Chapter 6
LANGUAGE ASSIMILATION:
Including The Shared Discourse of Grief

Throughout various cultures, then, and within the various languages observed in the Texas (and a significant few non-Texas) cemeteries, a core discourse of grief binds together about eighty-percent of the families. On gravemarkers, these families tell us the names of the deceased, their dates of death, their ages at death, family relationships, and perhaps a personal epitaph. This information is presented in a universal, consistent, predictable order of importance—with names having highest priority and personal epitaphs least.

In the gravemarker messages, we may also learn of places of birth and of death, of occupations, of lodge and/or religious affiliations, of means of death. These pieces of information, however, produce no pattern statistically valid enough to be considered part of the universal discourse of grief.

Mixed Codes as linguistic Entities

Gravemarker data, however, include one major aberration to the conventional division into recognizable languages. To wit, a significant number of the gravemarkers contain either bilingual or mixed language code messages.

For convenience sake, I am defining bilingual

gravemarker bilingual messages as those messages that

duplicate (all or parts of) a message in two different

languages (Figure 6.1). In this example the Spanish

Figure 6.1: Bilingual Message
(INSERT slide LS.7/97.#3)

```
            DO NOT
            DRINK
            WATER
        ------------
            NO TOME
             ESTA
             AQUA
```

language message duplicates exactly and totally the

English language message.   In mixed code gravemarker

messages NO information is duplicated (Figure 6.2). In

this example, the name is written in Spanish, the death

Figure 6.2: Mixed Code Message
(INSERT slide SF2-8.7/97.#21)

```
          Susie Peña
        Sept. 13, 1911
        Sept. 6, 1966
       Our Beloved Mother
```

and birth dates may be either Spanish or English. The

personalized epitaph is clearly written in English. No

information is duplicated.

While in most linguistic discussions this

distinction has importance, it has no relevance to

expressions of the universal discourse of grief.

Before I discuss that non-relevance, however, I wish to account for the presence of both bilingual and mixed-code data. The linguistic concept known as "language continuum" provides a useful explanation for these bilingual and mixed-code gravemarkers.

In 1966 linguist David Decamp published an article on Jamaican Creole in which he argued that a clear distinction between pure "dialect" [Creole] and pure "Standard British English" could not be found:

> Nearly all speakers of English in Jamaica could be arranged in a sort of linguistic continuum, ranging from the speech of the most backward peasant or labourer all the way to that of a well educated urban professional. Each speaker represents not a single point but a span of this continuum, for he is usually able to adjust his speech upward or downwards for some distance on it.[i]

This concept of the continuum has become a working hypothesis in "Creole" studies.

During the past several decades the study of bilingual and mixed-codes has become as important to linguists as has the study of monolingual codes. The

justification for that emphasis lies in the previously discussed search for linguistic universals—common structures that unite all languages.

Within the field of sociolinguistics, bilingual codes are isolated for study in the discipline known as creole studies. Creole scholars study the manner(s) in which bilingual codes (Creoles), especially new and temporary bilingual codes, relate to established language codes; how the three language codes change through time; and how, through time, bilingual codes either tend to merge into one of the established codes, or grow into separate and unique "languages."[ii]

Such research becomes important later, when we discuss the mixed-code of Spanish/English. Appling the continuum concept to gravemarker languages in any bilingual community requires only minor adjustment. Each gravemarker can, for starters, be a definite point on a continuum—not a "span on the continuum." The same family members ("each speaker") may be involved in the creation of several gravemarkers and those gravemarkers may differ on a linear scale (one marker may have monolingual Spanish writing conventions, a second marker a mixture of Spanish and English, and a third marker only Enlgihs) but each gravemarker is a unique

point on the continuum. (See, for example, the various
gravemarkers produced by the Fernandez family, in
Chapter 2).

ASSIMILATION THEORY: ELLIS ISLAND (NARROW AND BROAD)

    To understand the social background for the
linguistic presence of these bilingual and mixed-code
languages, we need to look at ways in which immigrant
languages become Anglicized. While the federal
government has utilized several immigration processing
centers, Ellis Island—and stories emanating from that
processing center—have dominated American understanding
of the immigration procedure. Most of the Ellis Island
stories focus upon surnames, ways in which surnames
become Anglicized.

