

kansas
working
papers
in
linguistics

volume 2
1977

P
1
.K36
v.2
1977

Laurel Watkins and Ginny Gathercole

Editors

Cover design by Jeanette Gunn

Funded by Student Activity Fees
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas
1977

R00002 22246

A

The editors are pleased to present this second collection of papers from the Linguistics Department at the University of Kansas. In preparing this issue, we have been aided in many ways by members of the faculty and by our department secretary, Ruth Hillers. We wish to express our appreciation for their kind assistance. We are also grateful to Jeanette Gunn for her work on the cover page.

CONTENTS

Agent, Instrument and Intention Ronald P. Schaefer	1
Speech Style Shifting in Young Children's Speech Linda Paul	37
A Study of the Comings and Goings of the Speakers of Four Languages? Spanish, Japanese, English, and Turkish Ginny Gathercole	61
Some Common Elements of Muskogean Verb Morphology Karen M. Booker	95
A Closer Look at Sundanese Phonology Geoffrey Gathercole	134
A Study of Speaker Sex Identification Ronald P. Schaefer	144
A Linguistic Identification for Kansas Volga German Gerald L. Denning	165
Second Language Acrolect Replacement in Limon Creole Anita Herzfeld	193

A LINGUISTIC IDENTIFICATION FOR KANSAS VOLGA GERMAN

Gerald L. Denning

O. The densest German settlement in Kansas exists in Ellis and Rush Counties (Carman 1962). This group's ancestors had taken part in the German exodus to Russia at Catherine the Great's invitation and under duress had been placed in the lower Volga river wilderness. Approximately a century later migrations of Volga Germans took them to various places around the world, including several thousand who founded villages in West Central Kansas from 1876 through the early 1900s (Toepfer and Dreiling 1966, Swan 1974).

The German language has continued to be spoken habitually with growing children although the number of speakers is dwindling. Carman (1962) reported that in Liebenthal a majority of families still used German in preference to English. In general there is a plenitude of speakers who could support linguistic investigations across the generations although future maintenance of German and the role of the local dialect would have to be dealt with in terms of values, rationales and practical steps (Gilbert 1971). For example, teaching materials could be produced similar to those by Buffington and Barba for what might be called the Pennsylvania German (PG) koine (leveled dialect, as used by Dillard 1973), spoken habitually by more than 300,000 persons mainly in Eastern Pennsylvania (Lockwood 1965, Laird 1970), and by members of smaller enclaves throughout much of the country.

A comprehensive outline for the study of the language of the Kansas Volga Germans of Ellis and Rush Counties has been provided (Gilbert 1976):

1. from exactly what area(s) of Germany did the 18th century emigrants to Russia come
2. how does the German language as it is now spoken in south-east Ellis and northern Rush Counties differ from the German dialects presently spoken in the areas of Germany located in (1)
3. what portion of the divergences identified in (2) are due to a) Russian loans or "influence," b) English loans or "influence," c) internal development
4. what Russian loans or influence remain in Ellis County English
5. in what localities is German still spoken, how often, by whom, under what circumstances
6. what styles or dialects of German (including Standard or High German) are used
7. what are the attitudes of the speakers toward the use of German and English, and especially their attitude toward certain socially diagnostic linguistic variants within these languages
8. what are the social and/or linguistic rules governing the alternate use of the two languages
9. what forms does ethnicity take, especially as expressed in style of life, sense of identification, primary group . . . characteristics
10. what part does language play in the ethnic matrix

With regard to the latter points above, bibliographic information on ethnicity of German American descendents is available in Fiedler (1975 reported in Gilbert (1976)).

My purpose is to establish a linguistic record of Volga Germans which would facilitate the identification of specific Ellis and Rush County subjects for sociolinguistic research. Secondly, I should like to extend knowledge of Volga Germans' speech by making certain synchronic and diachronic comparisons with other varieties of German. An effort has been made to limit description to Gilbert's research suggestions, especially his points 1-5. Order of presentation of subject matter will be grammar, lexicon and phonology, going back in time and place from Kansas to Russia and Germany. It is hoped that various types

of linguistic research in Volga German will be stimulated.

Data was collected mainly in 1976 by myself, largely from middle aged informants, particularly a representative of Emmeram speech born in 1911, Joseph Denning; a representative of Victoria speech, christened Alice Billinger in 1918; and a representative of Odin speech, christened Bernadette Huslig in 1916. The first two finished grade school, married in 1938 and have always kept in social and linguistic touch with the Ellis and Rush Counties speech island. The last informant completed high school, married Paul Eisenbart (a non-Odin Austrian descendent not reared speaking German) in 1936 and has always maintained social and linguistic bonds with **her** speech island. Informant contact with Standard German was minimal and was primarily associated with the formal aspects of church membership and religious classes.

1. Gilbert (1976) examined a number of characteristics of the language of Ellis and Rush County, Kansas Volga Germans (hereafter referred to as Volga German or VG). By means of Sackett and Weigel's (1966) and Gilbert's (1968) data, speech patterns of three Ellis County Volga German communities, Pfeifer, Victoria (formerly Herzog) and Catherine, were contrasted with each other and Standard German (SG).

