Marion Lois Huffines

The Function of Aspect in Pennsylvania German and the Impact of English

Aspect is a way of viewing the action expressed by a verb. Tense locates the action of a verb in time; aspect views that action by indicating its status or distribution across time (Lyons 1969). It specifies, for instance, whether an action has been completed or is continuing. Aspect may operate independently or in conjunction with verb tense. In some languages aspect is an obligatory morphological category marked by inflection or verbal particles. In other languages, such as English, German, and Pennsylvania German, aspect occurs optionally in conjunction with tense and/or with adverbs.

Pennsylvania German shares linguistic features with dialects of southern Germany and is most closely related to the dialect spoken in the eastern Palatinate (Buffington and Barba 1965). It has two primary tenses: the present, which is also used to express future time, and the past, which is formally related to the Standard German perfect. Only the verb *sei* 'to be' has an imperfect tense. A future may be constructed by using the auxiliary *warre* 'to become' and the infinitive of the main verb, but this construction occurs infrequently and is used to express probability. A past perfect is formed by the past tense (i.e., perfect forms) of the auxiliary *hawwe* 'to have' or *sei* and the past participle of the main verb; for example, *ich hab en Brief gschriwwe ghatt; mir sin ins Schteddel gange gewest.* In addition to these tense structures, Pennsylvania German employs three syntactic constructions which in conjunction with tense express aspectual information: 1. *sei* plus *am* and the infinitive of the main verb, ex. *sie sin am Balle schpiele* 'they are playing ball'; 2. *duh* plus the infinitive of the main verb, ex. *no duhn mir die Frucht maahle* 'then we grind the grain'; and 3. adverbial *als* with the main verb, ex. *no hen mir sell als uff Brot gesse* 'then we used to eat that on bread'. While these constructions also occur in other German dialects, they do not regularly express aspectual meaning in Standard German.

Teaching grammars of Pennsylvania German describe the formation of the aspectual constructions but indicate little of its usage. Buffington

and Barba (1965), the standardization to which most scholars refer, labels these three aspects as 1. progressive, 2. emphatic, and 3. habitual or repeated. Other more recent teaching grammars follow the Buffington and Barba lead (Frey 1942, rpt. 1981; Haag 1982). Drawing on his own fieldwork but quoting mostly from the Pennsylvania German writings of T. H. Harter, Reed (1947) describes the function of the aspectual constructions as follows: 1. the progressive form indicates continuation with regard to a given point in time; 2. the auxiliary *duh* indicates present iteration; and 3. the adverb *als* indicates past iteration. Neither the Reed nor the Buffington and Barba descriptions capture the full function and distribution of these constructions in today's Pennsylvania German.

All three constructions occur in the speech of both fluent and nonfluent Pennsylvania German speakers, so much so that one legitimately questions how much their usage has been influenced by the contact of Pennsylvania German with English. Does the existence of English counterparts promote the usage of these Pennsylvania German forms? Do nonfluent speakers of Pennsylvania German rely on these constructions as a strategy to produce acceptable Pennsylvania German? Do English rules of aspect superimpose themselves on Pennsylvania German discourse? The following study investigates the function and distribution of these three aspectual constructions in order to gauge the effect of English on Pennsylvania German. Attention is given to Pennsylvania German as it is spoken among nonsectarian speakers in a community where its use is declining and the language is dying, and among the separatist sectarian groups where children still learn Pennsylvania German natively.

Sample

The following study is based on interviews with 52 Pennsylvania Germans: 33 nonsectarians and 19 sectarians. All nonsectarians were born and raised on farms in the valleys of lower Northumberland County, upper Dauphin County, and western Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania. The nonsectarians are classified into three groups:

Group N: Native speakers of Pennsylvania German. The 13 native speakers of Pennsylvania German range in age from 35 to 75 years; all but four are 60 years old or older. All but the two youngest (35 and 47 years old) speak Pennsylvania German to their spouses and peers but English to their children. The two youngest informants have monolingual English-speaking spouses and little opportunity to speak Pennsylvania German.

Group 1: First in the family native English speakers. The 9 Pennsylvania Germans in this group are the first in their respective families to speak English natively. They range in age from 32 to 54 years. All acquired Pennsylvania German in their pre-teen years by hearing it spoken by their parents to each other and older family members, but their parents spoke directly to them only in English. Members of this group often speak Pennsylvania German to older members of the community for

whom Pennsylvania German is the preferred language, but seldom to their peers or younger people.