    Be warned, however, that more cultural anecdotes
exist than do actual analysis of immigration data. As
Daniel Levine, Kenneth Hill, and Robert Warren state in
the preface to their 1985 seminal collection of essays
in Immigration Statistics: A Story of Neglect:

>   As a nation built by waves of immigrants from
>   colonial times to the present, we know
>   remarkably little about the composition and
>   characteristics of the flow of new arrivals
>   in any given year or about how they settle in
>   to their new lives in the Unites States
>   (Levine, Hill, and Warren 2).[iii]

Most of us have vague ideas about the registration process itself. Most of those ideas jell with reality. Basically, when ships of immigrants arrived in the New York harbor, the immigrants underwent a screening process. In essence smaller boats or barges brought the immigrants and their baggage to Ellis Island, technically a barge itself. At Ellis Island the immigrants underwent an exhaustive three-part (medical, psychological, economic) examination. According to the first major Ellis Island historian, Henry Pratt Fairchild, "If the immigrant appears to be 'clearly and beyond a doubt' entitled to admission, he passes on to the disharboring quarters, where he is turned over to the agents of the appropriate transportation company, or to a 'missionary,' or is set free to take his way to the city by the ferry (Fairchild 188).

Remember, however, that this process took place before national registration of any type. The registration process amounted to little more than verification of a cargo manifest—and of the health of that "cargo." Names that people were given at Ellis Island had little, if any, legal status.

To broaden our understanding of this Ellis Island experience, Jewish scholar Bernard Marinbach reminds us that similar cargo manifest verification took place in Philadelphia, Baltimore, Boston, and Galveston (Texas). For most of us, even the Texans among us, the

importance of the Galveston center appears almost
incidental. Marinbach's Jewish community has seldom
dominated Texas folklore. Yet "Between the years 1907
and 1914," Marinbach writes, "about ten thousand Jews
were admitted as immigrants at Galveston, settling in
virtually every state of the West" (Marinbach xiii).

To broaden our understanding geographically (New
York, Baltimore, Boston, Philadelphia, Galveston)
certainly helps us understand our over-reliance upon
the insights warped by Ellis Island cultural mythology.
We must, however, understand the same captivating hold
that the Ellis Island stories have had upon our
understanding of the assimilation of family names.
These stories have provided our culture a red herring,
which has effectively cut off our understanding of the
obvious—the major ways in which second and third
generation families change their surnames. Check the
gravemarkers. They'll inform you.

Surname Changes

No, I am not belittling the reality of the Ellis
Island stories--nor the equivalent Baltimore, Boston,
Philadelphia, Galveston ones. Certain individuals did
indeed suffer "Foreignphobia" in these processing
centers. Historian August Bolino writes quite
succinctly: "In the process of inspection, many a
future American 'suffered' a name change. Today we can
laugh at these instances, but they must have perplexed

the aliens, who found themselves addressed in a fashion [by whom, he does not say] they did not recognize" (Bolino 17).

Bolino duplicates two of Maldwyn Jones' examples. One tells of the frustrated Jew who, when asked his name, said "Ich vergessen" [I forget]—and was named "Ferguson." The second story tells of an Italian man who said that his name was Mastroianni, and he became Mister Yanni" (Bolino 15).   Ellis Island officials, however, did not initiate these changes. In a 1974 article, genealogists Clifford and Anna Smith discuss at length the atrocious name changes that German pre-Ellis Island, eighteenth century immigrants suffered. For example, "Whenever there was an obvious near-equivalent in English to the German surname, American officials [in general, not Ellis Island] were likely to use it with or without permission of the bearer; thus, Schmid-Schmidt-Schmitz usually was recorded as Smith, Müller-Möller became Miller, Braun became Brown" (100).

