Spring 1999

The role of English in Pennsylvania German development: best supporting actress?

Janet M. Fuller
Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Recommended Citation

THE ROLE OF ENGLISH
IN PENNSYLVANIA GERMAN
DEVELOPMENT:
BEST SUPPORTING ACTRESS?

JANET M. FULLER

Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

T HE PRESENT STUDY addresses the interaction between internal and external factors in language change in bilingual settings. The data for this research come from Pennsylvania German, and the two features examined are variation in past participle forms and restrictions on separable prefix verbs. These particular structures have not been discussed in previous research and provide a new perspective on the interaction among factors in language change.

Two patterns of interaction between internal and external forces in diachronic processes will be discussed here.[1] First, surface ambiguity may become more salient in language contact situations, and this promotes internally motivated linguistic change. Second, the tendency toward transparency in form-function mapping may lead to a preference for semantically transparent loanwords over more complex native elements. In the case of Pennsylvania German, the end effect is the appearance of the structural convergence toward English, but with evidence that the changes are constrained by internal factors.

CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC MAINTENANCE AND CHANGE

Research among both secular and sectarian speakers of Pennsylvania German (e.g., Huffines 1989, 1992, 1993) has shown that while the language is dying out among the secular speakers, it continues to be used—and to change—among the sectarian or "Plain" speakers. These Plain speakers are Amish and Mennonites who live in communities throughout the eastern and midwestern United States and in settlements as far south as Florida and as far west as Texas. Plain Pennsylvania German (referred to here merely as Pennsylvania German or PG) has had unusual longevity for an immigrant language in the United States and has far outlived the pattern that is reported for many minority languages of language shift by the third generation. PG has not, however, emerged unscathed; the dialects of German brought to the United States have been leveled, mixed, simplified, and peppered with English. As will be discussed in the next section, the

changes that have occurred can only partially be accounted for by language contact; both internal and external motivations for language change must be considered.

The extralinguistic factors giving rise to these structural changes, on the one hand, promote the continued use of PG as an ingroup code but, on the other hand, leave the language open to rapid change. Several religious beliefs of the Anabaptists and, in particular, the Amish provide strong support for minority language maintenance (see Hostetler 1963, 76–77, for a more complete discussion of Amish beliefs and practices). Specifically, two core tenets of the Amish charter—the church community as separate from the outside world and the basic value of "closeness to nature"—dictate rural lifestyles in which the Plain community members are socially isolated from the mainstream culture and symbolically distanced from identification with the language of this culture, English. Despite this supposed avoidance of the English language and its speakers, however, PG speakers invariably become fluent in English and use this language in interactions in many public domains such as school, town, and, for the less conservative sects, church (Enninger et al. 1986).

The participants in the present study grew up in PG communities in the Midwest, most in Old Order Amish communities in Ohio and northern Indiana.[2] These Old Order Amish drove horses and buggies and had no telephones or electricity; they wore dark-colored clothing, and the women wore head coverings, which concealed most of their hair. Their church services were conducted in PG in the homes and barns of the community members. None of the participants in this study over the age of 40 attended school after the tenth grade, and most of them only completed the eighth grade. In their childhood communities, men generally farmed or worked as carpenters, and women did not work outside the home, staying on the farm to tend to large families, often ten children or more. Although almost all of these children attended public schools where the medium of instruction was English, most of the other pupils and the teachers were also PG speakers. Older speakers reported that when they stopped attending school, they also ceased to speak English on a regular basis, as contact with outsiders was minimal and discouraged.

However, the participants in this study report that the Midwestern Anabaptist communities in which they grew up are gradually becoming less conservative, although they remain Old Order Amish—telephones are common in barns and are creeping into homes, clothing colors are getting lighter, and the women's hair coverings are shrinking. In addition, as farming becomes a less viable lifestyle for all community members, contact with the mainstream society—and with it, use of English—increases.

More dramatic changes also occur when individuals or families change from one sect to another. The participants in this study, originally members of Old Order sects, are now members of Beachy or Conservative Mennonite communities in South Carolina, where they drive cars, have electricity, wear light-colored clothing and even patterns, and have church buildings where their services are held in English. Most of these South Carolina Mennonites have family businesses other than farming, and the women who do not participate in the running of these enterprises often have their own cottage industries (e.g., making jam or quilts). One research participant, a woman in her mid-thirties, works full-time as a nurse, something that was unheard of in her mother's generation.

Unsurprisingly, with the increased use of English within the community and the increased contact of all members of the family with monolingual English speakers outside of their religious groups, the South Carolina communities are undergoing language shift. However, the participants in this study are from generations in which the language is still being maintained—the youngest speaker is in her mid-thirties, and the oldest is in his seventies. They learned PG as their first language, and although they may speak more English than PG in their daily lives now, everyone in this study has at least one person in the community—a spouse or parent—with whom PG is regularly spoken. Because these speakers are proficient in PG, I argue that the patterns in these data are not caused by attrition in the speech of individuals but are the result of the processes of natural language change, augmented by the influence of generations of language contact.

