Those who travel between the South and the North in this country come
to expect that they will be served grits for breakfast in small cafes in
Mississippi and hash browns in small cafes in Missouri. They learn
that pork sausage is usually formed into patties like miniature ham-
burgers in Arkansas and packed in skins like little hot dogs in
Wisconsin. They notice that large houses on prosperous plantations in
Georgia commonly have rambling floor plans and columned verandas and
that large houses on prosperous farms in Iowa usually have blocky
floor plans and simple doorsteps. Such differences blend so smoothly into
the traveler's sense of changing scene that it sometimes takes a
conscious effort to realize that they cannot really be classified, along
with seashores and live oaks, hilltops and henequens, as mere
scenery. Rather, they are manifestations of cultural patterns, closer kin to dialect differences than to toponymical ones. Those
of us who served as fieldworkers for DARE were encouraged to note
such features and mention them in our brief descriptions of the
character of communities. Looking back on my year of fieldwork,
especially the months spent in the 18 Louisiana communities shown in
Figure 1, my chief regret is that it did not occur to me until after
the year was over that it might be possible to map cultural features in
the same way that linguistic features are mapped in dialect study.
Because of this lack of foresight, what I present here is not con-
cclusion but hypothesis, not the result of a study but the idea for one.

The hypothesis is nothing more than a statement of what dialect
researchers have long held as a working assumption—that dialect
differences are related to other cultural differences. The concern
with settlement history in virtually every study of American dialects
is a reflection of this assumption, as is the attention paid to the
spatial and social level of informants. But as in the case of scenery,
it can be interesting and profitable to bring to our conscious
attention certain details in our working assumptions. Louisiana
is especially suitable for illustrating such details for dialect-
ologists because a cultural and dialectal sub-region lies almost
entirely within the borders of the state. It consists of the territ-
ory which was already comparatively thickly settled by French
speaking people when the United States acquired Louisiana in 1803.
The geographical extent of this region has been defined as a tri-
gle with its apex near the junction of the Red and Mississippi
rivers and its base along the Louisiana gulf coast, as illustrated
in Figure 2. Realizing that the boundary is not intended to be
strict but approximate, let us accept it for the present and call


Figure 1. Communities studied for DARE. Reproduced from August Weston
Rubrecht, “Regional Phonological Variants in Louisiana Speech,”
the area "French Louisiana." The rest of the state, which is linguistically and culturally similar to adjacent parts of Texas, Arkansas, and Mississippi, we can call " Anglo Louisiana."

Our hypothesis leads us to expect that French Louisiana will be set off by both linguistic and cultural features which exhibit the same geographic spread. Our expectation is dramatically fulfilled. The DARE communities are to far apart for us to ascertain boundaries with precision, but they do allow us to see that French and Anglo Louisiana are disinguished by several dialectal features. Figure 3 shows the geographical limits of 12 phonological features that show the clear regional variation. The information for these isophones was abstracted from the tape recordings made for DARE.

Notice that a bundle of 5 to 7 isophones traces a path along the border of St. Francisville, Clinton, and New Orleans, along with Hammond, which is not very close to the border. We must not put too much faith in the exact placement of these lines, but the closest lines to our tentative boundary between the general position is so close to the other argument. We confirm both our expectation of dialect differences and our preliminary borrowed estimate of the boundary. A more precise idea of the dialect boundary can be gained from Rubrecht's investigations.

Eugene Hooton's study of Texas vocabulary, his investigations of Louisiana leads us to expect that his isogloss bundle follows pretty closely the southwestern part of the boundary of French Louisiana.

The conclusions are based on information on dialect characteristics but have not dealt with specific cultural ones. Our a characteristics but have not dealt with specific cultural one's. Our study of Louisiana leads us to expect that this isogloss bundle follows pretty closely the southwestern part of the boundary of these regions.

Another cultural feature that is used as an index to these regions, it is the kind of coffee that is preferred. A related consideration is the way in which coffee is served. The coffee characteristic of French Louisiana is typical served in demitasse cups. The beans are roasted considerably darker than the coffee most American beans roasted. It is brewed very strong with dripping hot water slowly through the grounds in a small drip pot. The coffee in French Louisiana is typically served in demitasse cups. The beans are roasted considerably darker than the coffee most Americans like. It is brewed very strong with dripping hot water slowly through the grounds in a small drip pot. The coffee in French Louisiana is typically served in demitasse cups. The beans are roasted considerably darker than the coffee most Americans like. It is brewed very strong with dripping hot water slowly through the grounds in a small drip pot.
Figure 3. Boundaries of 12 phonological features that show significant regional variation in Louisiana.

Figure 4. Boundaries compared. Dotted line--French Louisiana roughly outlined. Heavy line--Isogloss bundle showing 6-7 vocabulary differences, after Atwood, p. 97.
From Figure 6, cultural isomorphs presented so far correspond well enough to the dialectal isoglosses and toponyms that have been presented to confirm in a general way our hypothesis that dialectal and cultural regions should have about the same boundaries. At the same time, the failure of the cultural isomorphs in Figure 7 to correspond exactly to each other illustrates that it is not in the nature of things to be as neat and simple as we would like. It leads to a major qualification of our hypothesis: features associated with a region may extend outside that region or be restricted to only a part of it. Spread outside a region is well known to linguistic geographers. It has already been illustrated with cultural features in Figure 7. At the risk of overworking the subject of coffee, an example of a cultural feature restricted to only part of a region can be seen in chicory coffee, which is characteristic of the eastern part of French Louisiana, in the New Orleans area. People farther west in the dark-roast area generally prefer their coffee unadulterated.