Leading into our own gravemarker insights Smith and Smith talk about the gradual acquiescence of the family. "Wherever there was a translatable equivalent for a German surname, some family members were likely sooner or later to adopt it, usually in the third generation and thereafter; thus, Zimmermann became Carpenter, Schneider became Taylor, Dürr became Dry,

Gerber became Tanner, Bauer became Farmer" (100).

And thirdly, Smith and Smith discuss spelling difficulties. "Wherever American pronunciation was confounded by German orthography, the German surname was likely to be changed in such manner as to preserve the original German pronunciation of it; thus Ewald became Awalt, Dreier became Dryer, Meier-Maier became Myer, Koch became Cook, Bauer became Bower"(100).

ASSIMILATION THEORY: AMERICAN LANGUAGE INTOLERANCE

The following discussion will focus upon gravemarker data. The topic (language intolerance), however, triggers emotional responses among virtually everyone reading books written in English. My only caveat lies upon an appeal to anyone who has participated in the production of a gravemarker—or who intends to do so. Your grief will be written in a human language. Listen to your fellow grievers, and to the articulation of their grief.

In order to follow some of their messages, however, I need to explain the concept of diacritic marks, those funny little marks that people put on top of letters—like our dot on top of the letter "i." In many European, non-English languages, the various Roman alphabets that people utilized contain many more such diacritics. Most of our computers today contain "symbol inserts" that allow the free use of such diacritics. The letter *i* for example may have the

additional diacritics   *ì, í, î,* or *ï.*

Part of the cultural identity attached to written English is the avoidance of such diacritics. The British scholar Smalley excuses such intolerance with arguments that appears to make fools of all writers and readers of French: "A letter with a diacritic such as an acute accent [é] or a grave accent [è] is easily confused with a letter without a diacritic [e]. An acute accent is more easily confused with a grave accent that either is with no diacritic at all"(43).

Some onomastics scholars, those who study the origin of place and surnames especially, have found that "true American readers" are also reluctant to utilize dictionaries that include diacritics—and that "foreigners" learn that fact quickly. In his first book on American surnames, E. Smith minced no words:

> In this book the diacritical marks of the various languages are disregarded because they are not customarily used in American family names. A true "American" name does not have an accent, a tilde, an umlaut, a circumflex, a cedilla or any of the numerous other signs of marks used in the various languages. Americans just refuse to take the time to add such marks, and the foreigner soon ceases to insist upon it and he, himself, ignores the diacritical mark" (1956 xxxi).

In the second edition of this same book, Smith toned

down the rhetoric somewhat, but not his belligerence:

> Names are given with the spelling usually
> employed in America even though slightly
> different from the form found in the country of
> origin. Indeed, the spelling commonly employed
> in America may not be found at all in the country
> of origin. This book is about American names and
> not about names current in other countries. . . .
> Names are spelled as they are commonly used in
> America influenced by the English language
> without those diacritical marks so sacred to many
> from other countries." (E.Smith 1973 xviii).

Hanks and Hodges in their dictionary of American Family
Names do attempt some inclusion of diacritics—
especially in the index. In their discussion of
languages written in non-Roman scripts, however, they
do address the overall difficulty of "transmuting" any
language into English—including, I argue, the
assimilation of family names on gravemarkers.

> Reluctantly, it was decided not to attempt to deal
> with the comparatively recent advent of surnames
> derived from other naming traditions--in
> particular, those of India, Pakistan, China, and
> Japan--even though such names are found with ever-
> increasing frequency in English-speaking
> countries. Perhaps in a future edition it will be
> possible to tackle these names too, and show how

different systems of nomenclature from different

cultures have been transmuted into 20th-century

surnames (Hanks & Hodges vi).

ILLUSTRATIONS: MIXED CODES WITH UNIVERSAL DISCOURSE OF GRIEF

In 1992, Annelise Duncan and I argued that Texas-

German gravemarkers ranged from conventional German

language codes to conventional English language codes—

with a multitude of mixtures of the two codes (Baird &

Duncan). We argued that the mixture may be as simple

as using a comma instead of a period in the writing of

a death date.[iv] German conventions call for a "period";

English conventions call for a "comma."

