. Chomsky's *Current Trends in Linguistic Theory* (1964) described the phonological component of a generative grammar. He introduced in this work the ideas of systematic phonemics and systematic phonetics and showed how they fit into the overall pattern of the grammar. Chomsky and Halle's *Sound Patterns of English* (1968) postulated further refinements of the theory and applied these principles in the analysis of English.
CHAPTER II

VARIETIES OF FRENCH IN LOUISIANA

Louisiana French has traditionally been divided into three varieties that are considered to be historically, ethnically and linguistically distinct: Colonial, Acadian and Creole (Oukada, 1977). With the exception of the Acadian variety, there has been a confusing proliferation of labels applied to the different varieties (Broussard, 1942), in addition to the already complex and varied semantic domains of each label individually.

Colonial French

Colonial French refers to the variety of French first established in Louisiana in the early 18th Century (Wartburg, 1942: Conwell and Juillard, 1963). This type of French was brought to the New World by the early French explorers and settlers. The 1721 and 1722 censuses indicate population concentrations in New Orleans (founded in 1718), in villages along the Mississippi River near New Orleans, in Biloxi, in Mobile, along the Gulf Coast, and on plantations and land concessions along the Mississippi River (Maduell, 1972). Presumably these areas were where the language was first established. Although generally spoken of as being a standardized, relatively uniform variety of French, there were undoubtedly as many variations in this dialect as there were representatives of the different dialect areas of France in Louisiana.
Colonial French received great input from refugees from the West Indies at the time of the slave uprisings in the early 1800's, and from Émigrées from France after the French Revolution (Fortier, 1885; Tent-schoff, 1975). In addition, once the colony became established as a fruitful and profitable reality, with thriving upper and middle classes, there developed a strong literary tradition and a tradition of educating sons in France, or at least of hiring European tutors to instruct children of the more well-to-do citizens (Broussard, 1942). In as much as these influences had a stabilizing, standardizing effect on the language, it was probably restricted to the upper classes. The establishment of schools and increased newspaper circulation would have possibly increased the standardizing influence on the language of the general populace to at least some extent.

Colonial French is supposedly very similar to the Standard literary French of France\(^2\), differing only slightly in lexicon (Tisch, 1959). According to Conwell and Juillard (1963), this variety of French is now preserved only artificially by an elitist French-speaking group. It has been largely replaced by a Standard Louisiana French containing elements of Colonial and Acadian French (Lane, 1934).

**Acadian French**

The Acadian\(^3\) variety of Louisiana French is the variety easiest to define historically. It is the dialect carried to Louisiana by the French settlers of Acadia (Nova Scotia), Canada, who were expelled from their homeland by the British in 1755. (Cf. Ditchy, 1932, for more on "le Grand Dérangement.") Groups of Acadians began arriving in Louisiana around 1758; the first group came through Maryland, the Carolinas and Georgia (Costa, 1958). The last group arrived in 1785. Records vary,
but in all some 1,500 Acadians made their way to Louisiana, some via the West Indies, some via the Eastern Seaboard states, some via France and even England (Costa, 1958).

The Acadians arrived shortly before, and then during the time of Spanish domination of Louisiana. They were settled primarily on the left bank of the Mississippi River, above New Orleans, which became known as the Acadian Coasts (along with the German Coasts, which referred to the area settled by German settlers directly from Germany or from an abortive settlement in Arkansas. Cf. Deiler, 1909), in the plains area of Southwest Louisiana, around the Attakapas region near present day St. Martinville, and in the Opelousas area (Read, 1931). At first Acadian French was spoken exclusively by the descendants of the original French Canadian immigrants, who retained a very strong cultural and linguistic tradition among themselves (Read, 1931). Eventually, most other ethnic and linguistic groups that came into close contact with them while still isolated were absorbed into the Acadian tradition leaving only minimal traces of their original traditions. Acadian French differs in phonology and somewhat in syntax from Standard French and to a great degree in lexicon, due primarily to large numbers of loanwords especially from English (Read, 1931: Tisch, 1958, after Broussard, 1942).

Creole French

The third variety of Louisiana French is known extensively as Creole. It is a French-based Creole language originally spoken by the slaves of French speakers (Mercier, 1880; Perret, 1933: Tentschoff, 1975, etc.). Structurally and morphologically it should be considered as entirely distinct from the other varieties of Louisiana French; traditionally it has not been.
As this variety of French is derived from a Creolized language, it differs markedly in phonology, syntax and lexicon from the other varieties of Louisiana French.

**Dialect Mixing**

Although the three varieties of Louisiana French have traditionally been considered in the literature to be separate and distinct, there was mention very early of mutual influence among the dialects, in particular between the Acadian and Creole varieties. As early as 1891, Alcée Fortier in describing the linguistic situation in the community of St. Martinville (St. Martin Parish), an area settled primarily by the French of the West Indies with only minor Acadian influences, stated "French is essentially the language of the inhabitants and it is well spoken by the educated classes. The latter speak English also, but the lower classes speak the Acadian French mixed with the Creole patois and a little English" (Fortier, 1891).

George Lane, writing about the same area several decades later, indicated that there is great Creole influence on the Standard dialect, but said that a Creole-Acadian mixture has largely supplanted the standard variety (Lane, 1934-35).

James Broussard, in his work *Louisiana Creole Dialect* published in 1942, also mentioned the mutual influence among the different dialects, and spoke of the great variation to be found within the three types in different geographical areas. Broussard also based his work on the French of the St. Martinville area.

Sylvain R. Loupe, in the preface to his 1932 Master's thesis, stated that "in Louisiana today one may come in contact with three classes of French: Louisiana French, the 'Cajun' dialect, and the 'Creole' dialect."
Then sometimes one may find a mixture of the three languages" (Loupe, 1932).

**Review of the Literature On Louisiana French**

In the literature on Louisiana French, work on any aspect encompassed almost every aspect of the field. Although a considerable amount of work has been done on Louisiana French, until the recent decades very little of it dealt with specific topics of linguistic analysis such as phonology or syntax. Most of the work has been of a very general nature, treating all of Louisiana French or one particular variety, and attempting to encompass every aspect of the language. Until the 1930's, most of this work was concerned with the cultural and historical aspects of the language rather than with linguistic ones.

Alfred Mercier's "Etude sur la langue créole en Louisiane" which appeared in 1880, was a concise description of the Creole dialect in comparison with the Standard literary French of the day. This pamphlet was to become the standard reference work for future Louisiana French Creole studies for some time (Harrison, 1882: Fortier, 1884, 1894, 1895: Tinker, 1936).

Alcée Fortier's voluminous works on Louisiana French (1884, 1891, 1894 a, b, 1895) contained some phonological and grammatical description. Like most of the later works, his descriptions were based upon a comparison with Standard French categories.

An anonymous work, Les Acadiens Louisianais et leur parler, written around the turn of the century, but published by Jay Ditchy in 1932, also contained some phonological and grammatical description of the Acadian and Creole varieties of French.
In 1931, William Read published his *Louisiana French*, a glossary of the etymologies of the most unusual "native and foreign elements in the French dialect of Louisiana." Read identified three distinct varieties of French in Louisiana: Creole (here referred to as Colonial French), which he said is not far removed from Standard French in syntax, vocabulary and pronunciation, and which is spoken by most Creoles (i.e., white descendents of French and Spanish settlers of the Colonial Period) and cultivated Acadians. The second variety that he distinguished is Acadian, spoken by those of Acadian descent and those raised in the communities with Acadians. Acadian French differs from Standard French mainly in phonology and lexicon. Read referred to the third variety as the Negro-French patois. There was no discussion of this variety.

Although written at a later date, (1959), J.L. Tisch's monograph was essentially of the same general historical orientation as much earlier work. Tisch traced the European sources feeding into the three varieties of Louisiana French to which he refers after Read, as Acadian, Creole-French and Patois-Nègre. The book was essentially a history of the settlement and development of French Louisiana. Aside from general descriptive remarks, he made no attempt at linguistic analysis.

Oukada (1977) has loosely divided the work on Louisiana French into two periods according to the trends in linguistic thought, in particular the advance of phonemic theory. He set the 1950's as the time after which phonemic theory began, to some extent, to be felt in Louisiana studies. Prior to this, the concept of the phoneme and of separate, distinct levels of representation was simply not in usage outside of circles involved in primarily theoretical work. It is profitable to discuss the remainder of the literature on Louisiana French in the light of this division.
George Lane's 1934-1935 articles were the first attempt at a truly systematic analysis of two varieties of Louisiana French. Basing his division on Read (1931), Lane distinguished three varieties of Louisiana French: Standard (i.e., Colonial), Acadian and Creole. With data from the St. Martinville area he described the latter two varieties.

These studies were comparative, showing the changes that different phonological elements have undergone from Standard French. Although he did not talk in terms of rules per se, or generalize from any conclusions that he reached, Lane listed systematically all of the phonetic environments that caused the sound changes that occurred. He stated, for example, that "French [ɛ] remains ɛ in closed syllables, but becomes e in open syllables" (1935; p. 9). After treating the vowels and consonants of the dialects, Lane discussed mophological formation and behavior, again in relation to Standard French.

Edward Larocque Tinker (1936) gave a history of the Creole dialect in Louisiana, together with a grammatical exposition based almost completely on Mercier (1880). The basic assumption of the Negro's fundamental inability to learn the French language correctly as an explanation for the drastic changes that have occurred also harks back to an earlier era.

Over the years there had been some discussion of extending into Louisiana the Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada. In 1942, Walther von Wartburg published a report entitled "To What Extent Is An Atlas of Louisiana French Possible and Desirable?", based on preliminary fieldwork the results of which were never published. Wartburg concluded that, at that time, attempting such an undertaking would be very impractical.
James Broussard is *Louisiana Creole Dialect* (1942) stressed primarily morphology and syntax. He included a very short section on Creole phonetics, restricting his description to the surface level. Broussard attempted no analysis beyond indicating the dialect's relationship with Standard French, and phonetic description in unclear articulatory terms.

A number of Master's theses on Louisiana French were written at different universities around the state, beginning in 1916 and extending through the present decade. Of the forty-four examined by the investigator, the majority (twenty-five) were completed in the 1930's under the direction of two Louisiana State University professors, H. A. Major and W. Pickens. Since then, the number has declined drastically and steadily ---there were six done in the 40's; three in the 50's, six in the 60's; and two in the 70's. Twenty-six of the these were lexical studies, i.e., glossaries of the variants from Standard French found in different French parishes of Louisiana. Many of these were indirect contributions to a linguistic atlas of Louisiana French (Cf. Wartburg, 1942). They generally traced briefly the phonological elements that differ from the Standard French, explaining them as the result of traditional diachronic linguistic changes---the epenthesis, metahesis, assimilation, etc.

Twelve of the theses dealt in particular with the folkways of the Acadian or Creole cultures. Although there was little or no attempt at linguistic analysis made in these studies or in the lexical ones, and phonological technique used is sometimes questionable, usable data can be derived from them (Redfern, to appear).

Two of the theses dealt directly with grammar: Chaudoir (1937), for the Acadian dialect, and Perret (1933) for the Creole dialect. The theses of Ferdinand Iseringhausen and Louise Olivier pertained directly
to the area being studied here. Iseringhausen (1956) did a lexical study of the French of Church Point, Louisiana, using a questionnaire based on that of Wartburg. He stated that the Acadian variety is the most prevalent in the area, and estimated that French is spoken by about 90% of the population. Church Point is in Acadia Parish just eight miles southwest of Swords, the community under investigation here (see map). There is a great deal of interaction between the two communities, hence lexical and phonological similarities are possible.

Olivier's glossary of the variants from Standard French in St. Landry Parish was completed in 1937. As Conwell and Juillard (1963) stated in their annotated bibliography, it is an "accurate glossary from which phonology can be extracted." It would be interesting to contrast phonological developments discernable in her data with those postulated in this paper.

In 1950, John Guilbeau produced his dissertation "The French Spoken in LaFourche Parish, Louisiana." This work, based in part on his 1936 Master's thesis from Louisiana State University, "A Glossary of Variants from Standard French in LaFourche Parish," was a substantial study comprising a history of French in Louisiana, a systematic presentation of the phonology, morphology and syntax of the French of LaFourche Parish, and a presentation of vocabulary and texts of the dialect.

Although Guilbeau did not make use of standard phonemic notation, his analysis implies an understanding of fundamental phonemic theory. In a later work (1965), he restated some of his early work in terms of these principles.

The most prolific writer on Louisiana Creole French has been Raleigh Morgan. Basing most of his work on Louisiana French on data collected in
Morgan has continued to produce linguistic analysis of the dialect over a period of some 18 years. His data were collected in St. Martinville, St. Martin Parish, from primarily one Philip Wiltz, who was then in his 70's.

Morgan has done work on all levels of the dialect: phonological, syntactic, and semantic. If taken as a description of the phonetic level of representation, his phonological analysis seemed to be complete and quite consistent. As with most work that has been done on Louisiana French, however, there was great inconsistency in the specification of levels. The reader is not always sure whether phonological or phonetic levels are being described.

Marilyn Conwell and Alphonse Juilland's *Louisiana French Grammar Vol. 1*, which appeared in 1963, is a contribution to the field in that they attempted to analyze a large body of data. The authors set out to present a thorough description of the phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical aspects of the speech of Lafayette, a dialect designated in terms of linguistic homogeneity, not geographical or political boundaries, centering around the city of Lafayette, in Lafayette Parish. Although in terms of material covered, they discussed a wide range of phenomena, there was essentially no analysis in the sense of organizing and generalizing.

Their discussion consisted simply in listing all of the occurrences of every item without making any attempt to systematize or draw conclusions from their findings or to postulate any rules that might account for the behavior of the elements. Their phonological analysis was very inconsistent and ineffectively organized. As every phonological element referred to was put between slashes (//), it was often impossible to tell
if they referred to the phonemic or phonetic level of representation. The work of Conwell and Juilland is observationally adequate, i.e., it accurately describes the linguistic phenomena, but descriptively inadequate in that it gives no indication of the complex but ordered system that underlies the data (Hyman, 1975 after Chomsky, 1964).

William Thomas published in 1973 an article which discussed the different varieties of Louisiana French in terms of their phonological and morphological structure. This was essentially a reworking of many of the earlier studies, but done from a sociolinguistic perspective.

Joseph LeSage Tisch's monograph on the history of the French language in Louisiana (1959) traced the historical developments that led to the present day linguistic situation in Louisiana. He stated, after Broussard (1942), that there were originally three separate varieties of French in Louisiana, each with its own historical development and differences. These are usually mutually intelligible, and at present are tending towards unification. Tisch stated that this is particularly evident in the replacement of Creole features by Acadian features (p. 59). He mentioned that there are social correlations for the different varieties.

Raleigh Morgan's article entitled "Dialect-Leveling in Non-English Speech of Southwest Louisiana" concluded that leveling is going on, but not exclusively in one direction. Elements from all three varieties are being homogenized to form essentially one system.

Dorice Tentschoff (1975) concluded that the great variation found in Louisiana French today is the result of a certain dialect-leveling, but that this wide-spread fluctuation of forms is highly structured, and plays a significant role within the complex sociocultural environment in the French speaking part of the state.
There were several other studies in the recent past that mentioned Louisiana French as part of an overall complex of French speaking areas in the New World or outside of France. Morris Goodman's 1964 book contained a description of the phonology and morphology of the Creole variety of Louisiana French in comparison with all of the other French-based Creoles. This was strictly a taxonomic work, restricted to the phonetic level of the language. Hosea Phillips included what is essentially an updated description of the state of the French language in Louisiana in Volume I of Le Français en France et hors de France. This two volume work is a collection of papers presented at a conference in Nice, France on the study of "le français d'outre-mer."

Much of this work on Louisiana French, though admirable in many ways, has been done, as Tentschoff puts it, from an elitist point of view "examined from the perspective of the literary Standard French of the time of writing---whether 19th or 20th century" (Tentschoff 1975). This has largely been the result of the tradition in which anything associated with minority groups, in particular groups without a literary tradition, was somehow substandard and defective. The increasing appreciation of the complex, usually ignored, and at best misinterpreted linguistic and cultural habits of such groups has produced a trend towards examining these institutions in the light of their own merits, independent of comparison with the analogous standard or mainstream forms.