Group 2: Second or later in the family native English speakers. The 11 Pennsylvania Germans in this category are native speakers of English who were the second or later in their respective families to speak English natively. They range in age from 22 to 65. They understand Pennsylvania German without difficulty but seldom speak it. They learned what they know of Pennsylvania German from hearing it spoken in their childhood homes, but their parents and siblings always addressed them in English.

The Pennsylvania German sectarian sample consists of 9 Amish and 10 Mennonites, who range from 24 to 65 years of age and live on farms in Union County. All except the youngest were born and raised in Lancaster County; the youngest was born in Union County four months after her parents settled there. All the sectarians speak Pennsylvania German natively and are bilingual. Most learned English in school, but some had learned English as pre-schoolers by waiting on customers to sell farm produce at local farmers' markets or at roadside stands.

Group M: Mennonites. Of the 10 Mennonites in this sample, 8 are Old Order Mennonites, also called Team Mennonites. Their lifestyle is characterized by distinctive dress, limited education to the eighth grade, and horse and buggy transportation. Their church services are conducted in church buildings built for that purpose; the readings are in an older variety of Standard German and the sermons in Pennsylvania German. Their homes have electricity and some modern conveniences, specifically a refrigerator, washer, and freezer. Two informants are members of a more modern Mennonite group. In that group only the women have obvious dress requirements; education is not limited, although they prefer private parochial schools to public ones. The two informants in this sample attended high school, and they drive cars.

Group A: Amish. Of the Amish informants, 8 are part of a conservative wing of the New Order Amish. Their lifestyle is very similar to that of the Mennonites: distinctive dress, limited education, and horse and buggy transportation. Their homes also have refrigerators, freezers, and washers. In contrast to the Mennonites, Amish church services are held in private homes. The hymns and Bible readings are in an older variety of Standard German, the sermons mostly in Pennsylvania German. The one Old Order Amish informant in the sample lives in Northumberland County. His home does not have electricity.

Interview

The interviews were conducted in the informants' homes and lasted for about one and a half hours. Each one consisted of three parts: free conversation, translation of English sentences into Pennsylvania German, and description of pictures. The interviewer spoke only English during the interview, and the informants responded in Pennsylvania German, a common conversational situation in bilingual communities where one language is receding (cf. Dorian 1981). Each interview begins with free conversation which centers on growing up on a farm, farm

chores, butchering, recipes, and one-room schoolhouses. The translation task consists of sentences designed to elicit specific grammatical constructions, but the content of the sentences forms familiar contexts which refer to farm life and growing up. The pictures depict common household items and domestic activities and usually elicit one-sentence descriptions. Because the three tasks differ widely in the extent to which they elicit specific verbal aspects, the results are reported separately for each interview task. Also, not all informants respond with comparable grammatical functions, and totals vary from sentence to sentence.

I. The Progressive: *sei* + *am* + Infinitive

Reed (1947) describes the function of the progressive construction as expressing continuation with regard to a given point in time, and he emphasizes the notion of relative aspect, the expression of duration compared with the time occupied by some other action. Reed also indicates that the progressive construction is not used when the object of the main verb is preceded by a definite article, when the object is a personal pronoun, or when the verb occurs with a qualifying prepositional phrase. Although statistical evidence is lacking, Reed states that the proportion of progressive forms used is very small and restricted to the expression of relative aspect.

Results

The present data provide evidence for much fuller description of the formation and distribution of the Pennsylvania German progressive and its variants. The use of the progressive differs significantly across interview tasks. Speakers use the progressive most frequently while describing pictures of activities and seldom during free conversation, which tends to focus on the past. See Table 1.

Table 1
Frequency of the Progressive during Interview Tasks

Group	Translation Task	Picture Description	Free Conversation
N	116	276	9
1	101	194	8
2	91	166	8
M	110	200	21
A	135	227	7

The analysis below considers the use of the progressive during the translation task and picture descriptions. Attention is given to the position of objects and their modifiers, typical errors and repairs made by speakers during discourse, the occurrence of the progressive with prepositional phrases, and the phonetic realization of *am*.