We also suggested that the universal discourse of

grief pattern exists in the English influence upon the

German vocabulary. That emergence, however, appears

more noticeably in Chinese-English gravemarkers—more

noticeable because of the differences in orthography.

In Figure 6.3, a bilingual marker, the single

Figure 6.3: Chinese/English name
(INSERT slide /90.mission south.#06)

Young
[Chinese]

English item duplicates the Chinese item—the family

name. In Figure 6.4, a gravemarker that is both

Figure 6.4: Chinese/English name, death date
(INSERT slide 2/90.mission south.#29)

Fong Yick Man
Died Nov. 9, 1948
[Chinese]

bilingual and mixed-code, the English code repeats

(predictably) the name and death date, but does not

include the age. In Figure 6.5, the English code

Figure 6.5: Chinese/English name, death date, age
(INSERT slide MPS70.Mar92.#35)

ENG

Leung Yick   King Chin
Jan.1,1915-Jan.31,1965   Oct.20,1914-
Feb.7,1980
[Chinese]   [Chinese]

includes the predictable names, death dates, and

birthdates (age). And in Figure 6.6, the English code

Figure 6.6: Chinese/English name, death date, age, kin
(INSERT slide MPS72.Mar92.#37)

NG

Father   Mother
Foon Gim NG   Mildred Go NG
May 27, 1898   Oct. 14, 1903
Oct. 8, 1949   Nov. 16, 1980
[Chinese]

includes the names, death dates, ages, and kinship.

While the different scripts allow us to see

readily the movement from Chinese into English, the

movement from one language code into another does not

depend upon script. In fact, one may easily argue that

no movement really takes place. Gravemarker Grief is

Gravemarker Grief. Whether a family mourns in Chinese

or in English or in a mixture of Chinese and English,

the family mourns.

Nonetheless, the Texas cemeteries abound in

gravemarkers expressing grief in a variety of mixed

language codes. In addition to the Chinese/English

markers in Mission Park South, for example, the Wetmore

cemetery has several mixed-code German/English codes

such as in figure 6.7. Note the three predictable

Figure 6.7: German/English name, death date, age
(INSERT slide 3/92 Wetmore 19)

items—name, death date, and birth date—in English and

the predictable kinship term ("born Reeh") still in

German. In addition two stylized epitaphs remain in

German.

Figure 6.8 shows a picture (sent by a friend) of a

Figure 6.8: Hebrew/English name, death date
(Insert slide Marc Keltner, 6/90)

Hebrew/English marker in Mt. Moriah Cemetery, Deadwood,

South Dakota. Most of the marker has Hebrew writing,

but the predictable name and death date constitute the

two items in English.

Figure 6.9 shows a bilingual Arabic/English

Figure 6.9: Arabic/English name, Death, Birth, Kin
(INSERT SLIDE SF#1, 2/29/02, 1)

marker. The predictable names, death dates, birth

dates, and kinship terms all appear in English. The

Arabic code repeats the two given names: Joseph and

Mary.

Figure 6.10 shows a bilingual Korean/English

Figure 6.10: Korean/English name, death date, birth date
(INSERT SLIDE SF2-10, 7/97, #25)

marker. The English code contains the predictable

name, death date, and birth date. The Korean repeats

the full name.

Figure 6.11 does not show a mixed-code, nor a

Figure 6.11 Czech and English Family Transmutations
(INSERT SLIDE Czech, Eckert, 05)

bilingual marker. It does show, however, a monolingual

Czech marker in front of a monolingual English marker.

The family name on the Czech marker is spelled FAJKUS;

on the English marker the name is spelled the way it is

pronounced, but in English writing conventions: FAYKUS.

The birth dates indicated that Peter, on the Czech

marker, was 25 years old when Jerome, on the English

marker, was born. We can infer, then, that Peter was

Joseph's father and that in one generation, the entire

gravemarker information was "transmuted," to use Hanks

and Hodges' term, into English.