Later studies, for example the many theses, often simply applied the same categories of analysis that were used in earlier studies to data collected several decades later. This was to view the language and its functions as stagnant and unchanging. This must be a source of misinformation and misinterpretation about what is actually going on in the
language at the present moment.
Field Methodology:

In a linguistic study of this nature, it is highly desirable to capture the speech of the informants in a very natural, normal state, when subject to as few unusual influences as possible. To achieve this, when actually collecting the data the investigator must make herself, her paraphernalia, and her objectives as inconspicuous as possible without of course resorting to falsification. For this reason, and also for those of feasibility, much of the data (approximately 2/3) was collected in the absence of the investigator by a member of the family who were the major informants for the study. The investigator was present at about 1/3 of the recording sessions, and although this seemed to affect the speech patterns of the informants initially, once everyone relaxed normal patterns were resumed.

There are many advantages to unobtrusive data collecting of this sort, but there are also attendant problems. Although one can collect a vast body of data from undirected recording, certain features will simply not occur in some conversations or verbal exchanges that do occur in others. For example, in the data collected for this study, there is a dearth of /s/ /z/ contrasts. This could mean that the elements do not occur in contrastive pairs in the dialect, or simply that the relevant lexical items were not being used.
Another problem arising from this method of data collection is that the investigator must rely exclusively on verbal cues that can be recorded. Extra-linguistic cues that reveal so much are not available, except in after-the-fact discussion. In addition, when the explicit topic of conversation is not known, it becomes slightly more difficult to interpret some of the data, in particular where lexical items begin and end, etc.

Sampling:

Although the sampling for the study was not random enough to permit truly "scientific" generalization about the community at large, the investigator feels that given the small size and the relative ethnic and linguistic homogeneity of the community whose dialect is under investigation, those individuals chosen as informants were representative of it.

Selection of the informants for the study was not based on a mathematically random sampling of the Swords, Louisiana community. Of the 8 informants, 5 are members of one family, although they do not all live in the same house. The other 3 informants are all natives of Swords, but 2 of them live in Church Point, Acadia Parish, about 8 miles away, and the other lives in Swords. They represent 2 generations of speakers, those in the above 65 bracket, and those in the mid-40's bracket.

Although there are undoubtedly many differences among individual idiolects and speech patterns of different families of speakers, a superficial examination of the linguistic community as a whole indicates that they all speak a very similar variety of French. An examination of other studies of this sort shows that although it is preferable to have a larger, more random sampling of speakers, valid work can be done with only a limited number of informants, if the limitations of the study are recognized.
As the primary aim of generative analysis is to postulate the underlying system of grammar (linguistic competence) of the individual or individuals being investigated (Chomsky, 1964; Chomsky and Halle, 1968), when a linguistic community as a whole is being studied, it is the basic, shared system of rules that is being sought. This means implicitly that certain surface variations will be disregarded at first in the postulation of the fundamental core grammar of the linguistic community.

Data:

Approximately 4 hours of recordings were used in the analysis. These were made on tapes using a Superscope Three-Head Professional Cassette Recorder C-105. The data were transcribed using the International Phonetic Alphabet with some minor modifications.

The speech of the informants is for the most part in a relaxed register. Data were collected at informal social gatherings, a Christmas party, from telephone conversations and simple discussions. In most instances, the informants were unaware that they were being recorded.

About 45 minutes of recording are specifically elicited data in the form of sentence translations. This was the method used to go back and verify the postulated phonological classes and their phonetic variants. The investigator would say a sentence in English that contained the French element being tested for, and ask the informant to translate it into his dialect. This was done on an individual basis, one informant at a time. The investigator feels that this is a valid rechecking technique, as the original sentence was given in English, so there was no model in the target language (French) to affect the response. This method of enquiry could lead to problems in a syntactic study, where the English sentence patterns could have a greater influence on the French ones. However, all
of the informants seem to have two quite distinct phonological systems for English and French, so the English model is believed to have a minimal effect.

Background of the Area Under Investigation:

The area under study here is Swords, Louisiana. Swords is a rural community of approximately 180 inhabitants located in western St. Landry Parish near the Acadia Parish boundary. The community is located 10 miles due west of Opelousas, the largest urban center in the area, 10 miles east of Eunice, and 8 miles north of Church Point in Acadia Parish (see map).

Swords is a very small community, consisting largely of houses clustered along Highway 190 West, for about one mile, and farms extending for a 3 mile radius on either side. The settlement, which formerly boasted 2 stores and a cotton gin, now has one store. Its residents are traditionally farming people, now raising mostly soybeans, cotton, sweet potatoes and garden vegetables for home consumption. Large tracts of land are rented out to large scale farmers mainly for soybean and rice cultivation.

The majority of the adult male residents are employed in construction and related fields in urban areas of the State, such as Lafayette, Lake Charles, and Baton Rouge. Those employed close enough commute daily; the others spend the week where they are employed and come home for weekends. Many of the adult females also work outside the community, for example in clothing factories in Eunice or Church Point.

Swords is not a very old community, having grown up around the cotton gin in the late 1800's. According to a longtime resident of the area, the Missouri-Pacific Railroad named the community in 1915,
although others claim it was named Swords in memory of the longtime (16 years) Sheriff of St. Landry Parish, Marion Swords, who was shot and killed in 1916 in the nearby Pot Cove area while trying to capture the "desperado" Hillaire Carrier (Lake Charles American Press, 7/17/16; Opelousas Daily World 5/13/70).

Racially, the community is about 50% Black and 50% White. The vast majority of the residents of Swords speak Creole, a dialect that the informants consider to be very like their own. They contrast this variety of French with Standard (Book French, or the "good" French, and with Patois, or the "broken" French that they say is spoken around Lafayette. The individuals questioned also consider that their dialect differs very definitely from Acadian French, which they hear as being "flatter" in sound that their own dialect.

Most of the inhabitants of Swords are of the Roman Catholic faith. They attend churches in Lawtell, Eunice, Church Point or Mallette, an even smaller community located between Swords and Lawtell, which is between Opelousas and Swords. As a rule, children attend schools in Eunice or Lawtell. Most of them go through the 12th grade, although an increasing number are continuing on for higher education. Most of the people in their mid-40's attended school only through the 8th grade.

Informants indicated that there has been little change in the status quo in the past 50 years. There does not seem to be a trend of moving in or out of the community. Many of the men who are employed in distant cities spend a great deal of their time away but are considered residents and plan to move back permanently when the time comes.

Information on the Informants:

Although data were gathered from a total of 8 informants, the
analysis is based primarily on data from Informants 1 and 3. This is because these two informants were the most accessible to the investigator. Data from the other 6 informants was also used, but more to double-check data from Informants 1 and 3. All 8 informants are natives of the Swords area, and all speak the local dialect as a first language. As stated above, two of the informants no longer live in Swords, but they still maintain fairly close ties with the other informants. Informant 2 died before the last recordings were made.

Specific information of the individual informants follows:

| Informant #1: | Male; Creole; 76 years old; born in Swords, spent most of his life there; a retired farmer. |
| Informant #2: | Female; Creole; about 76 years old; born in Swords, spent most of her life there; wife of #1. |
| Informant #3: | Female, Creole, 42 years old; born in Swords, spent most of her life there; daughter of #1 and #2. |
| Informant #4: | Male; Creole; 45 years old, born in Swords, spent much of life there; now employed with State Highway Department in Baton Rouge; son of #1 and #2. |
| Informant #5: | Male, Creole, native of Swords area; spent most of life there; about 45 years old; farmer; employed in construction in Lake Charles; husband of #3. |
| Informant #6: | Female; Creole; native of Swords; spent most of her life there; about 40 years old; now residing in Church Point. |
| Informant #7: | Male; Creole; native of Swords; now residing in Church Point; about 43 years old; husband of #6. |
| Informant #8: | Female; Creole; native of Church Point; about 50 years old. |
Analysis:

This study attempts to describe and analyze the phonological component of the dialect and is restricted to the segmental units, although it was found necessary to include morphological information at certain points to facilitate the explanation of different occurrences.

A generative approach is used to analyze the data. In generative analysis, three components are assumed for any language: the syntactic, the phonological and the semantic. The syntactic and semantic components will not be discussed as they are not immediately pertinent.

In generative phonology 2 major levels of representation are assumed for the phonological component of any language (Hyman, 1975). These are a surface level, the phonetic level; and an underlying level, the phonological level.

In the theoretical system being followed, the phonological component of a language is actually more complex than this statement indicates. Beginning where the phonological component enters the picture, we have an utterance that is a lexical representation. This consists of formatives, or strings of minimal elements that have been generated by the syntactic component or the grammatical and lexical rules. These elements are the input to the phonological rules, and they must have the appropriate structure for these rules to apply. Should these formatives not fit the necessary structural specifications, readjustment rules are applied (Chomsky and Halle, 1968), which will produce what is referred to as the phonological representation. Then the phonological rules can be applied, ultimately deriving the phonetic representation.

This phonological representation has also been referred to as the "morphophonemic representation" (Bloomfield, 1939) and the "systematic
phonemic representation", which implies the existence of a level intermediate in abstraction between the phonological and phonetic levels. According to Chomsky and Halle (1968), the existence of such a level has not been adequately demonstrated.

In this study, the phonological component will be analyzed as consisting of two levels of representation, the phonological and the phonetic, as postulated by Chomsky and Halle (1968). The traditional terms phoneme, phone and allophone are used for convenience in this study. Phoneme will refer to a class of elements on the phonological level of representation. Phone refers to any segment occurring on the phonetic level, and allophone refers to any of the possible representations of a phonological class on the phonetic level.

An inventory of the phonetic level of a language provides a description of all of the occurring phonetic segments; all of the sounds that could be arranged into meaningful sequences. This includes many redundant items that are not meaningfully contrastive.

An inventory of the segments occurring on the phonological level provides a list of all and only the meaningfully contrastive elements of the language in question. As Sapir (1925) pointed out, two languages can have identical phonetic elements, but at the same time have totally different phonological inventories.

To arrive at the phonological level, one must eliminate all of the redundant elements, so that only those that are distinctive remain.

In generative analysis, a phonological explanation that is descriptively adequate must not only accurately describe the data, i.e., be observationally adequate, but must also accurately account for the native speaker's ability to produce these forms, his linguistic competence
(Hyman, 1975, after Chomsky, 1964). Essentially this means proposing a model of the system, the grammar, that the speaker has internalized and that he theoretically uses to communicate verbally. This is done by postulating a set of rules, both optional and obligatory, that describe the relationship between the two levels of representation; how the surface structure is derived from the underlying one. The obligatory rules will apply whenever all of the necessary conditions are met; optional rules will apply only occasionally, dependent generally upon extralinguistic factors, such as style or emotion.

There are, in addition, unpredictable changes in the surface level of representation that are not rule-governed, but that are simply the result of performance limitations, such as memory, breath, interruptions, etc. As a generative analysis attempts to postulate the basic set of rules that governs linguistic behavior, these unpredictable, nondistinctive variations are not considered in the analysis.

The rules postulated in this type of analysis must by definition be restricted to those generating the "ideal" form of the language for any one speaker or group of speakers. This is not to imply that variation does not occur, on the contrary, although the rules must represent the reality, they do so only in a very general, abstracted sense. The fundamental core rules are what are postulated, but in actual performance, these can be subject to a great deal of surface variation. The basic set of rules is postulated on the basis of most frequent, consistent occurrence vis-à-vis the variants. These variants assume a secondary status, because they are less frequent and more peripheral.

From data transcribed in the International Phonetic Alphabet, the investigator determined the phonetic inventory of the dialect under con-
sideration. In all, 36 distinguishable phones were found for the dialect. These elements were then specified in terms of distinctive features, using the inventory of features used by Schane (1973), and Chomsky and Halle (1968). Based on groupings by distinctive features, (and traditional categories), the 36 items were divided into 4 more specific groups, vocalic (13 members), semivocalic (3 members), liquid (2 members), and consonantal (18 members).

The distinctive features used to specify the segments are features of articulation, rather than acoustics. Features used to specify the vocalic segments are: Front, Central, Back, High, Mid and Low, and Round. Features to specify the consonantal classes are Voice, Anterior, Coronal, Continuant, Nasal, and Delayed Release. The same set of features were used to specify both the phonetic and phonological classes of segments.

The use of distinctive features to specify phonological elements allows for more effective description than does using individual phonetic figures, which represent a complex but unspecified bundle of features. Distinctive feature notation uses the elements of these bundles, thereby revealing explicitly how the different elements are related structurally and functionally. This allows for a more concise description, and more careful scrutiny of the phonological entities and their behavior.

The phonological classes for the dialect were posited by determining the relationship among the different phonetic elements. Then rules relating the two levels were posited to explain the overall phonological system of the dialect. Some rules were found to apply to whole classes of elements. These are discussed in a section apart from the rules applying to individual phonological classes.

The analysis is organized in the following way. Vocalic segments
are discussed first, then semivowels, then liquids, then consonants. This was seen as a logical progression, from the elements that are [+ vocalic] and [- consonantal], to those that are [- vocalic] and [+ consonantal], although the direction was arbitrarily selected.

First the whole class is discussed, then subdivided if possible, into related groups of elements. Each of the elements in the subdivisions is then discussed. When rules are presented, they are first given in the phonetic alphabet, and then in terms of distinctive features. Examples from the data are given with each rule.

The notational system used is that of generative phonology, as presented by Schane (1968; 1973). The key is given below.

\[ \begin{align*}
\alpha \beta & = \text{either + or -} \\
V & = \text{vowel} \\
C & = \text{consonant} \\
$ & = \text{syllable boundary} \\
# & = \text{word boundary} \\
+ & = \text{morpheme boundary} \\
/ & = \text{in the environment of} \\
\rightarrow & = \text{becomes} \\
() & = \text{optionality} \\
+ & = \text{having this feature} \\
- & = \text{without this feature} \\
\sim & = \text{nasalization} \\
\emptyset & = \text{null set} \\
\{} & = \text{either/or} \\
\_ & = \text{where the item in question occurs} \\
[ ] & = \text{containing these features} \\
X \sim X & = \text{alternation between items}
\end{align*} \]
CHAPTER IV

VOCALIC SEGMENTS

Phonetic Elements

For the dialect of the Swords area, the investigator has posited eight vocalic classes of sounds occurring on the phonological level of the language. These eight classes were arrived at by first examining all of the vocalic forms occurring in the rough data, i.e., on the phonetic level. These phones were placed on a physiological chart, or vocalic grid, according to place of articulation. The placement is based completely on the investigator's perception of the sounds and their relationship to one another. Another listener might distinguish them somewhat differently. For example, someone else might discern a difference between the utterances of the phones of /u/ occurring in checked and un-checked syllables, which this investigator did not. However, these differences are not crucial for the analysis of the underlying segments.

Since the differences in placement of elements on a physiological chart is completely relative, and not proportional, as for example elements arranged according to acoustic measurements would be, this was done simply to indicate visually where the different sounds are produced in comparison to each other.

The physiological chart for the oral vocalic segments of the dialect 35.
appears below. The chart shows the placement of the 13 vocalic segments on the phonetic level, and not the phonological classes. Nasal vowels are to be postulated as oral vowels with the added feature of nasalization.

PHYSIOLOGICAL CHART FOR ORAL VOCALIC SEGMENTS

Crosshatching indicates rounding.

This articulatory grid and others appearing in the study are based on Haudricourt and Thomas (1967).

In terms of articulatory features, the following distinctive feature matrix, including all redundant features can be posited for the vocalic segments:
A distinctive feature matrix indicating only the essential descriptive features would be:

From this overview, it is possible to postulate, on the basis of physiological and phonological associations, which phones are members of the same phonemic classes, and indeed, what these phonological classes are—what descriptive features can be assigned to each of them.

Criteria Used in Positing Phonemic Class Membership

Several criteria were used in determining which phones belong to the same phonological class.

(1) The most obvious is simply physiological proximity. Two segments that occur in close proximity (are neighbors), and share the same
major features, such as height, rounding, etc. are probably more than coincidentally that way. For example, [i] and [I] are more similar than [i] and [e]. Although in terms of actual physical proximity [i] and [e] may be closer than [i] and [I], the more shared features of the two give them membership in the same phonological class, in contrast with [e].

(2) If two forms are in complementary distribution, for example open and closed /o/ occurring in checked and unchecked syllables respectively ([ɛɔ] chaud "hot" vs. [ɛɔz] chose "thing"), are posited as being members of the same phonological class.

(3) Two elements are not eligible for inclusion in the same phonemic class if they have a contrastive function, that is, if the substitution of one element for another in the same slot in the word results in a different semantic correlation from the original. For example [pir] pire "worse" vs. [per] père "father", vs. [par] "by way of".