The Translation Task

The translation task contains 14 sentences designed to elicit the progressive construction, 9 in conjunction with the present tense, 5 with the past. Among the nonsectarians, Groups N and 1 translate a majority of English progressives by using the Pennsylvania German progressive. Group 2 uses the Pennsylvania German progressive least frequently of any group but still demonstrates productive mastery of it. The sectarians use the progressive construction to translate the English progressive almost exclusively and far exceed the level of usage among nonsectarians. See Table 2. These percentages obtain whether *sei* is present or past.

Table 2
Percentage of Translations
Eliciting the Progressive

Group	%
N	74
1	71
2	54
M	92
A	90

Of the 14 sentences, 5 contain noun objects, and 2 pronoun objects. Noun objects tend to follow the *am* and precede the main verb infinitive, ex. *die Fraa is am Buch lese* 'the woman is reading (a) book'; pronoun objects precede both *am* and the main verb infinitive, *er is es am fange* 'he is catching it'. See Table 3.

Table 3
Position of Noun and Pronoun Objects
(Translation Task)

Group	*am* obj V	obj *am* V	*am* pron V	pron *am* V
N	31	7	5	9
1	18	15	0	11
2	12	7	1	12
M	20	7	0	15
A	35	4	1	12

Almost all objects placed between *am* and the infinitive occur without modifying possessive or demonstrative adjectives or articles. Of the groups, only the sectarians offer objects in this position modified by the demonstrative *sell*, 2 occurrences for Group M and 4 for Group A. Objects placed before *am* and the infinitive are modified by articles and

demonstrative or possessive adjectives half of the time. The 5 occurrences of pronoun objects between *am* and the infinitive for Group N are given by the two youngest members in that group.

Several speakers in the nonsectarian groups made errors when trying to employ the progressive construction. One speaker in Group N and in Group 1 make a total of 4 errors by placing *am* both before and after the object; for example, *die Weibsleit sin am Kaffi am drinke* 'the women are drinking coffee'. Group 2, by contrast, produces 13 errors, some of which involve the formation of the construction itself; for example, *ich will's nimmimeh gauz' am heere* 'I don't want to hear it barking anymore'; *er is am drei Munet draa gschafft schunnt* 'he's been working on it for three months'. Group 2 also shows a greater tendency to omit objects altogether and to leave some sentences unfinished.

The sectarians produce the progressive in conjunction with a larger variety of verb forms than do the nonsectarians: with the perfect tenses of *sei*, with the subjunctive mood of *sei*, and with perfect and passive infinitives of the main verb, all directly translating the English original. This variety is lacking in the speech of the nonsectarian speakers, whose translations are less direct.

The Picture Descriptions

In the picture descriptions the relative usage of the Pennsylvania German progressive among nonsectarians parallels their usage during the translation task: Groups N and 1 use the progressive most frequently, Group 2 least frequently. The sectarian percentages are considerably lower than during the translation task. The Mennonite usage is equal to that of Group N; the Amish usage is still greatest of all groups. See Table 4.

Table 4
Percentage of Picture Descriptions
Containing a Progressive[1]

Group	%
N	47
1	44
2	34
M	47
A	54

The frequency distribution of the position of noun objects relative to *am* shifts dramatically. The clear trend presented by the translation data is not clearly discernible in the picture descriptions, and Groups 1 and 2 show a reversal of that trend in their speech, placing noun objects more frequently before *am* than after *am*. Group M shows a significant increase in pronoun object placement after *am*. See Table 5.

Table 5
Position of Noun and Pronoun Objects
(Picture Descriptions)

Group	*am* obj V	obj *am* V	*am* pron V	pron *am* V
N	90	43	6	8
1	30	76	1	8
2	27	42	2	5
M	64	46	10	4
A	79	32	3	4

Among the nonsectarians, if noun objects occur following *am*, they normally have no preceding modifier; among the sectarians that rule does not hold. For both Groups M and A more than half of noun objects following *am* are modified by articles or possessive adjectives, ex. *er is am sei Gleeder weck duh* 'he is putting away his clothes'. See Table 6.

Table 6
Modifiers of Noun Objects
in the *am* obj V Position

Group	None	Art	Poss	Other
N	68	15	8	1
1	28	1	1	0
2	24	0	2	1
M	31	15	18	0
A	37	20	22	0

If the noun object precedes *am* it is generally modified, but the non-native Pennsylvania German speakers of Groups 1 and 2 place unmodified objects before *am* in 26% and 45% of the occurrences respectively for each group. See Table 7.