As mentioned above, PG has survived much longer than most immigrant languages in the United States. The general pattern of language shift in three generations, as described by Fishman (1989, 187), is typical of bilingualism without clearly compartmentalized domains for language use. In this pattern, first-generation speakers are dominant in the minority language; second-generation speakers are bilingual in English and the minority language; and speakers in the third generation are dominant in English and do not pass the minority language on to the next generation. According to Silva-Corvalán (1994, 10–11), in Spanish language communities in the American Southwest, language shift in three generations occurs on the individual level. However, because there is a constant supply of new immigrants, this situation can be referred to as cyclic bilingualism, and Spanish is the most widely spoken minority language in the Southwest.

The Spanish-English bilingualism scenario contrasts sharply with the case of PG, in which the language has been maintained without the influx of new immigrants. The reasons for this unusual longevity of PG are

generally believed to be the isolation of the sectarians from the outside world and the different social functions of PG and English within the community (Enninger 1979). Thus, because PG has been maintained over so many generations, it represents a relatively rare language contact situation for immigrant varieties in the United States. Although language contact may play a role in many minority languages in the United States, language shift after three generations has prevented the type of development found in PG from occurring in other immigrant languages.

INTERNAL VERSUS EXTERNAL MOTIVATIONS FOR LANGUAGE CHANGE

For many of the developments in PG, the roots of change are in the structure of the German language. This is not to negate the importance of English in the development of PG, however. Generally speaking, language contact tends to have two influences on linguistic development: first, changes already under way may be accelerated (Silva-Corvalán 1994); and, second, structures from the donor language (in this case, English) may be used in the recipient language (Fuller 1996, 1997).

In PG, much of the structural development has been shown to have both internal and external motivations. Two features frequently discussed in the literature are the loss of dative case marking and the marking of progressive aspect; the arguments for the mixed causes of these changes will be briefly presented here. First is the issue of the case merger. Plain Pennsylvania German (in contrast to non-Plain varieties) has undergone the loss of dative case marking in all contexts (Louden 1988, 1994; Huffines 1989). Clearly, the loss of case is not solely due to English influence—other Germanic languages (including English) have lost case marking, and the Berliner dialect of European German is known for its accusative-dative merger in the pronoun system. However, because the change in PG has been rapid and does create a system more similar to English, it has been argued (Louden 1994) that contact with English provides motivation for a change rooted in the general linguistic processes of simplification and reduction.

Similarly, PG employs a construction to express ongoing action that shows a combination of internal and external factors in its development. Again, however, the role of language contact appears to be more of a facilitator than a catalyst. The construction itself is German in origin and does not mirror the English progressive in form. However, it has been argued (Louden 1988, 157–59; Huffines 1988) that it is used in PG in the same contexts as the English progressive, a distribution not seen in European varieties of German or in earlier (or secular) varieties of PG. The

example in (1b) from Louden (1994, 85) is claimed to be the pervasive or emergent pattern in Plain Pennsylvania German (PPG), in contrast with the pattern he cites for earlier Pennsylvania German (EPG), given in (1a).

1. Expression of the Progressive Aspect in PG
    a. EPG: *Er   geh-t   nau   in   die   Schtadt.*
          he   go-3SG   now   in   the   city
    b. PPG: *Er   is   in   die   Schtadt   an   geh-e   nau.*
          he   be/3SG   in   the   city   on   go-INF   now
      'He is going to town now.'

As can be seen in the discussion of the case merger and the progressive construction, simplification of already existing systems and emergence of new structures in PG may involve influence from both German and English structures. These data indicate that English has a supporting and not a starring role in language development. In the present study, the interaction between internal and external factors will be further investigated in patterns of past participles and inseparable prefix verbs, two features of PG that have received little attention in the literature to date. This analysis will show that while language contact may not be the star of the show in language change, the roles it plays are never bit parts.

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

The data for this analysis were collected in interviews with 18 native speakers of PG residing in Beachy Mennonite communities in South Carolina. These speakers, as discussed above, have their roots in Midwestern Amish communities. Along with the interview data, 15 of the 18 participants in this study also agreed to do a narrative task, which involved telling the story depicted in the children's book *Frog, Where Are You?* by Mercer Mayer. The quantitative analysis was done on the second ten minutes of each interview and the narrative data.

In addition, data from 20 Standard German-English (SG-E) bilinguals are used for comparison of participle forms. All of the speakers in this corpus are native speakers of German and live in the United States; their duration of residence in the United States at the time of data collection ranged from six months to approximately 25 years.[3] These bilinguals often employ intrasentential codeswitching, which involves the use of English lexical items inserted in an otherwise German utterance. The perspective taken in this research, following Myers-Scotton (1993, 162–63), is that codeswitching leads to lexical borrowing, and both processes involve the integration of lexical material from one language into the grammatical frame of another. The difference between the two phenomena is that in borrowing, the lexical items in question are viewed as part of the recipient

language lexicon. The processes by which integration takes place, however, are the same in both borrowing and codeswitching.