(4) Two neighboring or distant elements may not be eligible for membership in the same phonological class if they differ in primary (identifying) phonetic features, for example rounding. If two segmental elements have different morphological manifestations, or behave differently, though sharing almost all of the same phonetic features, they may not be eligible for the same phonological class. For example, though [ɔ] and [a] are very similar perceptually, [a] undergoes elision while [ɔ] does not. This disparity prevents these phones from being posited as members of the same phonological class.  

Vocalic Phonological Classes

At this point it was possible to postulate the underlying phonological classes, as composed of the different allophonic variants. The validity of these hypothetical classes was tested with minimal pairs. Where
differences or alternations in one or more features did not result in meaningful change to the informants, these differences were seen as being nondistinctive or simply allophonic, and the variants were taken as being different manifestations of the same underlying class. Where changes did result in distinctive differences, the two elements under consideration were interpreted as belonging to separate phonemic classes.

The nondistinctive variants were then further tested to determine if the variation was predictable and in patterned distribution (complementary distribution), or if it was apparently unsystematic behavior and simply the result of some phonological rule that was applied at a lower stage (i.e., closer to the surface) in the derivation of the form\(^{12}\). Predictable allophonic variation occurs between phones that are in complementary distribution; for example, as mentioned above, in the predictable occurrence of the different allophones of /o/, depending on phonetic environment.

On the basis of the segments occurring on the phonetic level, the following phonological classes were posited for the vocalic segments of the dialect in question. The vocalic and phonological segments were postulated on the basis of complementary distribution of neighboring phonetic elements, and minimal pair testing as described above. From the thirteen phonetic forms that occur, the following eight underlying vocalic segments are posited:

\(/i/, /e/, /a/, /y/, /\emptyset/, /\ddot{a}/, /\ddot{y}/, \text{ and } /o/\)

The "placement" of these phonemes could be roughly demonstrated by means of an abstract physiological chart, based on articulatory features as follows:
As phonological classes are in general broader, more abstract categories than the phonetic classes, only the grossest, most fundamental features that serve to differentiate between the classes need be indicated. This results in fewer distinctive features necessary to describe the classes. The less stringent specification needs also means that a simple binary system (+/-) is adequate to indicate values for the different features. All redundant features can be omitted, as is exemplified by the following complete distinctive feature matrix for the phonological classes.

![Physiological Chart for Vocalic Phonemes](chart.png)
As /i/ is specifiable by the features [+ high], [+ front], [- round], to distinguish it from all other vocalic classes on the phonological level, those other features which would introduce unnecessarily redundant information could be left unmarked. This reduction of features results in a simpler, more economical description.

The vocalic segments of a language can be examined from the perspective of two contrasting articulatory axes, that of placement in the mouth, and that of tongue height. In this presentation they will first be presented in terms of place of articulation, i.e., the front vowels will be considered as a class, and then the central vowels, etc. Then they will be grouped and discussed with respect to tongue height and any processes that are exclusively a result of this feature.

The following sections will deal in detail with each of the phonological classes individually. First the classes will be described in terms of their distinctive features. A list of the minimal pairs used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>ø</th>
<th>ə</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocalic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conson.</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to contrast the classes with others will be included and examples of each class of sounds as it occurs in different phonetic environments. Then a presentation of the phonological rules that result in the different predictable surface manifestations of the underlying classes will be presented. A subsequent section will discuss the rules that result in unpredictable surface forms that affect the vocalic segments as a whole class.

Front Vowels

The front vowels for this dialect consist of the following: /i/, /I/, /e/, /e/, /a/, /y/, /6/, and /oe/ phonetic forms. This group can be further divided into those sharing the feature [-round] and those with [+round]. The class of front unrounded vowels will be considered first.

Front Unrounded Vowels

The front unrounded vowels for this dialect consist of the following phonetic forms: /i/, /I/, /e/, /e/, /a/. The first two forms, /i/, and /I/ were postulated as belonging to the same phonological class, hereafter designated as /i/. The phonological class /i/ contrasts distinctively with the other front vowels. Supportive evidence is given by the following list of minimal pairs.

/pire/ pire "worse" /per/ père "father"
/il/ il "he" /el/ elle "her"
/i/ was found consistently to have the features [+high], [+front], [-round]. It occurs initially, medially and finally, pre-or post-consonantly as in /il/ île "island", /pir/ pire "worse", /ri/ rit "laughs", /pia(t)/ piastre "dollar".

In unchecked syllables, /i/ assumes the phonetic features [+high],
[++ front], [- round], for example, [di] dit "says", [i] il "he" (with loss of word final consonant), [mi di] midi "noon". In check syllables, the syllable final consonant causes slight lowering of the preceding vowel e.g., [te rIb] terrible "terrible", [i sI] ici "here", [pIr] pire "worse", resulting in the acquisition of a lowering feature, which is indicated as [+] open. This is particularly obvious before /r/. These lowering processes apply consistently to all vowel classes and will be discussed in greater detail later.

The phonological rules that derive the surface forms from the underlying representation of the phonological class /i/ are:

\[/i/ \rightarrow [i] / ___$/

Rewritten in distinctive features:

1. \[/i/ \rightarrow [+ vocalic]
+ front 
+ high 
- round 
- consonant ]/ ___$/

as in /pi/ → [pi] (tant) pis "too bad"
/pyi/ → [pyi] puis "then"
/sinjor/ → [si joer] seigneur "Lord"

\[/i/ \rightarrow [I] / ___C)$/ 

2. \[[+ vocalic
- consonantal 
+ front 
+ high 
- round 
- consonantal ] \rightarrow [+ open]/ ___[+ consonantal
- vocalic ] $

Examples of this lowering before a syllable final consonant are:

/livra/ → [lIv] livre "book"

/ma šina/ → [ma šIn] machine "machine"

/pa tita/ → [pi tIt] petite "little"
**Mid-Front Vowels**

The two front vowels occurring in the middle section of the physiological chart are [e] and [ɛ]. These two phonetic representations were assumed to be members of the same underlying phonological class designated as /e/. The distinctive features of /e/ are [+ front], [- high], [- low], [- round]. The following contrasting elements demonstrate the distinction between /e/ and other phonological classes;

/e/ occurs in all positions, initially, medially and finally, before and after consonants. As members of the phoneme, [e] and [ɛ] were found to occur in complementary distribution depending on phonetic environment. The allophone [ɛ], (it also occurs as an allophonic variant of another class of phonemes), occurs in checked syllables, where the final consonant causes a slight lowering and laxing in the articulation of the vowel. As with [ɪ], final /r/ was found to have a more noticeable lowering effect on the preceding vowel.

/e/ -» [ɛ] / ___$

The phonological rules which derive the surface forms from the underlying phonological class /e/ are as follows:

/e/ -» [e] / ___$
3. /e/ → [+ vocalic  
- consonantal  
- high  
- low  
+ front  
- round] /—[- C  
/pa se/ → [pa se] passer "to spend"
/se/ → [še] chez "at the house of"
/pe je/ → [pe je] payer "to pay"
/e ku te/ → [e ku te] écouter "to listen"
/ve ri te/ → [ve ri te] vérité "truth"
/e/ → [ε] /—[- C  

4. [+ vocalic  
- consonantal  
- high  
- low  
+ front  
- round] → [+ open]/—[- vocalic]  
/mem/ → [mˌem] même "same"
/ne gres/ → [ne grés] négresse "negress"
/el/ → [el] elle "she"
/res te/ → [rés te] rester "to live; to remain"
/sez/ → [sez] seize "sixteen"

This class of sounds, the mid-front vowels, is found to be particularly susceptible to lowering by post vocalic /r/. The physiological "location" of this class of sounds, in an only generally specificable area, with no definite physical boundaries may have some bearing on the wider range of variation. This possibility is discussed in more detail later. To account for the optional additional lowering of /e/ before syllable-final /r/, the following rule was postulated:
/e/ → [ε] /—[- r
In the phonetic alphabet, this optional lowering is indicated by the graph (v) placed under the vowel in question. This is to distinguish it from [a], with which it is homophonous, although usually [ɛ] is somewhat less open.

/pepɛr/ → [pɛr] père "father"

/rivɛr/ → [ri vɛr] rivière "river"

/rɛntu lɛr/ → [rɛn tu ɛlɛr] retourner "to return"

/ver/ → [vɛr] vers "towards"

/jɛr/ → [jɛr] hier "yesterday"

Further examples of this phonological class are:

/e/ → [ɛ] est "is"; /pe/ → [pɛ] paix "peace";

/kwɔfɛr/ → [kwɔfɛr] quoi faire "why"

/ka se/ → [ka se] cassé "broken"

/damɛn de/ → [damɛn de] demander "to ask"

Low Front Vowels

There is only one phonetic segment that has the features [+ low] and [+ front]. This element has been designated as [a]. This segment was found to contrast nondistinctively with another segment, designated as [ɔ], whose features are [+ central] and [+ low]. As the alternation between these two items is nonphonemic, and determined largely by phonetic environment and stylistic considerations, the two phones were postulated as members of the same phonological class to be designated as /a/. This phonological segment occurs in the three positions; initial, medial and
and final, pre-and-post consonantally. The surface forms of this phonological class are somewhat different from those of the other two classes of front vowels. /a/ appears to have optional alternation between [a] and [ə] in all environments except before a post-vocalic /r/ or after the semi-vowel /w/. As the [+ front] form [a] occurs in the majority of cases, it was posited as being the more basic form.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
/a/ \rightarrow [a] \\
6. [+ vocalic] \\
- consonantal \\
+ front \\
- high \\
+ low \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
/pa/ \rightarrow [pa] \text{ pas "not"} \\
/a\ pre/ \rightarrow [a\ pre] \text{ après "after"} \\
/kla\ s\ a/ \rightarrow [klas] \text{ classe "class"} \\
/a\ tra\ pe/ \rightarrow [a\ tra\ pe] \text{ attraper "catch"} \\
/ad\ mi\ re/ \rightarrow [ad\ mi\ re] \text{ admirer "to admire"}
\end{array}
\]

Two additional rules must be postulated to derive the phonetic forms of /a/ occurring after /w/ and before /r/.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
/a/ \rightarrow ([ə])/ \text{ w___} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
7. [+ vocalic] \\
- consonantal \\
+ front \\
- high \\
+ low \\
\end{array} \rightarrow \left(\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
+ back \\
+ round
\end{array}
\end{array}\right) \quad /\begin{array}{c}
- vocalic \\
- consonantal
\end{array}\right\}
\]

That is, /a/ assimilates in the features [+ back] and [+ round] to a preceding /w/. Although theoretically this form is still [+ low], due to physiological parameters---the shape of the mouth, there are in actuality no back vowels that are [+ low]. Therefore this variant of /a/ ends up
being essentially homophonous with the open mid-back vowel [ɔ], and phonetically is transcribed this way.

/ɪwa/ → [ɪwɔ] loi "law"
/pwa/ → [pwɔ] pois "green peas"
/mwa/ → [mwɔ] moi "me"

As with the other vowel classes discussed, the presence of postvocalic /r/ has a regular noticeable effect. /a/ becomes [+ central] when preceding /r/ in the same syllable.

/a/ → [a]/r

8. \[\begin{array}{c}
+ \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{consonantal}
\end{array}\] → \[\begin{array}{c}
- \text{front} \\
+ \text{front} \\
- \text{back} \\
+ \text{low} \\
- \text{round}
\end{array}\]

Again this backing is explainable in terms of physiological limitations. As [a] is the low front vowel of the class /a/ it is postulated as being articulated further back when it appears before /r/ which predictably has more effect than the consonants.

/bavrəd/ → [bəvərd] bavarder "gossip"
/pər lɛ/ → [pər lɛ] parler "to talk"
/arbrə/ → [arb] arbre "tree"

Both of these rules are optional; /a/ is found to occur as [a], or [a], except when preceded by /w/, when it becomes [ɔ]. These rules are posited to illustrate the fundamental underlying rules of the grammar.

Front Rounded Vowels

The next group of vocalic segments to be considered are those that belong to the (physiologically defined) class of front rounded vowels. These vowels possess all of the features of their corresponding unrounded
counterparts, except for being rounded. These front rounded vocalic segments are often referred to as mixed vowels because they share features of both front and back vowels.

The phonetic elements occurring in this category are [y], [ø], and [œ]. The distinctive feature matrix for these elements is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>y</th>
<th>ø</th>
<th>œ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no low front rounded vowels in this dialect. Disregarding for a minute the high, front rounded vocalic segment, we will examine the mid segments. Since [ø] and [œ] are found on the same level, the first inclination is to consider the possibility that they are members of the same phonological class. This proves to be the case in many instances. The two segments are often found in complementary distribution, the higher (closed) form, [ø], in unchecked syllables, and the lower (more open) form, [œ] in checked syllables. For example, [pø] peu "little"; [poer] peur "fear". These two phones were posited as belonging to the same phonological cases, /ø/, having the features [+ front], [- high], [- low], [+ round].

However, the closed vowel [ø] did not correspond in every case as a complementary element to the [œ]. Further examination of the data, and testing, revealed that the phonetic class [ø] is often a variant in complementary distribution with the high front rounded vowel [y]. [y] is the only phonetic segment occurring with the feature [+ high] in this class of vowels. Thus the phone [ø] was postulated as a member of the phonological class designated as /y/, and having the features [+ high],
[+ front], [+ round], when preceding /r/. This class contrasts meaningfully with other phonological segments.

The class of phonetic segments designated as /y/ is intrinsically irregular in that it has the same surface form in checked or unchecked syllables unless it precedes a syllable final /r/. When this occurs, /y/ is lowered, which results in a form that is homophonous with [ø]. This leads to an interesting complication in the description of the vocalic segments of the dialect.

The phonological rules which derive the surface forms of /y/ are:

\[
/y/ \rightarrow [y]
\]

9. \[
/y/ \rightarrow \begin{cases}
+ \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{consonantal} \\
+ \text{front} \\
- \text{low} \\
+ \text{high} \\
+ \text{round}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
/və ny/ \rightarrow [və ny] \text{venu} "came"
\]

\[
/pl y/ \rightarrow [ply] \text{plu} "rained"
\]

\[
/yn/ \rightarrow [yn] \text{une} "one"
\]

\[
/ʒyst/ \rightarrow [ʒys] \text{juste} "just"
\]

\[
/y/ \rightarrow [ø]/-r\$
\]

10. \[
\begin{cases}
+ \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{consonantal} \\
+ \text{front} \\
- \text{low} \\
+ \text{high} \\
+ \text{round}
\end{cases} \rightarrow [- \text{high}] / \begin{cases}
+ \text{vocalic} \\
+ \text{consonantal} \\
- \text{anterior} \\
+ \text{coronal}
\end{cases}
\]

\[
/dy r/ \rightarrow [dør] \text{dur} "hand"
\]

\[
/py r] \rightarrow [pør] \text{pur} "pure"
\]

In the linguistically defined Creole language of Louisiana, i.e.,
the variety written about by Broussard (1942), Lane (1935), and Morgan (1959), and exhibiting the features of a Creolized language, French /y/ has consistently become /i/ in the Creolized form. In this case these elements seem to have entered a completely changed phonological class. [i] as a surface form of the phonological class /y/ occasionally occurs in this dialect. It occurs in two different situations, as an independent variable, alternating with [y], in which case it can be traced to a phonological rule postulated to occur relatively late in the phonological cycle. Or it occurs in a few isolated instances most of the time, for example--/ty/ → [ti] tu "you". In the latter cases, it makes sense to postulate that there has been a complete shift in these few lexical items, and they now would contrast phonemically with their (historically) previous class, should a new lexical item develop, or have developed in the slot they have vacated. In either case, this description postulates that the dialect system under consideration has retained its original phonological contrasts for the class /y/ on this particular point.

Another possible explanation of [y] / [i] alternation is that given the dialect-leveling that seems to be going on, both of the forms, from different systems, are in free variation, the Creole influence providing the unrounded form, in a few particular lexical items and a different variety (Acadian perhaps) of French providing the rounded form.

If a shift is occurring, the direction of the change might be indicated by the direction of an alternation such as this.

Directly contradictory processes are demonstrated by the observation that /y/ sometimes becomes [+ back] when in the environment of a [+ back] [+ high] vowel ([u]). The expression in which this most often occurs in the dialect is de tout "not at all". /dy tut/ → [du tu]. This form
occurs in the speech of several of the informants, but so do the two forms derivable by the other rules, [di tu], and [dy tu]. This can probably be explained as a simple case of assimilation to the features of the following vowel.

