

# CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES	ix
PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	xi
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LINGUISTIC DIVERGENCE: THE EVIDENCE OF BAILEY AND MAYNOR	6
2.1. THE TWO BRAZOS VALLEY FEATURES	6
2.1.1. <u>The Syntactic-Semantic Feature</u> be2	6
2.1.2. <u>Postvocalic /r/</u>	36
2.2. THE FRONTING OF BACK VOWELS	47
2.2.1. <u>Thomas (1987, 1988b) on /o/ Fronting in</u> <u>Wilmington, North Carolina</u>	50
2.2.2. <u>California /o/ Fronting</u>	58
2.3. CONCLUSION	62
3. CONCERNING OTHER STUDIES IN SUPPORT OF THE DIVERGENCE HYPOTHESIS	66
3.1. DIVERGENCE CLAIMS FOR PHILADELPHIA WHITE VERNACULAR CHANGES	69
3.2. DIVERGENCE CLAIMS BASED ON CHANGES IN PHILADELPHIA BEV: NARRATIVE <u>-s</u>	79
3.3. PERCEPTUAL STUDIES AND OTHER ARGUMENTS	91
3.3.1. <u>The Philadelphia Vowel-Perception Study</u>	91
3.3.2. <u>The Texas "Speech Identification Task"</u>	94
3.3.3. <u>Samaná</u>	97
3.3.4. <u>Other Possibly Divergent Features: Multiple Modals,</u> <u>Verbal -s, /θ/ Realization</u>	101
3.4. CONCLUSION	114
4. CONVERGENT FEATURES IN WEV AND BEV	116
4.1. TWO FEATURES FROM WILMINGTON, NORTH CAROLINA	118
4.1.1. <u>Final Consonant Cluster Simplification</u>	118
4.1.2. <u>Embedded Yes/No Questions</u>	121

4.2. VAUGHN-COOKE (1987)	135
4.3. SOME OTHER CANDIDATES FOR CONVERGENT FEATURES	142
4.3.1. <u>Final Unstressed Vowels</u>	143
4.3.2. <u>More on Copulation</u>	144
4.3.3. <u>Quotative go 'say'</u>	146
4.3.4. <u>The get Passive</u>	149
4.3.5. <u>The Merger of {ɪ} and [ɛ] Before Nasals</u>	152
4.3.6. <u>Some "Minor" Convergent Features</u>	158
4.3.7. Edwards' (1988) Detroit Study	160
4.4. FURTHER POSSIBILITIES: VOCALIZATION OF /ɪ/	162
5. THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS	180
5.1. CONCLUSIONS	180
5.2. LINGUISTIC PROFIT	183
5.3. WHAT IS CAUSING THE DIVERGENCE HYPOTHESIS?	187
5.4. THE MYTH OF THE TRUE VERNACULAR	198
5.5. A FINAL NOTE ON FIELD METHODS	206
REFERENCES	210