Table 7
Modifiers of Noun Objects
in the obj *am* V Position

Group	None	Art	Poss	Other
N	6	23	8	6
1	16	39	10	11
2	13	20	8	1
M	1	22	23	0
A	6	12	9	5

Only the youngest speakers of Group N place pronoun objects after *am*; in Group M, 7 of the 10 pronouns following *am* are reflexive pronouns and half of the 10 are offered by one speaker, reflecting an individual placement rule. (See Table 5.)

As in the translation data, the typical error for Groups N and 1 is the repetition of *am* both before and following the object. The two youngest speakers of Group N make a total of 7 errors and 4 speakers in Group 1 make this same error once. While 2 of 7 errors in Group 2 are also of this kind, the 5 others violate the formation of the progressive construction by introducing *zu*; for example:

er is am die Wand zu peente
'he is painting the wall'
verleicht is sie am Brief zu schreiwe
'perhaps she is writing a letter'

Nonsectarian speakers also make repairs in mid-sentence during both the translation task and the picture descriptions. These repairs have the effect of placing *am* immediately before the infinitive; for example (// indicates a break in the sentence construction):

er is am // die Schtupp am aaschtreiche
'he is // painting the room'
sell Meedel is am Kopp // ihre Kopp am wesche
'that girl is // washing her hair (head)'
sie sin am // Pikters am nehme
'they are // taking pictures'
weil mir am // Brot un heesi Supp am esse waare
'while we // were eating bread and hot soup'

Contrary to Reed's observation, the progressive also occurs with qualifying prepositional phrases in the speech of members of all groups.[2] Most prepositional phrases follow the infinitive; for example, *sie is am schpiele mit em Hund* 'she is playing with the dog'. It is, however, possible to find prepositional phrases between *am* and the infinitive, especially in the speech of native speakers (Groups N, M, and A):

er is am Gleeder ins Klaaset henke
'he is hanging clothes in the closet'
do is er am Bee in der Schtul aamache
'here he is putting a leg onto the chair'
datt sin sie am Kaendi aus der Dutt griege
'there they are getting candy out of the paper bag'

The phonetic realization of *am* varies across groups. The nonsectarians generally retain the full vowel [a] and the bilabial nasal consonant [m] of *am*. The sectarians, by contrast, reduce the vowel to schwa half of the time and produce an alveolar nasal [n] for the final consonant half of the time. See Table 8. Examples of this usage include:

sie is [ən] *die Hinkelbieblin fiedre*
'she is feeding the chicks'
sie is [ən] *Blumme blanze*
'she is planting flowers'
er is ebbes [ən] *aus der Teekessel leere in sei Koppli*
'he is emptying something out of the tea kettle into his cup'

Table 8
The Phonetic Realization of *am*

Group	[am]	[an]	[ən]
N	335	57	0
1	293	2	0
2	237	20	0
M	76	75	158
A	44	128	190

The 57 occurrences of [an] reported for Group N are given by the two youngest speakers in that group, the very youngest produces no instance of [am]. Except for the few other occurrences of [an] produced by speakers in Groups 1 and 2, the nonsectarians use a form which historically reflects the contraction of the dative definite article and the preposition *an*. Among the sectarians, this dative *-m* generally does not occur although a few individuals have it in their speech. In Group M, the two oldest speakers produce 70 of the 76 occurrences of [am]; in Group A, the Old Order Amish informant produces 35 of the 44 occurrences of [am]. In addition to the realization of *-m* as *-n*, sectarian speakers also reduce the vowel [a] to [ə], and the preposition has a concomitant loss of stress.[3]

Discussion

The *sei* + *am* + infinitive construction expresses continuous or non-completed action in conjunction with either the present or past time expressed by tense. It regularly translates the English progressive and is used most frequently to describe actions in progress, such as those depicted by the pictures shown during the interview. Rules suggested by Reed (1947) are too restrictive to describe the distribution of Pennsylvania German progressive forms.

The frequency of the progressive varies considerably according to type of discourse. The sectarian speakers are exceptionally good translators. Evidence for this can be seen in the faithfulness with which they translate English progressives by Pennsylvania German progressives and in their use of *sei* in the tense, mood, and voice of the English original. Analysis based solely on translation data would overrate sectarian use of the progressive.