The following rules are postulated to derive the surface variants from the phonological class /ø/.

\[ /ø/ \rightarrow [ø] / - $ \]

11. \[
\begin{array}{c}
+ \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{consonantal} \\
+ \text{front} \\
- \text{high} \\
- \text{low} \\
+ \text{round}
\end{array} / - \]

\[ /ø/ \rightarrow [pø] \text{ peu "little"} \]

\[ /vø/ \rightarrow [vø] \text{ veut "wants"} \]

\[ /vjø/ \rightarrow [vjø] \text{ vieux "old"} \]

\[ /pø \text{ tet}/ \rightarrow [pø \text{ tet}] \text{ peut être "may be"} \]

\[ /ø/ \rightarrow [oe] / -C $ \]

12. \[
\text{[+ vocalic]} \\
\text{- consonantal} \\
\text{[+ front]} \\
\text{[+ open]} \\
\text{[- high]} \\
\text{[- low]} \\
\text{[+ round]}
\]

\[ /pør/ \rightarrow [poer] \text{ peur "fear"} \]

\[ /søl/ \rightarrow [soel] \text{ seul "alone"} \]

\[ /gøl/ \rightarrow [goel] \text{ gueule "mouth"} \]

\[ /sør/ \rightarrow [soer] \text{ soeur "sister"} \]

Interestingly enough, in the data, [oe] occurs mainly before /l/, /r/, i.e., liquids, [+vocalic] and [+consonantal]. Rule 10 could tentatively be corrected as:
/ʊ/ → [oe]/______________{r}/$

13. [+ vocalic
- consonantal
+ front
- high
- low
+ round] → [+open] /_________ [+ consonantal] $ [vocalic
+ consonantal]

/ʊ/ is optionally unrounded preceding a syllable final nasal consonant.

/ʊ/ → ([ɛ])/______________ ĉ

14. [+ vocalic
- consonantal
+ front
- high
- low
+ round] → ([ - round])/_________ [+ consonantal] $ [vocalic
+ nasal]

/z̃n ə/ → [zeנ] jeune "young"

The lexical item /z̃nə/ consistently has this surface form. This could simply be an isolated lexical change, in which case the item could simply be listed in the grammar as an exception. However, as the same [- round] feature also occurs in /y/, it could eventually result in a total class change. More work must be done on this point to investigate the trends in the language today.

In traditional phonetic and phonological descriptions the phonetic sign /ʊ/ has always represented a more closed sound than the /oe/. Physiologically, this sound is articulated higher in the oral cavity than is the other. In this case and in all the other phonological classes, the closed form seems to be the more fundamental of the two, and is therefore posited as the underlying category. The more open sounds in this dialect are generally the result of some environmental influence—usually a neighboring consonant, motivating feature changes which result in the secondary
forms. Although the differences between [ø] and [oe], are sometimes almost imperceptible, /ø/ was postulated as the underlying class in the interest of consistency with the rest of the description, where the more closed form is considered basic.

**Back Vowels**

The class of back vocalic segments for this dialect includes the phonetic forms [u], [o] and [œ]. These three items all contain the feature [+ round]. In terms of a distinctive feature matrix they are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>u</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>œ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The phone [u] was postulated as being the sole member of the phonological class /u/. This autonomy of this class is demonstrated by these contrast items:

/\u/ → [u] òù "where"
/\o/ → [o] au "to"
/\a/ → [a] â "at"

15. /\u/ → [+ vocalic]
        - consonantal
        [+ high
        [+ back

/\u/ → [u] òù "where"
/pul/ → [pul] poule "chicken"
/vule/ → [vule] voulaît "wanted"
/žur/ → [žur] jour "day"
/mu tan/ → [mu tän] mouton "sheep"

The above rule for the phonological class /u/ was postulated as being the basic underlying rule for the speakers of the dialect. There is, in addition, an optional rule which lowers and diphthongizes the vowel.

/u/ → ([u];)

16. [+ vocalic] [+ high] [+ vocalic] [+ high]
   [- consonantal] [- low] [- consonantal]
   [+ back] [+ back]

/u bli je/ → [ou bli je] oublier "to forget"

/bon zür/ → [bô źür] bonjour "hello"

This seems to occur mostly in unchecked syllables, but as the second example indicates, there can be a final consonant in the underlying structure that has been lost by a final consonant deletion rule that operated on the representation at an earlier stage. This rule must be seen as subsuming two which apply in this order: lengthening then diphthongization.

The two phonetic forms [o] and [O] were found to occur more or less consistently in complementary distribution, and consequently were posited as being members of an identical phonological class, designated as /o/.

The closed phonetic form [o] occurs predominantly in unchecked syllables and the open variety [O] in checked syllables.

/o/ → [o] /

17. /o/ → [+ vocalic] [+ back]
   [- consonantal] [- high]
   [+ high]
   [- low]

/bo/ → [bo] beau "beautiful"

/ka po/ → [ka po] capot "coat"
When /o/ occurs in a closed syllable, it becomes more open.

\[ /o/ \rightarrow [3] / \_ \ C \]$ 

18. \[
\begin{bmatrix}
+ \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{consonantal}
\end{bmatrix} 
\rightarrow 
\begin{bmatrix}
+ \text{open} \\
- \text{vocalic}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

For example:

\[ /\text{pro}\ddagger/ \rightarrow [\text{pro} \ddagger] \text{ proche} \text{ "almost"} \]

\[ /\text{nu} \ddagger \text{zot}/ \rightarrow [\text{nu} \ddagger \text{zot}] \text{ nous autres} \text{ "us"} \]

\[ /\text{bros}/ \rightarrow [\text{bros}] \text{ brosse} \text{ "brush"} \]

The lower, less tense form often diphthongizes as did the phonetic variant of /u/.

\[ /o/ \rightarrow ([o]\ddagger) / \_ \]$ 

19. \[
\begin{bmatrix}
+ \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{consonantal}
\end{bmatrix} 
\rightarrow 
\begin{bmatrix}
+ \text{vocalic} \\
+ \text{back}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

This occurs especially if the final consonant is a voiced sibilant. This also occurs where the sound is syllable final, for example:

\[ /\text{gro}/ \rightarrow [\text{gro}] \sim [\text{gro} \ddagger] \text{ gros} \text{ "big"} \]

These instances of nonphonemic diphthongization seem explicable in terms of stylistic variation. They occur primarily in very relaxed situations, although not exclusively.

**Schwa**

The final oral vowel to be examined is the schwa, /ə/, which forms a class quite by itself, both structurally and functionally.
There has been a considerable amount of work done on the /a/ in the recent past. Variously referred to as the "e muet," "e caduc," "e feminen," "e neutre," the schwa does not function like the other oral vowels (Schane, 1968, p. 19). The mid-central vowel /a/, was posited for the dialect under consideration as having the features [- round], [- high], [- low], [- front], [- back]. It is somewhat restricted. Unlike other vowels, it can occur only in unstressed position and it is the only vowel that can occur posttonic. /a/ can occur in only unchecked (i.e., open) syllables.

Although the /a/ is sometimes not perceptively different from other phones articulated in the same general area of the mouth, for example [ø] or [oe], there are both phonological and morphological reasons why it was posited as a separate class in the underlying representation.

**Elision and Liaison**

Although this is a strictly phonological study, it became obvious very early in the analysis that some morphological information was necessary to explain some of the basic phonological processes that occur. Two of the phonological processes that appear to be motivated almost exclusively by morphological considerations are elision and liaison. Elision could be defined (after Schane, 1968) as the suppression or dropping of a word-final vowel before another word also beginning with a vowel sound (Schane, 1968, p. 1). For example:

```plaintext
## /za ta em/ ## → ## za tɛm ##
```

Liaison is defined (also after Schane) as the linking of a word final consonant before a word beginning with a vowel sound, the consonant being otherwise mute or dropped. For example:

```plaintext
## /grand ami/#/ → ## grα tami ##
```
Traditionally considered as separate processes, Schane views elision and liaison as essentially the same process, the deletion of a segment in word final position, i.e., a final vowel is deleted before another word beginning with a vowel, and a final consonant is deleted before a following initial consonant. Schane classifies both processes under the term "truncation" (page 2). Thus, they fit more easily into a binary classification.

In this study, truncation (in particular elision), is one of the reasons for positing the underlying phonological class /ə/. Contrast with other phones articulated in the same surrounding area, and even minor (morphological) differences are valid criteria for distinguishing two separate classes of sounds. In this particular case, /ø/ and /ə/ are often not perceptibly different on an acoustic level. In terms of a distinctive feature matrix, the two classes share most features; differing only in fronting and rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ø</th>
<th>ə</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If an underlying unchecked syllable ending in schwa becomes checked, the /ə/ appears in the phonetic representations as an allophonic variant with different features than /ø/, generally fronted. Although the dialect under consideration has a restricted verbal paradigm, the stem change process is still exemplified in the system. For example, take the verb /aʃəte/ acheter "to buy". Acheter belongs to the class of French verbs that historically has /ə/ in the underlying structure of the stem. In
this class, when the personal endings are pronounced (e.g., /ons/; /e/), or the infinitive /e/, the final stem syllable of the verb remains unchecked—/ašat/ → [aš te]. However, in the singular forms, the personal verb endings have no surface manifestation and the final consonant becomes linked with the stem, checking the syllable and creating an impossible environment for the /a/. For example: /žašat + #/ → /žaš#/. /a/ → [ə] is a rule that will be discussed later. The other changes are all systematic and traceable, but are not applicable to the study at this point. As the final /a/ and the personal ending, have been dropped by rules that will be discussed below, the stem /a/ is no longer in syllable final [-stress] position, and cannot retain features [-round] and [-front], in the surface representation, without violating both of its identifying restrictions. In addition, it has assumed a stressed position. The same type of morphological processes occur in the same verb forms in the dialect under consideration. In order to account for this type of morphological patterning, it is essential to posit a class /a/ in the underlying representation.

To explain another critical morphological process, elision, discussed above, it was necessary to posit the /a/ class on the underlying phonological level. As defined earlier, elision refers to the truncation process whereby a final vowel sound is dropped or suppressed before another word beginning with a vowel (Schane, 1968). In the dialect under consideration, as in Standard French, the process occurs only in monosyllabic words ending in /a/, for example /lə/, le "the"; /mə, tə, sə/ me, te, se "me, you, him".

As in all languages, there are cases in this dialect where the contrast between certain phonetic elements in conjunction with other phones
is not clearly perceptible. Often, if measured acoustically, the two
forms will actually not have identical wave formations, but this will not
be perceivable without the use of sensitive measuring instruments. In
such cases, morphological information is often helpful in determining the
underlying classes. An example of this in the Swords dialect is the dif­
ference between /ɔpɔ eme/ je peux aimer "I can love" and /ʁapɔ ta eme/
je peux t'aimer "I can love you". The former has a surface derivation
something like this: [ɔpɔ eme]; the latter: [ʁa pɔ teme]. Although the
/ɔ/ and /a/ have imperceptibly different articulations, in the derivations,
there can be no elision between /ɔ/ and a following word initial vowel,
whereas in the latter example, elision is obligatory for /a/ before an
identical phonetic environment. The elision of the final /a/ before the
following initial vowel has caused the /t/ to link with the following ini­
tial vowel; in other words, liaison has also occurred as a result of the
elision. So although on the phonetic level the two forms /ɔ/ and /a/ are
often perceptually indistinguishable, because of their morphological pro­
properties, two separate phonemic classes had to be posited to account for
their differences.

For this dialect the phonological class schwa /a/ as posited as hav­
ing the features [- front], [- back], [- high], [- low], and [- round]
([- stress]).

/ɑ/ [lɑ] le "the" /mɑ/ [mɑ] me "me"
/tɑ/ [tɑ] te "you" /vɑ nir/ [vɑ nir] venir "to come"

/ɑ/ → [Ø] / ___, V

20. [+ vocalic]
- front
- back
- high
- round

→ Ø / ___, [+ vocalic] [- consonantal]
/ʒataem/ → [ʒə tɛm] je t'aime "I love you"
/pul da o/ → [pul do] poule d'eau "coot"

For this dialect, the schwa alternates optionally disappears when followed by a stressed V.

/ə/ → (Ø) / — (C) V
[+ stress]

21. [+ vocalic]
   - Front
   - back
   - high
   - round
   → (Ø) / — (C) [+ vocalic]
      [+ consonant.]
      [+ stress]

/va nîr/ → [va nîr] or [ v nîr] venir "to come"
/sa miz/ → [sa miz] or [z miz] chemise "shirt"

When for grammatical reasons the /ə/ appears in a checked syllable in the surface structure, for example in the vowel paradigm, it becomes [+ front].

/ə/ → [ɛ] / — C $

22. [+ vocalic]
   - front
   - back
   - high
   - low
   → [+ front] / — C$

/a ʒatə/ → [a ʒɛt] achète "buys"
/a pələ/ → [a pɛl] appelle "calls"

As this process of fronting of the schwa seems to be restricted to verb paradigms, in the total grammar of the system, the rule accounting for this would be included in the syntactical aspect of the grammar. This is another example of the interaction among the levels of language.

/ə/ alternates with several of the front vowels:
Nasal Vowels:

As the dialect under consideration is not written dialect, (although there are individuals who do on occasion write things in it, using basically a phonetic script), a particular problem is encountered in explaining certain features that historically derive from an older form that is no longer evident except in the written form. A particular case in point is the nasal vowels.

On the phonetic level there are four distinct nasal vowels that occur with varying frequency. On the physiological chart they appear as follows:

\[
/\varepsilon/ \rightarrow \{ i \} / [+\text{stress}] 
\]

23. \[
\begin{align*}
+\text{vocalic} & \rightarrow \{ +\text{front} \} / [+\text{stress}] \\
-\text{front} & \\
-\text{back} & \\
-\text{high} & \\
-\text{low} & 
\end{align*}
\]

\[
/gard\ 1\varepsilon/ \rightarrow [g\text{\textAE}rd\ l\varnothing] \text{garde-\textit{le}} \ "\text{look at it}"
\]

\[
/bu\varepsilon\ 3\ 3\ 3/ \rightarrow [b\text{\textAE}\textsc{i}\text{\textAE}\textsc{r}i] \text{boucherie}
\]

\[
/pr\varepsilon\ 3/ \rightarrow [p\text{\textAE}\textsc{r}\text{\textAE}e] \text{prenez} \ "\text{take}"
\]

\[
/p\varepsilon\ 3\ 4/ \rightarrow [p\text{\textAE}\textsc{i}\text{\textAE}]\text{ti}] \text{petit} \ "\text{little child}"
\]
These nasal vowels have the following distinctive feature specifications:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>~</th>
<th>€</th>
<th>oë</th>
<th>ō</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>front</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>round</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 4 elements cluster into 2 groups that differ from each other in the feature front. [€] and [oë] are both [+ front], and occur in free variation, although [€] is a great deal more common. [ā] and [ō] which are both [- front] also occur in free variation, about equally. This indicates that the feature round is not distinctive for these vocalic segments. The following examples support this:

[€] ~ [oë] un "a; an"
[mu tā] ~ [mu tō] mouton "sheep" [tā] ~ [tō] temps "time"

There are no high nasal vowels. Nasalization causes lowering of
[+ high] segments. /a/ is [+ front], but nasalization causes it to become [- front].

\[24. \begin{array}{c}
[+ \text{vocalic}] \\
[- \text{high}] \\
[+ \text{nasal}] \\
[+ \text{consonantal}]
\end{array} \rightarrow \\
\begin{array}{c}
[+ \text{nasal}] \\
[+ \text{consonantal}]
\end{array}\]

/\text{vin}/ \rightarrow \text{[ṽ]} \text{ vin "wine"}

As these nasal vowels contrast meaningfully with the oral vowels, they could justifiably be posited as phonological entities in their own right. This would be particularly in keeping with a truly synchronic study of the present day language and further study may indicate that this is indeed the situation. However, at the moment it seems that a more economical description of the dialect can be given by attributing the nasal vowel segments to oral vowels that have been nasalized by a neighboring nasal consonant, /m/ or /n/.

