

## **THEORETICAL MODALS: TAYLOR TEXAS CITY CEMETERY DATA**

**Scott Baird**

### **Taylor City Cemetery**

Taylor City Cemetery, with 20,000 burial records,<sup>1</sup> beginning in 1852<sup>2</sup> and continuing through the present, sprawls out over a large slope, not quite a hill, east of Taylor, Texas. The town of Taylor, present population 11,472,<sup>3</sup> sits comfortably astride Texas Highway 79, about thirty miles north and east of Austin, in central Texas.

On a daily basis and usually in small numbers, living members of Taylor, Texas, visit the Taylor City Cemetery to communicate with each other, with the dead, and with the messages on the grave markers. This type of communication, while carried out all over the world every day, has received almost no study by sociolinguists.<sup>4,5</sup>

### **Cemeteries as Language Communities**

Part of the reason for the lack of sociolinguistic research on cemetery communication results from the inability of established sociolinguists to agree on a definition of any language community--let alone a cemetery one. (Note that sociolinguists use the terms language community, speech community, and linguistic community interchangeably.) In his introductory text on Sociolinguistics, Richard Hudson presents an excellent summary of the difficulties: some sociolinguists use a given language to define a language community; others use daily communication, regardless of numbers of languages involved;

others think that attitude suffices--if people think they participate in a language community, then they do.<sup>6</sup> At one point in his summary of all the confusion, Hudson makes a plaintive plea for a definition that offers more stability:

What would help the sociolinguist most in his work would be if he could identify some kind of natural speech community with reference to which he could make all his generalizations . . . .<sup>7</sup>

Hudson made his observation in 1980. In 1989, I argued in a paper given at the annual meeting of the American Name Society that cemeteries provide such a natural language community.<sup>8</sup> In essence I argued then--and argue now--that a language community consists of what one finds within any given graveyard border. That means that if one walks into the Taylor City Cemetery, the language community will involve several languages, consisting of data first written in the nineteenth century and still being used today. On the other hand if one walks into Mission Park North Cemetery, in San Antonio, the language community will consist of English only, first written in the 1930s.

Note, as an aside, that even though daily communication occurs within the geographically limited space of Taylor City Cemetery, I am able through this publication of *Markers* to photograph and communicate messages to an extended language community--extended both in space and in time.

### **Language Change and Sociolinguistic Theory**

In the Taylor City Cemetery one of the poignant tales being communicated involves the 1911 murder of a death mute (Fig. 1: William Seymore)

Combining William Seymore's message with one hundred and thirty years of messages on at least 10,000 gravemarkers,<sup>9</sup> provides ample data for sociolinguists to, in Hudson's terms, make their generalizations. I find, in fact, that the Taylor City cemetery provide sufficient evidence to challenge existing sociolinguistic theories about language change.

I mentioned above that the Taylor City Cemetery encompasses more than one language. Taylor, like most of Texas, takes "pride in its ethnic diversity, which includes Czech, Polish, German, English, Scotch-Irish [sic], Swedish, African-American, Hispanic, Mid-Eastern and other ancestry."<sup>10</sup>

Not all of these languages exist in the City Cemetery. The Polish and German can be found in the town's Catholic Cemetery; the Swedish in the nearby town of Hutto. The Arabic groups wrote their markers in either Spanish or English.

One would have to be fluent, however, in at least four languages--English, Spanish, German, and Czech--to understand all of the communication that exists in the City Cemetery language community.

Finding a language community that includes these four languages is important if one wishes to extend sociolinguistic

generalizations to the larger geographic definition of the Texas speech community. Note the wide distribution of all four languages, as illustrated in Figure 2: Distribution of Texas's four major language codes in Texas.