In Gilbert (1976) other German dialects or koines in the United States were compared with Volga German. For example, the inflectional system in Catherine (especially due to the absence of the dative case) was described as being similar to Central Texas German (CTG). For more detailed information on CTG see Gilbert (1970, 1972). Also Pfeifer and Victoria speech was said to resemble Pennsylvania German. For infor-

mation on PG see Lockwood (1965), Reed (1948), Reed and Seifert (1954).

The Case System

1.1 Although dative inflection survives, e.g., in Pfeifer after the preposition mit 'with' (Gilbert 1976), and in general appears to be used more in personal pronouns than in other forms, there is evidently a trend away from it, e.g., in definite articles after prepositions. This is the apparent result of phonological leveling between the dative and accusative in favor of accusative forms (Winter 1973, Denning 1973). Whereas VG and SG agree in the accusative case in (1) and (2), the accusative form in VG (3) and (5) has assumed the dative functions visible in SG (4) and (6). (Certain SG examples are from Mitzka's (1952) list). VG data is from Emmeram and Victoria and principally reflects usage of those communities.

1. Des Seiche geht scharf durch den Garde.
2. Das Schwein geht schnell durch den Garten.
'The pig goes swiftly through the garden.'
3. Do untig den Baum iss es kiel un schen.
4. Hier unter dem Baum ist es kühl und schön.
'Here under the tree it is cool and beautiful.'
5. Vor den Krieg han ich an Amerika gar net gedenkt.
6. Vor dem Krieg hab ich an Amerika nicht gedacht.
'Before the war I didn't think about America.'

In sentences (7) and (8) third generation VG shows variation

in pronoun usage with the verb helfen 'help', which in SG requires dative mir.

7. Morige dust du mich helve.

8. Du musst mir morige helve.

"You will help me tomorrow." (You must help me tomorrow.)

Similar variation exists in data from another German speaking community (principally Austrian Americans), Odin, in neighboring Barton County:

9. Du wirst mir helfen.

10. Du wirst mich helfen.

'You will help me.'

The same ambivalence was shown in usage of ordinary indirect objects by VG informants in (11) through (13).

11. Geb mich a Glas voll Milich.

'Give me a glass of milk.'

12. Geb 's mir.

'Give it to me.'

13. Bring mir finif Ebbel.

'Bring me five apples.'

In like manner, in Odin Austrian German (OAG) the indirect object forms mich and mir may be mixed. In (14), (15) OAG an 'an' rhymes with 'Bonn' in deliberate speech (Cardinal number one, ans, rhymes with German Hans):

14. Bring mir an Eppel.

15. Bring mich an Eppel.

'Bring me an apple.'

Uncertainty sometimes surfaced in both VG and OAG as to which inflection should be used for such first person indirect objects. Uncertainty may have been enhanced by informants currently not being in frequent contact with the speech island. And informants at times reflect that their speech pattern is not 'right' and may grasp for SG forms they know.

In Victoria and Emmeram (16) and Odin (17) the preposition mit 'with' requires the dative personal pronoun dir for second person singular informal usage.

16. Was iss 'n los mit dir?

17. Was iss 'n lus mit dir?

'What's the matter with you?'

With regard to case, PG has a nominative-dative system. Since VG has a nominative-accusative system in most respects, it may be compared to CTG, North Texas (Cooke County) dialects at Valley View, Lindsay and Muenster, and the Oklahoma (Washita County) dialect in Corn (Pulte 1970). Pulte raises the interesting point that although Low German (LG) influences may be responsible for the nominative-accusative case system in CTG, Valley View and Corn it does not appear to be the causal factor in Lindsay and Muenster German. Similarly, although a small number of Low German speakers settled among Volga High German speakers in Ellis and Rush Counties (especially between Walker and Victoria) with gradual assimilation the result,

their area-wide linguistic influence was minimal and does not appear to be a pivotal element in two-case VG usage (Toepfer and Dreiling 1966).

Possession

1.2 The VG possessive construction as shown (Denning 1971) in (18), (19), (20) and contrasted by SG (21) is shared by many German dialects.

18. Der neie President sei Plan helf die Leit net.

19. Der neie President sei Plan helf net die Leit.

20. Der neie President sei Plan dut net die Leit helve.

21. Der Plan des neuen Präsidenten wird den Leuten nicht helfen.

'The new president's plan will not help the people.'

This structure is actually related to an old dative, explained by Behaghel (1915), whose examples follow. The genitive in (22) is paraphrased by the dative in (23), (24), (25).

22. Meines Vaters Haus hat er gekauft.

23. Meinem Vater hat er sein Haus abgekauft.

24. Er hat meinem Vater sein Haus abgekauft.

25. Er hat meinem Vater sein Haus gekauft.

'He bought my father's house.'

VG data shows a likeness in masculine and feminine renditions of possessive constructions. In (26) and (28) a sein 'his or 'its' form (masculine or neuter gender in SG) rather than an ihr 'her' form (feminine gender in SG) is used for singular possessive adjectives. (27) and (29) provide SG counterparts.