There is historical evidence that supports this conclusion. In Standard French, nasal vowels are derived from oral vowels that are nasalized by nasal consonants followed either by a non-nasal consonant, or by a word boundary (Schane; 1968). That is:

\[V \rightarrow \tilde{V}/ \begin{array}{c}
[C] \\
[#]
\end{array} \]

\[25. \begin{array}{c}
[+ \text{vocalic}] \\
[- \text{consonantal}]
\end{array} \rightarrow \\
\begin{array}{c}
[+ \text{nasal}] \\
[+ \text{consonantal}] \\
[+ \text{vocalic}] \\
[- \text{voice}] \\
[- \text{nasal}]
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
[+ \text{voice}] \\
[- \text{voice}]
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
[+ \text{nasal}] \\
[- \text{nasal}]
\end{array} \begin{array}{c}
[#] \\
[#]
\end{array}\]

In addition to this strictly historical, or comparative reason, there is some internal evidence that suggests that nasal vowels in the dialect are derived from oral vowels in the same way. Whenever an ordinarily
nasalized vowel is immediately followed by a word beginning with a vowel sound, a nasal consonant (/n/ or /m/) is linked to the following initial vowel. This would seem to indicate that a nasal consonant is in the underlying representation, although this could conceivably be traced to be effect of the nasal vowel causing an excrescent nasal consonant to appear to separate the two consecutive vocalic segments. In addition to this predictable occurrence, informants occasionally insert a nasal consonant after a nasal vowel before a consonantal segment, where there is no phonological requirement. These rules are further discussed in the section under nasal consonants.
CHAPTER V

SEMI-VOWELS

The semi-vowels are a class of segments for which there are several possible descriptions. In the dialect of Swords, there are three segments found on the phonetic level of representation that are classified as semi-vowels. These are distinguished in terms of the IPA as [ɨ], [ʉ], and [w]. Following traditional feature specifications for semi-vowels, or glides as they are often called, these segments were described as having the features [- vocalic] and [- consonantal]. The former distinguishes this class of sounds from vowels; the latter distinguishes them from consonants. In terms of a physiological chart, the semi-vowels have the following placement, corresponding to the place of articulation of the three high vowels /i/, /y/, /u/.

PHYSIOLOGICAL CHART FOR SEMI-VOWELS

66.
In terms of distinctive feature notation, the semi-vowels are distinguished by the following identifying characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>j</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>w</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vocalic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consonantal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>front</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>round</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The investigator has postulated that three classes of semi-vowels occur on the phonological level of this dialect. These are represented in IPA as /j/, /y/ and /w/. This is in keeping with other work on different varieties of Louisiana French (Conwell and Juilland, 1963; Guibebau, 1955; Morgan, 1959).

The phone [j], the palatal glide, is postulated as a member of the phonological class /j/. It has the features [- vocalic], [-consonantal], [+ front], [- back], [+ high] and [- round]. It is the only element in the class of semi-vowels that is [- round].

[j] can occur initially, medially and finally, as in the following example:

/mwa jen/ moyen "middle"
/vjen/ vient "comes"
/ma rjaž/ mariage "marriage"
/fa mij/ famille "family"
/bu tej/ bouteille "bottle"
/jer/ hier "yesterday"

When [j] occurs in a word initial position it is often traceable to a final liquid (/l/ or /r/) in the underlying representations of the preceding word. The most common example of this is with 3rd person forms of the verb avoir, to have.
This optional rule could conceivably be a construction analogous with the expression /il ia/ → [i lja] [i ja] il y a "there are (is)", but in any case, it has been extended to forms without the meaning of "there is..." This rule is described in the section on the liquid /l/.

The phone [j] may alternate with ® especially in word final position, preceded by a high front, unrounded vowel

/fij/ → [fij] ~ [fi] fille "daughter"
/fa mij/ → [fa mij] ~ [fa mi] famille "family"
/va nij/ → [va nij] ~ [va ni] vanille "vanilla"

but not in:

/travaj/ → [travaj] travail "work"

The other two semi-vowels seem to be closely related in structure and function. They are both [+ round]. /γ/ is specifiable by the features [+ front] [+ round]. It occurs syllable initially, medially, but never syllable finally as it is always immediately followed by /i/.

27. /γ/ [− vocalic − consonantal] [− consonantal − vocalic]
    [− consonantal − consonantal]
    [− front − front]
    [− high − high]
    [− round − round]

/γit/ huit "eight"
/diz γit/ dix-huit "eighteen"
/kyi zin/ cuisine "kitchen"
/syi/ suis "am"
/o žur d̪i/ **aujourd'hui** "today"

/ɪyi/ **lui** "him"

/w/ is specifiable by the features [+ back] and [+ round]. It occurs syllable initially, medially, but not syllable finally. /w/ cannot occur finally, but must be followed by a [+ vowel] segment that is [- round].

\[
/w/ \rightarrow \left[ \begin{array}{c}
- \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{consonantal} \\
+ \text{back} \\
+ \text{round}
\end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[ \begin{array}{c}
+ \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{round}
\end{array} \right]
\]

28. /wi/ **oui** "yes"
   /bwa/ **boit** "drinks"
   /mw'en/ **moins** "least"
   /dʁwa/ **droit** "right"
   /wa warɔn/ **ouaouaron** "bull frog"

When followed by vocalic segments that are [+ low], /w/ generally causes them to acquire the features [+ round] and [+ back], as discussed earlier in the section on /a/.

29. /swa/ → [swɔ] **sois** "be"
   /krwa/ → [kʁwa] **croit** "believes"
   /bwa/ → [bwɔ] **boit** "drinks"

As they are so similar, it is conceivable that /y/ and /w/ are in actuality members of one and the same phonological class—or are moving in this direction. There is a great deal of alternation between the two
forms, but the change is always towards the back of the mouth and only before /i/, the high, front unrounded vowel.

\[ /γ/ \rightarrow [w] / — i \]

29. \[ \begin{array}{c}
- \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{consonantal} \\
+ \text{front} \\
+ \text{round}
\end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
- \text{front} \\
+ \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{consonantal} \\
+ \text{front} \\
- \text{round}
\end{array} \]

\[ /pγi/ \rightarrow [pγi]~[pwI] \text{puis "them"} \]
\[ /kγi zin/ \rightarrow [kγi zin] ~[kwi zin] \text{cuisine "kitchen"} \]
\[ /friγi/ \rightarrow [friγi] ~[frwI] \text{fruit "fruit"} \]
\[ /γi t/ \rightarrow [γi t] ~[wI t] \text{huit "eight"} \]

This could be a change in the direction of English phonology which has no front rounded vowels. If this is, or is becoming the case, the following rules would be posited to describe \[ γ \] as a variant of the phonological class /w/.

\[ /w/ \rightarrow [γ] / — i \]

30. \[ \begin{array}{c}
- \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{consonantal} \\
+ \text{front} \\
+ \text{round}
\end{array} \rightarrow \begin{array}{c}
+ \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{consonantal} \\
+ \text{high} \\
+ \text{front} \\
- \text{round}
\end{array} \]

Another rule that is applicable to the front rounded semi-vowels, is the optional deletion of the semi-vowel before a final /i/.

\[ /γ/ \rightarrow (\emptyset) / — i \]

31. \[ \begin{array}{c}
- \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{consonantal} \\
+ \text{round} \\
+ \text{front}
\end{array} \rightarrow (\emptyset) \begin{array}{c}
+ \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{consonantal} \\
+ \text{high} \\
+ \text{front} \\
- \text{round}
\end{array} \]

\[ /pγi/ \rightarrow [pɪ] \text{puis "then"} \]
\[ /lγi/ \rightarrow [lɪ] \text{lui "him"} \]
This could be another effect of the creolized language, in which /ʃ/ is consistently unrounded in all environments. Or in this case it could be another instance of assimilation to the following /i/. Yet a third possible description for the semi-vowels is that except for a relatively rare /ʃ/, they do not represent their own phonological classes, but are simply allophonic variants of the vowels near which they are articulated, in conjunction with following unstressed vocalic segments. In this system, the semi-vowel that has membership in a phonological class that is specifically distinct from all of the other vocalic and consonantal classes is [ʃ]. This phonological class would have the features [-vocalic] [-consonantal], [+front], and would be designated as /ʃ/.

The other two semi-vowels and some occurrences of phonetic form [ʃ] would be posited not as having phonological independence but as resulting from a rule that causes any vocalic segment with the features [+high] and [-stress] to become [-vocalic] when preceding another [+vocalic] segment that is [+stress].

32. \[ +vocalic \]
   \[ -consonantal \] \[ -vocalic \] /\[ +vocalic \]
   \[ -consonantal \] \[ +place \]
   \[ -stress \] \[ +stress \]

For example:

/\[bjɛ\]\] bien "good"
/i\[jɛr\]\] hier "yesterday"
/\[bwɔr\]\] boire "to drink"
/\[yit\]\] huit "eight"
/\[vwa jɛ\]\] voyez "see"

The rule of semi-vowel formation as postulated has serious implications for morphological structure, in particular for syllabic structure,
because this rule results in the elimination of a syllable boundary and the merging of two syllables. This is the result of the feature [+ vocalic] becoming [- vocalic]. This causes the loss of one syllabic nucleus.

Another phonological rule for the dialect in question that is dependent at least partially on semi-vowels is that of palatization of velar stop consonants before front semi-vowels.

```
33. [+ consonantal
    - anterior
    - coronal
    - continuant
    - delayed release] → [+ coronal [+ delayed release] [- vocalic
    - consonantal] [+ front [+ round]
```

/kyi zin/ → [cción] cuisine "kitchen"

/kýir/ → [cción] cuir "leather"

This rule will later be included in a more general one that accounts for optional palatalization of all consonants before front vowels.
CHAPTER VI

LIQUIDS

Also considered separately from the consonants, and the vowels, is the class of elements referred to as the liquids, or the lateral consonants. These contain the features [+ consonantal] and [+ vocalic], thereby differing from the vocalic segments and consonant segments. The two liquids designated in phonetic alphabet by [l] and [r], can be distinguished by the following distinctive feature matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>l</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocalic</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consonantal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anterior</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuant</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed Release</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two forms are distinguishable from each other by the feature + anterior. Examples supporting the validity of these two elements as members of separate phonological classes are:

/lu/ lu "read"
/pal/ pâle "pale"
/ru/ roue "wheel"
/par/ par "by"
/lwa/ loi "law"
/pwa/ pois "green peas"
The phone [l] was posited as a member of the phonological class designated as /l/. This segment occurs initially, medially, and finally, for example:

/le se/ laisser "to leave"
/a le/ aller "to go"
/tel men/ tellement "so"
/el/ elle "she"
/ap əl/ appelle "calls"
/kre əl/ créole "creole"

34. /l/ [+ vocalic  
+ consonantal  
+ anterior  
+ coronal  
+ continuant  
- del rel]

In word final positions, /l/ is often deleted, after /i/:

/l/ → (∅)/  i _ #

35. [+ vocalic  
+ consonantal  
+ anterior  
+ coronal] → (∅)/ [+ vocalic  
- consonantal  
+ front  
+ high  
- round] _ #

For example in: /ba ri l/ [ba ri] baril "barrel"
/l/ alternates with /j/ in word final position. This occurs particularly in the third person singular masculine pronouns occurring before verbs beginning with vocalic segments.

/l/ $\rightarrow$ ([j]) / i __ # V

This has apparently been generalized to the third person plural masculine forms, with deletion of the final /s/ on these forms.

/ils on/ $\rightarrow$ [i ə] ils ont "they have"

This does not occur with the same frequency as with the singular forms, and is restricted mainly to the forms of avoir, the verb "to have."

The phone [r] is posited as a member of the phonological class /r/, which has the features [+ vocalic], [+ consonantal], [+ voice], [- anterior], [+ coronal], [+ continuant], [- nasal], and [- delayed release].

Conwell and Juillard (1963) give two surface variants for this phonological class in the dialect. One of these is the lingua-alveolar that is slightly rolled (trilled) and occurs mainly syllable initially, or intervocalically, but never in syllable final position. The other form is a dorso-velar fricative (not rolled), which occurs in any of the positions, but mostly syllable finally. They state that the two variants are in
free variation intervocally, but that the more fronted form tends to occur before front vowels, and the more backed form before back vowels. This does not seem to occur in this variety, though there is some assimilation which is not dependent upon the following vocalic segments. The /r/ in this dialect of Louisiana French is a voiced lingua-alveolar flap, which in animated speech can become trilled. However, there is essentially only one surface form to be distinguished.

37. \( /r/ \rightarrow \begin{cases} + \text{vocalic} \\ + \text{consonantal} \\ - \text{anterior} \\ + \text{coronal} \end{cases} \)

\( /r/ \) was found to be consistently (though optionally) deleted when occurring in a syllable final consonant cluster or before a syllable-initial consonant.

38. \( \begin{cases} + \text{vocalic} \\ + \text{consonantal} \\ - \text{anterior} \\ + \text{coronal} \end{cases} \rightarrow (\emptyset) / \_ \_ \$ \) \( \begin{cases} + \text{consonantal} \\ - \text{vocalic} \end{cases} \)

/\text{ne gr\text{\textipa{a}}}/ [n\text{\textipa{\textae}g}] \text{n\text{\textipa{\textae}gre} "black"

/\text{porte}/ [p\text{\textipa{\textoe}te}] \text{porter "carry"

/\text{ar bra\text{\textipa{a}}}/ [a:b] \text{arbre "tree"}

Where the /r/ is deleted to simplify a consonant cluster, the preceding vowel will undergo compensatory lengthening. This is discussed in the section on rules affecting all of the vocalic segments. Word final /r/ is optionally dropped except before words beginning with a vocalic segment: \((r) \rightarrow (\emptyset) / \_ \_ \#C\)

/\text{ply zj\text{\textipa{\textoe}r}}/ \rightarrow [\text{ply zjoer}] \sim [\text{ply zj\text{\textae}}] \text{plusieur "many"

/\text{v\textipa{\textae} nir}/ \rightarrow [\text{v\textipa{\textae} nir}] \sim [\text{v\textipa{\textae}ni}] \text{venir "to come"

At the risk of turning this into a taxonomic inventory, mention
should be made of the several instances in the data where /r/ alternated with /l/, for example in the three lexical items:

- [ar kul] alcool "alcohol"
- [pol tre] portrait "portrait; picture"
- [ple ri] prairie "prairie"

Most probably these are simply lexical changes which should be entered into the lexicon as exceptions, but they do point up the structural and functional closeness between the two elements.

In summary, the semi-vowels appear to be highly unstable in final position. This is truer of the class /r/, which causes more changes in its environment than does /l/.
CHAPTER VII

CONSONANTS

From the transcribed data it was possible to distinguish 18 elements on the phonetic level that have the features [+ consonantal] and [- vocalic], and the class of sounds called semivowels or glides, which are both [-consonantal] and [-vocalic]. These two classes are discussed in other sections.

On the phonetic level of representation, the consonantal segments are [p], [b], [t], [d], [k], [g], [f], [v], [s], [z], [ʒ], [ʐ], [h], [m], [n], [ɲ], [č], [ʒ].

Examples of these phones, as they occur in different phonetic environments are given below:

[p] [pa] pas "not"; [a pre] après "after"; [ka po] capot "coat";
[ɛg zɔp] exemple "example"
[b] [ba] bas "low"; [bwɔ] bois "wood"; [arb] arbre "tree"
[t] [ta] ta "your" [two] toi "you"; [pɔ tɛt] peut être "maybe"
[d] [dã] dans "in"; [dwɔ] doit "should"; [ma lad] malade "sick"
[k] [ka] capable "able"; [va kãs] vacances "vacation", [pak]
Pâques "Easter"
[g] [gar de] garder "keep"; [ma ga zin] magazine "magazine"; [nɛg]
ngère "Black"
[f] [fo] faut "must"; [di fi sɪl] difficile "difficult"; [oɛf]
oeuf "egg"

78.
As with the vocalic segments, it was found useful to classify the consonantal segments in terms of their placement on a physiological chart, as below. Except for nasal, each articulatory specification is divided into voiceless and voiced.

### PHYSIOLOGICAL CHART - CONSONANTAL SEGMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Lingual</th>
<th>Palato-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilabial</td>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>Alveolar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstruent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p b t d</td>
<td>k g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f v s z</td>
<td>ž Ž</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m n n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed Release</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All of the consonantal segments can be distinguished from one another with a binary system using the following set of articulatory distinctive features. The features needed to specify the consonantal segments in this dialect are, in addition to vocalic and consonantal, voice, anterior, coronal, continuant, nasal, and delayed release. The feature voice refers to whether or not the vocal cords are involved in the production of the sound. Anterior refers to the place of articulation, if the sound is articulated forward of the Palato-alveolar region which includes the consonants traditionally classified as lingua-dental, labio-dental and bilabial. The feature coronal indicates a sound that is articulated with the blade of the tongue raised above its natural mid-line, regardless of the point of articulation. This includes sounds that are traditionally classified as lingua-dental, palato-alveolar and palatal. Continuant refers to whether or not the stream of air from the lungs is obstructed, which takes care of the stop/fricative distinction. Nasal refers to whether the oral or nasal cavity is used as a resonating chamber. The feature delayed release serves primarily to distinguish affricates from stops in articulatory terms.