The white spaces indicate the presence of various Texas cemeteries that possess English language gravemarkers. The horizontal black lines indicate the presence of gravemarkers written in Spanish; the left-to-right upward slanting black lines indicate German; the left-to-right downward slanting black lines indicate Czech.<sup>11</sup> The Taylor City Cemetery language community exists within an area of Texas that includes cemeteries with all four of the same language codes: English, Spanish, German, and Czech.<sup>12</sup>

Geographer Terry Jordan describes well the numerous Texas environments that include such cultural diversity. Jordan, in fact, divides Texas into five such cultural/ethnic regions; the area that includes Taylor, he calls the Shatter Belt: "where a large European population of Germans, Slavs, and Scandinavians is thoroughly mixed with lower-southern whites, blacks, upper southerners, and Hispanos."<sup>13</sup>

To illustrate the generalizations that involve sociolinguistic theories of language change, sufficient data exist in one particular section of Taylor City Cemetery. The data in this subsection tell of the interplay of language codes during ninety-two years (1902 through 1994).

**Baird - Taylor, Texas, Cemetery - p. 5**

The first generalization one can draw from these data does, indeed, extend to all of the City Cemetery language community and to the larger Texas language community. Basically the gravemarkers in this one section record the shift from a trilingual language community (Czech, German, and English) to a contemporary monolingual English one.

(I will later show that the Spanish language offers a secondary challenge to sociolinguistic theories. The Spanish language has not disappeared; it exists in other sections of City Cemetery, and most certainly throughout Texas.)

Such complexities of language codes within single language communities provide the subject matter for sociolinguistic scholars in such diverse fields as sociolinguistics, creole language studies, and language change.<sup>14</sup> As a sociolinguist, I argue that a theory of sociolinguistics known as Linguistic Variable Rules accounts both for the German and Czech shift to English in City Cemetery--and still allows for visitors to the cemetery to still communicate in the outdated German and Czech.

Other sociolinguistic theories (notably Biological; Wave; Continuum; Cluster; Diglossia; and Network theories) cannot adequately account for the complexity of communication in such a simple language community. And yet all of these theories might help explain the extreme complexity of language data that exist in all cemeteries.



**Baird - Taylor, Texas, Cemetery - p. 7**

Taylor City Cemetery by language on markers).

E EE

C E E E E E C E EE EE EE E E E E E CC C E EE E

E C E CC C C EE E E E E

E|G G EE E EE G E G G C E E

EE E EE C C E C CC C CC E E E E E E EE E EE E

E E|E E E E E E E C C C C C C E E E C E E E E E E G E E E E E

E E

(C = Czech; E = English; G = German. Four shaded markers oldest:  
1902)

A close comparison of Figures 4 and 5 reveal that the families with Danish, English, Irish, Polish, and Swedish surnames always elected to communicate their bereavement in the English language. In addition, Czech families chose to write 29 of the 52 Czech markers in English, with 23 in Czech; German families chose to write 18 of the German markers in English, with 6 in German. The language data for this section of Taylor City Cemetery includes 74 in English, 23 in Czech, and 6 in German.

The four oldest markers in this subsection of City Cemetery all show death dates of 1902. Note the four shaded areas in Figure 5, for the locations of these four markers. For our language study purposes all three languages appear in this first year. Most people will have no difficulty reading P. S. Lundsford's marker because it is written in English, see Figure 6.

Those visitors, however, who wish to read either Ida Geldmacher's marker (see Figure 7) or Wilhelmine Haverland's marker (see Figure 8) need to understand German.<sup>16</sup> Finally, those visitors who wish to read Veronyka Mikus's marker, Figure 9, need to understand Czech.

Up to this point, then, the Taylor City Cemetery language data in this one subsection include three languages--all three languages date back to 1902. In addition, we know that 23 of 103 markers have Czech language written on them; six of the 103 have German. To complete the three-language overview, the last German language marker (Wilhelmine Haverland<sup>17</sup>, Figure 10) has a 1928 death date and the last Czech language marker (Johanna Pokorny, Figure 11) has a 1960 death date. The death date for the latest English language marker (Edmond Daniel Pokorny, Figure 12), indicates the period during which the data were collected, 1994. The distribution of these data appear in Table 1 Marker language by time.