26. Den Tochter sei schenster Rock iss verriss.

27. Das schönste Kleid der Tochter ist zerrissen.

'The daughter's prettiest dress is torn.'

28. Geh un sei so gut un sah dei Schwester dass die dei Mamma
sei Sack fertig nehe soll, un sauber mache mit der Barst.

29. Geh, sei so gut und sag deiner Schwester, sie sollte die
Kleider für eure Mutter fertig nähen und mit der Bürste
rein machen.

'Go, be so good and tell your sister she should finish sewing
the clothes for your mother and clean them with the brush.'

A phrase in VG (28), repeated as (30), was also rendered as (31), (32).

30. dass die dei Mamma sei Sack fertig nehe soll

31. dass die dei Mamma sei Sack fertig soll nehe

32. dass die dei Mamma sei Sack ... soll den Sack fertig nehe

'that she should finish sewing your mother's-clothes'

OAG data indicates that a sein form is used for the masculine gender as in (33) while neither sein nor ihr is used for the feminine in this type of possessive construction. Instead, unlike VG, at least some second generation OAG feminine usage seems to be SG (possible even modeled on the English possessive) as in (34) or is rendered by some other structure as in (35).

33. Otto sei Kalt iss besser.

'Otto's cold is better.'

34. Marys Kalt iss besser.

'Mary's cold is better.'

35. Oliva hot an neie Ruck.

'Oliva's dress is new.' (Oliva has a new dress.)

Possessive force can be obtained in VG through the use of the preposition von (similarly 'of' in English) as in (36), (38) with SG paraphrases (37), (39).

36. Ich gleich die Farb von den Hund sei Haar.

37. Ich habe die Harrfarbe des Hundes gern.

'I like the color of the dog's hair.' (I like the dog's hair color.)

38. Die Milich von die Kiy schmeckt ziemlich gut.

39. Die Milch der Kühe schmeckt ziemlich gut.

'The milk of the cows tastes rather good.' (The cows' milk tastes rather good.)

In like manner SG utilizes von in achieving a possessive force, such as in (40) which helps differentiate it from (41) in which the genitive is used (Kufner 1962).

40. das richtige Füttern von Löwen

'the proper feeding of lions'

41. durch das richtige Füttern der Löwen

'by properly feeding the lions'

Tense

1.3 Future time in VG is sometimes expressed by present tense, an ancient dialectal trait (Lockwood 1965) as was the case in (7), (8) —cf. (18), (19) also — and may be accompanied by counterparts of SG tun 'do' used as auxiliary verbs as in (7) —cf. (20), by forms of the modal auxiliary müssen 'must' such as in (8), and by adverbs of time such as morgen 'tomorrow.' OAG future time can be expressed by forms of werden, like SG, in (9), (10).

Lexicon

1.4 Volga German shares the lexical items Stinkkatz 'skunk' and Steinesel 'stubborn donkey,' with Texas and Oklahoma German dialects. As reported in Gilbert (1970) it had been thought that these particular terms had arisen in Central Texas where, besides other localities, German Americans have largely populated most of a forty county area properly in the East Central part of the state. It is estimated (Gilbert 1970) that approximately 70,000 persons continue to speak German in this region (roughly the Austin-San Antonio-Houston triangle but especially extending northwest of Austin), particularly in population centers such as Fredericksburg, Gillespie County or Brenham, Washington County. Pulte (1970) has shown that Stinkkatz and Steinesel also exist among German speakers of the North Texas Valley View, Lindsay and Muenster communities, as well as the one in Corn, Oklahoma. It might be hypothesized that known northward movement of some German speakers from what could be designated the heavily populated core area in Central Texas has spread the use of these and other lexical items. However, the Valley View Seventh Day Adventists apparently moved

north to remove themselves from the numerous Central Texas Lutherans. In addition, Muenster and Lindsay Catholics may not have been in close contact with the larger Lutheran groups to the south. Finally, Corn, Oklahoma Low German-Russian Mennonites had moved south from the Hillsboro, Kansas area (Pulte 1970). Along with Catholic Volga Germans' (who render Steinesel as Stenesel) use, Stinkkatz and Stanesel occur in OAG. The origin of a number of German lexical items in the Central Plains remains an interesting question pending further research.

Russian Loans

2. Also of linguistic interest are the Russian loan words in VG. Ruppenthal (1913, 1916, 1923) compiled a list of approximately thirty Russian borrowings of which a third generation VG informant might use one-fourth or more. Table 1 gives some of the Russian loans gathered by Ruppenthal (1913) that are still current. Gender represents Emmeram usage.

VG	RUSSIAN	ENGLISH
der Ambar	ambar	granary
des Arbus	arbuz	watermelon
die? Klapot	khlopoty	lawsuit
des Papyrus	papirosa	cigarette
die Steppe	step'	prairie

TABLE 1. VG RUSSIAN LOAN WORDS

Actually Klapot was not elicited but rather a Russian-English hybrid noun; see (42).