A second issue that must be addressed is the matter of comparing two different dialects of German. Clearly the grammatical frames of SG, as used in the codeswitching data, and PG, which stems from nonstandard dialects of German from an earlier point in time, may differ. For many points of grammar, a comparison of SG-E codeswitching and PG is not possible. This study, however, gives external evidence that the participles in the SG-E codeswitching data pattern like earlier varieties of PG (see below). Thus, the contrasts between these two data sets shed some light on developments in PG that may stem from the influence of extended contact with English.

<center>PAST PARTICIPLES</center>

In both the PG and the SG-E codeswitching data, there are two types of past participles involving English-origin verb stems. First, the majority of the English-origin verbs appearing in both corpora receive full German morphology. Native German verbs can be divided into strong and weak verbs; weak verbs receive a *ge-* prefix and a final *-t* (Haag 1982, 146–47). In these data the English-origin verbs receiving German morphology are treated as if they were weak verbs, as weak conjugation is the productive pattern for all new verbs. An example of a past participle from PG is given in (2), and a similar example from the SG-E codeswitching data is given in (3).

2. Past Participle with German Morphology in PG
   F1: *Mer   hen   some   light,   light   colors,   aber,   sie   hen   viel*
       we   have   some   light   light   colors   but   they   have   much
       ge-change-t.   Ja,   well,   sie   warre   mehr,
       PART-change-PART   yes   well   they   become/PAST   more
       mehr   liberal,   weesch-t.
       more   liberal   know-3SG
       'We have some light, light colors, but, they have changed a lot. Yes, well, they're getting more, more liberal, you know.' [F1 is describing the Old Order Amish community she lived in as a child.]

3. Past Participle with German Morphology in SG-E Codeswitching
   C9: *Da   hab-e   ich   ge-hire-t   und   ge-fire-t*
       there   have-1SG   I   PART-hire-PART   and   PART-fire-PART
       wie   ich   lustig   bin
       how   I   happy   be/1SG
       'I hired and fired as I pleased there.' [C9 is discussing her previous position as manager of her own company.]

Past participles of the second type appear, at first glance, to be full English participles. Such participles appear in both the SG-E codeswitching and PG corpora; examples are given in (4) and (5).

4. Apparent Full English Participle in PG

   F1: *un'　　ham　　mer　　ein　　Buh*　　ADOPTED
       and　　have　　we　　a　　boy　　adopted
       'And we adopted a boy.'

5. Apparent Full English Participle in SG-E Codeswitching

   C10: *Jeff,　es　war　　　　ein　Samstag,　hat　　　　　gerade　Pizza*
        Jeff,　it　be/PAST　a　　Saturday　have/3SG　just　　pizza
        da　　　druben　DELIVERED.
        there　over　　delivered
        'Jeff, it was a Saturday, [he] had just delivered a pizza over there.'

A closer examination of these participles, however, shows that they follow German rules for participial formation. In both SG (Lederer 1969, 53) and in more conservative forms of PG (Enninger 1979, 54; Louden, personal communication), past participles with an unstressed first syllable do not take the *ge-* prefix. The most common verbs in this category are verbs with inseparable prefixes, of which there are many in both SG and PG. While verbs with separable prefixes take the *ge-* as an infix, inseparable prefix verbs do not allow the separation of their parts, and because the prefixes are unstressed, they also do not allow *ge-* as a prefix (e.g., *be-* in *besuche(n)*[4] 'to visit', past participle *be-such-t, *ge-be-sucht, *be-ge-sucht;* cf. with the separable prefix verb *aus-suchen* 'choose', past participle *aus-ge-sucht*). As can be seen in examples (4) and (5) above, these English-origin verbs fall into the category of verbs not taking the *ge-* prefix because they have unstressed first syllables. Despite the orthography used, there is little phonological distinction between the alveolar stop of the German participial suffix *-t* and the English participial suffix spelled *-ed.* Therefore, such verbs are considered to follow a German pattern which corresponds closely to the form of full English participles.

Both types of participles appear in both data sets. In the SG-E codeswitching data, only 4 of the 21 participles (19%) do not take the *ge-* suffix. All of these (*delivered,* which occurs twice, *retired,* and *recorded*) have unstressed first syllables and final alveolar stops and thus fit the criteria for SG verbs, which also do not take the participial prefix *ge-.* Therefore, although they appear at first glance to be full English participles, they are actually integrated into native German patterns for past participial morphological marking.

While this pattern is categorical in the SG-E codeswitching data, there is variation in the PG participle data that indicates the erosion of this system. Forty-nine of the 140 participles (35%) appearing in the quantitatively analyzed portion of the PG data in this study do not receive the *ge-* participial marker. Of these 48, 13 (9% of all participles) do not have unstressed first syllables. For these 13 tokens, then, the lack of the *ge-* prefix

cannot be accounted for with the explanation that the German morphological patterns are being applied; see (6).[5]

6. Full English Past Participle in PG
   M2: *Ich   hab-e   auch   ein   skin   cancer   problem   ich*
       I   have-1SG   also   a   skin   cancer   problem   I
       hab-e   REALIZED   [unintelligible]   meh   aus   de   Sun
       have-1SG   realized   more   out   the   sun
       'I also have a skin cancer problem, and I realized [I had to get] out of the sun more.'