Figure 8 illustrates with a dialect term the qualification that features may have boundaries different from those of the region they are associated with. It maps the area in Louisiana of the French word soule d'eau, including its anglicized forms pulldun and pulldog as seen in Figure 6, as well as the area of its restriction, attested on the DARE questionnaires. In the eastern part of the state it extends a considerable distance into Anglo Louisiana; in the western part, however, it does not extend much outside French Louisiana, and even failed to appear as a questionnaire response in one French Louisiana community, Donaldsville.

Referring again to Figure 3, we see a number of isophones showing phonological variation within French Louisiana, illustrating once again with dialectal features that the range of individual features is not always the same as the region they are associated with.

Now that we see that dialectal features and cultural features may be related to each other without sharing the same geographic spread, the following question arises: Are there dialectal features that have nothing to do with cultural regions? And are there cultural regions with no dialectal features associated with them? Perhaps unfortunately for our faith in the order and rightness of things, the answer to both questions is "No."
Figure 6. Cultural features compared. Squares—dark-roast coffee. Circles—demitasse cups. Triangles—crawfish used as food.

Figure 7. Cultural isomorphs. Dashes—dark-roast coffee. Dots—demitasse cups. Carets—crawfish used as food.
First, let us look at a dialectal feature. Figure 8 shows that in a diagonal band across Louisiana, some words which usually have [o̮] in American English may occasionally have a vowel shifted to or toward [a]. No other phonological feature has the same range in Louisiana: [o] and [a] may fall together in the position before [ə] in many of the communities within this band, but the latter feature extends all the way east to New Orleans and Grand Isle and it does not have the same northern and western boundary, either. Nor is any cultural feature that I know of associated with this band.

Now, let us look at a cultural region. The major river valleys of Louisiana, the Mississippi and the Red, are often called the Black belt because of the large number of Negroes imported there to work on plantations established on the rich bottom land. Figure 10 shows that these regions are still characterized by a higher percentage of blacks in the population than the average for the state. Residents of Louisiana consider the part of the Black belt which is in Anglo Louisiana culturally distinct from the piney woods regions of the north central and southwestern parts of the state. For example, a cultivated resident of Lake Providence, on the Mississippi, in the northeast, said that the people of Lake Providence have "an entirely different way of life" from those just across the Parish line to the west. And on a purely impressionistic basis, it seemed to me that Lake Providence showed more similarity to Natchitoches, on the Red River in the west, than either did to Columbus or Ruston, which are about halfway between. Conscious of cultural differences, we naturally expect substantial dialectal differences between the Black belt and the piney woods. But in this case our expectations go unfulfilled almost as dramatically as they are fulfilled in French Louisiana.

Note once again that Figure 3, based on phonetic data from the DARE tapes, shows no isoglosses that even hint that the Black belt exists. Furthermore, Atwood's "Regional Vocabulary of Texas" shows a number of isoglosses in Louisiana, but none of them trace a path along the Black belt. Furthermore, a study focused specifically on North Louisiana, using a questionnaire similar to Atwood's, revealed no consistent vocabulary differences between the Black belt and the piney woods. The vocabulary contains a homogenous mixture of Midland and Southern terms; it varies less according to geography than according to age, education, and community size.

If we stop now and review the cultural and linguistic features that have been discussed and make a concise summary of the possible relationships between them, what we come up with is this: cultural and linguistic features may be either interdependent or independent. It does not make a very impressive conclusion to say, in effect, "anything can happen." But remember that this paper is not the result of a careful study but the idea for one—or for several. It can be interesting when a study reveals that a particular cultural region is defined partly by its dialectal characteristics, but it is just as interesting and just as important to know that another region is not so defined. There is a lot of material on record concerning dialects that sociologists could well make use of. There is a lot of sociological material that dialect researchers could find relevant to their work. And there are hundreds of unanswerable questions for sociolinguists.

And besides the broad questions concerning social and linguistic relationships, there are hundreds of others important chiefly because they pose our curiosity about details of the cultural scenery.
Figure 9. The vowel of such words as *job*, *pot*, and *clock*.

Figure 10. Louisiana's Black Belt. Shaded areas—regions in which Negroes make up 36% or more of the population. Adapted from Smith and Hitt, p. 39.
August Rubrecht

would like to know, for example, whether the shotgun house—so-called because all the rooms and all the doors are in line, so that a person could stick a shotgun in at the front door and shoot all the way out the back—is more common in the Black Belt than the piney woods, as I suspect it is. I would like to know whether the fish known to ichthyologists as the bowfin is eaten more frequently in those areas where it is called choupique and green cypress trout than where it is called dogfish, grindle, or mudfish. And I would like to know exactly how far north I can go on any given highway before I have to give up grits for breakfast and settle for hash browns.

NOTES

*Read at the SAMLAA-ADS Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia, November, 1971.
3 See maps 119-125, pp. 249-55.