Although at first glance (43) might seem to contain a hybrid German-Russian verb, in fact verklat is a more phonetically exact spelling than its SG counterpart: verklagt (Galton 1977). (Similarly SG sagt 'says' could accurately be rendered as VG sat due to dialectal ach-laut dropping.)

42. Die Klasuit iss net recht.

'The lawsuit isn't right.'

43. Der hot den verklat.

'He sued him.'

Papyrus was given in a slightly different form as in (44), and Steppe was produced as in (45) with a somewhat different meaning. Note the hybrid in (46).

44. Des Paparetsye iss ausgang.

'The cigarette went out.'

45. Die Step iss sure gut.

'The pasture (or 'grass') is sure good.

46. Mir sin heit in der Stepfence hrum gelof.

'We walked (literally 'ran') around in (within) the pasture today).'

A lexical item noticeably absent from Ruppenthal's list was the current Nuschnik (Russian nuzhnik) 'toilet', generally referring to an outdoor toilet while Badstub is reserved for indoor 'bathroom.' Another item which appears to be borrowed is atye (The last syllable is stressed.) which was used as a common farewell, for example, in the expression Noh,

atye! (Noh is used commonly to introduce VG utterances much as 'well' is in English.) Russian no, a conjunction meaning 'but' or 'yet,' is the probable source of noh, while Russian atu (word final syllable is stressed) meaning 'tally ho' is apparently not the source of atye.

French adieu 'goodbye' has been borrowed by various German dialects as an alternate farewell. Its use in Germany is evidently diminishing but it can be found in a number of stage plays, written adie. Some German dialects could not accommodate the last syllable of French adieu and therefore produced adie or, at least in VG, atye (Galton 1977).

The net effect of Russian on VG appears to be minimal. There is a need to investigate what linguistic influence a second century of dwelling in Russia may have had on the Volga Germans who did not emigrate in the late 1800s. However, it is difficult to obtain permission from the Soviet Union to do the necessary fieldwork. Surprisingly, a scholarly study on Low German in Siberia has been published recently (Winter 1973).

The largest detriment to establishing a continuous linguistic identity for Kansas Volga Germans is that those in Russia have traditionally found it nearly impossible to communicate with the outside world (Leiker 1974). This situation obtained both before and after the existence of the Autonomous Republic of the Volga Germans which had 600,000 citizens and German as its official language. The universal displacements of Volga Germans during World War II, mainly to Siberia and East Central Asia, have yet to be sorted out. Despite having officially exonerated Volga Germans from all previous accusations on August 29, 1964,

the Soviet Government has been slow to implement its rehabilitation program, and to grant permission for resettlement in the Volga homeland or for emigration, either of which would be linguistically promising (Haynes 1974).

Two organizations dedicated to gathering all types of information about Germans from Russia have been formed (Leiker 1976): International American Historical Society of Germans from Russia, 615 D Street, Lincoln, Neb., 68502 with archives at 1004 A, Ninth Avenue, Greeley, Col., 80631; Landsmannschaft der Deutschen aus Russland, Stafflenberg Strasse, 66, 7 Stuttgart 1, West Germany. The American society maintains personnel to translate German documents and tracts into English. A Mennonite encyclopedia exists for obtaining information on that group alone (reported in Pulte 1970).

Comparisons of German Dialects Across Time

3. Regardless of the state of knowledge about the language of the Volga Germans while they were in Russia, it is necessary to make both a contemporary and historical inspection of German varieties in Germany, and to attempt to relate them to features of VG or other American German dialects.

3.1 Tables 2, 3, and 4 give comparative information on personal pronouns, sein 'be' and haben 'have.' Old High German (OHG) and PG examples are from Lockwood (1965). Middle High German (MHG) data is from Paul (1966), Lockwood (1965). Superscript bars indicate long vowels. Numbers refer to first, second, third person. M. represents masculine gender, f. feminine and n. neuter. In OHG and MHG underlined z evidently

stands for a dental fricative that merged with the sound s in modern times, and OHG h, viz., in ih denotes a voiceless velar fricative (Lockwood 1965).

The use of mir 'we' (see Table 2) is a common German dialectal form (Gilbert 1976). Its historical development in Yiddish is given in Lockwood (1965) as a result of assimilation in enclitic position to the infinitive hoben 'have,' the stages being hoben wir → hobm wir → hobm mir. The last stage represents the contemporary Yiddish forms with mir becoming generalized in all positions. The extension of the VG and OAG der, die and des to third person singular and plural personal pronouns is also a fairly common dialectal characteristic, not found, however in PG.