These eight features were found to be sufficient for distinguishing each consonant segment from every other. Elements that share more than one feature are obviously more closely related structurally than those sharing only one.

When regrouped according to shared distinctive features, it becomes easier to see the closer relationships among certain groups of segments than when they are viewed as monolithic phonemes, or undifferentiated bundless of features. Below is a complete distinctive feature matrix for the consonantal segments of this dialect, arranged according to
patterned feature sharing.

<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>ŋ</th>
<th>ŋ</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>ŋ</th>
<th>h</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vocalic</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>consonan.</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>voice</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>anter.</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>coron.</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>contin.</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>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>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>del. rel.</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>

Using distinctive features one can classify segments on different axes. One axis is according to feature specification, whether or not certain segments are similar structurally. Another is whether they are similar functionally; whether they undergo the same phonological processes in a similar fashion. In the following discussion the consonantal phonological classes will be posited first in terms of distinctive features, and then grouped loosely according to shared features. They will then be examined in terms of functional similarities, and in terms of various phonological processes which they undergo.

The criterion that was used to classify the vocalic segments of the dialect, that of place of articulator, could also have been used to classify the consonantal segments. But as these features are not as important for the class specification of consonants as are those specifying manner of articulation, the latter were used to specify the consonants. This is consistent with the vocalic analysis in that they both are specified in terms of articulatory distinctive features, although it made necessary the inclusion of additional features, thus making the analysis somewhat less economical.

**Phonological Consonantal Classes**

From the 18 consonantal classes found on the phonetic level, the
following 16 phonological classes were posited: /p/, /t/, /k/, /b/, /d/, /g/, /f/, /v/, /s/, /z/, /ʃ/, /ʒ/, /m/, /n/, /h/. This reduction by three results from the omission of the two elements containing the feature [+ delayed release], [ʃ] and [ʒ], which were found to be surface variants derived from several other categories, and one of the nasal [j], which is a variant of the underlying class /n/.

The consonantal classes were found to have much less variation on the surface level than the vocalic classes. Once the phonetic classes had been systematized, and their membership in the different phonological classes posited, it seemed more straightforward to examine them individually from the starting point of the phonological classes, rather than moving from the phonetic classes "upward" as was done with the vocalic classes. This makes the presentation not quite consistent but a bit smoother.

The following section will consist of a discussion of each of the tentatively posited phonological classes, their surface variants and their function in the overall phonological pattern of the dialect. With the consonantal segments, it is possible to distinguish two broad categories of sounds that differ on the basis of the feature [continuant]. The two classes distinguished would be traditionally referred to as the stops, those that are [- continuant], and the fricatives, those that are [+ continuant]. The affricates are excluded from this group on the grounds that they are [+ delayed release], while the other consonantal classes for this dialect are [- delayed release].

Beginning arbitrarily with the segments that are [- continuant] and [- delayed release], /p/, /t/, /k/, /b/, /d/, /g/, we find that these can be further subdivided into two classes that are distinguishable by
by the feature [+ voice]. Those that are [- voice] are /p/, /t/, and /k/, and those that are [+ voice] are /b/, /d/, and /g/. The voiceless stop consonants will be considered first.

Looking at a distinctive feature matrix for this class of phonological elements, we find that they can be distinguished from one another on the basis of the features anterior and coronal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>k</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anterior</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lexical support for positing these three as independent classes of sounds is demonstrated by the following list of contrastive pairs.

/pwa/ pois "green peas"; /tw/ toi "you"; /kwa/ quoi "what"  
/pon/ pont "bridge"; /ton/ ton "your"; /kon/ con "jerk; idiot"  
/py/ pue "stinks"; /ty/ tu "you"; /ky/ cul "backside"

The phonological class designated as /p/ has the features [+consonantal], [- vocalic], [- voice], [+ anterior], [- coronal], [- continuant], [- delayed release], [- nasal]. This class has one major allophonic variant, denoted as [p], which occurs in all positions, initially, medially and finally, and in all environments.

For example:

[pɔ] peu "little" [a praš] après "after" [kup] coupe "cuts"  
[ɛs pa ʒɔl] espagnol "Spanish" [si rɔp] sirop "syrup"

The phonological class /t/ has the distinctive features [+ consonantal], [- vocalic], [- voice], [+ anterior], [+ coronal], [- continuant], [- delayed release], and [- nasal]. It occurs in all positions, and in all environments, for example:
This class of sounds has an optional rule for affrication that applies when /t/ occurs syllable initially before high front unrounded vowels. Before these segments /t/ retains all of its features, but becomes [+ delayed release].

\[
/t/ \rightarrow ([t^s]) / \quad \$ - i
\]

39. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[+ consonantal]} \\
\text{- vocalic} \\
\text{- voice} \\
\text{+ anterior} \\
\text{- coronal} \\
\text{- continuant} \\
\text{- delayed rel.}
\end{array}
\rightarrow \left(\begin{array}{c}
\text{[+ consonantal]} \\
\text{- vocalic} \\
\text{- voice} \\
\text{+ anterior} \\
\text{+ coronal} \\
\text{+ continuant} \\
\text{+ del. rel.}
\end{array}\right) /\$ - [t^s]
\]

/ty/ \rightarrow [ti] \sim [t^s]i \quad tu "you"

/men ti/ \rightarrow [m\dot{a} ti] \sim [m\dot{a} t^s]i \quad menti "lied"

/pâti\dot{a}/ \rightarrow [p\dot{a} ti] \sim [p\dot{a} t^s]i \quad petit "little"

/tri w\dot{a}r/ \rightarrow [tir w\dot{a}r] \sim [t^sir w\dot{a}r] \quad ti\dot{a}oir "drawer"

Affrication also occurs when /t/ precedes the high front rounded vowel /y/, and the front unrounded semivowel /j/, so the above rule could be generalized to the following form:

\[
/t/ \rightarrow ([t^s]) / \quad \$ \quad \{i\}_y \quad \{j\}_j
\]
When /t/ occurs in these environments, more frequently before the last 2, especially in emphatic speech, it is optionally palatalized, thereby acquiring the features [+ delayed release] and [- anterior]. The surface form of this is written ç.

\[
/t/ \rightarrow ([ç]) / \quad $ \rightarrow \{y\} \quad \{i\}
\]

The phonological class /k/ has the following distinctive features in its basic phonetic representation:

\[
/k/ \rightarrow [+\text{consonantal}] \\
- \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{voice} \\
+ \text{anterior} \\
- \text{coronal} \\
- \text{continuant} \\
- \text{delayed release}
\]
This element occurs with these features in all phonetic environments, for example:

[kə] quand "when"; [kek tə] quelqu'temps "some time"
[ra kɔ te] raconter "to relate"; [bo ku] beaucoup "many; much"
[sɛk] sec "dry"; [my zik] musique "music"

/k/ optionally becomes palatalized in word initial position preceding the high front rounded vocalic segment /y/, or the front rounded semivowel /ɥ/.

\[
/k/ \rightarrow ([c]) \quad /\quad /\quad \{y\}
\]

43. [+ consonantal] - vocalic - anterior - coronal - voice - continuant - delayed rel
\rightarrow \left( [- delayed release] \right) \quad /\quad /\quad \left[ - consonantal \right]
\rightarrow \left[ + coronal \right] \quad /\quad /\quad \left[ + front \right]
\rightarrow \left[ + round \right]

For example:

/ky i zin/ \rightarrow [kə i zin] ~ [cə i zin] cuisine "kitchen"

/ky/ \rightarrow [kə] ~ [cə] cul "backside"

The voiced counterparts of the three consonantal segments just discussed, are /b/, /d/, /g/. These two sets differ from each other only in the feature \([+\text{ voice}].\) The following minimal pairs demonstrate that this feature is distinctive for the dialect in question:
Like the voiceless stops, these three are distinguishable from one another by means of the features anterior and coronal.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{anterior} & b & d & g \\
\text{coronal} & + & + & - \\
\end{array}
\]

The phonological class designated as /b/ has one surface form in the dialect in question, which has the features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44. /b/</th>
<th>+ consonantal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- vocalic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- continuant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ anterior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- coronal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- del. rel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This phone occurs in all positions:

[be be] bébé "baby"  [ba to] bateau "boat"
[a bi te] habiter "to live"  [ob že] object "thing"
[rɔb] robe "dress"  [ɛp ʁɛb] impossible "impossible"
The phonological class /d/ has one basic surface form that occurs in all environments. This form has the following distinctive features:

45. /d/ → [+ consonantal]
    - vocalic
    + voice
    - continuant.
    + anterior
    + coronal
    - del. release

[do] dos "back"  [d əd] dinde "turkey"
[ma lad] malade "sick"  [de za] déjà "already"
[gar de] garder "keep"  [a bi tyd] habitude "habit"

Again like its unvoiced counterpart, /d/ can optionally become affricated when preceding a high front vowel or the front unrounded semi-vowel.

/d/ → ([dI]/$ {y}j$

46. [+ consonantal]
    - vocalic
    + voice
    + anterior
    + coronal
    - continuant
    - del. rel.

/dja bļa/ → [dIba] diable "devil"  /dit/ → [dIzi] dit "says"
/dy/ → [dIy] du "of"  /di ziem/ → [dIzi Iem]

Also like /t/, when this element occurs before any of the above elements, it optionally palatalizes, in particular in emphatic speech.
Both of these rules for affrication and palatalization for the voiced and unvoiced dental obstruents can be collapsed into 2 rules that apply to both sets, as they differ only in voicing.

A /d/ that has been deleted in the phonetic representation by the rule of final consonant deletion, can optionally appear following a nasal consonant, or a nasalized vowel resulting from a nasal consonant that has been deleted.

\[ \emptyset \to ([d]) \]
\[ \begin{cases} \sim \hfill V \hfill \sim \hfill \$ \\ \sim \hfill V \hfill C \hfill \sim \end{cases} \]

50. /mon də/ → [məʊ] ~ [mən] ~ [mənd] ~ [məd] monde "people"

/pren də/ → [prə] ~ [prən] ~ [prənd] ~ [prəd] prend "takes"
In the last two forms it is almost impossible to distinguish (aurally), the difference between the nasalized vowel or the nasalized vowel and a nasal consonant when preceding the final stop consonant.

The final element of this group to be considered is /g/. This segment occurs in all positions. It has one basic surface variant which has the following features:

51. \( /g/ \rightarrow [\text{+ consonantal}] \)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{+ vocalic} \\
\text{- continuant} \\
\text{+ voice} \\
\text{- anterior} \\
\text{- coronal} \\
\text{- delayed release}
\end{array}
\]

\( [\text{g\,r\,s\,o}] \text{ garçon } "\text{boy}" \quad [\text{gro}] \text{ gros } "\text{big}" \)

\( [\text{ma\,g\,a\,z\,i\,n}] \text{ magazine } "\text{magazine}" \quad [\text{di\,s\,t\,é\,g\,e}] \text{ distinguer } "\text{to distinguish}" \)

\( [\text{n\,g}] \text{ nègre } "\text{Negro}" \quad [\text{b\,u\,g\,r\,e}] \text{ bougre } "\text{guy}" \)

When preceding a front rounded vocalic segment /y/, or /ø/, it can optionally become palatalized.

\( /g/ \rightarrow ([\text{y}]) /$ \quad \{\emptyset\} \)

52. \( [\text{+ consonantal}] \)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{+ vocalic} \\
\text{+ voice} \\
\text{- continuant} \\
\text{- anterior} \\
\text{- coronal} \\
\text{- delayed release}
\end{array}
\]

\( /\text{g\,o\,l}/ \rightarrow [\text{jo\,e\,l}] \text{ gueule } "\text{mouth; throat}" \)

The two rules for palatalization of the velar stops /g/ and /k/ could be collapsed into one rule as follows:
The next two elements to be considered are /s/ and /z/, the dental fricatives. Very few contrastive pairs were found in the data for these two items.

[ku sɛ] coussin "cushion"  [ku zɛ] cousin "cousin"

The unvoiced segment of the two appears initially, medially and finally. The rule deriving this basic form is:

54. /s/ $\rightarrow$ $\begin{bmatrix}
+ \text{consonantal} \\
- \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{voice} \\
+ \text{anterior} \\
+ \text{coronal} \\
+ \text{continuant} \\
- \text{delayed release}
\end{bmatrix}$

This is the surface form occurring in most instances, for example:

[sam di] samedi "Saturday"  [pa se] passé "past; last"
[sa ve] savait "knew"  [a se] assez "enough"
[sas] chasse "chase"  [mɛs] messe "Mass"

There is an optional rule by which a final [s] in the phonetic representation is deleted,

55. $\begin{bmatrix}
+ \text{consonantal} \\
- \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{voice} \\
+ \text{anterior} \\
+ \text{coronal} \\
+ \text{continuant}
\end{bmatrix}$ $\rightarrow$ $(\emptyset)$

as in

/tus/ $\rightarrow$ [tus] - [tu] tous "all"
The element /s/ will optionally become palatalized before the front rounded vocalic segment, /y/.

/s/ \rightarrow [\xi]/ ______ y

The same also occurs optionally when /s/ is in the environment of a palatal consonant.

/s/ \rightarrow ([\xi]) /

/z/ has the following distinctive features:

/z/ \rightarrow [+ consonantal]
- vocalic
+ voice
+ anterior
+ coronal
+ continuant /

This phonological class occurs in all positions except word initial
(in the underlying structure). It will occur word initially in the surface structure after the application of the linking rule discussed below.

/ˈbaː zwen/ besoin "need" /ˈvaz/ vase "vase"

As with /s/, /z/ palatalizes optionally when in the environment of a palatal consonant.

/z/ → ([ˈz̩])

59. [+consonantal]  
    - vocalic  
    + voice  
    + anterior  
    + coronal  
    + continuant  

    [− anterior]  
    → ([− anterior])

    [+consonantal]  
    - vocalic  
    - anterior  
    [+continuant]

/ˈʃoz/ → [ˈʃəz] chose "thing"

These two rules could be collapsed as follows:

60. [+consonantal]  
    - vocalic  
    + anterior  
    + coronal  
    + continuant  

    [− anterior]  
    → ([− anterior])

    [+consonantal]  
    - vocalic  
    - anterior  
    [+continuant]

    [+consonantal]  
    - vocalic  
    - anterior  
    [+continuant]

The next pair of consonantal elements to be considered are /ˈs/ and /ˈʃ/, which differ only in the feature [voice]. These two segments differ from /s/ and /z/, their unpalatalized counterparts, only in that they are [− anterior], or articulated somewhat further back in the mouth.

The unvoiced element of the two, /ˈʃ/, which occurs in all positions, has the following set of distinctive features:
61. /ʃ/ → [+ consonantal]
   - vocalic
   - voice
   - anterior
   - coronal
   + continuant
   - delayed release

[ʃa se] chassez "chase!" [ʃe r ʃe] chercher "to look for"

[hãʃ] hanche "haunch" [krãʃ] crache "spits"

The voiced form /ʒ/ occurs in all phonetic environments. It has the
following set of features:

62. /ʒ/ → [+ consonantal]
   - vocalic
   + voice
   - anterior
   - coronal
   + continuant
   - delayed release

[ʒã gle] jongler "to think" [ʒã tij] gentille "nice"

[aʃ] âge "age" [bu že] bouger "to move"

[le z moʃ] logement "lodging" [le ʃ linge "washing"

/ʒ/ can optionally become [- voice] when followed by a unvoiced
consonant.

63. [+ consonantal]
   - vocalic
   + voice
   - anterior
   - coronal
   + continuant
   - delayed release
   \rightarrow [- voice] / ___ (#) [+ consonantal]
   - vocalic
   - voice

/ʒə# e te/ [ʃte] - [ʃte] j'étais "I was"

/ʒã# tombe/ [ʃtobə] [ʃtobə] je tombais "I was falling"

Except for the nasal segments, the remaining consonantal segments
all share the feature [+ continuant], i.e., they are fricatives. These
will now be discussed in the order of their placement in the oral cavity, from front to back.

The first segments to be examined are /f/ and /v/. These two are identical except for the feature voice. They can be distinguished by the following set of distinctive features:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>consonantal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocalic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anterior</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coronal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>continuant</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delayed rel.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following contrastive items demonstrate that the two are indeed separate phonological classes.