	<b>English</b>	<b>Czech</b>	<b>German</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>1902-1928</b>	35	20	06	61
<b>1929-1960</b>	24	03	XX	27
<b>1961-1994</b>	15	XX	XX	15
<b>Total</b>	74	23	06	103

**Table 1 Marker language by time**

Clearly the data indicate a change in language code usage. In 1902 people used all three codes in the inscriptions written

on their markers: English, German, and Czech. After 1928, however, monument inscribers stopped using German; the inscribers used only English and Czech. After 1960, only English appears on the markers. Communication with these 103 markers, however, still requires all three languages in present-day Taylor, Texas.

The data, however, reveal an even more complicated language mixture than appears in this overview. A closer look at Veronyka Mikus's marker in Figure 9 reveals a mixture of Czech and English codes; the marker is a bilingual marker. While her name, death date, and birth date are written in English, all of the other information is written in Czech.

Previous research has verified the common presence of such bilingual markers in multilingual cemetery language communities.<sup>18</sup> Moreover these bilingual markers tend to mix their languages in a predictable pattern. One expects to find five basic pieces of information on all gravemarkers: the name of the deceased, a death date, a birth date, kinship terminology, and an epitaph. On bilingual markers, if only one piece of information is in English, that one type will be the name. If two pieces are in English, those two pieces will be the name and death date. If three pieces are in English, the three will be the name, death date and birth date; if four, then the kinship terms will appear--with only the epitaph remaining in the immigrant language.

To add to the necessary predictability of the data on these markers, sociolinguists also need to note that on monolingual markers (English, German, or Czech) the same pattern occurs: if a marker has only one semantic item, that item will be the deceased person's name; if the marker has two semantic items, those items will be the name and the death date; if three, the name, death date, and birth date, etc.<sup>19</sup>

In addition to these five basic pieces of information, some markers also reveal the place of death, the place of birth, and/or the person's occupation. The presence of these three additional pieces of information do not fit any predictable patterns--a fact that theories of language must also incorporate.<sup>20</sup>

### **Language Data: A Summary**

The language data in Taylor City Cemetery, especially the data in the subsection described above, present four phenomena that sociolinguistic theories should be able to explain. First, both historical (1902) communication signals and contemporary (1994) communication signals occur simultaneously. In language research, scholars refer to this difference (historical versus contemporary) as *diachronic* versus *synchronic*.

The second language phenomenon concerns the three languages that exist in the data: English has appeared throughout the ninety-two years of marker engraving. The German language, however, last appears on a marker inscribed in 1928, while the

Czech last appears on a 1960 marker.

The third phenomenon concerns the appearance of semantic items in a predictable sequence, no matter what languages appear on the markers. If five items appear, they will be names, death dates, birth dates, kinship terminology, and epitaphs; if only four items appear, the marker will have no epitaph; if only three items appear, those three will be name, death date, and birth date; if two, name and death date; one--only the name.

While these five items appear in a predictable order, however, three other semantic items--occupation, death place, and birth place--may appear, but in a non-predictable order.

The fourth language phenomenon consists of an extension of the third. The markers include bilingual markers, but only involving English: the data include Czech/English markers and German/English markers--but no Czech/German markers. On these bilingual markers, the same predictable sequencing occurs as occurs in monolingual markers: If one item appears in English, that item will be the person's name; if two items, the name and death date; if three, the name, death date, and birth date; and if five, the kinship terminology will be added--with only the epitaph remaining in either Czech or German.

The same caveat pertains to occupation, death place, and birth place: if they appear on bilingual gravemarkers, the language code cannot be predicted.