In addition, there is variation between participle types for some verbs; 7 of the 12 different verbs that appear as full English participles also occur in the PG corpus with complete German participial morphology, as shown in (7) and (8). Such variation is not attested in descriptions of more conservative varieties of PG (Enninger 1979, 54; Louden, personal communication).

7. PG: Participle Forms Used with the English Verb *farm*
   a. Full English Participle
      F9: *mer   hen   FARM-ED   mit   geil*
          we   have   farm-**PART**   with   horses
          'We farmed with horses.'
   b. Participle with an English Stem and German Morphology
      F1: *mer   hen   'bout   three   years   GE-FARM-T*
          we   have   [a]bout   three   years   **PART**-farm-**PART**
          'We farmed about three years.'
8. PG: Participle Forms Used with the English Verb *move*
   a. Full English participle
      F7: *Ein   jung   Bu,   Greg,   MOVE-ED   vun   Missouri*
          a   young   boy   Greg   move-**PART**   from   Missouri
          'A young boy, Greg, moved [here] from Missouri.'
   b. Participle with an English Stem and German Morphology
      M1: *Er   is   nach   Florida   GE-MOVE-T*
          he   be/3SG   to   Florida   **PART**-move-**PART**
          'He moved to Florida.' [PG:M1.4]

The overall picture, then, is one of consistent use of German patterns for participial marking in the SG-E codeswitching data, but some variation between the German patterns and English participles in the PG data. The significant tokens are those verbs with stressed first syllables that occur as full English participles (or sometimes occur as English participles and sometimes as English stems with German participial morphology), and these tokens occur only in the PG corpus.

I believe the interaction between the historical patterns of German past participial morphology and language contact is the catalyst for this change. The participles not carrying the *ge-* prefix due to their initial unstressed

syllable are homophonic with full English participles; because of this surface ambiguity for some of the participles, the door has been opened for all verbs to appear as full English participles. Although the occurrence of full English participles is infrequent—13 total, comprising 9% of the total participles—this option has been established in the PG of these speakers.

However, English cannot be given the starring role in this incipient change. While the overlap of the forms of many regular English past participles with German past participles of verbs with unstressed first syllables does provide external motivation for change, internal motivation for this change can also be found in the trend toward simplification and reduction of verbal morphology. Evidence for this is found in the fact that Old English, like modern SG, employed a *ge-* prefix on participles that was discarded by the Middle English period (Pyles and Algeo 1993). Also, other modern dialects of Low German (e.g., varieties of Plattdeutsch) lack the *ge-* prefix for past participle marking (Keller 1961, 305), and the Palatinate dialect (one of the main source dialects for PG) also contains some specific verbs which do not take *ge-* participial marking. For example, in modern-day Palatinate dialect, the participles for several verbs beginning with velar stops do not take the *ge-* prefix (Green 1989, 255), and these forms also appear in PG (e.g., PG *kumme,* Palatinate dialect *kom,* SG *gekommen* 'came'; PG *gange,* Palatinate dialect *gang,* SG *gegangen* 'went').

Evidence that PG is not just borrowing certain past participle forms but indeed moving toward prefixless past participles can also be found in the fact that variation between full participial morphology and participles which lack the *ge-* prefix can be found with German-origin as well as English-origin verbs. This variation is found with both strong and weak verbs. For example, *schlofe* 'sleep' appears in participial contexts in both the form of *ge-schlofe* and *schlofe*; the weak verb *schwetze* 'talk, speak' shows variation between the participle forms *geschwetzt* and *schwetzt.*

Overall, then, participle forms in PG show high variability. With English-origin verbs, the patterns shows erosion of the use of the *ge-* participial marker in favor of more English-like forms, that is, those marked only with a final alveolar stop. Variation in the participle forms of German-origin verbs supports the contention that while English may provide a model for participle forms, overall simplification processes in verbal morphology paradigms may also be at work.

SEPARABLE PREFIX VERBS

Separable prefix verbs in German, although they have some semantic parallels to English verb-plus-particle constructions, represent a structural

pattern not shared by the two languages. These prefixes in German are termed "separable" because in simple present form they are clause-final (while the verb stem is in second position), as shown in (9); and in the present perfect construction, the past participial morphology is inserted between the prefix and stem, as shown in example (10). Compare these with the English verb-plus-particle construction in (11), in which the particle cannot be separated from the verb except by a pronoun or noun object.

9. SG: Stem of the Verb *um-ziehen* in Verb-Second Position
   Ich   zieh-e   morgen   um
   I   pull-1SG   tomorrow   around
   'I'll move tomorrow.'
10. SG: Participle of the Verb *um-ziehen* in Clause-Final Position
    Ich   bin   gestern   um-ge-zogen
    I   be/1SG   yesterday   around-PART-pull
    'I moved yesterday.'
11. English: Possible Positions for the Object of the Verb + Particle Construction *pick up*
    a. Yesterday I picked up some groceries.
    b. I picked some groceries up yesterday.
    c. *I picked some groceries yesterday up.