APPLYING DIACRITICS TO ASSIMILATION STUDIES

Note, now, in Figure 6.12. The same generational

Figure 6.12: Diacritic changes on Czech markers
(INSERT SLIDE '90.Czech.Eckert.#33)

assimilation takes place on the names, only, on two

totally different Czech markers. The use of the háček

diacritic over the letter "c" on the right marker

indicates palatalization—or pronouncing the "c" as

"ch." The Czech pronunciation would be [Meech-ah].

The newer marker (on the left) has no háček—leaving the

pronunciation of the name up to the whims of English

speakers; either [Meek-uh] or [Maik-uh][v].

This loss of diacritic markers occurs in several

languages, including German, Czech, Polish, and

Spanish. The Spanish data provide a multitude of

examples. Figures 6.13 through 6.18, for example,

illustrate the movement from monolingual Spanish,

through predictable Spanish-into-English mixed code

samples, into monolingual English.

In Figure 6.13, Alex Treviño's San Fernando #2

Figure 6:13: Entire Discourse of Grief in Spanish
(INSERT SLIDE Treviño.SF2-7.7/97.#11)

Alex Treviño
Julio 17, 1908
Nov. 9, 1944
Recuerdo de su madre
Y hermanos

marker includes the entire universal discourse of grief

in Spanish: *name* Alex Treviño, *death date* Nov. 9, 1944,

birth date Julio 17, 1908, *kinship/personalized epitaph*

Recuerdo de su madre y hermanos ["erected by your

mother and your siblings"].

In Figure 6.14, another monolingual Spanish

Figure 6.14: Four elements of grief in Spanish
(INSERT SLIDE Cantú.SF2-7.7/97.#12)

```
               Cantú
        Madre              Hermana
        Petrita F.         Antonia
        1864~1940          1895~1947
```

language marker, also from San Fernando #2, has two

kinship terms: madre and hermana [mother and sister].

Predictably the death dates, birth dates, and names are

also present.

San Fernando #1 has a mixed-code marker that has

three names, three death dates, and three birth dates

in English, with the two kinship terms (husband, wife)

and a stylized (not personalized) epitaph in Spanish

[Departed in Peace](Figure 6.15).

**Figure 6.15: English name, death date, and birth date;
kinship in Spanish**
(INSERT SLIDE SF#1.2/29/92.#17)

```
        Esposo              Esposa
        Edward C.          Maria Moreno
        Dec. 28, 1896       Delgado
        Mar. 12, 1973      1899~1967
```

```
                Henry C. Delgado
                   1902~1928
                Descansen in Paz
```

Figure 6.16 shows a San Fernando #2 marker

Figure 6.16: Two Predictable Spanish/English Mixtures
(INSERT SLIDE SF2-9.7/97.#20)

```
                   Canales
        Father              Madre
       Antonio O.          Adela A.
      Jan. 20, 1916      Sept. 30, 1929
      Sept. 14, 1980     Abril 28, 1986
      Recuerdo de su      Recuerdo de su
      Esposa E Hijos       Hija E Hijos
```

memorializing two people, both of them memorialized

within the complete universal discourse of grief. The

father, who died in 1980, has name, death date, birth

date and a kinship term in English, but a second

kinship term is combined with a personalized epitaph in

Spanish. The first three items appear (predictably) in

English; the last two items still in Spanish.

The mother, on the other hand, who died six years

later, has her name either in Spanish or English (they

would be spelled identically), but death date, birth

date, and combined kinship/personalized epitaph in

Spanish.

The father's memorial is in the name of his wife

and his children (or maybe his sons). The mother's

memorial is in the name of her daughter and her sons

(or maybe her children).

Figure 6.17, from the Canary Island Cemetery in

**Figure 6.17: Name, death date, age in English;
Kinship, personalized & stylized epitaphs in Spanish**
(INSERT SLIDE Canary.1933.#17)

Refugio Faris
Mar. 11, 1933
Age of 59 Years
Recuerdo de sus Hijos Y Hijas

Floresville, again has the complete universal discourse

of grief—plus a stylized epitaph. Predictably the

name, death date, and age are in English while kinship

terms and personalized epitaph are in Spanish.