Among the nonsectarians, non-native Pennsylvania German speakers do not gravitate toward greater use of the Pennsylvania German progressive in spite of the relatively easy template it provides to relieve nonfluent speakers of the burden of inflecting a large number of verbs. For Groups 1 and 2, *am* + infinitive appears to function as a constituent unit, a unit which they are reluctant to divide by inserting noun objects or prepositional phrases. The strategy provides for them a more rigid skeletal format for word order and relieves them of having to make word order decisions for a second syntactic field, the first being between *sei* and *am*. By removing the syntactic field between *am* and the infinitive,

nonfluent speakers reduce their linguistic work while violating grammatical norms only in terms of frequency, not in kind.

Among sectarian speakers, the distinctiveness of the progressive construction has been reduced, not only by the loss of the dative -*m* in *am* but by the reduction of the vowel and the loss of word stress.[4] The form [ən] is used with much greater frequency than either [am] or [an] and may presage the ultimate loss of the preposition altogether. This speculation is supported by the evidence provided by the occurrence of object nouns between *am*, however it is realized, and the infinitive. The rule which specifies that object nouns occurring after *am* be unmodified has clearly been lost for Groups M and A. The combination of the linguistic and perceptual reduction of [am] to [ən] and the free variation in the occurrence of modified and unmodified noun objects following *am* results in utterances which closely parallel an English model.

II. The Auxiliary *duh*

Reed (1947) devotes one full paragraph to a discussion of the aspectual use of auxiliary *duh*. He notes its infrequent occurrence, but offers no rules describing its usage. Reed concludes that the construction expresses present tense iteration. Buffington and Barba (1965) describe the auxiliary *duh* as an emphatic form used most frequently to ask questions or to make negative statements. [For most verbs *duh* is the obligatory auxiliary in the formation of the Pennsylvania German present subjunctive. Consideration of the subjunctive formation is not included in this discussion of the auxiliary *duh*.]

Results

In order to elicit a range of the possible uses of the auxiliary *duh*, the translation task contains 8 questions and 7 negative statements, including 2 negative commands. Also included are 2 emphatic uses of English *do* and 2 occurrences of *do* functioning as a pro-form, i.e., occurring in place of the main verb: "I don't know, *do* you?" and "She likes big yellow flowers that smell good, and I *do* too." The results for each of these usages are reported separately below.

Translation Task

The translation task elicited a total of 158 auxiliary *duh* forms, of which 49% are either in questions or in negative statements. Group 2 makes the greatest use of the auxiliary *duh*, especially to form questions. The sectarians, Groups M and A, make the least total use of the auxiliary *duh*. See Table 9 for the total number of occurrences of the auxiliary *duh* and its use in questions and negative statements.

Table 9
Use of the Auxiliary *duh*
(Translation Task)

Group	Total	Quest	Neg
N	30	10	7
1	33	10	1
2	48	18	8
M	23	2	6
A	24	11	4

The two English sentences in which emphatic *do* occurs elicited few occurrences of Pennsylvania German *duh*; three speakers in Group 2 and one speaker in each of the other groups translated "She *does* understand . . ." by using *duh* and the infinitive *verschteh* or *wisse*. By contrast, the English *do* pro-forms are almost invariably translated by Pennsylvania German *duh*; see Table 10 for the occurrences of *duh* as a pro-form as opposed to the use of a main verb (MV) in that context.

Table 10
PG *duh* in Pro-Form Function
(Translation Task)

Group	*duh*	MV
N	15	2
1	12	2
2	16	5
M	13	3
A	14	1

Picture Descriptions

The picture descriptions elicit few uses of the auxiliary *duh*. In Group 1, 12 of the 13 occurrences are given by the two youngest informants in that group. All occurrences in Group 2 are offered by only one informant. None of the sentences given are questions or negated statements. See Table 11.

Table 11
Use of Auxiliary *duh*
(Picture Descriptions)

Group	*duh*
N	1
1	13
2	4
M	3
A	1

Free Conversation

During free conversation the use of the auxiliary *duh* occurs most frequently in the speech of members of Group 1, least frequently in the speech of members of Group N. Because groups differ significantly in the amount of free conversation they produced, it is helpful to develop a score for auxiliary *duh* usage relative to the average amount of discourse offered by each group. The number of occurrences of the auxiliary *duh* is divided by the average number of words per speaker for each group and multiplied by 10^3 in order to achieve a score reportable in whole numbers; see Table 12.