Separable prefix constructions such as those shown in (9) and (10), above, continue to be productive in both the SG-E codeswitching and the PG data. Indeed, the speakers in the SG-E codeswitching data show no differences at all from monolingual usage of separable prefix verbs, and thus that data set will not be discussed further. In PG, however, semantic restrictions on the prefixes are developing which, I argue, are fostered by English language contact.

The semantics of the combination of prefixes and stems in SG range from completely transparent to quite opaque. For example, the prefix *mit-* 'with' in combination with a verb such as *gehen* 'to go' forms a semantically transparent verb-plus-prefix construction: the meaning of the whole is exactly the sum of the parts (*mit-gehen* 'to go with'). However, this same prefix with another verb stem alters the meaning of the stem considerably, as in *mit-teilen* (literally, 'with-share'), which can only be used with the specific meaning 'to inform' (i.e., to share information with someone) and does not describe the sharing of concrete entities.

Further, the meanings of other separable prefix verbs cannot be determined easily, or at all, by analysis of the parts. One such verb is *um-ziehen*, as used in examples (9) and (10) above. The root is *ziehe* 'pull', and it is used in SG to form a variety of prefixed verbs with quite different meanings (e.g., *sich an-/aus-/um-ziehen* 'to get dressed/undressed/changed', as well as *aus-ziehen* 'to move out' and *um-ziehen* 'to move house, relocate').

In PG, separable prefix verbs are still used frequently, and the form of these verbs is a productive pattern in borrowings, as can be seen in (12) and (13).

> 12. PG: Separable Prefix Verb with an English Root
>   F11:   *sie*   PICK-E   *es*   *easy*   UFF
>   they   pick -PL   it   easy   up
>   'They pick it [English] up easily.'
> 13. PG: Separable Prefix Verb with an English Root
>   M8:   *ein*   *lot* *vun*   *die*   *Leit*   *es*   *Beachy*   *Amisch*
>   a   lot   of   the   people   that   Beachy   Amish
>   *ware*   *hen*   RUBER-GE-CHANGE-T   *zu*   *de*   *Beachy*
>   be/PAST/PL   have   over-PART-change-PART   to   the   Beachy
>   *Fellowship*
>   Fellowship
>   'A lot of people who were Beachy Amish changed over to Beachy
>   Fellowship.'

However, the use of separable prefix verbs is restricted: separable prefixes plus stems appear only in contexts where they have compositional meaning (i.e., the meaning of the whole can be ascertained from the meanings of the parts). The separable prefix verbs in these data occur with both English- and German-origin stems and prefixes (although the vast majority have German prefixes), as is discussed below. However, all separable prefix verbs share the property of semantic transparency and concreteness of prefix meaning, with the exception of one verb used by one speaker in this corpus. This development indicates a trend in PG toward semantic transparency in separable prefix verbs which is not necessarily the result of contact with English.

Most of the separable prefix verbs in these data are of German origin (245/275, 89%). Many of these verbs are historically present across dialects of German, and there is no reason to assume any PG-specific origins for them; an example is given in (14). The one exception to the rule of compositional meaning in separable prefix verbs, the verb *uff-heere* (SG *aufhören*) 'to quit, stop', is also a German-origin verb. This verb is used 5 times by speaker M4; one usage is shown in (15).

> 14. PG: Use of a Typical Separable Prefix Verb
>   F9:   *du*   *bist*   *net*   *viel*   FART-GANGE
>   you   be/2SG   not   much   away-go/PART
>   'You didn't go away much.' [The speaker is discussing the lifestyle
>   of her childhood]
> 15. PG: Use of a Separable Prefix Verb with Noncompositional Meaning
>   M4:   *So*   *finally*   *hab-e*   *ich*   UFF-GE-HEER-T . . .
>   so   finally   have-1SG   I   up-PART-hear-PART
>   'So finally I quit . . .'

Except for the usages of *uff-heere* such as that given in (15), all of the German-origin separable prefix verbs in this corpus have prefixes with a locative and/or directional meanings (e.g., *raus-, nei-, nunner-komme* 'to come out, in, down'; *mit-, zrick-, fart-gehe* 'to go with, back, away'). Three of the prefixes are of English origin *(along-komme* 'to come along', *back-schleiche* 'to slink back'; *on-gehe* 'to go on'), and four of the usages are calques of English constructions. An example of a calque of English 'to work out' (in the sense of a situation being viable, not physical exercise) is shown in (16).

16. German-Origin Separable Prefix Verb That Is a Calque from English
    F3: *es   hat   juscht   net   AUS-GE-SCHAFF-T   far   Amisch*
        it   have/3SG   just   not   out-PART-work-PART   for   Amish
        Leite,   so   ham   mer   vehicle   grieg-t
        people   so   have   we   vehicle   get-PART
        'It just didn't work out for Amish people, so we got vehicles.'

As shown in (12) and (13) above, there are separable prefix verbs with English-origin stems in these data (30/275, 11%). In addition, three instances of these English-origin verbs also have English-origin prefixes (17–19). They cannot be considered complete English verb phrases, however, as they are marked with German verbal morphology. English-origin prefixes and verb stems marked with the German participial prefix *ge-* are shown in (17) and (18); an English-origin prefix and stem marked with German infinitival morphology is given in (19).