		OHG	MHG	SG	PG	VG	OAG	ENGLISH	
Singular	1.	ih	ich	ich	ich	ich	ich	I	
	2.	dū	du, dū	du	du	du	du	you	
	3.	m.	er	er	er	er	der	der	he
		f.	siu	siu	sie	sie	die	die	she
	n.	iz	ez	es	es	des	des	it	
Plural	1.	wir	wir	wir	mir	mir	mir	we	
	2.	ir	ir	ihr	dihhr, ihr, nir	ihr	ihr	you	
	3.	m.	sie	sie	sie	sie	die	die	they
		f.	sio	sie	sie	sie	die	die	they
		n.	siu	siu	sie	sie	die	die	they

TABLE 2. PERSONAL PRONOUNS: NOMINATIVE CASE

		OHG	MHG	SG	PG	VG	OAG	ENG.
Infinitive		wesan, s̄in	s̄in, wesan	sein	sei	sin	sei	be
Present Indicative Singular	1	bim	bin	bin	bin	sin	bi	am
	2	bist	bist	bist	bischt	bist	bist	are
	3	ist	ist	ist	iss	iss	iss	is
Plural	1	birum	birn, s̄in	sind	sin	sin	san	are
	2	birut	birt, s̄it	seid	sin, seid	seid	sat	are
	3	sind	sint	sind	sin	sin	san	are
Imperative Singular		wis	wis	sei	sei	sei	bi, sei	be

TABLE 3. SEIN PARADIGMS

		OHG	MHG	SG	PG	VG	OAG	ENGLISH
Infinitive		habēn	hān	haben	hawwe	han	hom	have
Present Indicative Singular	1	habēm	hān	habe	hab	han	hol	have
	2	habēs	hāst	hast	hoscht	host	host	have
	3	habēt	hāt	hat	hot	hot	hot	has
Plural	1	habēmēs	hān	haben	hen	han	ham	have
	2	habēt	hāt	habt	hen, hett	hett	hot	have
	3	habēt	hānt	haben	hen	han	han	have
Imperative Singular		habe		habe	hob	hol	hol(t)	have

TABLE 4. HABEN PARADIGMS

VG has preserved MHG contracted forms of OHG verbs to a great extent (See Tables 3 and 4.) VG infinitival forms for both sein and haben are used for first person singular as well as for expected first and third persons plural. Some vocalic and consonantal patterns overlap among the three American German dialects represented.

In the haben paradigm, OAG first person singular hol as in (47) and

imperative hol(t) as in (48), (49) possibly represent some type of analogic change or phonological merger between certain forms of the verbs 'have' (SG haben) and 'hold, keep' (SG halten).

47. Ich hol Durst.

'I am thirsty.' (Literally 'I have thirst.')

48. Ho holt a guter Zeit.

'Have a good time.'

49. Blah holt a Wohl hungerig.

'Just be hungry a while.'

Such a merger between forms of haben and halten seems unlikely in VG, however, in view of imperative hol as in (50) which is differentiated from the imperative hal as in (51).

50. Hol der Schneppsye.

'Have a little nip of Schnapps.'

51. Hal dei Durst.

'Hold your thirst.'

In the sein paradigm it is possible that OAG first person singular bi as in (52) and imperative bi as in (53) reflect English interference, especially since these forms are homophonous with 'be.' Contrast the alternate OAG imperative in (54).

52. Ich bi gescheit.

'I am smart.'

53. Bi still.

'Be quiet.'

54. Sei still.

English interference is perhaps unlikely because it seems that Standard English 'I am' rather than nonstandard 'I be' would have been a causal factor. Nevertheless, members of the OAG community, when speaking English informally, often use nonstandard 'be,' for example, for third person singular present, i.e., 'she be...'. Actually it is possible that among such bilinguals a German sein form, bi, is affecting the Standard English 'be' paradigm and not the converse. A VG first person singular counterpart follows as (55) and an imperative as (56).

55. Ich sin schmart.

'I am smart.'

56. Sei ruhig.

'Be quiet.'

Source of Kansas Volga German

3.2 Various phonological and lexical characteristics of VG appear in several parts of Germany. According to Ramisch (1908) the lower Rhine area contains a number of diminutive suffixes, e.g., -ye, -ke and -ske, the first of which is in VG. Yet VG also has -chye which differs, for example, from PG -che (Lockwood 1965). Dialectal use of net 'not' for SG nicht stretches from the Rhine eastward across Germany in numerous areas such as around Fulda (Reichhardt 1976) and Dresden (Borchers 1929). Both VG and PG negation is expressed by net instead of nicht.

Unrounded diphthongs such as in VG and PG Feier 'fire', Leit 'people', nei 'new', nein 'nine' (as opposed to SG Feuer, Leute, neu,

neun) are not uncommon in German dialects and certainly can be found on the lower Rhine on all sides of Wiesbaden (Wagner 1927). Neither VG nor PG has affricated p, e.g., SG Apfel 'apple' becomes Abbel; the plural for SG Äpfel is Ebbel. (VG proper names Pfeifer, Pfannenstiehl, as well as Pfeffer 'pepper' are pronounced with unaffricated p.) Earlier Franconian-dominated High German dialects of the Palatinate on the lower Rhine evidently resisted p-affricatization longer than any other area. The written record shows unaffricated p as late as near the end of the ninth century (Lockwood 1965). Perhaps such resistance to p-affricatization also resulted in early deaffricatization of emigrant groups as evidenced in VG and PG. For other characteristics of the speech of that area, refer to Bohmer (1909).