Table 12
Use of Auxiliary *duh*—Scored
(Free Conversation)

Group	# occ. Aux *duh*	Aver # words per speaker	Score
N	24	1303	18
1	37	735	50
2	14	490	28
M	32	1520	21
A	40	1255	31

The auxiliary *duh* occurs no more than 3 times in a negative sentence for each group. No auxiliary *duh* occurs in a question. In Group 1 half of the occurrences of auxiliary *duh* are produced by one speaker, and 31 of the 37 are in the speech of just 3 individuals. One speaker in Group 1 and four speakers in Group 2 make errors in forming the auxiliary *duh* construction.

Discussion

The use of the auxiliary *duh* is relatively infrequent when compared to the other two constructions bearing aspectual information. Speakers who repair sentences by beginning them anew do so to avoid reliance on the auxiliary *duh*; for example:

ich duh net // ich will net ihn heere gauze
'I do not // I don't want to hear him barking'
wu duh ich // finn ich der Daadis Buch
'where do I // do I find Daddy's book'
duh net // geb en nichts fer esse
'do not // give him nothing to eat'

A translation of the emphatic English *do* also deletes *duh* in a repair: *sell alt Haus dutt // muss uffgefixt sei* 'that old house does // must be fixed up'. Such repairs are most frequent in the translation task, where speakers first attempt a word-for-word translation, but repairs also occur in the free conversation and picture descriptions and indicate an avoidance of the auxiliary *duh*:

sie dutt die // sie langt fer ebbes
'she does the // she reaches for something'
er dutt // hot en Loch datt rum sei Schuh
'he does // has a hole there round his shoe'
awwer ich duh naat // ich wees net
'but I do not // I don't know'
mir duhne // mir lewe in die alt Haus noch
'we do // we still live in the old house'

In the above examples one notes other grammatical difficulties which nonfluent speakers have in speaking Pennsylvania German, but the use of auxiliary *duh* has not become a viable alternate strategy for resolving difficulties.

The use of auxiliary *duh* cannot be described as emphatic, nor does it primarily occur in questions or negative statements. During the free conversation many of the auxiliary *duh* constructions occur in extensive discussions of butchering. Nonsectarian native speakers (Group N) use the construction to describe the activities which regularly take place during annual family butcherings and the recipes for the by-products regularly associated with butchering; for example:

no dutt der Butscher es mixe
'then the butcher mixes it'
deel Leit duhne Schperribs schneide
'some people cut spareribs'
no duhn ich sie rooschde
'then I roast them'

The speakers in Groups 1 and 2 use the auxiliary *duh* more frequently than Group N in all three interview tasks. In the translation task, speakers in Group 1 translate 7 sentences using the auxiliary *duh* which speakers in Group N translate by inflected main verbs. Speakers in Group 2 translate 18 sentences by using the auxiliary *duh* construction, 12 of which are translations unique to that group. These native English speakers (Groups 1 and 2) greatly expand the use of the auxiliary *duh*, but evidence from the picture descriptions and the free conversation indicates that its use is an individual strategy relied on by some nonfluent Pennsylvania German speakers to produce sentences in Pennsylvania German. Group 2 relies on this strategy particularly heavily when required to translate, and individuals in Group 1 when asked for extensive descriptions. The increased use by these individuals cannot be ascribed to influence from English. English has no auxiliary *do* in noncontrastive affirmative statements. Nonfluent Pennsylvania German speakers' usage of the auxiliary does not increase appreciably in questions or with negation. However, the construction serves these speakers well: it helps them avoid inflections on main verbs and provides them with a correct format for troublesome word order.

The sectarians, Groups M and A, use the auxiliary *duh* less during the translation task but more frequently during free conversation than the nonsectarian native speakers. Particularly noticeable in the sectarian

use of the auxiliary *duh* is the concomitant occurrence of adverbs and temporal clauses indicating repeated time; for example:

> *Ich duh alsemol Yogert mache*
> 'sometimes I make yogurt'
> *mer dutt's allegebott schtarre*
> 'one stirs it every now and then'
> *wann mir butschere duhn ich Fleesch kaenne*
> 'whenever we butcher I can meat'
> *ich duh ebmols helfe*
> 'I help sometimes'

For sectarian speakers, the auxiliary *duh* construction seems to have lost the strength of its iterative function and needs the reenforcement of temporal adverbs and clauses. The more frequent use of *duh* in a proform function among sectarian speakers during free conversation provides other evidence for this loss of iterative meaning; see Table 13.