17. PG: Separable Prefix Verbs with English Roots and Prefixes
    M2: *die   Kinner   zusammen   komm-e . . . Du   bist   UP-GE*
        the   children   together   come-P   you   be/2SG   up-PART-
        GROUP-T   warre   in   dei   Alt.
        group-PART   become   in   your   age
        'The children came together . . . and you were grouped up according to your age.'
18. PG: Separable Prefix Verbs with English Roots and Prefixes
    F7: *nu   die   alte   [Sprache]   sin   net   ON-GE-CARRI-ED*
        now   the   old   [languages]   be/PL   not   on-PART-carry-PART
        'The old [languages] aren't being carried on.'
19. PG: Separable Prefix Verbs with English Roots and Prefixes
    F1: *and   de   Hund   war   an   bark-e   and   ON-*
        and   the   dog   be/PAST/SG   on   bark-INF   and   on-
        CARRY-E
        carry-INF
        'and the dog was barking and carrying on'

All of these separable prefix verbs, whether consisting of English- or German-origin prefixes and stems, have compositional meaning. The al-

most complete absence of separable prefix verbs with opaque meanings indicates that PG verbal morphology is undergoing semantic simplification. While the pattern of separable prefix verbs is still quite productive, it is restricted to the use of prefixes with a locative or directional meaning.

This claim is strengthened by the presence of English-origin borrowings that have replaced German-origin separable prefix verbs with noncompositional meanings. In particular, verbs for which the affixation of a prefix changes the meaning of the root verb are falling out of use. In (20), the separable prefix verb *um-ziehe* 'move house' (literally, 'pull around') has been replaced with the English borrowing *move.*

> 20. PG: Replacement of *um-ziehe* with *move*
>   M1: *er   is   nach   Florida   ge-move-t*
>   he   be/3SG   to   Florida   PART-move-PART
>   'He moved to Florida.'

There is one occurrence of the use of *ziehe* to mean 'move'; significantly, this usage is found in an amusing anecdote, given in (21), which relies on the translation of this verb for its humor. Note that when the speaker discusses the action of moving, he uses the verb *move*, and uses the verb *ziehe* only when it is integral to the story he is telling.

> 21. Use of *ziehe* to Mean 'move' in Pennsylvania German
>   M1: *Eemol   bin   ich, bin   ich   nuff   in   die   Stadt*
>   once   be/1Sg   I,   be/1SG   I   up   in   the   city
>   *gange,   as   ich   Heem   gange   bin,   nau*
>   go/PART   as   I   home   go/PART   be/1SG   then
>   *hat   de   Stahrkeeper   g-sagt,   "Wo   sin   sei*
>   have/3SG   the   storekeeper   PART-say   where   are   your
>   *Leit?"   Oh,   sie   ware   gange   mei   uncle   and   mei*
>   people   oh   they   were   go/PART   my   uncle   and   my
>   *aunt   helf-e   move-e.   Nau   hab-e   ich   ge-sagt*
>   aunt   help-INF   move-INF   then   have-1Sg   I   PART-say
>   *zu   ihm,   mer   sag-e   'ziehe', gange   helf-e   zieh-e,*
>   to   him,   we   say-PL   'pull'   go/PART   help-INF move-INF
>   *un   nau   hab-e   ich   ge-sagt   zu   ihm,   "oh, they went*
>   and   then   have-1SG   I   PART-say   to   him,   "oh, they went
>   *to help Mose Kolenz pull."*
>   'Once I went into the city, as I went home, then the storekeeper said, "Where are your people?" Oh, they had gone to help my uncle and aunt move. Then I said to him, we say "ziehe" [literally, 'pull'], went to help "ziehe," and then I said to him, "Oh, they went to help Mose Kolenz pull."'

This anecdote attests to the fact that when this elderly speaker was a child—approximately 60 years ago—the nondirectional prefix *um* was not used with the verb *ziehe*.[6] However, this speaker recognizes that *ziehe* then

had two distinct meanings, 'pull' and 'move'; indeed, that is the point of the story. Thus, dropping the separable prefix of a noncompositional verb did not eliminate ambiguity but created it. As can be seen in the example, the preferred usage for this speaker has become *move*, which is unambiguous; *move* is also used by three other speakers in this sample, while *ziehe* or *um-ziehe* does not occur at all outside of the anecdote cited in (21).

Others English loanwords that are candidates for this analysis as replacements of separable prefix verbs that have noncompositional meaning are shown in (22) and (23). In (22), the English borrowing *imagine* occurs; any of the potential German-origin variants cited in Frey (1942) and Beam (1982) would be separable prefix verbs with noncompositional meaning (cf. *ei-bilde* 'imagine' [literally, 'to picture in']; or *vor-stelle*[7] 'pretend' [literally, 'to put in front of']). Although *imagine* cannot be conclusively shown to have replaced either of the German-origin possibilities, neither variant is attested in these data.

> 22. PG: Replacement of *vor-stelle* with *imagine*
> F4: *ich   kann*   IMAGINE-E   *es   waer*   *confusing*
>   I   can   imagine-INF   it   be/COND   confusing
>   'I can imagine it would be confusing.'