[Erected by your sons and daughters]. (The stylized

acronym is also in Spanish.)

We started this series of Spanish-English markers

with a monolingual Spanish example of Petrita and

Antonia Cantú; we will close with a monolingual marker

for someone else named Cantu (no diacritic), Abelardo

(Figure 6.18). All five elements of the universal

Figure 6.18: Cantu monolingual marker
(INSERT SLIDE SF2-7.7/97.#14)

Brother
Abelardo Cantu
1895~1942
Sleep, brother, sleep and take thy rest,
God called you home, he thought it best.

discourse of grief express Abalardo's siblings'
feelings.

To summarize the arguments and examples: In all of
the bilingual and all of the mixed-code gravemarkers,
assimilation into English follows the universal
discourse of grief. If only one item appears in
English, that item is the name; if two items appear in
English, those two items are name and death date; if
three items appear in English, those three items are
name, death date, and age; if four items appear in
English those four items are name, death date, age, and
kinship terminology; and if five items appear in
English, those five items are name, death date, age,
kinship terminology; and personalized epitaph.

REFERENCES

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. <u>Borderlands/La Frontera: The
    new mestiza</u>. San   Francisco: Spinsters: Aunt
    Lute.

Aranoff, Mark. 1985. "Orthography and linguistic
    theory." *Language* 61.1, 28-72.

Arthur, M.A. 1857. An Etymological Dictionary of

Family & Christian Names, with an Essay on their

Derivation and Import. New York: Sheldon,

Blakeman & Co.

Atwood, E. Bagby. 1962. The Regional Vocabulary of

Texas. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Baird, Scott. 1992. "Language Codes in Texas German

Graveyards." Markers, 217-256.

Baird, Scott and Annelise Duncan. 1982. "Tombstone

Talk: Variation in a German Dialect."

Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference

on Methods in Dialectology. W. Werkentyn,

Editor. Vancouver, Canada: University of

Victoria.

Bahlow, Hans. 1967. Deutsches Namen-Lexicon.

München: Keysersche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Baugh, Albert C. and Thomas Cable. 1978. A History of

the English Language, 3rd. ed. Englewood Cliffs,

N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Benjamin, Steven M. and Luanne von Schneidemesser.

1979. "German loanwords in American English, A

Bibliography of Studies, 1872-1978." American

Speech 54:210-15.

Benton, Barbara. 1985. <u>Ellis Island: A Pictorial</u>

    <u>History</u>. New York: Facts on File Publications.

Biber, Douglas. 1986. "Spoken and written textual

    dimensions in English: Resolving the

    contradictory findings." <u>Language</u> 62.2,

    384-414.

Biber, Douglas and Edward Finegan. 1989. "Drift and

    the evolution of English style: A history of

    three genres." <u>Language</u> 65.3, 487-517.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. <u>Language</u>. New York: Holt,

    Rinehart and Winston.

Bolino, August C. 1985. <u>The Ellis Island Source Book</u>.

    Washington, D.C.: Kensington Historical Press.

<u>Cemeteries in Texas</u>. 1985. Geographical Names

    Information Management, Branch of Geographic

    Names, Office of Geographic Research. National

    Mapping Division, U.S. Geological Survey, 1985.

Cottle, Basil. 1967. <u>The Penguin Dictionary of</u>

    <u>Surnames</u>. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1967.

Couture, Barbara. 1989. "Attributing value to written

    text: Some implications for linguistics and

    interpretation." <u>Word</u>, 40.1-2, April-August,

    51-64.

Dauzat, Albert. 1980. Dictionnaire Etymologique des
    Noms de Famille et Pronoms de France. Paris:
    Librairie Larousse, (c. 1951)

De Leon, Arnoldo. 1982. The Tejano Community. 1836-
    1900. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico
    Press, 1982.

Eckert, Eva. 1993. "Language Change. Testimony of
    Czech Tombstone Inscriptions in Praha, Texas."
    In Eckert, Varieties of Czech. Holland: Rodopi
    Editions.