3.3 In view of the many similarities between VG and PG one might hypothesize a similar origin for both. Indeed, the Palatinate has been given as a source for these two varieties: for VG by Dreiling (1926) and for PG by Klees (1958). However, there are two places in Germany to which the name Palatinate might be attributed: Rheinpfalz or the Rhenish Palatinate and Oberpfalz or the Upper (eastern) Palatinate. The former is situated roughly between Saarland and Baden on the lower Rhine and the latter lies in the Danube area around Regensburg. During the time of the old German Empire (Holy Roman Empire) these at times constituted a single Palatinate state governed by counts Palatine. Since then both the Rhine Palatinate and Upper Palatinate, and the adjacent parts of the old Swabian duchy as well, generally have been political districts of Bavaria.

It has been established (Laird 1970) that PG originated mainly in the eastern Palatinate, with limited Swiss German as the secondary source (Klees 1958). There are phonological similarities between PG and VG, such as uf 'on' vs. standard auf; unig, or unich 'under' vs. standard unter; and Stross 'street' vs. standard Strasse. Other similarities have been presented. Nevertheless, in view of salient differences between PG and VG such as among the personal pronouns (See Table 2.) and the variant verb morphophonemics (See Tables 3 and 4,) and phonological differences such as PG Hond 'hand' vs. VG, SG Hand and PG Olles 'everything' vs. VG, SG Alles, it is clear that the eastern Palatinate could not be designated as the principal source of VG as authoritatively as it has been for PG.

It is probable that VG origins were somewhat more widespread than were those of PG. There is no doubt that dialect leveling occurred in VG, most probably resulting in a koine. Dreiling (1926) reported that VG closely resembled the speech of the Palatinate and Bavaria, and noted that examples of e in words such as stehen 'stand', Weizen 'wheat' could still be found pronounced as ä, â, õ, í in the different Ellis and Rush County villages. (His precise phonetic superscripts are undefined.) He also noted that words obsolete elsewhere, such as bloede (SG blöde 'imbecile, weak-sighted') in the sense of 'timid' were still used.

In addition to evidence previously presented which points to a lower Rhine, perhaps a Rhine Palatinate, primary source area for VG, relevant support for secondary Bavarian roots may be added on the basis

of proper names. Behaghel (1915) indicated that derivatives of OHG proper names were made for offspring, e.g., in Bavaria the suffix -inger could be added to Karl, resulting in die Karolinger or 'the descendents of Karl' and -ing could be joined to Henno (shortened form of Heinrich), producing Henning or 'son of Heinrich.' Opposite Bavarian -inger, -ing were Alemannic (Swiss) -ingen (These two groups were separated by the river Lech.). In like manner, -ungen designated Thuringen and Hessian, -sheid Middle Franconian, and -lar Middle and Low German. Too much time has passed and too many movements of people have occurred to justify formulating a hypothesis of the origin of VG speakers on this basis, but there are a number of VG proper names ending in -inger and -ing to the exclusion of the others, i.e., Wasinger, Billinger, Dreiling, Denning.

Reduction of the definite article des (SG neuter das 'the') to 's before nouns occurs in Bavaria and Switzerland, at least in written examples (Lockwood 1965). Its presence in Victorian speech may suggest Bavarian roots. Relatively speaking, des reduction is not an Emmeram speech habit. In spite of the VG leveling process referred to previously, some minor differences remain, for example, although there is general agreement on the lexical item Hingel 'chicken' for SG Henne, members of the Emmeram and Victoria communities have preferred SG Hahn 'rooster' as opposed to Ginkel in Pfeifer, Schoenchen, Liebenthal.

There is no overwhelming evidence for Bavaria as a whole to be the primary source of VG. Various linguistic differences exist be-

tween many Bavarian dialects and VG. For example, frequent pronunciation of o for VG, SG a occurs in Bavaria and Austria, and as has been reported previously, in PG. For example, one notices Bavarian wos 'what' for VG, SG was (Lockwood 1965).

Individual VG genealogies or testimonies tend to support the lower Rhine as the motherland of at least some Ellis County residents. Dr. Thomas Weigele from Becherbach, a village southwest of Wiesbaden, between the towns of Bad Kreuznach and Idar-Oberstein, participated in the trek to Russia. His Weigel descendents were among the founders of both Emmeram and Herzog, that is, present day Victoria (Toepfer and Hall 1976). According to Joseph Denning, son of Prudentius and grandson of Joseph I., one of the founders of Emmeram (Both were well educated and literate in Standard German.), this family's pre-Russia homeland had been Alsace-Lorraine, a region of German populace (now controlled by France) adjoining the Rhenish Palatinate and Baden.

Gilbert (1976) also pointed to the Southwest of Germany (Swabia) as the starting point for a majority of ancestors of Ellis and Rush County Volga German settlers. He utilized evidence such as regionalisms (in Germany) that were widely used in Ellis County, e.g., the verb schaffen 'work' for SG arbeiten, to support this view.