In (23), the English loan *stop* is used; as discussed above, the German-origin alternative in PG, used by only one speaker in this data set, is *auf-heere*. The English-origin *stop* is much more popular, used at least once by five different speakers; one example is given in (23).

> 23. PG: Use of the English-Origin Verb *stop*
> F6: *ich   hab-e*   *(unintelligible)   in   die   Schul   bis   ich*
>   I   have-1SG   in   the   school   until I
>   *sixteen   war,*   *but   hab-e*   *ich   miss-e*
>   sixteen   be/PAST/SG   but   have-1SG   I   must-INF
>   STOPP-E.
>   stop-INF
>   'I went to school until I was sixteen, but then I had to stop.'

I suggest that for at least some of the above-mentioned cases, borrowing is motivated by the simple form and transparent meaning of the loanwords when their separable prefix verb counterparts have noncompositional meaning. For example, the English loanwords shown in examples (20), (22), and (23) (*move, imagine,* and *stop*) are unlikely candidates for borrowing motivated by unique semantic or pragmatic features; their meanings are virtually identical to those of their German counterparts. Further, they can hardly be claimed to be new concepts connected to life in America. Arguably, their form is the salient feature that has promoted their use in PG. The tendency toward the borrowing of simple English verbs to replace

German-origin verbs with separable prefixes has also been observed by
Enninger (1980, 345) among PG speakers in Delaware.

Admittedly, this motivation cannot be claimed for most English borrow-
ings; in general, lexical borrowing tends to be motivated by perceived
semantic/pragmatic uniqueness or because the foreign lexical items make
reference to new objects or concepts (McClure and McClure 1989; Myers-
Scotton 1993, 169). The English loan + calque in (12) (*uff-picke* 'to pick
up') is a case in point; there is no easy equivalent for *pick up* with the
meaning 'learn quickly' in German. Certainly this collocation differs
pragmatically from semantically similar alternatives such as PG *lerne* 'learn'.
A further example of borrowing motivated by semantic features is the PG
borrowing *calle* 'to call on the telephone'; obviously, this loanword is most
likely the result of the introduction of telephones.

However, while unique semantic or pragmatic features must be recog-
nized as the motivation for borrowing in many cases, it is also probable that
some borrowings are taken from the donor language because of their
simplicity of form. I posit that the loanwords *move*, *imagine*, and *stop* are such
cases. Their German-origin semantic counterparts are separable prefix
verbs that, due to their opacity in form-meaning mapping, are incompat-
ible with the internal developments of PG; thus borrowing enhances inter-
nally motivated trends in language change.

In summary, PG is maintaining separable prefix verbs, which are dis-
tinctly non-English patterns, but those with noncompositional meaning are
rare. Only one such verb, used by one speaker, is found in these data. The
use of separable prefix verbs with compositional meaning continues to be a
productive pattern, but combinations whose meaning cannot be derived
from the verb stem and a locative preposition are out of favor. This appears
to be an internal development, motivated by the general tendency toward
transparency in form-meaning mapping, and aided by the availability of
English verbs to replace the dispreferred German forms. Thus, language
contact, while not responsible for the change per se, provides lexical
resources that enable continued development.

CONCLUSION

This study has examined two features not previously discussed in the
literature, past participles and separable prefix verbs, to show that both
internal and external (i.e., language contact) factors are at work in the
variation and change of Pennsylvania German. The interaction between
internal and external factors is both complex and varied. Previous research

has shown that the use of German-origin forms (such as the progressive construction) can be encouraged, and the environments for usage determined, by contact with English. Also, language contact is given partial credit for the case merger in PG; this development, which reflects simplification of morphological paradigms, has arguably been accelerated by contact with a language which does not have dative case morphology.

In this study, two other possibilities for interaction between internal and external factors in intense language contact have been illustrated. First, variation in past participle formation rules, which is strictly constrained in German, has created ambiguity as to the language status of the participial marking when applied to English-origin verbs, opening the door for the introduction of full English participles. Second, the trend away from the use of separable prefix verbs that do not have compositional meaning has been encouraged by the availability of English loanwords, because these English elements can be used instead of German-origin separable prefix verbs which do not have maximal transparency.

While English clearly plays a role in the real-life drama of the development of PG, it is the role of best supporting actress rather than the leading lady. In this analysis, simplification of inflectional systems and transparency of form-function mapping have been shown to be strong internal factors at work in language change. However, contact with English also provides lexical resources and the model of a less-inflected language. While these contributions are integral to the plot in the story of PG, the internal motivations for language change are at center stage.

NOTES

The author would like to gratefully acknowledge the helpful comments of Werner Enninger and two anonymous reviewers on earlier drafts of this paper.

1. The term *external* is used here to refer to the influence of language contact, not language-external (i.e., sociological or historical) factors.

2. Three of the 18 speakers were raised in Old Order Mennonite communities in Holmes County, Ohio; all others were members of Old Order Amish communities in Ohio or Indiana before moving to South Carolina.