Table 13
duh in Pro-Form Function
(Free Conversation)

Group	*duh* as pro-form
N	3
1	3
2	9
M	14
A	14

The sectarians have also extended the use of the auxiliary *duh* to verbs which cannot be iterative; for example:

> *er dutt alles wisse wie sell*
> 'he knows everything like that'
> *es dutt mich gleiche*
> 'it likes me'
> *. . . Blumme, wu gut schmacke duhn*
> '. . . flowers which smell good'

Whether the loss of iterative meaning by the auxiliary *duh* construction is due to English influence is not clear. The use of the construction appears always to have been restricted to the present tense. The extension of the use of *als* to report habitual or repeated action to the present, especially among sectarians (see below), is a more likely explanation for the demise of the auxiliary *duh* construction. However, the use of *duh* in pro-form function is clearly based on an English model.

III. Adverbial *als*

While Reed lists *als* as occurring only in conjunction with the Pennsylvania German past, Buffington and Barba (1965) describe it as expressing habitual or repeated activity when used with either present

or past forms. As suggested by Reed, the use of *als* to express iteration occurs so regularly, that "its function as such seems indisputable" (1947:11).

Results

Speakers use adverbial *als* during two parts of the interview, the translation task and the free conversation. Table 14 gives the distribution of *als* across these two interview tasks by tense; total occurrences during the free conversation are also scored relative to the average amount of discourse produced by each individual in each group.

Table 14
Occurrences of Adverbial *als*

Translation Task				Free Conversation			
Group	Total	Pres	Past	Total	Pres	Past	Score
N	25	5	20	116	7	109	89
1	20	3	17	50	8	42	68
2	14	0	14	30	6	24	61
M	21	3	18	67	28	39	44
A	14	1	13	74	25	49	59

In the translation task, 2 sentences are specifically designed to elicit adverbial *als* as the translation of English "used to": "Old men used to sell vegetables" and "They used to knock on the kitchen door." Except for members in Group 2, most speakers use *als* in the translation of these two sentences; most speakers in Group 2 do not. Two other sentences which frequently elicit *als* in Pennsylvania German contain English "often," once with the present and once with the past.

Topics during free conversation tend to focus on past events, especially in the conversations of members of Group N, the group having the largest number of older individuals. This accounts for the high usage of *als* by members in Group N compared to all other groups. Adverbial *als* is regularly used to express habitual or repeated activity; for example:

mei Dad hot als en Brein gemacht
'my dad used to make a brine'
ich hab als gholfe die Grummbeere lese
'I used to help gather potatoes'
mir hen als Brot gebacke
'we used to bake bread'

The use of *als* in the speech of the sectarians differs significantly from its use among nonsectarians in the number of occurrences with the present tense: 42% and 33% of occurrences of adverbial *als* for Groups M and A respectively occur with the present tense, ex. *ich schteh als uff baut finef Uhr* 'I get up (usually) about five o'clock'. Of particular interest is the use of *als* in sentences with the auxiliary *duh*; for example:

maryets duhn ich als hinaus geh
'mornings I (usually) go out'
mir duhn's Fleesch als maahle
'we (usually) grind the meat'
dutscht als Raahm abschebbe misse
'you must (usually) skim off the cream'

Discussion

Adverbial *als* clearly expresses habitual or repeated action in conjunction with present or past time. The nonsectarians seem to associate *als* only with past time and seldom use it with the present tense. The use of auxiliary *duh* seems to fulfill the present tense iterative function for them. The sectarians use *als* with both tenses, frequently in sentences also containing the auxiliary *duh*. It is likely that the loss of aspectual meaning of the auxiliary *duh* among the sectarians has been promoted by the extension of adverbial *als* to express iteration in the present tense.