Dialectal information presented here is fully in accord with Gilbert's conclusion that VG speakers' forebears were from the Southwest of Germany. With regard to Swabia in particular, there is currently no reason not to consider it a secondary or even a primary source of the VG in Ellis and Rush Counties. Swabian and Rhine Palatinate

citizens share some of the same territory. West Bavarian districts (which would exclude the eastern Palatinate) are essentially Swabian: Baden, Hessen and Württemberg. As has been noted previously, the Rhenish Palatinate has frequently been included in the same governance.

4. Concluding remarks will be made regarding some communities in or near Ellis and Rush Counties which appear to be promising to the potential researcher, and several of which have a direct or indirect bearing on VG.

Munjor (Ellis County) is perhaps the most challenging of all VG communities to the linguist because of French lexical items in its dialect. Hypotheses have shown a resemblance to Bavarian, Württemberg and Baden speech, and possibly a source farther west into French territory, but thus far no positive individual identification has been made. In Russia, Obermonjou, from which most Munjorites emigrated, was named after a French commissioner, Otto de Monjou, whose task was to help lay out Volgan villages and attract French immigrants. He spoke German and became the leader of the German group that founded Obermonjou. There were a few French settlements in the Volga region, but this fact is apparently unrelated to Munjor's linguistic record (Toepfer and Dreiling 1966).

A good place for the researcher on Munjor (earlier spelled "Obermonjour") to begin would be Meyer (1976) in which a rigorously prepared historical resume is presented, including genealogical information that bridges emigration from Obermonjou, Herzog and Marienthal to Munjor and its satellite community, Antonino. Information about the Bavarian Capuchin Franciscan friars who have served the two parishes (and all those of

the speech island) is also contained in this centennial monograph.

Schoenchen (Ellis County), founded in 1876, expanded rather quickly, drawing citizens from Munjor, Pfeifer and Liebenthal, and in 1926 drew up plans for the construction of a high school which only Herzog (Victoria) had hitherto accomplished. Worthwhile linguistic research could be done here, especially with regard to comparisons of locally leveled dialectal features with dialectal forms in the three sister villages.

St. Peter (Graham County), established in 1894, is the most mixed VG community, having been populated by families from various villages of Ellis County. Dialectal leveling and comparisons with Ellis and Rush County varieties would be of prime interest here. And as in any VG community, a variety of sociolinguistic topics could be pursued, including aspects of English interference.

Trego Center (Trego County) consists of Russian-German Lutherans. Basic research needs to be done here.

Bukovina Lutheran Germans settled in northwest Ellis County and now reside mainly in Ellis City. VG speakers have generally referred to them as Ehsterreicher (Austrian) although they also referred to the few Moravian and Bohemian Catholics who settled in Ellis County by the same term. The Austrian Empire had included Slavic and other areas and many German settlers have come from them. This is especially true for Moravia and Bohemia, now parts of Czechoslovakia. Bukovina, whose north portion has been joined to the Ukrainian SSR, is situated in Romania.

Collyer (Trego County) is largely a Catholic Russian-German community that refers to itself as Odessre, evidently because it originated

in the German enclaves at Odessa, a Russian port on the Black Sea. Collierites call their Volga German neighbors Samarische, which must refer to the Russian city, Samara, on the Volga north of the German settlements there.

Odin (Barton County) was settled principally by Catholic Austrians, beginning in 1874 with Moravians (Leunissen 1954) and later reportedly by settlers from a village near Vienna. A sprinkling of Catholic Germans from Bohemia, Bavaria, Luxemburg and the Volga in Russia has been added and some intermarriage has occurred. Diachronic and synchronic linguistic research should be done here. Refer to Hornung and Roitinger (1950) for information on Austrian dialects.

Quinter (Gove County) is mainly a Pennsylvania German (Church of the Brethern or Dunkard) community. Various types of comparative and sociolinguistic studies could be done here, as in each of these communities.

As new general information that is only now becoming available is winnowed, and as more specific work such as on genealogies progresses, conclusions about the linguistic history, current social status and Kansas features of VG can be refined. Hopefully, additional research in Ellis and Rush Counties along the guidelines presented earlier by Gilbert (1976) will be forthcoming from linguistics scholars.