[fo] faut "must"       [vo] veau "calf"
[fi] fille "daughter"   [vi] vie "life"
[fɛ] fin "end"         [vɛ] vin "wine"
[fwɔ] fois "time"      [vwɔ] voit "sees"

The phonological class /f/ has only one feature specification:

64. /f/ \rightarrow [+ consonantal]  
- vocalic  
- voice  
+ anterior  
- coronal  
+ continuant

/nɔf/ \rightarrow [nɔef] neuf "nine"
/fo to/ \rightarrow [fo to] photo "photo"
/en fan/ \rightarrow [ɛfɑ̃] enfant "child"
/a fer/ \rightarrow [a fɛr] affaire "business"
/di fi sɪl/ \rightarrow [di fi sɪl] difficile "difficult"

The phonological class /v/ occurs in all positions. It has the sur-
face form designated as [v], which has the following features:

65. /v/ $\rightarrow$ (+ consonantal)
    - vocalic
    + voice
    + continuant
    + anterior
    - coronal
    - delayed release

/vals/ $\rightarrow$ [vals] valse "walse" /vas/ $\rightarrow$ [vas] vache "cow"
/ari ve/ $\rightarrow$ [ari ve] arriver "arrive" /vy/ $\rightarrow$ [vy] vu "seen"
/vjø/ $\rightarrow$ [vjø] vieux "old" /lav/ $\rightarrow$ [lav] lave "washes"

When /v/ precedes the back semivowel /w/, it can be deleted, optionally. This applies particularly in the infinitive form of the verb "to have," avoir.

66. (+ consonantal)
    - vocalic
    + voice
    + continuant
    + anterior
    - coronal
    - delayed rel.

$\rightarrow$ (\$)/\$
    - vocalic
    - consonantal
    + back

For example:

/av war/ $\rightarrow$ [awar] avoir "to have"

If this does apply only in this case, it will have to be posited as a lexical variant, and entered in the complete grammatical description only under this item.

On the level of phonetic representation, there are three nasal segments, [m], [n], and [ŋ]. On this level these have the following set of features:
The bilabial nasal [m] was posited as being a member of a phonological class designated as /m/. This element can occur in any position, on both the phonetic and phonological levels, but some of the underlying syllable final /m/’s will not appear in the surface structure, as discussed below:

/mi jon/ → [mi jô] million "million"
/fa mij/ → [fa mij] famille "family"
/fam/ → [fam] femme "wife"
/en semble/ → [ē sām] ensemble "together"
/temp/ → [tē] temps "time; weather"

The other two nasal segments on the phonetic level were posited as predictable variants of the phonological class designated as /n/. This class has the following features:

\[ + \text{consonantal} \]
\[ - \text{vocalic} \]
\[ + \text{voice} \]
\[ - \text{continuant} \]
\[ + \text{nasal} \]
\[ - \text{delayed release} \]

The first, more basic variant occurs in all positions except before the front unrounded semi-vowel /j/, when it becomes [- anterior] and
[- coronal].

\[/n/ \rightarrow [n] / except before /j/\]

67. \([+ \text{ consonantal}] - \text{vocalic} + \text{nasal} + \text{coronal} \rightarrow [+ \text{ consonantal}] - \text{vocalic} + \text{anterior} + \text{coronal} \] / ____ - X

\[X = [- \text{ consonantal}] - \text{vocalic} + \text{front} - \text{round}\]

For example:

\[/\text{non}/ [n] \text{ non} "no" /\text{bon}/ [b\ddot{\text{o}}] \text{ bon} "good"\]

\[/\text{ba na n\ddot{o}}/ [\text{ba nan}] \text{ banane} "banana" /\text{ne}/ [\text{ne}] \text{ nez} "nose"\]

When /n/ occurs in the surface structure before the front unrounded semi-vowel /j/, it becomes palatalized:

\[/n/ \rightarrow [n] / ____ j\]

68. \([+ \text{ consonantal}] - \text{vocalic} + \text{nasal} + \text{coronal} \rightarrow [+ \text{ consonantal}] - \text{vocalic} - \text{anterior} - \text{coronal} + \text{nasal} + \text{coronal} \] / ____ \[[- \text{ vocalic} - \text{consonantal}]

\[\text{+ front} - \text{round}\]

\[/\text{es pa njol}/ \rightarrow [\text{es pa n}\ddot{\text{o}}l] \text{ espagnol} "Spanish"\]

\[/\text{swa nje}/ \rightarrow [\text{swa n}\ddot{\text{e}}] \text{ soignez} "take care"\]

This variant cannot occur in word initial position.

There is one other rule that is predictable for the nasal classes.

This accounts for deletion of a nasal segment that occurs in the underlying structure before a syllable boundary, before a nonnasal consonant, or before a word boundary, after the nasal consonant has nasalized the preceding vocalic segment. These two rules, the one of vowel nasalization preceding a nasal consonant, and the one of nasal consonant deletion are ordered.

\[V \rightarrow \tilde{V} / ____ \tilde{C}\]

69. \([+ \text{ vocalic} - \text{consonantal}] \rightarrow [+ \text{nasal}] / ____ [- \text{vocalic} + \text{nasal}] \]
For example:

/dan/ → [dan] ~ [da] dans "in"
/din do/ → [d̞̚ nd] ~ [d̞̚ d̚] dinde "turkey"
/san/ → [sâ̞n] ~ [sâ] sans "without"

In instances where the nasal consonant following a nasalized vowel in the surface structure appears, this can be explained by the second rule above not having been applied, or by the nasal consonantal segment having been introduced. This does occur, and initially was one of the motivations for positing the nasal vowels as being oral vowels in the underlying structure subject to nasalization due to phonetic environment.

The rule to reintroduce a nasal consonant following a nasalized vowel follows:

\[
\emptyset \to \left( ^{+} \text{nasal} / \tilde{V} \right) \left( \{ C \} \right) \]

The element \([+ \text{bilabial}]\) will determine whether a /n/ or /m/ will be inserted in the surface structure. This is a necessary addition, as nasal consonants are homorganic with following consonantal segments.

With the application of this rule, the following surface variations
result:

/bon/ → [bɔ̃] ~ [bɔ] bon "good"
/dans/ → [dã] ~ [dã] dans "in"
/sem blɔ/ → [sãmb] ~ [sãb] semble "seems"

In addition to the predictable, nasalization discussed above, there is also a good deal of partial nasalization of vocalic segments that occur adjacent to nasal consonants, even when the other conditions for true nasalization are not present. This partial nasalization occurs in vocalic segments preceding or following the nasal consonant, or both. For example:

/kɔ̃ ne/ → [kɔ̃ nɛ] ~ [kɔ̃ nɛ] connaître "knows"
/dɔ̃ nɛ/ → [dɔ̃ nɛ] ~ [dɔ̃ nɛ] donner "to give"

Although not exclusively, this seems to occur in lexical items that historically have double nasal consonants in the underlying representation, which could possibly account for the nasal feature in both syllables. The double nasal C's are maintained in the orthographic system of Standard French, but phonologically speaking, double nasals no longer occur in the language.

The glottal voiceless fricative, /h/ is the last consonantal element to be examined. As this segment occurs rarely, and exclusively before word-initial low V, one way of accounting for its unpredictable phonological behavior was to postulate an underlying /h/ before every word initial vocalic segment that would appear in the surface representation only in the individual lexical items that historically have an /h/ in this position. That the /h/ would occur only before vowels with the feature [+ low] is predictable physiologically. As the /h/ is articulated in the back quadrant of the oral cavity, which actually has no high area, although on physiological charts it is given one, /h/ would tend to occur mostly be-
fore these elements.

\[
/h/ \rightarrow [h] / \ # \varepsilon \{a\}
\]

72. \[
\begin{array}{c}
+ \text{consonantal} \\
- \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{voice} \\
- \text{anterior} \\
- \text{coronal} \\
+ \text{continuant} \\
- \text{delayed release}
\end{array}
\rightarrow
\begin{array}{c}
+ \text{consonantal} \\
- \text{vocalic} \\
- \text{voice} \\
- \text{anterior} \\
- \text{coronal} \\
+ \text{continuant} \\
+ \text{delayed rel}
\end{array}
\] / # \[+
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vocalic} \\
- \text{consonantal} \\
+ \text{low}
\end{array}\]

\[
/hont/ \rightarrow [h\text{ont}] \quad \text{honte} \quad "\text{shame}"
\]

\[
/ha\text{le}/ \rightarrow [ha\text{le}] \quad \text{haler} \quad "\text{pull}"
\]

\[
/ho/ \rightarrow [ho] \quad \text{haut} \quad "\text{high}"
\]

Although this may be getting somewhat into the metaphysical, a generative model attempts to describe the "inner workings" of the competence of the speaker, in a way that works, though this explanation may have no ultimate basis in reality. What actually transpires in the use of language is probably no less bizarre. For example, how do speakers who have never seen their language written "know" that historically a lexical item contained an /h/ or an /n/ that is no longer produced, but whose effect is still evident.
CHAPTER VIII
GENERAL RULES AFFECTING WHOLE CLASSES OF SEGMENTS

There are a number of phonological rules that affect the consonantal or vocalic segments as units. These are generalized from the individual rules that were found to apply consistently to all elements in the different classes. This section will be a discussion of these general phonological rules. The rules applying to the vocalic segments will be considered first, then those dealing with the consonantal segments.

General Rules Affecting Vocalic Segments:

In this dialect, there are a number of phonetic environments that affect the vocalic segments in the same, predictable fashion. An explanation of this phonological behavior fits under the rules for each individual element, but can be generalized for the whole class of segments. Several of these rules make up part of the basic set of rules to derive the surface representations from the underlying ones, but some of them are rules that apply at a later point in the derivation and are not part of the core set. These rules will be written in notation that does not specify individual vowels.

The most obvious of the rules is that of lowering (or opening) of a vowel in a checked syllable. This is known in the literature as the "law of position," first discussed by Phillips (1945). This rule applies to all of the classes but is most perceptible in the mid vowels. This is
due to physiological reasons. The vocalic segments having the feature 
[+ mid], or in the binary system, [- high] and [- low], have a greater 
range than the elements having the features [+ high] or [+ low]. In the 
latter cases, the range of articulation is limited in at least one direc­
tion (up or down) by definite physical parameters. The mid vowels are 
not subject to these boundaries, and as a result, their range of varia­
tion is relatively greater than that of the high or low vowels. There­
fore the mid-segments can theoretically be relatively higher and lower 
than their high and low counterparts. This variation is restricted, cer­
tainly, by some physiological parameters, but is governed more by percep­
tual boundaries: what is sufficiently different from the other sounds to 
avoid semantic ambiguity becomes significant. If the range of phonologi­
cal variation is not distinctive, it will not lead to misinterpretation. 
However it is widely exploited for the purposes of stylistic variation.

The rule for lowering in a checked syllable is as follows:

\[(73a) \quad V \to [+ \text{open}] / \quad \_\_\_ \quad C$\]

An extension of this rule is that of further lowering by a postvo­
calic /r/. This rule affects all vocalic segments to some extent.

\[(73b) \quad V \to \left[ + \text{open}\right]/ \quad \left[ + \text{consonantal}\right] \quad \left[ + \text{vocalic}\right] \quad \left[ - \text{anterior}\right] \quad $\]

In addition, post vocalic /r/ can optionally cause lengthening of 
the preceding vocalic segment.

\[73. \quad V \left[ + \text{open}\right]/ \quad \left[ + \text{consonantal}\right] \quad \left[ + \text{vocalic}\right] \quad \left[ - \text{anterior}\right] \]
This rule applies before that of /r/ deletion, as in the following examples:

/par le/ → [pa:r le] ~ [pa: le] parler "to speak"
/ar br³/ → [a:r b ] → [a:b] arbre "tree"
/per dr³/ → [pɛ:rd.] ~ [pɛ:d] perdre "to lose"

Nasalization is another process that applies to every vocalic segment preceding a nasal C. Nasalization can be obligatory, when all of the conditions for the rules are met, or optional.

74.

V → ~ / ___ ~ 

C

#

In optional nasalization, because of nasal phonetic environment, the adjacent vocalic segments assimilate to the nasal consonant.

75.

V → (V) /

{ ~ C ~ }

There appears to be a trend in the dialect under investigation of producing unrounded free variants of the front rounded vowels.

76. [+ vocalic]

+ round

+ front

→ ([- round])

/y/ → [i] ; /va ny/ ~ [va ni] venu "come"

/ty/ ~ [ti] tu "you"

/ø/ [ɛ] ; /zøn/ ~ [zɛn] jeune "young"

/søl/ ~ [s’h] seule "only"

or with the front rounded semivowel /y/ :
Again this could be lexical variation, but it seems more likely, since the two forms do occur in the data for the same speakers, that either there is a trend in the language towards unrounding front vowels, or that there are several dialectal variants here. The first explanation could indicate a change in the direction of English language phonological rules. In the second, we would have to look to the different varieties of Louisiana French to decide what exactly is occurring.

General Rules Affecting Consonantal Segments

Perhaps the most obvious phonological rule affecting this class of segments is the one predicting the loss of word final consonants.

77. \( C \rightarrow \emptyset / \# (-V) \)

Again introducing morphological consideration, this will apply in every instance unless the following word begins with a vocalic segment. If the following segment is vocalic, liaison will occur, so that in the surface representation, the final consonant will become the initial consonant of the following word. In addition, a [+ voice], [- continuant] consonant will become [- voice], and an [- voiced] [+ continuant] will become [+ voice]:

78. \( C \quad \# \quad V \rightarrow \# C \quad V \)

\[
\begin{align*}
&[\text{[- voice]}] \\
&[\text{- [continuant]}] \\
&/\text{gran d\# om}/ \\
&/\text{sis \# ans}/ \\
&/\text{sez \# ans}/
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&[\text{[+ voice]}] \\
&[\text{- [continuant]}] \\
&/\text{grand homm\#e "big man"}/ \\
&/\text{six ans "six years"}/ \\
&/\text{seize ans "sixteen years"}/
\end{align*}
\]
This rule is subject to morphological constraints in that words in certain functional relationships with each other may not link. This is beyond the scope of this paper.

In surface forms where a final consonant appears, it is necessary to postulate an underlying vocalic segment, the schwa /ə/. This form is deleted, leaving the consonant in final position, which is then subject optionally to deletion.

Consonant Clusters:

Consonant clusters that occur on the phonological representation of this dialect are as follows: /tr/, /pr/, /kr/, /dr/, /br/, /gr/, /kl/, /pl/, /gl/, /bl/, /fr/, /vr/. These all occur initially, and medially, but not finally, unless followed by a schwa in the underlying structure. In terms of phonological properties, the second element must always be a liquid.

/ tren / train  "train"  / a tra pe / attraper  "to catch"
 / pro ʃ / proche  "almost"  / kra ʃ / crache  "spits"
 / e tre / etre  "to be"  / sem blə / semble  "seems"

There is a marked tendency for consonant clusters to simplify in syllable final position, by deleting the liquid element,

79. $\left[+\text{vocalic} \atop +\text{consonantal}\right] \rightarrow \emptyset / \left[+\text{consonantal} \atop -\text{vocalic}\right]$

This rule can be applied only after the rule that deletes a post-tonic schwa has been applied, i.e.,

(1) $\emptyset / \rightarrow \emptyset / \_ \_ \_ \#$
(2) $\left[-\text{vocalic} \atop -\text{consonantal}\right] \rightarrow \emptyset / \_ \_ \_ \#$
Another type of consonant-cluster simplification results from the insertion of an excrescent vowel, generally a schwa, between the two members of the cluster.

80. $\emptyset \rightarrow \partial \left[ \begin{array}{c} + \text{consonantal} \\ - \text{vocalic} \\ - \text{continuant} \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \partial \left[ \begin{array}{c} + \text{vocalic} \\ - \text{consonantal} \end{array} \right]$

/brə/ $\rightarrow$ [bɔ̃ra] bras "arm" /gran də/ $\rightarrow$ [ɡɔ̃rã] grand "big"

This changes the syllable structure of the lexical item.

**Palatalization**

The final general rule to be considered is that of palatalization of initial dental consonants before high front elements.

81. $\left[ \begin{array}{c} + \text{consonantal} \\ - \text{vocalic} \\ + \text{anterior} \\ + \text{coronal} \\ - \text{del. rel.} \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[ \begin{array}{c} + \text{anterior} \\ / \# \\ - \text{consonantal} \\ + \text{del. rel.} \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \left[ \begin{array}{c} - \text{low} \\ + \text{front} \end{array} \right]$
CHAPTER IX

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

On Problems Inherent in the Study of Louisiana French:

In addition to the predictable linguistic problems, there are several other obstacles encountered in attempting a linguistic analysis of present day Louisiana French dialects, problems that are due specifically to nonlinguistic causes. Historically, there are three separate varieties of French, each derived from different sources and each arriving on the scene at different times and under different conditions. Traditionally, the greatest differences between varieties have been between Colonial French and Acadian French on the one hand, and Creole on the other. Although blending of the three varieties has occurred to different degrees in different areas of the state, the original disparity still plays a role.