IV. Summary

In today's spoken Pennsylvania German two aspects appear to be important: the expression of duration and the expression of iteration. Both occur in conjunction with present and past tenses. Duration is expressed by the use of *sei + am + infinitive*, the so-called progressive. Among the nonsectarians, nonfluent speakers tend toward a rigid word order, but evidence does not indicate that this strategy is a result of influence from English. Among sectarians, the progressive construction appears to be changing toward an English model in terms of the phonetic realization of *am* and the loss of a rule which distinguishes the placement of modified and unmodified noun objects. The expression of iteration in Pennsylvania German can be achieved by two constructions, one by using auxiliary *duh* and the other by adverbial *als*. The former occurs only in conjunction with the present tense; the latter tends to occur only with the past. Nonsectarian speakers observe this distribution, but the use of auxiliary *duh* occurs infrequently. Among sectarian speakers, the iterative meaning of the auxiliary *duh* has weakened and the use of adverbial *als* has been extended to the present tense.

The differences in the speech of the sectarians and the nonsectarians point to the existence of two separate Pennsylvania German norms. The nonsectarians retain a more conservative norm, observing rules for the forms and functions of verbal aspect which do not show evidence of English influence. Nonfluent Pennsylvania German speakers attempt to use these rules but fail to achieve the full norm of the native speaker model. The variation in forms and functions which occurs in their speech is indicative of their incomplete mastery of that norm. Members of Group 2 represent the last generation to possess some productive control of Pennsylvania German in this community, but their errors do not show evidence of impinging English rules. Faulty forms and aberrant distributions of forms suggest strategies which apply a Pennsylvania German rule, not a reliance on a substitute English structure. In

the Pennsylvania German of fluent and nonfluent nonsectarian speakers, the impact of English has been minimal. In contrast to the Pennsylvania German of nonsectarians, the Pennsylvania German spoken by the sectarians shows evidence of substantial English influence in the form and function of verbal aspect. Their speech indicates that their rules are converging toward an English model. The influence of English is, therefore, not to be found in the Pennsylvania German of the nonsectarians, among whom the language is dying, but it is a likely cause of differences found in the Pennsylvania German of the sectarians, who continue to learn Pennsylvania German natively and use it for daily discourse.

Bucknell University
Lewisburg, Pennsylvania

Notes

[1] The percentages reported in Table 4 represent the number of responses containing at least one progressive. Only one progressive was counted for each picture although the description may have contained more than one.

[2] Reed (1947) also rules out the use of the progressive for verbs describing certain "psychological states." However, verbs describing psychological states, such as those mentioned by Reed, occur in the progressive; for example:

waar ich am denke zu mir selwert
'I was thinking to myself'
er is am wunnere, wie er die Ebbel vum Baam griege kann
'he is wondering how he can get the apples from the tree'
seller is en dieseide, weller Abbel es bescht waer
'that one is deciding which apple would be the best'
er is yuscht en wunsche, 's er kennt en Abbel hawwe
'he is just wishing that he could have an apple'

[3] The phonological progression of [am] to [ən] and the expanded use of the progressive with the full inventory of tenses, moods, and voices directly parallel the historical development of the progressive in English as it is thought to have evolved by some scholars (see Baugh 1963).

[4] The loss of this -*m* most likely reflects the merger of the dative and common cases in the Pennsylvania German of sectarians (see Huffines, forthcoming). This merger is complete for sectarian speakers in this sample, and only a few fossilized dative usages remain in their speech.

Works Cited

Baugh, Albert C. *A History of the English Language*, 2nd ed. New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1963.
Buffington, Albert F. and Barba, Preston A. *A Pennsylvania German Grammar*. Allentown, Pa.: Schlechter, 1954, rev. 1965.
Dorian, Nancy C. *Language Death: The Life Cycle of a Scottish Gaelic Dialect*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Pr., 1981.
Frey, J. William. *A Simple Grammar of Pennsylvania German*. Reissued with a new preface by C. R. Beam. Lancaster, Pa.: Brookshire Publications, 1942, rpt. 1981.
Haag, Earl C. *A Pennsylvania German Reader and Grammar*. University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State Univ. Pr., 1982.

Huffines, Marion Lois. "Case Usage Among the Pennsylvania German Sectarians and Nonsectarians." *Investigating Obsolescence: Studies in Language Contraction and Death.* Ed. Nancy C. Dorian. Cambridge: Univ. Pr., forthcoming.

Lyons, John. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics.* Cambridge: Univ. Pr., 1969.

Reed, Carroll E. "The Question of Aspect in Pennsylvania German." *Germanic Review* 20 (1947): 5-12.