Eckert, Eva, editor. 1993. Varieties of Czech.
    Studies in Czech Sociolinguistics.
    Amsterday/Atlanta: Rodopi Editions.

Eckert, Eva. 1994. "The Language of Tombstone
    Inscriptions: The Issue of Authorship." *Studies
    in Slavic Sociolinguistics* Special issue of
    Slavic and East European Journal).

Eckert, Eva. 1998. "Language and Ethnicity
    Maintenance: Evidence of Czech Tombstone
    Inscriptions. Markers XV 204-233.

Fairchild, Henry Pratt. 1930. Immigration, revised
    edition. New York: Macmillan Company.

Field, Fred. 1994. "Caught in the Middle: The Case of

Pocho and the Mixed Language." Paper presented,

American Dialect Society, San Diego.

Fasold, Ralph. 1984. <u>The Sociolinguistics of Society</u>.

Oxford and New York: Basil Blackwell.

Fayer, Joan. 1988. "First Names in Puerto Rico: A

Change in Progress." <u>Names</u>. 36.1-2, 21-27.

Ferguson, Charles. 1959. "Diglossia." <u>Word</u>. 15,

325-340. Also in Dell Hymes. <u>Language in Culture</u>

<u>and Society</u>. New York: Harper and Row,

Publishers, 1964, 429-439.

Fishman, Joshua. 1967. "Bilingualism with and without

diglossia; diglossia with and without

bilingualism." <u>Journal of Social Issues</u>,

32:29-38.

Gilbert, Glenn. 1972. <u>Linguistic Atlas of Texas</u>

<u>German</u>. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Graves, Thomas. 1988. "Pennsylvania German

Gravestones." *Markers* V, PAGES.

Gumperz, John. 1968. "Types of linguistic

communities." <u>Anthropological Linguistics</u>, 4.1,

1962. 28-40. Also in Joshua A. Fishman.

<u>Readings in the Sociology of Language</u>. The

Hague:Mouton,460-472.

Hanks, Patrick and Flavia Hodges. 1989. A Dictionary
    of Surnames. Oxford, New York: Oxford University
    Press.

Hernândez-Chavez, Eduardo, Andrew D. Cohen, and Anthony
    F. Beltramo, eds. 1975. El Lenguaje de los
    Chicanos: Regional and Social Characteristics of
    Language Used by Mexican Americans. Arlington,
    VA.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Jones, George F. 1990. German-American Names.
    Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc.,
    1990.

Jones, Maldwyn A. ND. Destination America: 1815-1914.
    New York: Rinehart and Winston.

Jorden, Terry. 1983. Texas Graveyards. Austin:
    University of Texas Press.

Kaganoff, Benzion C. 1977. A Dictionary of Jewish
    Names and their History. New York: Schocken
    Books.

Kirkpatrick, Larry and Dennis Moreno, eds. 1993. San
    Fernando Cemetery No. 1, Volume I, History &
    Tombstone Index. San Antonio: Los Bexareno
    Genealogical Society.

_____. 1993. San Fernando Cemetery No. 1, Volume
   II, Tombstone Inscriptions. San Antonio: Los
   Bexareno Genealogical Society.

Labov, William. 1966. The Social Stratification of
   English in New York City. Washington, D.C.:
   Center for Applied Linguistics.

Levine, Daniel B., Kenneth Hill, and Robert Warren,
   eds. 1985. Immigration Statistics: A Story of
   Neglect. Washington, D.C.: National Academy
   Press.

Luebke, Frederick C. 1990. Germans in the New World:
   Essays in the History of Immigration. Urbana:
   University of Illinois Press.

MacLysaght, Edward. 1969. The Surnames of Ireland.
   New York: Barnes & Noble Inc.

Marinbach, Bernard. 1983. *Galveston: Ellis Island of
   the West*. Albany: State University of New York
   Press.

Meyer, Richard E. (ed.). 1989. Cemeteries &
   Gravemarkers, Voices of American Culture. Ann
   Arbor and London: UMI Research Press.