REFERENCES

- Behaghel, Otto. 1915. A Short Historical Grammar of the German Language. Translated and adapted from the German by Emil Trechmann. London: Macmillan and Co., Limited.
- Bohmer, Emil. 1909. Sprach-und Gründungsgeschichte der pfälzischen Kolonie am Niederrhein. Deutsche Dialektgeographie, Vol. 3. Marburg: N.G. Elwertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Borchers, Erich. 1929. Sprach-und Gründungsgeschichte der erzgebirgischen Kolonie im Oberharz. Deutsche Dialektgeographie, Vol. 22. Marburg: N.G. Elwertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Buffington, A.F. and P.A. Barba. 1954. A Pennsylvania German Grammar. Allentown, Pennsylvania.
- Carman, J. Neale. 1962. Foreign Language Units of Kansas: Historical Atlas and Statistics, Vol. 1. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press.
- Denning, Gerald L. 1971. A comparison between Volgadeutsch and Standard German usage of the definite article. Unpublished paper.
- _____. 1973. Historical, procedural, and pedagogical aspects of sociolinguistics. The Kansas Journal of Sociology 9.201-208.
- Dillard, J.L. 1973. The American koiné-origin, ruse, and plateau stage. The Kansas Journal of Sociology 9.157-190.
- Dreiling, B.M., Compiler. 1926. Golden Jubilee of the German-Russian Settlements of Ellis and Rush Counties, Kansas. Hays, Kansas: Ellis County News.
- Fiedler, Timothy. 1975. Ethnicity in later generations: the case of German Americans. Dissertation Prospectus, Department of Sociology, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
- Galton, Herbert. 1977. Personal Communication.
- Gilbert, Glenn G. 1968. 25 hours of tape recording and unpublished biographical, folkloric and linguistic data on the German of Ellis and Rush Counties, Kansas.
- _____. Editor. 1970a. Texas Studies in Bilingualism. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co.
- _____. 1970b. The phonology, morphology, and lexicon of a German text from Fredericksburg, Texas. Texas Studies in Bilingualism. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co.

_____. Editor. 1971. The German Language in America. A Symposium. Austin: The University of Texas Press.

_____. 1972. Linguistic Atlas of Texas German. Marburg, Germany and Austin, Texas: Elwert Verlag and University of Texas Press.

_____. 1976. The German language in Ellis County, Kansas. Heritage of Kansas 9.8-16.

Haynes, Emma Schwabenland. 1974. Recent events. Conquering the Wind; An Epic Migration from the Rhine to the Volga to the Plains of Kansas. Toepfer, Amy Brungardt and Agnes Dreiling. Garwood, New Jersey: Victor C. Leiker, 3rd Printing.

Hornung, M. and F. Roitinger. 1950. Unsere Mundarten. Vienna.

Klees, Frederic. 1958. The Pennsylvania Dutch. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Kufner, Herbert L. 1962. The Grammatical Structures of English and German. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Laird, Charlton. 1970. Language in America. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Leiker, Victor C. 1974. Postscript. Conquering the Wind; An Epic Migration from the Rhine to the Volga to the Plains of Kansas. Toepfer, Amy Brungardt and Agnes Dreiling. Garwood, New Jersey: Victor C. Leiker, 3rd printing.

Leunissen, Rev. Cornelius, pastor. 1954. Diamond Jubilee; Holy Family Parish, Odin, Kansas. Claflin, Kansas: Clarion.

Lockwood, William B. 1965. An Informal History of the German Language. Cambridge, England: W. Heffer and sons.

Meyer, Rev. Earl, pastor. 1976. Saint Francis Parish, Munjor, Kansas; 1876-1976. Hays, Kansas: Print Press, Inc.

Mitzka, Walther. 1952. Handbuch Zum Deutschen Sprachatlas. Marburg: Elwertsche Universitatsbuchhandlung.

Paul, Hermann. 1966. Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Pulte, William, Jr. 1970. An analysis of selected German dialects of north Texas and Oklahoma. Texas Studies in Bilingualism. Glenn G. Gilbert, editor. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 105-141.

- Ramisch, Jacob. 1908. Studien zur niederrheinischen Dialektgeographie. Deutsche Dialektgeographie, Vol. 1. Marburg: N.G. Elwertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Reed, Carroll E. 1948. A survey of Pennsylvania German morphology. Modern Language Quarterly 9, September.
- _____ and Lester W. Seifert. 1954. A Linguistic Atlas of Pennsylvania German. Marburg, Germany: privately printed.
- Reichhardt, Friederike. 1976. Personal Communication.
- Ruppenthal, J.C. 1913. Miscellaneous notes (to Part 1): Russian words in Kansas. Dialect Notes 4.161-162 (added to Part 2).
- _____ 1914. A word list from Kansas. Dialect Notes 4.101-114 (Part 2) and Part 5, 1916, 319-331.
- _____ 1923. Minor notes: jottings from Kansas. Dialect Notes 5. 245-246 (Part 6).
- Sackett, S.J. and Lawrence A. Weigel. 1966. Unpublished data on the German spoken in Victoria, Pfeifer and Catherine, Ellis County, Kansas.
- Swan, Robert A., Jr. 1974. The Ethnic Heritage of Topeka, Kansas: Immigrant Beginnings. Lawrence, Kansas: Institute of Comparative Ethnic Studies, 83-123.
- The Mennonite Encyclopedia. 1955. Scottdale, Pennsylvania.
- Toepfer, Amy Brungardt and Agnes Dreiling. 1966. Conquering the Wind: An Epic Migration from the Rhine to the Volga to the Plains of Kansas. Garwood, New Jersey: Victor C. Leiker.
- _____ and Helen L. Hall. 1976. Weigel Genealogy. Hutchinson, Kansas: Hutchline, Inc.
- Wagner, Kurt. 1927. Deutsche Sprachlandschaften. Deutsche Dialektgeographie, Vol. 23. Marburg: N.G. Elwertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Winter, Werner. 1973. Personal Communication.