It is not always clear when variation within the dialect of one area, or the idiolect of one individual should be attributed to historical, sociological or purely linguistic causes, or to an interaction of the three.

On a more immediate level, three specific complications must be pointed out. First, although in many areas French still serves to a great extent as the intracommunity language, fulfilling all or most linguistic requirements of the "over 40" segment of the population, it is rarely an intercommunity language. People from one area visiting or...
doing business in another area will tend to use English as the common language, unless they are dealing with family, or friends, or people with whom they have previously established a bond that is in a sense manifested by the use of French. Secondly, French is usually restricted to particular situations, such as social gatherings or places where the same close groups would go together. Otherwise, English is used, in general when there are monolingual English speakers present.

The third point is the most complex and has the most far-reaching effects. French in Louisiana is gradually losing ground to English, though not quite so rapidly as some scholars would have us believe. As early as the late 1800's, writers were predicting the demise of the French language in the State (Fortier, 1885; Lane, 1934), but at the present it is still quite strong in certain areas, in particular rural sections.16

As there are no French language newspapers, and no French radio stations, and as there is little official support for the indigenous French language and heritage,17 there is little opposition to the ever-encroaching Anglo-American culture and language, with all of its ancillary manifestations.

With the increase in use of the English language, it becomes easier and easier for the native French speaker to substitute English words, phrases, even paragraphs into his French conversations and interactions, as there is little danger of being misunderstood. This type of bilingualism must eventually lead to loss of the less dominant language, though not without leaving some residue.

An additional complicating factor is the question of when people acquire their knowledge of French. In the French speaking parts of the State, most of the "over 40" group are native speakers; French is their
first language. However, many of the younger people who are fluent in French have learned it after reaching adulthood. French is for them a second language. This has significant implications for the grammatical systems that are being internalized by these speakers, and which they will transmit to other learners. This also has implications for the status of French in Louisiana. Very often French will be learned by an adult in order to facilitate his assimilation into a particular segment of society.¹⁸

All of these factors—the already present differences due to separate historical and linguistic origins, and the sociolinguistic significance these multiple variations might assume, compounded with the penetration of the English language results in an incredibly complex linguistic situation (Cf. Tentschoff, 1975). All of these influences will inevitably affect the basic core structures of the different varieties, if each has a different set. Where influences have only been partial, they greatly complicate the interpretation of the linguistic variation.

This paper has attempted to describe systematically the segmental units of the phonological component of the dialect of Louisiana French spoken in Swords, Louisiana. The study has postulated a fairly consistent underlying system that does include, however, numerous rules for optional variation.¹⁹ Although based on a limited sampling of informants, the study can be generalized to other speakers living in the same area who share the same cultural and demographic backgrounds.

The study indicates that the phonological aspect of the dialect is fairly close to the dialect described by Conwell and Juillard (1963), but contains more prominent secondary articulations such as palatalization, affrication and diphthongization.
As the analysis is meant to describe the shared underlying phonological rules, and not individual idiosyncrasies, although these must be taken into consideration, a more representative sampling would be needed to account systematically for all of the predictable variation in the dialect.

If the organization of the analysis is somewhat erratic, it is because at this point there are still too many variables that have not been accounted for. As more studies of this nature are done, a fuller comprehension of the current linguistic situation in French Louisiana will be achieved. Hopefully this study has contributed something towards that understanding and appreciation.
FOOTNOTES

1
Colonial French is also referred to in the literature as Louisiana French (Loupe, 1932; Fortier, 1891; Broussard, 1942), Standard Louisiana French (Morgan, 1959; Phillips, 1945; Lane, 1934), "French" French (Durand, 1930), dialectal French (Viator, 1935), Creole (Read, 1931), Creole French of New Orleans and Baton Rouge (Tisch, 1959), and "Domestic" French (Tentschoff, 1975), among others.

2
Standard French is defined in the literature in a number of different ways. In this study, the expression refers (after Tentschoff, 1975) to the currently most prestigious form of the language at any time. This is generally the form of the literary standard.

3
Acadian French is also commonly called Cajun French (Durand, 1930; Loupe, 1932; Viator, 1935; Lane, 1935; Phillips, 1945; Tentschoff, 1975).

4
Of the Germans who settled in Louisiana among the Acadians, almost the only German trace that remains is some family names, many of which have assumed French phonological shape, for example LeBranche from Zweig; Hymel from H·mmel (Deiler, 1909).

5
This variety is called Creole (Broussard, 1942; Loupe, 1932; Morgan, 1959; Phillips, 1945; Bourgeois, 1927; Jarreau, 1931; Tinker, 1936; Perret, 1933; Mercier, 1880; Fortier, 1891). It is also known as Negro-French (Lane, 1935): Patois-nègre (Tisch, 1959); Gombo, Kuri-vini, patois, nèg (Tentschoff, 1975).

6
There are innumerable definitions of the term Creole, differing in terms of ethnic, historical or linguistic perspectives (Oukada, 1977; Hintze and Oukada (to appear). The explanation herein is based on De-Camp (1971).

The term Creole, from Portuguese crioulo, originally meant a white man of European descent born and raised in a tropical or semitropical colony. It was later extended to include descendants of indigenous natives and others of non-European origin. From a linguistic point of view, the term Creole was applied to languages spoken by Creoles in the Caribbean and on the West African coast, and later extended to other languages of similar types.
A creole language is generally considered to have evolved from a pidgin, i.e., a minimal language which functions as an auxiliary contact language. A pidgin is by definition no one's first language; a creole is the native language of most of its speakers. A pidgin language is greatly simplified lexically and structurally. A creole, on the other hand, by assuming the status of a full fledged native language of a community, must extend its syntax and vocabulary to fulfill all of the linguistic needs of its speakers. Most of the better-known creole languages are based at least in lexicon on European languages: English, French, Portuguese or Spanish, or some combination thereof.

7
This is a rough guess as the community is too small to appear in any of the demographic indices of Louisiana.

8
According to Chomsky and Halle (1968), at least two conditions of adequacy must be met by any grammatical description. The explanation must allow clear and explicit presentation of the data, and it must go beyond the actual data in depth and scope. It must allow significant and true generalizations based on the description that go beyond what ever amount of data is analyzed.

For example if in the data /t/ and /d/ are usually affricated before high front vowels, but not before low or back vowels, it can be postulated that affrication will be predictable in these particular environments, and not the others. This one rule will account for all instances of affrication when they occur, without having to list each instance individually.

9
The investigator is greatly indebted to Sanford Schane. Parts of this analysis follow quite closely his works on Standard French (1968) and generative phonology (1973). Without these models the work would have progressed much more slowly.

10
The investigator wishes to express her gratitude to Larbi Oukada. Without his constant help and encouragement this paper may never have been a reality.

11
This morphological distinction between [a] and [ø] is based on Schane (1968).

12
Following the approach Schane (1968) used in the analysis of French phonology, the investigator has posited the existence of at least two types of phonological rules, those that apply automatically in the derivation of the surface representation from the underlying structures, for example, all vocalic segments become [+ open] in the phonetic environment —C$ This has been postulated for this dialect as a fundamental rule in deriving the allophonic variants of any vocalic segment (whether it is actually perceptible or not), and is referred to as the "law" of position.
(Phillips, 1945). On the other hand, certain phonetic environments will affect only particular vowels in certain ways. This behavior can be predictable or optional, but in either case it is not part of the basic body of rules that specifies a particular phonological element. This type of rule will be applied only after the basic functions have been completed. For example, /w/ preceding a vowel often causes the following vowel to acquire the feature [+ round] /pwa/ \(\rightarrow\) [pwa] \(~\) [pwo] pois "green peas" /bwa/ \(\rightarrow\) [bwa] \(~\) [bwo] boit "drinks".

As an example of a rule applying at a later stage in the derivation, consider the effect of post-vocalic /r/ on the preceding vowel. The /r/ consistently lowers a preceding V occurring in the same syllable.

/rat/ \(\rightarrow\) [ra] rat "rat"

/sar/ \(\rightarrow\) [sar] char "car"

As this occurs even when the final /r/ is dropped, the change obviously takes place before the rule of final C deletion applies.

13 When /a/ occurs in stressed position, it assumes the features of [ø]:

/fet la/ \(\rightarrow\) [fet 1ø] faîtes-le "do it"

14 Following Schane (1968), this change is considered to be morphologically motivated. In actuality it results from a change in stress, and subsequently juncture, which are phonological phenomena.

15 To arrive at the surface form [a:b], there are two applications of rule 36 /ar bea/ \(\rightarrow\) [arb] \(\rightarrow\) [a:b], one to delete final post consonantal /r/ after the final /a/ is dropped, then one to delete preconsonantal /r/.

16 The investigator was told by informants that in many areas as large as Opelousas and Eunice, it is almost necessary to be bilingual to get a job in a store, or agency that deals with the general public. This indicates that the French language is still very much used in these areas.

17 Louisiana French is being taught on the high school level in Crowley, Acadia Parish by Mr. Charles Faulk. A course in Louisiana French language and culture will be initiated at Louisiana State University in the fall of 1977.

Although purporting to support Louisiana French, the Council for the Development of French in Louisiana (CODOFIL), is bringing in teachers who teach continental French. This does little good for the speakers of Louisiana French, and could in fact be harmful. By introducing other
kinds of French, they are simply promulgating the traditional implicit assumption that Louisiana French is inadequate and inferior.

18
I wish to thank Larbi Oukada for discussion of these factors.

19
This is not to imply that these rules have any psychological reality in the minds of the speakers. They are merely one possible model postulated to describe a very small segment of their linguistic competence.
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APPENDIX
APPENDIX

These sample tests were selected to illustrate the phonological rules posited by the study. They are not meant to represent coherent segments of conversation.

Informant 1

ai ën mutə e difisIł ply difisIł kən bèt
ai un mouton est difficile, plus difficile qu'une bête

ën bèt kã ti li ën ñik u ël êe êl vø
une bête quand tu lui donne un shick où elle e, e veut

pa ël kraš fo ti li fe ën ñik kɔm ê vø
pas elle crache. Et faut tu lui fait un shick comme elle veut
....kã ël a pgrédy sa ñik ê ñik pa ël e
....quand elle a perdu sa shick elle shick pas elle est

malad e sa va la fər murI...
malade et sa va la faire mourir...

....ël marš sa krwɔ ël ave dɔne la ñik avek la
elle marche je crois elle avait donné la shick avec la

mɔs a bale...i vjɛ mʃɡrʃe - di kɛ sɔ: dɔ dɔk toe:r
manche à balé...il vientme chercher-dit quelle sorte

vu ave. kɔne pa i dzi
de docteur vous avez - connais pas il dit

Informant 3

la verite nɔ pa dɔ ŋsɔs
la vérité n'apas de chance

Informant 2

sa se bɔ nɔ
ça c'est bon, non
Informant 4

sa se grou bô
ça c'est gros bon

Informant 1

a ja ave ŋn vaš i vule së pias pu la
a ily avait une vache-îl voulaït cent piastres pour la
vaš - tši vwo la vaš...štole pa dône wësë
vache - tu vois la vache...jetolé pas donné vingt-cinq
pias pu - i ja dã la mezo de balô
piastres pour - il ya dans la maison des ballon
kâ ẓeï râtuljer - tu kône kô ave ñue
quand ye (j'âi) retourné tu connais qu'on avait tué
la vaš...e li a di - a ta pase isIt
la vache...et lui a dit - a t'as passé ici
a loer - si tši vule pa la vaš vu mëse
a l'heure - si tu voulaïs pas la vache vous me laissez
kôns - me żâ di...tro dâ kawz deza
connaitre - mais je dis...trop de cows déjà
ê ste vre
et c'était ce té vrai

Informant 2

mẽ o gard tu bjê kã mê
mais on garde tout bien quand même

Informant 6

sô kô mo, mwo ŋa mâ sã pa bjê....
sans que moi, moi je me sens pas bien...
boku move dâ mô bâra
beaucoup mauvais dans mon bras

Informant 7

lei mën pa:l tãto pa:l
les monde parle tantôt parle
Informant 6

kwa i di - l a jape bwɔʁ
quoi il dit - a, il apé (est après) boire

Informant 3

me se dlo kilape bwɔʁ:
mais c'est de l'eau qu'il apé (est après) boire

Informant 6

...il a mäti - il a di kekʃuz dɔ:t - kwɔ
il a menti - il a dit quelquechose d'autre-quoi

Informant 3

mwa ŋatadi i jadi ileme...
moi j'entendu il a dit il aimait...

kɔpã ʒe sa ŋatãdi
comprendre rien, ça j'entendu

matã sɛt ɗ drag...
matin c'est un drug...

Informant 5

eri tu krwo ɗne tru mizɛrab
eri tu crois on est trop miserable?

Informant 6

wei, sa se tru pouv, mo žalu se žɔ
ouï, ça c'est trop pauvre, mo jaloux ces gens

riš; źɛ dɔ riš
riches; gens de riche

Informant

vremɑ̃ ti kɔne kwɔ ʒe i di a ti neg - si
vraiment tu connais quoi j'ai dit à tit neg - si

ʒame mwaža moe:r e ty rmari mwa
jamais moi je meurs et tu remaries - moi
za va mregarde i va dir wi u non...
je va me regarder il va dire oui ou non...
il a mi jenot nègres
il a mis une autre nègresse

Informant 5
il a ê soer ki pa marie, non
il a une soeur qui pas mariée, non?

Informant 4
nô, ê se la soel soer al a - e sa
non une c'est la seule soeur elle a et ça
marije...
mariée...

Informant 6
i jên soer...
il y a une soeur

Informant 7
i jên soer ki vi dâ la fami
il y a une soeur qui vit dans la famille

Informant 6
me la soer e marie li tu - i ja
mais la soeur est mariée li too - il y a
dezôme, ta źyst źublije...sa
des années...tu as juste oublié...sa
marije a lak źarl
mariée à Lake Charles

The following examples are drawn from the sentences used to check the rules:
don mwê la moćje
donne-moi la moitié.
cũ pra ñ sala; ñje pra ñ sula
tiens prends cela (ça là)

$t$i pø la wɔ:r a stø
tu peux le voir à cette heure (maintenant)

sa pël e d$ø
ce pain-là est dur

lo e boku pø:r
l'eau est beaucoup pur

d$zi mwɛ kã t$i sra pare
dis-moi quand tu sera prêt

$ska t$i pa:l à krew:el
est-ce que tu parles en créole?

komã ñi fe sa
comment tu fais ça?

šã krew ile šãsø
je crois il est chanceux

il a pa d šaus dutu
il a pas de chance de tout

žã lem pa ditu
o je l'aime pas du tout

žem pa džy mæze bryle d$ži tu
j'aime pas du manger brulé du tout

ele av arõže ñ gr$u dežene
elle avait arrangé un gros déjeuner

žei gon avõ katrö:
j'ai gone avant quatre heures

žø mave deža lave smatïn
je m'avais déjà levé ce matin

el se marije žën
elle s'est mariée jeune

ste ñ dejo: dla mezø
c' était (ceté) en dehors de la maison

že bozwɛ sala
j'ai besoin (de) cela

mele ñ ho
mets les en haut
sa séd larke! pór
ça s'est de l' alcool pur
la frér a ju ë bātā
le frère a eu un bon temps
i ste āsām
ils étaient (ils té) ensemble
ž̄a va vne ply ta:
je va venir plus tard
il ełev de patat e dźy mai
il élève des patates et du maïs
ō va gōn madži
on va gone mardi
il a körje la bwēt
il a cognë (caché) la boîte
la pē e bryle
le pain est brulé
VITA

Margaret Anne Sullivan was born in New Orleans in 1952. She spent her childhood in Honduras and the Dominican Republic. She attended the Academy of Sacred Heart at Grand Coteau, Louisiana from 1965-1969. In 1973 she graduated from Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana with a B.A. in French. She entered graduate school in Linguistics that fall. During her graduate studies she held a teaching assistantship in French, taught in the English language and Orientation Program, and held the Linguistics assistantship. She was a member of the L.S.U. Dance Theatre, the Linguistics Circle, and the Cajun Club.
EXAMINATION AND THESIS REPORT

Candidate: Margaret Anne Sullivan

Major Field: Linguistics

Title of Thesis: A Phonological Analysis of the French of the Swords, Louisiana, Area

Approved:

J. Donald Razdolsky
Major Professor and Chairman

James A. Trautman
Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

James R. Mann

William R. Van Riper

S. James Kinzie

Date of Examination: