

*Derek Drake and Alexander Kramer*

## **Northwestern Dane County German: A “Speech Mixture Problem?”**

### **1. Introduction**

This study presents findings of ongoing case study research on the variation in dialects of German spoken in Roxbury, Northwestern Dane County (NWDCG), Wisconsin. As previous work examined a number of dialects historically represented in Dane County (most notably Dane County Kölsch (DCK), see also McGraw 1973, 1979), this paper deals with residents of the village of Roxbury, a community that has a high number of residents of Bavarian heritage. Expected traces of Bavarian linguistic heritage in Roxbury have received no attention in prior work on German dialects in Dane County. Drawing upon earlier investigations (Eichhoff 1971, 1985, Seifert 1947–49, 1951, 1993, among others), we examine previous analyses of the diverse German dialect landscape of Northwestern Dane County, we touch on the defining role Bavarian may have played in this dialect landscape, and we present evidence for koinéization in the Northwestern Dane County German (NWDCG) of Roxbury. In this manner, we will highlight the various input dialects of NWDCG, and give special attention to the likelihood of the heretofore undescribed importance of the broad ranging historical input dialects—particularly various Bavarian dialects—in the development of an unfocused koiné in NWDCG.

Lester W. J. Seifert’s (1947–49) “The Problem of Speech Mixture in the German Spoken in Northwestern Dane County, Wisconsin” emphasizes the variability of German in Roxbury and surrounding communities. Seifert recorded German speakers across Wisconsin including first-generation German-born consultants, as well as 2nd, 3rd and 4th generation native speakers of German, ranging in age from 17-83 (1951:202). 14 consultants were recorded in Dane County, two from Roxbury. From this group, six

spoke Kölsch, and the remaining eight a variety of Standard German referred to as *Hochdeutsch*—and these Standard German speakers were the focus and source of data presented in Seifert's study (1947–49:129–33). In a later work, Seifert notes, however (in regards to Wisconsin as a whole): “Although there was a clear majority of emigrants from North Germany, especially in the early period of settlement before the Civil War, the contingents from the middle and southern parts of the German-language area of Europe could not simply be submerged. What a multitude of German dialects was at one time spoken in Wisconsin!” (1993:323–24).

Similarly, McGraw's (1973) “The Kölsch of Dane County Wisconsin: Phonology, Morphology and English influence”<sup>1</sup> highlights the linguistic diversity of Northwestern Dane County, specifically Roxbury. McGraw's work is based on recordings made in Roxbury in 1969–70, where the interviewed speakers described their dialect as *Kölsch*, which McGraw argues to be a mix of both *Stadtkölsch* and *Landkölsch* (1973:33–34). McGraw's consultants were principally third-generation speakers, ranging from age 53 to age 76. Of the 16 consultants in McGraw's study, only seven claimed fluency in both English and Dane County Kölsch in 1969–70. Dane County Kölsch was also the language spoken in the childhood homes of 14 consultants, but only four continued to speak it in their households at the time of McGraw's research; of those only two reported speaking it with their children. Furthermore, Dane County Kölsch was only spoken in limited social domains, such as church events and card games (1973:26).

These two seminal studies provide an overview of German as documented earlier in the 20th century in NWDCG. However, the main emphasis in both was Kölsch, thereby neglecting not only the fact that many German speakers in Roxbury/Dane county are of Bavarian heritage, but also the linguistic impact this heritage might have had on the development of the local German dialects. We address the issue of Bavarian heritage, paying attention especially to the ways in which the linguistic side of this heritage affected the dialectal development of varieties of heritage German spoken in NWDCG.

The remainder of this essay is structured as follows: We first provide an overview of koinéization and koiné formation (particularly in European and American German dialects) in §1.1. This is followed by an overview of 19th century German immigration to Northwestern Dane County, including description of the language situation of the various German dialect groups that settled the area (§2) and a brief outline of the history of Roxbury in §3. §4 gives an overview of our methodology, after which we (a) discuss the elicited German language forms produced by our modern-day speakers in §5, and (b) provide a detailed overview of the sociolinguistic and sociohistorical role of and production of German in Roxbury in §6. §§5 and 6 allow for us to better contextualize both current and historical German language

production in Roxbury, as well as to examine the possibility of influence on this language community by inherited European German dialects originally spoken by 19th century immigrants in Roxbury. In §§7.1 and 8, we show that the phonological and morphological forms produced by our consultants provide convincing evidence that the dialect spoken in Roxbury is, indeed, likely the result of an “unfocused koiné” (compare Kerswill 2002, Trudgill 1986; cf. “new dialect” as defined in Trudgill 2004),<sup>2</sup> and not an unmitigated “speech mixture problem.”

### *1.1 Koinéization and Koiné<sup>3</sup> formation in North American German dialects*

We show that by paying close attention to the diverse linguistic backgrounds of the people living in Roxbury, we can arrive at a closer understanding of how the German dialect in Roxbury was shaped. In particular, we will show that the current dialect spoken in Roxbury is the result of an unfocused koiné—whereby there is a clear dialect contact scenario that allows for reduction of and leveling of different German dialects—one in which Bavarian dialects play a crucial role. Siegel (2001:175) defines a koiné as a:

stabilized contact variety which results from the mixing and subsequent leveling of features of varieties which are similar enough to be mutually intelligible, such as regional or social dialects. This occurs in the context of increased interaction or integration among speakers of these varieties.

Koiné development is contact-induced and occurs rapidly (yet more gradually than pidginization) and is typified by mixing, reduction (or leveling, see here Trudgill 1986:127), and simplification (Kerswill 2002:670–79). These processes encompass the simplification of linguistic forms that occurs during koinéization; thus, competing forms from various input dialects are essentially phased out and less, but more productive, forms remain. Furthermore, Siegel (2001:175–76) differentiates koiné into two broad categories, elsewhere also referred to as exogenous and endogenous (per Chaudenson 1977):

- (1) immigrant koiné, which develops when speakers of different dialects move to another location and form a new community, and
- (2) regional koiné, which remains in the area where the contributing dialects are spoken.

NWDCG exhibits features of both of these types, and the timeframe of koinéization in Roxbury was likely “delayed” by immigration (Salmons & Purnell 2010:457).<sup>4</sup>

Recent work (Nützel & Salmons 2011, Loudon 2009, etc.) examines other colonial (see Nützel & Salmons 2011) varieties of German in North America and show that koinéization has not occurred in Haysville (Indiana) East Franconian and Wasau (Wisconsin) Pommerian, for example. Texas German, however, offers a different scenario—one where mixing of Low and High German immigrants resulted in a koiné most similar to Standard German (Louden 2006:131).<sup>5</sup> In the case of Haysville and Wasau, key aspects of koinéization, such as leveling, did not occur (Nützel & Salmons 2011:712, see also Loudon 2009:172). Nützel & Salmons (2011:714, emphasis in original) establish that koinéization may or may not occur in colonial dialects, and that these scenarios must be examined “not only in terms of *language* contact, but equally in terms of *dialect* contact and the role of the *standard*.” As discussed in subsequent sections, heritage dialects—and not Wisconsin High German (cf. §7)—are noted by our consultants and be earlier investigations of NWDCG as playing the more pivotal role in defining the German language as spoken in Roxbury. We return to koinéization and further aspects of this process in NWDCG in §7.1.

## **2. German immigration to Northwestern Dane County**

Between 1880 and 1910, Wisconsin (as a state and endpoint for emigration) had the largest percentage of German immigrants of any state in America. In terms of the total number of German immigrants, Wisconsin stood fourth in the nation in 1880 and then third from 1890 until 1910 (Seifert 1947–49:127, Eichhoff 1971:45) in regards to total number of German immigrants in a state. The majority of these immigrants settled in eastern Wisconsin, along with other areas, including the area of Northwestern Dane County. As previously indicated, research on Northwestern Dane County German shows that the area has a rich tradition of diverse dialect representation. Eichhoff (1971:52) claims, however, that Rhineland dialects (to which, e.g., Bavarian does not belong) “have all but disappeared” in Northwestern Dane County. Furthermore, he argues that, although the dialects present in Wisconsin mirror the “home” dialect found in Germany in the mid-nineteenth century, there is no dialect mixing or “inter-German influence” (Eichhoff 1971:51–52) in Wisconsin German, a notion that this study reevaluates. Many of our consultants trace ancestry to a general region in Germany (i.e., the Rhineland or Bavaria), and we conclude that there was a mixed population of German immigrant groups in Roxbury, and that there was mixing and leveling of the respective regional dialects in the immigrant community in Roxbury. Seifert (1947–49) makes a similar assessment through his historical analysis of German in Wisconsin in the nineteenth century. Seifert acknowledges the presence of Bavarian immigrants, but does not provide linguistic evidence for Bavarian speakers, and for this reason, we were interested in NWDCG,

specifically Roxbury, as we will show that Bavarian immigrants may have indeed linguistically influenced the local German varieties, and thus play a role in the sociohistorical dialect landscape of Wisconsin German in a way not previously described by the research.

### **3. History of Roxbury**

Roxbury has long been a site of German immigration, and the first Bavarians arrived there in 1846. McGraw 1973 draws attention to the diversity of German immigrant communities, and from his and others' description of the scenario, such as the ones below, it is apparent that Bavarian played a role as such:

In Dane county there are several interesting groups of German Catholics. Roxbury is nine-tenths German, the people coming mostly from Rheinisch [*sic*] Prussia and Bavaria . . . . (Thwaites 1890:59 in McGraw 1973:11)

Most of the families which settled on the west side of the Wisconsin River (in Sauk County) were "Prussians from the Rhine Province," while those on the east side (in the Town of Roxbury) were from Bavaria. (Adelbert "Letters," 1928:72 in McGraw 1973:12)

. . . was settled almost entirely by settlers from Cologne, Trier and Bavaria—all three in fairly equal proportions—with a sprinkling from elsewhere. (Seifert 1947–49:132)

The township of Roxbury traces its earliest settlement to one established in 1840 by "Count" Augustine Haraszthy, a Hungarian immigrant to Sauk City (Clark 1877:499). Roxbury has maintained a relatively stable population, and according to data from the 2000 census, Roxbury currently has approximately 1,809 inhabitants, which shows some growth from the 1875 census, which indicated a population of 1,151 (Clark 1877:504). Of this population, 67.2% have German ancestry—exactly the population highlighted in this study—and 5.7% of households have persons 65 years and older.<sup>6</sup> These data are reflected in a handful of buildings and local institutions in Roxbury, most notably St. Norbert's, "The Roxbury Tavern," and the Bavarian restaurant the "Dorf Haus." Centers of cultural transaction, these gathering places have long preserved elements of the community's German heritage.<sup>7</sup>

### **4. Methodology**

This case study draws on roughly 7 hours of German recorded conversation stemming from 12 consultants—these data reflect longer sessions where both

English and German was spoken. The sessions were set up in places of the consultants' choosing, and began with the obtaining of informed consent from all consultants.<sup>8</sup> This was followed by a basic sociolinguistics interview (see appendix), where speakers were asked about their family background, the variety of German that they speak, as well as descriptions of life in their community. All consultants also gave basic responses to questions regarding their production of numerals, days of the week, and months. Where possible, consultants were also asked about specific forms as produced by other German speakers in the community (cf., for example, *Mädchen* as discussed in §6.5). All of these data were recorded using a USB condenser microphone with the software Audacity, and the elicited data were analyzed using the phonetic analysis software Praat.

#### *4.1 Consultant Language Backgrounds and Proficiencies*

All interviewed consultants are heritage speakers of German who, as is often the case in such scenarios, primarily learned and spoke German in the home. Our speakers have different heritage—their families have emigrated to Wisconsin from (a) in and around Cologne where Stadt/Land Kölsch<sup>9</sup> was/is spoken, (b) from regions in which a variety of Bavarian was/is spoken (Amorbach im Odenwald, Linz, Austria, Regensburg, Augsburg), and (c) from areas where Rhine-Franconian and Triersch was/is spoken. All speakers are life-long residents of Roxbury and the immediate area. With the exception of one self-described “Rhine” speaker, 5 consultants from Roxbury proper were of some degree of Bavarian heritage.<sup>10</sup> The remaining 5 speakers only give *Deutsch* as the variety that they speak, but admit to the ubiquity of *Kölsch* in the Roxbury area. Additionally, all consultants indicated that they spoke no English until they entered primary school. Furthermore, the consultants in this study were essentially never exposed to a European Standard German (i.e., *Hochdeutsch*) or European German dialects during their acquisition of the language at home and in their community, and they only were exposed to modern variants of European German during brief, post-retirement vacations to Germany, Austria and Switzerland. In §4.1 below we provide overviews of participants who provide a cross-section of the groups (a)–(c) described above.

In addition to the interview questions from Appendix 1, data in this study were also collected from free, i.e., unscripted conversation. The interviewed consultants have not actively spoken German in a number of years, with the exception of social gatherings and card games (such as *Schafkopf*, or “sheep’s head”). Topics discussed during data collection include life around the household, free-time activities, life on the farm, experiences in church, and experiences in school. Free conversation was guided and limited by the ability and willingness of the consultants, as well as by topic-related constraints—that

is, daily life, i.e., childhood on the farm and memories of church experiences were some of the only themes that were discussed, as they were the only domains in which German was spoken regularly by our consultants.

Our consultants exhibit a range of fluency that can be potentially attributed to not acquiring German fully, or to acquiring a certain level of fluency, which has lessened over time. These consultants did not learn to read or write German in school; thus the gap between these consultants and those who use(d) German all the time could potentially be attributed to attrition or incomplete acquisition.<sup>11</sup> Here, it is well worth mentioning the existing and growing body of research on the (in)acquisition of heritage language grammars. Putnam & Sánchez (2013), Montrul (2002), Polinsky (2006), among others, have recently examined the issue of attrition vs. incomplete acquisition in American heritage language speakers of various languages, and they share common concerns about the complexity of grounding views on such language usage—similar to that found in our consultants of NWDCG.<sup>12</sup> Putnam’s and Sánchez’s (2013) explication of the ‘dissociation between functional and lexical features in heritage grammars’ is a common factor in this discussion, and is also exemplified in Polinsky’s (2008; see also Polinsky 1997, 2006, etc.) line of argumentation regarding issues with lexical retrieval. Both of these concepts help in illuminating the systematicity and complexity of heritage languages, as well as the regular and irregular changes of the process.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, Polinsky (2008:161) offers that

. . . heritage speakers’ language is not simply ‘frozen’ at the stage where acquisition stops. Instead their limited mental representation of the heritage language may undergo reanalysis in concordance with universal linguistic rules and constraints.

Here, we must simultaneously acknowledge the assertion that our consultants variety of German is not “frozen” at some earlier point in time, but that their language and language usage was predicated on ongoing processes of change and reanalysis over multiple generations dictated by both the English of the outside community as well as their native German-American heritage dialect inputs.<sup>14</sup> This reinforces Putnam’s and Sánchez’s (2013) claim that, in the maintenance of a heritage language throughout a lifetime, the most important factor is the “degree of activating and processing of the L1 throughout the course of a heritage speaker’s lifetime” (Putnam & Sánchez 2013:502). It is still not entirely clear to what degree external, superstrate language influence may have been exerted on, for example, consultant phonology discussed in §§6.1–6.5 below. Because our focus is on how the linguistic background of inhabitants in Roxbury was most likely influenced by dialectal developments in Roxbury rather than on the individual consultants’ command of German/

Bavarian (or other varieties) we will leave the issue of potential attrition vs. (in)complete acquisition at this point of the debate.

*4.2 Consultant backgrounds*

Here, we provide an overview of our consultants, as well as description of their familial history (where available),<sup>15</sup> and their self-descriptions of their knowledge and usage of German. This is summarized in Table 1 (below), followed by expanded description of the consultants in the order presented in this table in the remainder of §4.2.

Consultant	Familial Background	Familial Input Dialect(s)
E	Cologne (Rhineland-Palatinate)	Kelsch
M	Amborbach (Odenwald; Bavaria)	Bavarian, Kelsch
K	Amborbach (Odenwald; Bavaria)	Bavarian, Kelsch
A	Amborbach (Odenwald; Bavaria)	Bavarian, Kelsch
W	Regensburg (Bavaria)	Bavarian
V	Augsburg (Bavaria); Trier (Rhineland-Palatinate)	
D	Bavarian (Linz, Austria)	Bavarian
F	*Rhineland	Kelsch
B	*Rhineland	Kelsch
C	*Rhineland	Kelsch
J	*Rhineland	Kelsch
L	*Rhineland	Kelsch

**Table 1. Consultant Overview Background.**<sup>16</sup>

Consultant E is unsure of the area in Germany from which his family emigrated though he traces his origins to around Cologne. He does, however, currently have family in Leubsdorf am Rhein in Rhineland-Palatinate. He reported that understanding his relatives during visits (later in life) and



speaking the local variety of German was not difficult. Additionally, his wife is of Swiss heritage, but has only passive comprehension of German, i.e., she can follow basic topics of conversation but does not actively speak German.

Consultant M, also born and raised in Roxbury, is of Bavarian heritage. His father's side of the family came to Wisconsin from Amorbach (Odenwald), Bavaria, a region that does not speak traditional Bavarian dialects, but rather shows a mix of Bavarian, Hessian and Swabian dialects. His mother is also noted as a *Kelsch* speaker. M has older and younger siblings who also grew up as native speakers of German, but they use the language less than M. Furthermore, his wife, who does not speak German, has Bavarian heritage, but is unsure of the exact location of her family's origins in Bavaria.

Consultant K is a younger sibling of M, and as such has a similar Bavarian and *Kelsch* background. She learned her variety of German from M, and not from her parents (for which she does not give an explanation). K's husband (a relative of Consultant E) grew up speaking a variety closer to how the community at large describes *Kelsch*. K speaks German less actively than M. She describes her variety simply as *Deitsch*.

Consultant A is an older sibling of M and K, and in contrast to K, A learned her German from her parents. Her variety is also self-described as *Kelsch*, though A also speaks German less actively than M.

Consultant W traces his father's heritage to Regensburg, Bavaria. W was born and raised in Roxbury and left the family farm following high school to work on other farms in the area, and then pursued work in a local factory. Although he spoke German in the household growing up, the role of German was diminished upon leaving the family farm, and as such, he has less active command of German than other consultants in this study. His wife is a cousin of E, and though his wife is of German heritage, she does not speak German.

A lifelong resident of Roxbury, Consultant V is a long time proprietor of a local establishment. V's father immigrated to Wisconsin from Augsburg, Bavaria. His mother, however, is only mentioned as a speaker of *Triersch*.

Consultant D is also a lifelong member of the farming community in Roxbury. He was raised on a farm and exposed to Bavarian there. According to D, his uncle (and *Ersatzvater*, "surrogate father") who was from Linz, Austria, spoke solely Bavarian, and was his primary source of German-language interaction at home.

Consultants F, B, C, J and L have very similar backgrounds, and all grew up in and lived in Roxbury and the surrounding countryside. These speakers all describe their variety of German as *Deitsch*, yet some recall older family members and friends in the community that knew and spoke *Kelsch*, although they did not claim outright proficiency in this variety. These speakers did not have Bavarian background, and claimed to have no proficiency in Bavarian

varieties.

### 5. European base dialect region: Amorbach (Odenwald), Bavaria<sup>17</sup>

A number of our speakers, e.g., M and siblings, trace their heritage to the village of Amorbach<sup>18</sup> in the *Dreiländereck* of northwestern Bavaria. This dialect area shows a convergence of features of surrounding dialects (e.g., Bavarian, Hessian, and Swabian) based on the geographic proximity of these dialects. The following overview focuses on forms found indicative of the language scenario present in Roxbury—i.e., forms which show dialect mixing, leveling, and are indicative of koiné formation. Wenz's (1911) traditional, detailed description of the nearby city dialect of Beerfelden devotes little time to the diversity of dialects present in the surrounding area, which is located in the Odenwald of Bavaria's *Dreiländereck* approximately 40 km from the village of Amorbach. The Bayerische Landesbibliothek Online<sup>19</sup> (BLO) provides an excellent resource, where a number of cities/villages across Bavaria are represented with audio recordings of various lexical items. Schneeberg (Odenwald) and Aschaffenburg are the closest areas<sup>20</sup> to Amorbach represented by the BLO project. We include, where possible, transcription of pertinent forms from the BLO's sound recordings from Schneeberg. We address these differences in §6 below and assess Eichhoff's claim of the preservation of 19th century European German dialects in the German of heritage speakers in Wisconsin.

### 6. Language of Consultants

All of the consultants interviewed described their language as *Deutsch* or *Hochdeutsch*. Regardless of familial background, all consultants claimed competency in and familiarity with various dialectal forms. A few of our speakers also claimed outright some level of competency in Bavarian (Consultants M, D and V), but our data shows that these speakers do not speak traditional Bavarian dialects, i.e., a Bavarian with clear hallmarks of the regions or cities that represent their familial origins. Additionally, most consultants claimed some level of familiarity with *Kelsch*, but none claimed outright competency in this variety. Our speakers are best described as existing on both a standard German and dialect continuum; that is, our speakers show varying levels of proficiency but consistency with forms highlighted in Tables 2 and 3 below. In the following sections (6.1–6.3) we provide a detailed analysis of the phonology and phonetic realization of the most salient features in our speakers' production of numerals and the days of the week.

6.1 Consultant Phonology – Numerals in NWDCG

Standard German	Beerfelden	DCK	NWDCG
eins, ‘one’	ɛnɐ, ɛni, ɛns	e:n	aɪns
zwei, ‘two’	tswɛ, tswɔ, tswai	tswaj	tsvaɪ
drei, ‘three’	draɪ	dʀɛj	draɪ
vier, ‘four’	fɪɐ	fɪə	viɐ
fünf, ‘five’	fɪnf, fɪnfə	ʔʏnəf	fɪnəf, fʏmf <sup>21</sup>
sechs, ‘six’	seks, seksə	sɛks	sɛks
sieben, ‘seven’	siwə, siwənə	sɪbə	zibə
acht, ‘eight’	axd, axdə	a:x	axt
neun, ‘nine’	nɔɹ, nɔɹnə	nʏŋ	naɪn
zehn, ‘ten’	tseə, tsenə	tseːn	tseɪn, sen
elf, ‘eleven’	ɛlf, ɛlfə	iləf	ɛləf
zwölf, ‘twelve’	tswɛlf, tswɛlfə	tswyləf, tswylf	tsvɛləf
dreizehn, ‘thirteen’	draɪdse, draɪdsenə	dʀʏkse:n	draɪdsen
hundert, ‘one hundred’	hunɐd	-	hunɐd

**Table 2. Numerals in Standard German, Beerfelden dialect, DCK and NWDCG.**

Table 2 above shows numeral forms as recorded from our speakers, as well as the same forms as produced historically in Dane County Kölsch (albeit with unrounding, see McGraw 1979:115, 45, 19, McGraw 1973:202) and the Beerfelden dialect of the Bavarian Odenwald.<sup>22</sup> Table 2 also shows that our speakers produce forms similar to both DCK and the Beerfelden dialect, but that they do not match systematically, that is, throughout the listed forms with any one input dialect. Their production shows, rather, influence from various dialects historically attested in the proximity of Roxbury. These numerals show similarities to Standard German with [aɪns], “one,” [naɪn], “nine,” whereas [ɛləf], “elven” and [tsvɛləf], “twelve” show patterns that embody expected production of these numerals in all of the forms given in Table 2.<sup>23</sup> Notably, NWDCG speakers produce *drei*, “three”

[drai] and *vier*, “four” [viɐ] exactly as noted for Beerfelden ([drai], [fiɐ]). The numeral *dreizehn*, “thirteen” [draɪtsɛn] is also closer to the Beerfelden forms [draidsɛ], [draidsɛnə] than to the form shown in DCK, [dʁɪksɛ:n]. Additionally, epenthetic [ə] is present in our data above, as in [fɪnəf], “five.” [ɛləf], “eleven” and [tsvɛləf], “twelve.” In these instances, these numbers most closely, yet not exactly, resemble forms expected in DCK, where DCK show initial [i] in [iləf], “eleven,” and *zwölf*, “twelve” exhibits forms with an epenthetic vowel—[tswyləf] and [tswylf].

These forms indicate the likelihood of past mixing and leveling (further discussed in §7.1). In terms of the numerals, our speakers produce forms closer to DCK speakers than to forms historically attested in the Beerfelden dialect. In this manner, it is possible that the non-traditional Bavarian heritage speakers in our study may have brought forms with them that are slightly different from speakers that surrounded them, i.e., *Kelsch* and Rhenish speakers. At the same time, however, Northern/Central Bavarian and Upper Austrian forms show little similarity to the forms produced by our speakers of NWDCG. Phonological markers, i.e., “typical” Bavarian diphthongization (in *eins*, “one,” *zwei*, “two” etc.) and assimilation (*fünf*, “five,” *sieben*, “seven” etc.) evidenced throughout much of Bavarian and attested in these dialects (as seen in *Baydat: die bayerischen Dialektdatenbank*<sup>24</sup> as well as König 2009: Maps 328-38 for Augsburg, Regensburg, Riedenburg, Straubing, Passau, and Untersperger 2009 for the Upper Austrian Dialect of Weyregg am Attersee) appear to not have survived language change processes in NWDCG. Similar trends can be seen in our speakers’ production of the days of the week, which are discussed in detail in the following section.

Standard German	Beerfelden Dialect <sup>25</sup>	DCK <sup>26</sup>	Schneeberg (Odenwald)	NWDCG
Montag, ‘Monday’	mundak, mantac	ˈmɛ:n,dax	mɔndax	mɔndax, mundax
Dienstag, ‘Tuesday’	dɪnʃdag	ˈdiŋs,dax	dɪnʃdax	dɪnsdax
Mittwoch, ‘Wednesday’	-	ˈmɪt,wɛx	mitwɔx	mitwɔx
Donnerstag, ‘Thursday’	dunɐʃdag		dunɔʃdax	donɔʃdax, dunɔʃdax
Freitag, ‘Friday’	-	ˈfri:dax	fɾaidax	fɾaidax
Samstag, ‘Saturday’	-	ˈsams,dak	samʃdax	samsdax, sumsdax, samstɔs
Sonntag, ‘Sunday’	sundags (adv.)	ˈsɔn,dax	sundax	sondax, sundax

**Table 3. Days of the week in varieties of German.**

6.2 *Consultant Phonology—Days of the week in NWDCG*

As with numerals, speakers show uniformity in producing days of the week (shown in Table 3 above), yet the historical development of these particular forms within the community is unclear.

Again, the days of the week are not entirely representative of one particular input variety, or may belong to a dialect not described in previous literature, which developed through dialect mixing and leveling. Along these lines, the items of particular interest in Table 3 are [mɔndax], [mundax], [donəsdax], [dunəsdax], and [sondax], [sundax]. These forms more closely resemble those attested in the dialects of Beerfelden and Schneeberg than those associated with DCK or Standard German.<sup>27</sup>

6.3 *Consultant Phonology—Preconsonantal shibbolization of /s/*

All speakers<sup>28</sup> are essentially uniform in their production of days of the week. For *Donnerstag*, however, E, M, and J shibilize /s/, resulting in [donəsdax] or [dunəsdax], “Thursday.” For *Samstag*, “Saturday” and *Sonntag*, “Sunday,” however, E produces the expected /a/ and /o/, while M produces a raised /u/, resulting in [sumsdax] and [sundax] (also produced by J, though this consultant does not have a raised [sumsdax]). For all days of the week, all speakers consistently produce a word final velar fricative. M’s and J [sumsdax] does not correspond to BLO recordings from Schneeberg (Odenwald), which more closely resembles E’s [samsdax] (however, with the shibbolization of /s/). The BLO audio recordings from Schneeberg show, in fact, that /s/ is shibbolized where possible for every day of the week. *Dienstag*, “Tuesday” and *Donnerstag*, “Thursday” also have attested shibbolized forms in Augsburg (V’s paternal heritage dialect), though shibbolization is shown to be a widely recognized feature of this dialect (see Féry & Ruben van Vijver 2003:9). Additionally, North/Central Bavarian and Upper Austrian dialects show marked forms unlike the forms produced by our speakers. W, however, (with paternal heritage from Regensburg) produces [samstɔs],<sup>29</sup> a form historically attested in Regensburg and surrounding communities, as well as variations of this base form in Augsburg and Linz (see Mitzka & Schmitt 1968, Map 11 for /samste/; similarly Keller 1976 for Regensburg; BayDat shows this form attested in Straubing, but not in Riedenburg or Passau; Untersperger 2009 shows forms attested in Upper Austrian).

6.4 *Consultant Phonology – /g/ > [j]/[ç]*

Our speakers regularly produce /g/ as [j] or [ç] as exemplified by *Morgen*, “morning” [morjə]/[morçə].<sup>30</sup> They also show medial /j/ for /g/, where this is realized as either a glide or a palatal fricative. Similarly, the adverbial *morgens*, “in the morning” is realized as mɔɪjens in the dialect of Beerfelden (Wenz 1911:70). NWDCG speakers only show this phenomenon medially, whereas

/g/ is realized as a glide across the board in DCK, that is word initially, medially, and word finally. Examples include the production of [jra:t] *gerade*, “just,” [jə'janə] *gegangen*, “to have gone,” [ˈkrɪs,kɪŋkjə] *Christkindchen* “Christ Child” (diminutive) and [mɔ:rjə] *Morgen*, “morning” (McGraw 1973:34–35, 1979:36).

The production of /g/ as voiced lenis palatal-alveolar stop [g] in DCK occurs only in medial positions, however, except for English words with initial /g/ and final /g/ in sandhi (see McGraw 1973:72 for examples). In summary, DCK, then, shows broader range and variability of possibilities for /g/, where this is realized phonetically as [g], [j], and [ç] depending on the linguistic environment. Our NWDCG data, however, only exhibits the production of coda /g/ as [j] or [ç].

[ɔʏ]	[ʏ] <sup>31</sup>	[ø], [œ]
[zɑɪç], ‘Zeug’, ‘thing’; Consultant M	[hɪnd], Hünde, ‘dogs’; Consultant D	[keɪnɪç], ‘König’, ‘king’; Consultants M, D
[nɑɪ], neu, ‘new’; Consultant W	[heɪnə], ‘Hühner’, ‘chickens’; Consultant B	[beɪmənwɔld], ‘Böhmenwald’, ‘Bohemian Forest’; Consultant D
[nɑɪntsen], ‘neunzehn’, ‘nineteen’, Consultants D, V, B	[kɪ:], ‘Kühe’, ‘cows’; Consultants D, E, M	[ʃe:n], ‘schön’, ‘nice, pretty’; Consultant D
[dɑɪtʃ], [dɑɪtʃɔnd]; ‘Deutsch’, ‘German’, ‘Deutschland’, ‘Germany’; all consultants; Consultant D	[frɪlɪŋ] <sup>32</sup> , ‘Frühling’, ‘Spring’; Consultant V	[fuxsenlɛjə], ‘Füchsenlöcher’, ‘fox holes, fox dens’; Consultant F

**Table 4. Unrounding in Speakers of NWDCG.**

### 6.5 Consultant Phonology – Rounding/Unrounding

Unrounding as a feature is present across speakers of all backgrounds in our study. Geiger & Salmons (in Cravens 2006) note that some Wisconsin Standard German speaking communities show both rounded vowels, and sometimes unrounded vowels as well (indicative of the likelihood of speaker access to multiple varieties). To that end, they propose that DCK (on the basis of recordings from the 1940s and 1970s) is likely leveling “in a direction to become like most German-American dialects and losing some of its most Cologne-specific features” (46). To illustrate this, they provide examples of front rounded vowels, including [y] in *Tür*, as well as “secondary rounding,”

as in /d̥œʃ/, *Tisch* (noted as expected in Rhenish and other northern and western German dialects). One speaker in their study (stemming from the 1970s recordings), however, “typically inconsistently unrounds” including English /d̥ɪr/, *door* and German /bɪçələ/, *bügel*n (yet produces /kœ/ “cows” for standard German /ky:ə/ (46). This sort of “inconsistency” is in line with forms produced by our speakers of NWDCG, and would be expected in an unfocused koiné. Table 4 above gives examples of unrounding exhibited by our speakers.

Rounding is exhibited by Consultants M and K, who produces both a Standard German form *ich weiß*, ‘I know,’ as well as a form where the diphthong is rounded to [ɔʏ]. Gütter (1971:Map 21) shows rounding of MHG /ei/ in Northern Bavarian, including parts of the Upper Palatinate (around Amberg-Sulzbach), as well as around Donauwörth and northwest of Ingolstadt in Upper Bavarian. In light of these mixed forms, the rounding exhibited here could be further indication of dialectal leveling in Northwestern Dane County. This is particularly of interest knowing that Consultant K learned her variety from her brother, M, and not from her parents. M shows more consistent usage of forms likely gleaned from Bavarian (i.e., from his father), and not from the *Kelsch* that his mother spoke—which was the defining aspect of the oldest sibling’s, A’s, dialect acquisition. That K is married to a consultant (not recorded for this study) with *Kelsch* heritage further complicates and illuminates the complexity of the linguistic scenario in this community. Furthermore, the scenario just described complicates Seifert’s description of the ‘linguistic dominance’ of one parent in a family (Seifert 1947-49:130), namely that of the mother. While this may hold true, it seems that nuclear-family external contacts, as well as situationally-bound dominance of either of two parents with divergent dialects further obfuscates an already complex language contact situation (cf. also Trudgill 2004).

## 6.6 Phonological Outliers

### (a.) *Mädchen*, “girl”

We now examine some phonological outliers, or items that appear to show clear divergence from expected forms available in our consultants’ heritage dialects. First, we investigate the lexical item *Mädchen*, “girl.” Here, with the exception of V, all of our consultants produced [mɛʃə]. One consultant (D) explained that *Mädche*, *Mädchen* shows the singular vs. plural distinction. It must be noted that this consultant also spoke strictly his variety of Upper Bavarian (Linz, Austria) on his farm in Roxbury. According to Mitzka’s (1955:30, see also König 2007:166) isoglosses, [mɛʃə] only occurs

in dialects north of Frankfurt. In DCK, [mæ:ɪtʃə] is the expected singular and plural form (McGraw 1979:33). Interestingly, the Schneeberg entry for *Mädchen* represents a more “Badisch” form, *Mädēl* [me:dlə], where the entry for Aschaffenburg is *Mädche* [me:ɪtʃə], more closely resembling the forms produced by our Roxbury consultants. V, however, produces *Mädēl* [me:dl], while the base form for this item in Augsburg (from which his father comes) is *Dirnlein* (BLO, compare also Mitzka 1955:30).

(b.) *Jungel Bube*, “boy”

Speaker (M) uses both variants of both *Junge* [juŋ] and *Bube* [bu:βə].<sup>33</sup> In *Bube* we see a bilabial fricative [β] instead of a voiced bilabial [b], and in [juŋ] we see apocope of [e]. M produces a form that is uncommon in “Rhine” dialects (i.e., Kölsch, Triersch, Rhenish, etc.) or Odenwäldisch, but forms similar to his (for example /buʃ/, /buʋ/) are attested across boundaries stretching from south of Koblenz into Central German and Rhine Franconian (Mitzka 1955:23).

M alternates between both forms in the same narrative, within roughly 30 seconds of each other. Dialect forms of *Junge* occur in middle and lower German dialects, and dialect forms of *Bube* occur mainly in Central and Upper German dialects. Accordingly, anticipated forms in northwestern Bavarian (i.e., in the Odenwald dialect) are /bu/ and /bou/ (Mitzka 1955: 23, see also König 2007:166), and D, in fact, produces /bu/.<sup>34</sup>

(c.) *anderscht*, “different,” *Erbſcht*, “pea,” *Auguſchtin*, “Augustin,” *erſcht*, “first”

Both speakers E and M produce [andɛʃt] for standard German *anders*, “different.” According to Wenz, in the Beerfelden dialect MHG /d/ disappears medially following /l/ and /n/. Word finally, however, /ld/ and /nd/ remain (1911:33). Additionally, /d/ is often represented word finally in other environments such as *laixd Beerdigung*, “funeral,” *boſd Bursche*, “boy” as well as *anɛʃd anders*, “different” (Wenz 1911:33). Similarly, both Speakers D and V also produce *Erbſe*, “pea” [ɛrbʃt], and D produces *Auguſtin* [auguʃtin] and *erſt* [ɛrʃt]. Based on our background information for all speakers, they have roots in areas historical straddling the fe[s]t, fe[ʃ]t isogloss (compare also Gütter 1971:Map 30 for this isogloss in Northern Bavarian).<sup>35</sup> The shibilization of [s] and the addition of [t] following shibilization (as in [ɛrbʃt] and [fɛʃt]) exemplify the sorts of features that expand beyond the limitations of lines and isoglosses as presented historically. It is, thus, plausible that speakers in Dane County, Wisconsin would show both forms, as both E’s and M’s families likely historically had this feature. Even if these features were lost over time, the sort of leveling that likely occurred in Northwestern Dane County could account for E and M both producing similar forms, and this can likely



be attributed to the contact scenario of mixing and leveling expected in the koinéization process. Forms such as [andɛft] *anders* and *Erbse* [ɛrbʃt] show an historical feature representative of the diverse linguistic landscape of the various input varieties, including that of Cologne, Northern Bavaria and the Bavarian Odenwald that appear to be present in NWDCG.

### 6.7 Consultant Morphology—Loss of word final /n/

The loss of word-final /n/ is attested across all of our speakers. McGraw 1973 and Templin 1999 have both discussed the formation of plurals in DCK, noting that -n and Ø plurals vary (Templin 1999:31, McGraw 1973:110–16).<sup>36</sup> Our speakers' production of *Mädche* is consistent with this explanation. Schirmunski (2010:448) also examines final /n/ deletion in Rhine Franconian (with the exception of North Hessian or Niederhessisch and the Palatinate), Southern Franconian, Western East Franconian (to around Würzburg), Alsatian, Swiss, and various “Rhine” dialects—this is expected in the Low Franconian “Rhine” dialect of Cologne, but not in the dialects of the *rechtes Rheinufer*, “right side of the Rhine.” Once more we have a feature produced by all of our speakers that, although present in numerous dialects, is not particularly representative of any one input dialect, but is seen across the board in our speakers of NWDCG.

## 7. Wisconsin High German

Even in a dialect-rich landscape such as Wisconsin, something resembling a standard existed and still exists today. To the overall dialect situation, Eichhoff (1985:233–34) states that, even though many immigrants spoke a form of non-standard German referred to in lay terms as Plattdeutsch most of these speakers understood, sometimes with difficulty, Standard German.<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, Eichhoff writes that (1971:51):

The relationship of the dialects to Standard German in Wisconsin closely reflects the situation in mid-nineteenth-century Germany. In rural areas of Germany the dialects reigned almost exclusively, while in the cities the standard language was gaining predominance, especially among the educated.

Though Eichhoff (1971) writes that Wisconsin Standard German developed and existed primarily in and around Milwaukee, both Seifert (1947–49:128–32) and McGraw (1973:27–33) show that varieties of Standard German were also represented in Roxbury and throughout Dane County. Seifert and McGraw also highlight the interplay and importance of Standard German and English, where Seifert (1993:335–36) notes that in “cross-dialect

communication, use was made of English or a variety of Standard German and the latter served as the basis for the beginning stages of leveling.”

Our Roxbury consultants, who range from 2nd to 4th generation heritage speakers, all learned German as their first language at home. They in fact, often first encountered English upon entering the school system. It must, however, be taken into account that all of our consultants claim different, distinct heritage, that is to say *Kelsch*, Bavarian, Austrian and others that are likely a mix of these varieties. To that end, however, with the exception of D and V (who directly assert their Austro-Bavarian heritages), all speakers identify themselves primarily as of speakers of *Deutsch*. Even speakers with “Rhine” (*Kelsch*, Triersch, etc.) backgrounds do not self-identify as speakers of these varieties, and, in fact, claim some knowledge of *Kelsch*, but do not claim outright competency in this variety.<sup>38</sup>

### *7.1 Northwestern Dane County German: Dialect, standard, or somewhere in between?*

Earlier studies make clear the variability of language forms in Northwestern Dane County, which include varieties of Standard German, different dialects, as well as the impact of English on these variants of German. Seifert (1947–49, 1951, 1993, etc.), McGraw (1973, 1979) and Eichhoff (1971, 1985, etc.) have highlighted the mixing of these forms—be it the local variant of Kölsch, a sort of Standard German (or “Wisconsin Standard German”), or other Rhine dialects such as Triersch. These studies show, however, that the exact nature of the interplay of these dialects, and the role they play within a given speech community or area is not always clearly definable. For example, early studies have put forth the notion that Standard German is predominately found in “urban areas of eastern Wisconsin” (Eichhoff 1985:234), and that “the dialects are almost identical to those still spoken in Germany” (Eichhoff 1971:51).

Our data shows a varied and rich German landscape that encompasses even more linguistic diversity than was described by Seifert’s pioneering work from the mid-20th century on Northwestern Dane County German. Our consultants show a mixing of dialects that do not correspond one-to-one with a certain European base dialect, in our instances the dialects of Beerfelden and Schneeberg (Odenwäldisch), varieties of Kölsch, and Bavarian dialects. As such, there are certainly features that do lend credence to the claim that older elements from the above-listed historical dialects may very well be attested in the modern speech of our Roxbury consultants. There seems to be more evidence in support of dialectal leveling in the German of our Roxbury speakers. The process here is most likely regional dialect leveling,<sup>39</sup> which is defined by Kerswill (2002:671) as “the decrease in the

number of variants of a particular phonological, morphological, or lexical unit in a given dialect.” Such leveling also “leads to a reduction of difference in dialects and hence a gradual homogenization of the vernacular speech in a region.” Jacob (2002:78) supports this scenario and states that, although a number of German immigrants arrived in America as monolinguals, they often became (potentially) multi-lingual by acquiring dialects, Standard German and English. One very salient example of this is evidenced in the numerals produced by our speakers. All speakers produced their numerals in exactly the same way. In the same manner, our speakers also produced very similar forms for the days of the weeks and the months of the year. These kinds of “stabilized,” “crystallised” forms point to the survival of majority forms described within Stages II and III of Trudgill’s “new dialect” paradigm (2004:100-23). The exceptions to this are a few days as elicited from Speakers E and M. The variation here could very well point to M’s maintenance of features present in his Bavarian-influenced dialect that differ from the *Kelsch* and Rhenish of E’s dialect, such as non-lowering of /a/ to /u/ and /o/ to /u/ in [sumsdax] and [sundax]; this is less clear for J, as this consultant is not entirely certain of her linguistic heritage.<sup>40</sup> Here it must also be noted that the forms produced by our speakers also do not match up one to one with those expected in DCK. The variation and common forms among our speakers would seem to indicate that dialect mixing and leveling had occurred at an earlier point in Roxbury. This sort of “extreme variability,” likely from mixing in previous generations, allows for inter- and intra-individual variability in Stage II of Trudgill’s “new dialect” framework (cf. Chapter 5, pp. 113 ff.)

The German spoken by our consultants in Roxbury is almost certainly due to contact based change as described by Kerswill & Trudgill (2005). Van Coetsem’s (2000) “stability gradient” for language contact change can also help explicate further the scenario in Roxbury. Here, Van Coetsem asserts that (among other features), when speakers are symmetrically bilingual, then components are transferred freely between the languages at the speakers’ discretion, though it seems our speakers are only bilingual in the sense of being native speakers of their variety of German and Wisconsin English (Van Coetsem 2000, see also Nützel & Salmons 2011:3). As previously noted, mixing and leveling are also features of koinéization and new dialect formation (Nützel & Salmons 2011, Kerswill 2002, and Kerswill & Trudgill 2005), and Nützel & Salmons (2011:3–4) assert that:

the strong tendency for leveling and simplification to occur over time, as a compromise variety emerges from generations receiving variable, heterogeneous input (see also Trudgill 2002:711–15). Features most likely to survive koine formation are those not associated

with any particular input variety, those not saliently marking some subpopulation of the new community. Koine formation requires several generations, at least three typically, with a period of great variability before that.

The scenario described by Nützel & Salmons (2011) mirrors in many ways the language of our consultants in Roxbury; NWDCG is very much a mixed, compromise variety, with remnants or *Überbleibsel* of marked, heritage input dialect features that have likely changed and developed over the preceding three to four generations of speakers of this dialect—the associated dialect feature are, also, not markings of a dialectal subgroup, but distinctive features of the main dialect areas representative of the immigrants that came to form the community in Roxbury. Our data show, hence, that the range of historical dialect inputs in conjunction with both variability and commonalities in our speakers is exemplary of an early stage of language contact and development typical for koinéization still visible in our modern speakers of NWDCG.

Our consultants have, in some instances, family heritage that extends back to the first Bavarian/German immigration in Roxbury in the mid 1840s. Furthermore, the German produced by our consultants show leveling and simplification not necessarily associated with any particular input variety. The clearest association of these in our consultants is the almost total lack of connectedness to any sort of traditional Bavarian linguistic heritage—the Bavarian influences shown in our consultants is mixed, at best, and shows influence from the highly variable Odenwald region, as well as rounding not unexpected in other German dialect areas. The same, however, can be said of our consultants with *Kölsch* heritage. Similarly, these speakers produce forms not attested in modern European Kölsch dialects.

## **8. Conclusion**

This case study, our initial and continuing investigation into the German of Roxbury, Northwestern Dane County, Wisconsin, shows that, through multiple generations of dialect contact, the German as spoken by our consultants lends itself to models of leveling in language/dialect contact, and also to the earlier formation of an unfocused, mixed, incomplete koiné (as defined by Kerswill 2002 and Trudgill 1986, respectively; this definition also fits the “new dialect” model described in Trudgill 2004) among the sample of NWDCG speakers we interviewed in Roxbury. This is exemplified in our speakers’ language, which exhibits:

- (a) elements of “Rhine” dialects (various Kölsch dialects, as well as varieties of Landkölsch, Triersch),

- (b) Rhenish (e.g. Rhine-Franconian elements in Beerfelden),
- (c) potential maintenance of Odenwäldisch/various Bavarian dialects and
- (d) elements of what can best be described as Wisconsin Standard German.

As Kerswill (2002) has noted:

... when dialects (and not languages) are in contact as in koineization, speakers can continue to use their own vernaculars for all informal interaction within a newly formed community (Siegel 2001). When this is coupled with solidarity, mutual accommodation on the part of the speakers results, forming the basis of a future new dialect. (9)

This may help account for the more overriding evidence that, even though some of our consultants, particularly D (Bavarian background), E (*Kelsch* background), and M (Bavarian/*Kelsch* background) often show features reflective of those expected in the inherited parent dialects, the majority of high-frequency forms (i.e., days of the week, numerals, and months) in this speech community point towards to compromise or interdialectal forms (cf. Trudgill 1986, Trudgill 2004).

While there appears to be any number of elements at play here, there was more than likely stabilized bilingualism in certain domains of interaction. Contact with extra-regional forms, such as non-Kölsch “Rhine” dialects and Wisconsin High German, could have given way to other dominant forms in the area (such as the local *Kelsch*) that created a leveling situation among the existing forms, such as Bavarian dialects which, in many of our consultants’ description played a secondary role to familial and community contacts who are most often described as *Kelsch*. American English has also clearly exerted its effects on NWDCG, as exhibited in the community wide pronunciation of *Februar*, “February” with an American retroflex [ɹ], as well as likely in consultant pronunciation of *neun*, “nine” as [nɑɪn]. This is consistent with other observations of contact situations involving American English and Germanic dialects in the United States.<sup>41</sup>

In light of the scenario suggested above, an environment conducive to dialect contact and leveling could have triggered koineization at an earlier stage in North Western Dane County German. Still, whereas some previous research has indicated that this has not happened, our case study data show a great deal of dialect contact and leveling characteristic of an unfocused or incomplete’ koiné, which developed over multiple generations, where (even in the wake of likely sooner-than-later’ language death)<sup>42</sup> heritage speakers

of varied German origin (Bavaria, Cologne, Trier, etc.) produce mixed, non-standard forms with clear distinctions from any one parent dialect.

*Ferris State University  
Big Rapids, Michigan*

### **Appendix: Sociolinguistic Interview Questions**

- 1.) Wie heißen die Wochentage auf Deutsch? (“What are the days of the week?”)
- 2.) Wie heißen die Monate auf Deutsch? (“What are the months of the year?”)
- 3.) Wie zählen Sie auf Deutsch? (“How do you count in German?”)
- 4.) Können Sie über Ihre Kindheit in Roxbury sprechen? (“Can you tell me about your childhood and growing up in Roxbury?”)
- 5.) Sprechen Sie Deutsch oder Dialekt? Wie beschreiben Sie Ihr Deutsch? (“Do you speak German or a dialect? How would you describe your German?”)
- 6.) Was können Sie mir noch über Ihr Leben in Roxbury erzählen? (“What else can you tell me about your life in Roxbury?”)
- 7.) Waren Sie schon mal in Deutschland? Haben Sie Freunde in Deutschland oder irgendwo anders, die Deutsch sprechen? (“Where you ever in Germany? Do you have friends in Germany or elsewhere who speak German?”)

### **Notes**

<sup>1</sup> More recent work on DCK focuses on the substrate influences of DCK on Wisconsin English, such as Voice Onset Time (see for example Geiger & Salmons 2006 and Geiger 2002).

<sup>2</sup> Similarly, Kerswill (2002:673) discusses Le Page’s (1980) notion of diffusion, which is described as “linguistic heterogeneity among the population, with variability both between and within individuals” (2002:18).

<sup>3</sup> Both *koine* and *koiné* spellings exist in the literature, and we use *koiné* except in citations where this spelling is not adopted.

<sup>4</sup> This may be linked to the discussion on the timescale of *koinéization* in a given community by Kerswill & Williams (2000), where they address the possible lack of sociolinguistic continuity in a community—in their data from Reading, for example older phonological variants are sometimes retained while in Milton Keynes older variants are absent. In our consultants, those with Bavarian heritage mostly trace their origins to the mid-18th century (with the exception of Consultants V and D, whose heritage dates to the turn of the century), while those with more familiarity with *Kelsch* tend to trace their roots to immigration in the late 19th century.

<sup>5</sup> Boas 2009 (and others; see also Boas et al. on the Texas German dialect project) and Roesch 2012 argue, however, that only the initial stages of Trudgill’s (2004) *koinéization* process were completed in the Texas Alsatian dialect. Guion 1996 asserts that simplification and regularization can account for rapid changes in the dialects of Texas German from the late

19th to mid-20th centuries (462).

<sup>6</sup> Census information for Roxbury can be accessed at the following URL: [http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ADPTable?\\_bm=y&-geo\\_id=06000US5502569850&-qr\\_name=ACS\\_2009\\_5YR\\_G00\\_DP5YR2&-ds\\_name=ACS\\_2009\\_5YR\\_G00\\_-&-lang=en&-sse=on](http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ADPTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=06000US5502569850&-qr_name=ACS_2009_5YR_G00_DP5YR2&-ds_name=ACS_2009_5YR_G00_-&-lang=en&-sse=on).

<sup>7</sup> Heggland 2002 provides more information on the history of Roxbury and other communities in Dane County.

<sup>8</sup> This research is covered by the ongoing and active protocol “German in Wisconsin: Linguistic Consultant Consent Form” by the Center for the Study of Upper Midwestern Cultures and the Max Kade Institute at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

<sup>9</sup> Speakers referred to the local variety of ‘Kölsch’ as either [kelʃ] or [keltʃ], where the majority used the former.

<sup>10</sup> See §§4.2 and 5 for more on these backgrounds.

<sup>11</sup> Because our focus is on how the linguistic background of inhabitants in Roxbury influenced the dialect development in Roxbury rather than on the individual consultants’ command of German/Bavarian (or other varieties) we will limit the discussion of issues related to attrition and acquisition here.

<sup>12</sup> See Putnam & Sánchez (2013) also for a discussion of the competing definitions of heritage language.

<sup>13</sup> Silva-Corvalan (1994) (in Putnam & Sánchez 2013) gives a description of language change in Los Angeles heritage Spanish not regulated by transfer from the superordinate or superstrate language, for example.

<sup>14</sup> Though it must be noted that in the first decades of Roxbury’s existence (i.e., during the formation phase of this koiné), the town did not have its own marketplace. Based on geography and dialect distribution, German-language speakers in Roxbury likely principally interacted with community outsiders who spoke Rhine- and Bavarian derived dialects (cf. Clark 1877).

<sup>15</sup> It must also be noted that many of these speakers are closely related, and that this must be taken in mind when discussing the nature of the data discussed in the remainder of this study.

<sup>16</sup> \* in this table denotes that consultants were unsure of their exact background, but were, nonetheless, insistent on some connection both geographically (i.e., original source of emigration) and linguistically to *Kelsch*.

<sup>17</sup> Consultants D, V, and W have more traditional Bavarian backgrounds (Linz, Regensburg, Augsburg), and are likely minority representatives of Bavarian—consultants with Northern Bavarian heritage represent the first Bavarians in Roxbury, and they represent a larger demographic of Bavarian in the area. Where necessary, forms representative of traditional Bavarian will be included for comparison’s sake.

<sup>18</sup> The dialect of Beerfelden, Odenwald as described in Wenz 1911 is also used as a point of reference to examine dialect contact, and the preservation of dialect elements in NWDCG.

<sup>19</sup> The BLO can be accessed at <http://sprachatlas.bayerische-landesbibliothek-online.de/>.

<sup>20</sup> Schneeberg is located approximately 3 km east of Amorbach.

<sup>21</sup> Of our consultants, only V produces *fünf*, “five” as a standard-like form. Similarly, K is the only consultant to produce *zehn*, “ten” without a word-initial voiceless alveolar affricate [ts].

<sup>22</sup> These numerals are listed in Wenz (1911:77), and have been transcribed from the original *Teuthonista* symbols into IPA.

<sup>23</sup> NWDCG speakers show tendency to unround where possible. Other examples include *neun* [naɪn], *Deutsch*, and Speakers D and M unround the noun *Stück* and the adjective *schön*.

<sup>24</sup> Baydat: die bayerischen Dialektdatenbank is available at: <http://www.baydat.uni-wuerzburg.de:8080/cocoon/baydat/>.

<sup>25</sup> Wenz only provides days of the week as glosses (examples above 1911:23, 29).

<sup>26</sup> These examples are found in McGraw (1979:115).

<sup>27</sup> To the extent possible, we compare Central and Southern Bavarian forms attested by the BLO, and these forms do not match one-to-one those produced by our consultants.

<sup>28</sup> E claims *Kelsch* heritage, whereas M has both *Kelsch* heritage (through his mother) and Bavarian heritage (through his father). V (Bavarian and Triersch), D (Austrian Bavarian) and (W North/Central Bavarian) also produce nearly identical forms to E and M; see Trudgill 2004 on the variability of forms due to mixing in previous generations.

<sup>29</sup> Rob Howell (p.c.) notes that *Ertag* “Dienstag” and *Pfingstag* “Donnerstag” are salient forms also found in Bavarian (see BLO and BayDat entries), yet are the kind of marked forms that are expected to be lost during koinéization. A handful of similarly marked forms, however, are produced by our speakers, including *schwätzen* “to talk” (Consultant M produced this for Standard German *sprechen, reden*, “to speak”), and *gelbe Rüben*, “carrots” (Consultant D produced this for Standard German *Karotten*). These forms, while not unequivocally representative of one dialect, are found across dialect boundaries (*BayDat*, also Retti notes that *schwätzen*, “to speak” is used in Austrian and Southern German, but in Austria denotes *während des Unterrichts verbotenerweise reden*, “to talk during class when you are not supposed to”).

<sup>30</sup> Similarly, Speaker D produces *borgen*, “to borrow, to rent” (in the sense of (*aus*)*leihen*, “to borrow, to rent”) with coda [j], [borjə].

<sup>31</sup> Consultant D may interpret [u] in Standard German *gruselig*, “creepy” as [ʏ], and as such produces [grʊtsliç], though Veronika Drake (p.c.) notes that this form is also produced in Northern Bavarian.

<sup>32</sup> Forms such as this are attested across dialect boundaries, ranging from Central German dialects to Bavarian (see Mitzka 1968:Map 30).

<sup>33</sup> Veronika Drake (p.c.) notes that [β] for [b] is also present in the Northern Bavarian dialect of Hahnbach, where *arbeiten*, “to work” is realized as [ɛrβan], yet another example of how phonological features present in NWDCG exist across the range of its potential input varieties.

<sup>34</sup> The BLO’s online audio resources do not account for *Junge* or *Bube* in Schneeberg and Aschaffenburg. Gütter (1971:Map 16) indicates that [bou] and [buə] are the expected forms of *Bube* in Northern and Central Bavarian.

<sup>35</sup> A similar sort of addition is also present in Speaker E’s production of *Kelsch* and *zwischen-drin*, where [t] appears before [ʃ].

<sup>36</sup> Templin (1999:35) and McGraw (1973:114) also show plural marking of *Mädchen* with stem + [s] and stem plus [rə], where stem + [s] is found solely in Templin’s data collected in the 1990’s. Schirmunski also (2010:458, 448) discusses [ər] plurals and the variation of [ən] and [n] in plurals in Kölsch. Münch (1904:152–53) discusses unmarked plurals in Kölsch, as well as *Schärfung* in unmarked plural forms.

<sup>37</sup> In light of this assertion, it is important to recognize that Standard German, as discussed in today’s terms, is a construct that was, however, not clear or defined at the time of German immigration to Wisconsin (cf. Elspass 2002).

<sup>38</sup> For a discussion of the linguistic impact of heritage and identity, see (among others) Schmidt & Herrgen 2011 and Barbour & Stevenson 1990: Ch. 8.

<sup>39</sup> Similarly, Schirmunski 1930 describes primary and secondary leveling in koinéization, whereby the former describes features of a dialect replaced by a form of Standard German or a regional koiné, and the latter encompasses features retained in the developing koiné. The ‘primary’ phase of leveling, then, is phonologically dependent (1930:180, compare Auer, Henskins & Kerswill 2005:224–25) and helps account for the apparent loss of highly marked forms brought to the area by our consultants’ forefathers through the process of koinéization.

<sup>40</sup> This can be seen in examples from Münch (1904:145) such as *zondäg*, “Sunday.”

<sup>41</sup> Loudon 1997 (as well as Seifert 1947–49 for NWDCG), for example, addresses the



effect of American English on Pennsylvania German phonology, i.e., the realization of the liquids /l, r/.

<sup>42</sup> Even in the midst of language death and “language suicide” (see Hock and Joseph 1996:447) this likely last generation of NWDCG speakers decided wholesale (according to our interviewed consultants) to purposely not pass down their heritage language variety of German to their children and grandchildren. In light of this, many reported that (specifically) their grandchildren pursued acquisition of Standard German at the high school and university levels, though the consultants themselves report not communicating with them in German.

## References

- Auer, Peter, Frans Henskens, & Paul Kerswill. 2005. *Dialect Change: Convergence and Divergence in European languages*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bayerische Landesbibliothek Online. *Sprechender Sprachatlas von Bayern*. (<http://sprachatlas.bayerische-landesbibliothek-online.de/>).
- Barbour, Stephen & Patrick Stevenson. 1990. *Variation in German: A Critical approach to German sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. *BayDat: die Bayerische Dialektdatenbank*. (<http://www.baydat.uni-wuerzburg.de:8080/cocoon/baydat/>).
- Boas, Hans C. 2009. *The Life and Death of Texas German*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Boas, Hans C., Marc Pierce, Karen Roesch, Guido Halder & Hunter Weilbacher. 2010. “The Texas German Dialect Archive: A multimedia resource for research, teaching, and outreach.” *Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 22:3.277–96.
- Clark, John T. 1877. “Roxbury.” In *Madison, Dane County and Surrounding Places*, ed. by William J. Park, 495–504. Madison, WI: William J. Park & Co.
- Cravens, Thomas D. 2006. *Variation & Reconstruction* (= Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 268). John Benjamins: Amsterdam.
- Eichhoff, Jürgen. 1971. “German in Wisconsin”. In *The German Language in America*, ed. by Glenn Gilbert, 43–57. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Eichhoff, Jürgen. 1985. “The German Language in America”. In *America and the Germans: An Assessment of a Three-Hundred Year History* (Immigration, Language, Ethnicity, 1), ed. by F. Trommler & J. McVeigh, 223–240. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Elspass, Stephan. 2002. “Standard German in the 19th Century?” In *Standardization: Studies from the Germanic languages*, ed. by Paul Chilton & Nicola McLelland, 43–65 (=Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 235). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Féry, Caroline & Ruben Florentius Hendricus Eduardus van de Vijver, eds. 2003. *The Syllable in Optimality Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Geiger, Steven R. & Joseph C. Salmons. 2006. “Reconstructing Variation at Shallow Time Depths: The historical phonetics of 19th century German dialects in the U.S.” In *Variation and Reconstruction (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series IV, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 268)*, ed. by Thomas Cravens, 37–58. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Geiger, Steven R. 2002. “Phonetic Substrate Effects of German on Wisconsin English? VOT evidence from Dane County Kölsch.” Paper presented at GLAC 8, April 26–28, 2002. Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Guion, Susan. 1996. “The Death of Texas German in Gillespie County.” In *Language Contact Across the North Atlantic* (Linguistische Arbeiten, 359), ed. By P. Sture Ureland and Iain Clarkson, 443–464. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Gütter, Adolf. 1971. *Nordbairischer Sprachatlas*. München: Verlag Robert Lerche.
- Heggland, Timothy F. 2002. “Unincorporated Hamlets of Dane County, Wisconsin: Intensive Survey Report.” Madison, Wisconsin: Dane County Department of Planning and

Development.

- Hock, Hans Heinrich & Brian Joseph. 1996. *Language History, Language Change, and Language Relationship: An Introduction to Historical and Comparative Linguistics* (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs, 93). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jacob, Alexandra. 2002. *Niederdeutsch im Mittleren Westen der USA. Auswanderungsgeschichte—Sprache—Assimilation*. Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte.
- Keller, Thomas L. 1976. *The City Dialect of Regensburg*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Kerswill, Paul. 2002. "Koineization and Accommodation". In *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, ed. by J.K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, & Natalie Schilling-Estes, 669–702. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Kerswill, Paul & Peter Trudgill. 2005. "The Birth of New Dialects." In *Dialect Change: Convergence and Divergence in European Languages* ed. by Peter Auere, Frans Hinskens, & Paul Kerswill, 196–220. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kerswill, Paul & Ann Williams. 2000. "Creating a New Town Koine: Children and language change in Milton Keynes." *Language in Society* 29:65–115.
- König, Werner. 2007. *dtv-Atlas Deutsche Sprache*. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.
- König, Walter. Ed. 2009. *Sprachatlas von Bayerisch-Schwaben*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
- Louden, Mark L. 2006. "Patterns of Language Maintenance in German American Speech Islands." In *Studies in Contact Linguistics: Essays in Honor of Glenn G. Gilbert*, ed. by Janet Fuller & Linda Thornburg, 127–145. New York: Peter Lang.
- Louden, Mark L. 1997. "Linguistic Structure and Sociolinguistic Identity in Pennsylvania German Society." In *Languages and Lives: Essays in Honor of Werner Enninger*, ed. by James R. Dow & Michèle Wolff, 79–91. New York: Peter Lang.
- Louden, Mark L. 2009. "Das Wisconsin-Pommersche im Spiegel deutsch-amerikanischer Sprachvarietäten." *Niederdeutsches Jahrbuch* 132:165–76.
- McGraw, Peter A. 1973. "The Kölsch Dialect of Dane County, Wisconsin: Phonology, morphology and English influence." PhD dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- McGraw, Peter A. 1979. *Dane County Kölsch—Wisconsin/USA* (=Phonai. Lautbibliothek der europäischen Mundarten. Deutsche Reihe, 21. Monographien 12). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Mitzka, Walter, ed. 1955. *Deutscher Wortatlas*, vol. 4. Gießen: Wilhelm Schmitz Verlag.
- Mitzka, Walter & Ludwig Erich Schmitt, eds. 1968. *Deutscher Wortatlas*, vol. 16. Gießen: Wilhelm Schmitz Verlag.
- Montrul, Silvina. 2002. "Incomplete Acquisition and Attrition of Spanish Tense/Aspect Distinctions in Adult Bilinguals." *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 5:39–68.
- Münch, Ferdinand. 1904. *Grammatik der ripuarisch-fränkischen Mundart*. Bonn: Verlag Friedrich Cohen.
- Nützel, Dan & Joseph Salmons. 2011. "Connecting Social and Structural (In)stability in Dialect and Language Contact: Recent Work in German-American dialects." *Language and Linguistics Compass* 5/10:705–17.
- Polinsky, Maria. 1997. "American Russian: Language loss meets language acquisition." In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* ed. by Wayles Browne et al., 370–407. Anne Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Polinsky, Maria. 2006. "Incomplete Acquisition: American Russian." In *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 14:161–219.
- Polinsky, Maria. 2008. "Heritage Language Narratives." In *Heritage Language Education: A New Field Emerging*, ed. by Donna Brinton, Olga Kagan & Susan Baukus, 149–64. New York: Routledge.
- Putnam, Michael & Liliana Sánchez. 2013. "What's So Incomplete about Incomplete

- Acquisition? A prolegomenon to modeling heritage language grammars.” *Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism* 3.4:478-508.
- Retti, Gregor. Datenbank zur deutschen Sprache in Österreich. (<http://oewb.retti.info/oewb/index.html>).
- Roesch, Karen A. 2012. *Language Maintenance and Language Death: The Decline of Texas Alsatian* (Culture and Language Use, 6). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Salmons, Joseph & Thomas Purnell. 2010. “Language Contact and the Development of American English.” In *The Handbook of Language Contact*, ed. by Raymond Hickey, 454–77. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schirmunski, Viktor. 1930. “Sprachgeschichte und Siedlungsmundarten 2.” *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift* 18.5/6.
- Schirmunski, Viktor. 2010. *Deutsche Mundartkunde*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang Verlag [1st edition published 1962].
- Schmidt Jürgen Erich & Joachim Herrgen. 2011. *Sprachdynamik: eine Einführung in die moderne Regionalsprachforschung*. Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- Seifert, Lester W. J. 1947–49. “The Problem of Speech Mixture in the German Spoken in Northwestern Dane County, Wisconsin.” *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters* 39:127–39.
- Seifert, Lester W. J. 1951. “Methods and Aims of a Survey of the German Language Spoken in Wisconsin.” *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters* 40:201–10.
- Seifert, Lester W. J. 1993. “The Development and Survival of the German Language in Pennsylvania and Wisconsin.” In *The German Language in America: 1683–1991*, ed. by Joseph C. Salmons, 322–37. Madison: Max Kade Institute.
- Siegel, Jeff. 2001. “Koine Formation and Creole Genesis.” In *Creolization and Contact*, ed. by Norval Smith & Tonjes Veenstra, 175–97. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen 1994. *Language and Contact: Spanish in Los Angeles*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Templin, Thor. 1999. “Real-time Change in Dane County Kölsch: From the 1940s to 2001.” M.A. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1986. *Dialects in Contact*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2002. “Linguistic and Social Typology.” In *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, ed. by J.K Chambers, Peter Trudgill & Natalie Schilling-Estes, 707–28. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2004. *New Dialect Formation: The Inevitability of Colonial Englishes*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Untersperger, Eva Katharina. 2009. “Der Dialekt von Weyregg am Attersee.” M.A. thesis, Universität Wien.
- US Census Bureau. Roxbury Town, Dane County, Wisconsin. Social characteristics in the United States: 2005-2009. ([http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ADPTable?\\_bm=y&-geo\\_id=06000US5502569850&-qr\\_name=ACS\\_2009\\_5YR\\_G00\\_DP5YR2&-ds\\_name=ACS\\_2009\\_5YR\\_G00\\_&-\\_lang=en&-\\_sse=on](http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/ADPTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=06000US5502569850&-qr_name=ACS_2009_5YR_G00_DP5YR2&-ds_name=ACS_2009_5YR_G00_&-_lang=en&-_sse=on)).
- Van Coetsem, Frans. 2000. *A General and Unified Theory of the Transmission Process in Language Contact*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Wenz, Heinrich. 1911. “Laut- und Formenlehre der Mundart von Beerfelden.” PhD dissertation, Kaiser Wilhelms-Universität Strassburg.