3. Previous analyses have shown that these SG-E codeswitching data, if divided into two categories based on the speakers' duration of residence in the United States, pattern quite differently: data from those who have been active bilinguals for over five years share some features with PG, while those from the shorter-term bilinguals do not. However, the participial data from the SG-E bilinguals do not show any internal variation; thus the SG-E codeswitching data are treated as one corpus for this analysis.

4. The PG infinitive (and plural) marker is a final -*e* suffix; in SG infinitival (and plural) marking is realized as -*en*.

5. An additional verb—*graduated*—fits PG criteria for the nonapplication of the initial *ge-* participal marker for a different reason; verb stems with initial [g] sounds in PG are not assigned the *ge-* prefix (Haag 1982, 147).

6. It should be noted that in some constructions in modern SG, it is also possible to use the verb *ziehen* to mean 'move' without a prefix, but it can be used only when the destination being moved to is given (e.g., *Ich ziehe nach Hanover* is possible, but *Ich ziehe morgen is ungrammatical.

7. Although a form of the SG *vor-stelle* 'imagine' was not cited in any of the sources consulted, both *verstellich* 'pretentious' and *Verstellung* 'pretense' are cited in Frey (1942) as part of the PG lexicon.

REFERENCES

Beam, C. Richard. 1982. *Pennsylvania German Dictionary.* Lancaster, PA: Brookshire.
Enninger, Werner. 1979. "Language Convergence in a Stable Triglossia Plus Trilingualism Situation." *Anglistik: Beiträge zur Fachwissenschaft und Fachdidaktik: Festschrift für Eleonore Cladder.* Ed. Peter Freese, Carin Freywald, Wolf Paprotte, and Willi Real. Münster: Regensberg, 43–63.
———. 1980. "Syntactic Convergence in a Stable Triglossia Plus Trilingualism Situation in Kent County, Delaware, U.S." *Sprachkontact und Sprachkonflikt.* Ed. Peter Hans Helde. Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik 32. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 343–50.
Enninger, Werner, John A. Hostetler, Joachim Raith, and Karl-Heinz Wandt. 1986. "Rules of Speaking and Their Mediation: The Case of the Old Order Amish." *Studies on the Languages and the Verbal Behavior of the Pennsylvania Germans.* Ed. Enninger. Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik 51. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 137–70.
Fishman, Joshua. 1989. *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective.* Clevedon, Eng.: Multilingual Matters.
Frey, J. William. 1942. *A Simple Grammar of Pennsylvania Dutch.* Clinton, SC: Frey.
Fuller, Janet. 1996. "When Cultural Maintenance Means Linguistic Convergence: Pennsylvania German Evidence for the Matrix Language Turnover Hypothesis." *Language in Society* 25: 493–514.
———. 1997. "'Pennsylvania Dutch with a Southern Touch': A Theoretical Model of Language Contact and Change." Diss. U of South Carolina.
Green, W. A. I. 1989. "The Dialects of the Palatinate (Das Pfälzische)." *The Dialects of Modern German: A Linguistic Survey.* Ed. Charles V. J. Russ. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 241–64.
Haag, Earl C. 1982. *A Pennsylvania German Reader and Grammar.* University Park: Pennsylvania State UP.
Hostetler, John A. 1963. *Amish Society.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP.
Huffines, Marion Lois. 1988. "Building Progressive: Evidence from Cognitive Structures." *Journal of English Linguistics* 21: 137–48.
———. 1989. "Case Usage among the Pennsylvania German Sectarians and Nonsectarians." *Investigating Obsolescence: Studies in Language Contraction and Death.* Ed. Nancy C. Dorian. New York: Cambridge UP, 211–16.

————. 1992. "Language Change and Enabling Strategies of Pennsylvania Anabaptists." *Diachronic Studies on the Languages of the Anabaptists.* Ed. Kate Burridge and Werner Enninger. Bochum: Brockmeyer, 166–81.

————. 1993. "Dying by Convergence? Pennsylvania German and Syntactic Change." *The German Language in America, 1683–1991.* Ed. Joseph C. Salmons. Madison, WI: Max Kade Institute for German-American Studies, 250–63.

Keller, R. E. 1961. *German Dialects: Phonology and Morphology.* Manchester: Manchester UP.

Lederer, H. 1969. *Reference Grammar of the German Language.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Louden, Mark L. 1988. "Bilingualism and Syntactic Change in Pennsylvania German." Diss. Cornell U.

————. 1994. "Syntactic Change in Multilingual Speech Islands." *Sprachinselforschung: Eine Gedenkschrift für Hugo Jedig.* Ed. Nina Berend and Klaus J. Mattheir. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 73–91.

McClure, Erica, and Malcolm McClure. 1989. "Macro- and Micro-Sociolinguistic Dimensions of Code Switching in Vingard [Romania]." *Codeswitching: Anthropological and Sociolinguistic Perspectives.* Ed. Monica Heller. Berlin: de Gruyter, 25–51.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Pyles, Thomas, and John Algeo. 1993. *The Origins and Development of the English Language.* 4th ed. New York: Harcourt.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1994. *Language Contact and Change: Spanish in Los Angeles.* Oxford: Clarendon.