Ortega, R.C. 1977. Dialectogia Del Barrio, trans. by
   Hortencia S. Alwan. Los Angeles, Calif.: R.C.
   Ortega Publisher and Bookseller.

Peñalosa, Fernando. 1980. Chicano Sociolinguistics: A

        Brief Introduction. Rawley, Mass.: Newbury

        House.

Pyles, Thomas and John Algeo. 1993 (copyright 1964).

        The Origins and Development of the English

        Language, Fourth Edition. Fort Worth: Harcourt

        Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

Reaney, Perry H. 1967 The Origin of English Surnames.

        London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

_____ 1958. A Dictionary of British Surnames.

        London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

_____ & R. M. Wilson. *A Dictionary of British*

        Surnames, 3rd Edition. London & New York:

        Routledge, 1991.

Sawyer, Janet. 1959. "Aloofness from Spanish

        Influence in Texas English." Word 15 (2),

        August, 270-281.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1986. "Bilingualism and

        Language Change: The Extension of ESTAR in Los

        Angeles Spanish." Language 62.3, 587-608.

Smalley ????????

Smith, Elsdon C. 1969. American Surnames.

        Philadelphia, New York, London: Chilton Book

        Company.

_____. 1956. Dictionary of American Family
     Names. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers.

_____. 1956, 1973. *New Dictionary of American
     Family Names*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Smith, G. 1984. 1984. "Sampling linguistic
     minorities: a technical report on the adult
     language use survey." *LMP Working Paper 4*.
     London: University of London Institute of
     Education.

Smith, Clifford N. and Anna Piszczan-Czaja Smith.
     1974. "National Archives Soundex Rules."
     National Genealogical Society Quarterly 62,13-16.

_____. 1976. Encyclopedia of German-American
     Genealogical Research. New York: R.R.Bowker
     Company.

Underwood, Gary. 1975. "American English Dialectology:
     Alternatives for the Southwest." International
     Journal of the Sociology of Language 2, 19-40.

Woods, Richard D. and Grace Alvarez-Altman. 1978.
     Spanish Surnames in the Southwestern United
     States: A Dictionary. Boston: G.K. Hall & Co.

Zangwill, Israel. *The Melting Pot*. np:nd

[i] Page 81 of David DeCamp, "Social and geographical factors in Jamaican dialects," in R.B. LePage, ed., *Creole Language Studies II* (London: 1961) 61-84. DeCamp later clarified his arguments with mathematical concepts in "Implicational scales and sociolinguistic linearity," *Linguistics* 71 (1971) 30-43.

[ii] An excellent introduction to the linguistic study of Creoles can be found in Sarah Grey Tomason and Terrence Kaufman, *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: 1988). To observe how the field of creaole studies has slowly gainene prominence, note the scholarship of John E. Reinecke, "Trade jargons and Creole dialects as marginal languages," *Social Forces* 17 (1938) 107-118; Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact* (New York: 1953); R. Lowie, "A case of bilingualism," *Word* 1 (1945) 249-259; Einar Haugen, *Bilingualism in the Americas: A Bibliography and Research Guide*, Publication of the American Dialect Society, No. 26 (Tuscaloosa, Ala: 1956); John Gumperz, "On the linguistic markers of bilingual communication," *Social Issues 23* (No. 2, April) 48-57; Richard W. Howell and Harold J. Vetter, *Language in Behavior* (New York: 1976); John R. Rickford, *Dimensions of a Creole continuum: History, texts and linguistic analysis of Guyanese Creole* (Stanford: 1987); and finally, Glenn Gilbert, ed., *Pidgin and Creole Languages: Essays in memory of John E. Reinecke* (Honolulu: 1987).

[iii] In addition to the Levine, Hill, & Warren scholarship, I have found useful information in the insights of Barbara Benton (1985), of August Bolino (1985), of Henry Fairchild (1930), of Bernard Marinbach (1983), and of Maldwyn Jones (ND) .

[iv] Baird and Duncan (note 5).

[v] For an in-depth discussion of gravemarker assimilation of Czech into English, see Eva Eckert 1998.