### Theories of Language Change: Variable Rules

Sociolinguists have access to at least seven theories to help explain these types of language phenomenon.<sup>21</sup> Of these seven, one known as Variable Rule Theory<sup>22</sup> accounts for the Taylor Cemetery data rather well. In Variable Rule Theory, a series of "rewrite" rules tries to account for all the data in a given set. The rules always start with a given assumption--written with the mathematical symbol  $\Sigma$ . For our research, we subsume the Taylor data:

$\Sigma$ : Gravemarkers in Taylor, Texas, City Cemetery

We start our series of Variable Rules, by recognizing that the majority of gravemarkers communicate in the English Language--written in our rules as E. We also recognize that other languages exist--symbolized as OL--and that people who inscribe the markers must make a choice, either E or OL. The use of brackets--[ ]--indicates this required choice. At this point in the rewrite process, you must choose English or German or Czech, no combinations. Thus rule number 1 "rewrites" our assumption about gravemarkers into a required choice: English or other language. (The use of the arrow  $\Rightarrow$  indicates the command to "rewrite.")

1 Markers  $\Rightarrow$  [ E ]  
                  [ OL ]

We now have can rewrite either the English (E) or Other Language (OL). If we choose the English language, we must write

**Baird - Taylor, Texas, Cemetery - p. 13**

the name (using the symbol N); but we have an option on the Death Date, DD. We write the option with the parentheses symbols ( ).

$E \Rightarrow N (DD)$

If we choose the option of the death date, then that opens the option of the birth date, (BD):

$N (DD) \Rightarrow N DD (BD)$

Instead of writing separate rules for each of the Name plus Death Date plus Birth Date plus kinship, symbol KIN, plus epitaph, symbol EPT, we can collapse all of these options into one rewrite rule--with the symbol # at the end, which requires us to cease using the Variable Rules. We have finished completing one marker. We now have a compact rewrite rule for all English language markers:

$E \Rightarrow N (DD (BD (KIN (EPT))))\#$

If we choose German or Czech, however, all we know for sure is that the epitaph must be written in that language; the other items may be written in English--on a bilingual marker. So we write those options:

$OL \Rightarrow EPT + \left[ \begin{array}{l} E \\ OL1 \end{array} \right]$

Where OL indicates that whatever language you choose, Czech or German, that language carries over into the rewrite options.

You cannot switch between German and Czech, in other words.

We now can collapse the rewrite of E and OL into one, compact, rewrite rule:

**Baird - Taylor, Texas, Cemetery - p. 14**

$$\begin{array}{l}
 2. \quad [E \Rightarrow N (DD (BD (KIN (EPT)))) \# \quad ] \\
 \quad |OL \Rightarrow (EPT) + [E \quad ] \\
 \quad [ \quad \quad \quad [OL \quad ] \quad ]
 \end{array}$$

Note that from this point on, the English language options only exist on the bilingual markers. The English monolingual markers have all been accepted by this rewrite rule 2. The non-English markers all have their epitaphs--if they have epitaphs--written either in German or in Czech. We now need to account for those non-English markers that do not have epitaphs, but do have kinship terms (KIN) written in German or Czech. We also need to account for those non-English markers that do have epitaphs; but some markers have the kinship terms written in English, others do not. Rule 3 accounts for those markers.

$$\begin{array}{l}
 3. \quad [E \Rightarrow KIN \quad ] \\
 \quad |OL \Rightarrow (KIN) + [E \quad ] \\
 \quad [ \quad \quad \quad [OL \quad ] ]
 \end{array}$$

The non-English markers now all have their kinship terms--if they have kinship terms--written either in German or in Czech. We now need to account for those non-English markers that have neither epitaphs nor kinship terms, but do have birth dates (BD) written in German or Czech. We also need to account for those non-English markers that do have either epitaphs and/or kinship terms; but some markers have the birth dates written in English, others do not. Rule 4 accounts for those markers.

$$\begin{array}{l}
 4. \quad [E \Rightarrow BD \quad ] \\
 \quad |OL \Rightarrow (BD) + [E \quad ] \\
 \quad [ \quad \quad \quad [OL \quad ] ]
 \end{array}$$

**Baird - Taylor, Texas, Cemetery - p. 15**

In a similar manner, rule 5 accounts for those non-English markers that have no epitaph, no kinship terms, nor any birth dates, but do have death dates (DD) written in German or Czech. Rule 5 also accounts for non-English markers that do have epitaphs, and/or kinship terms, and or birth dates; but some of those markers have the death dates written in English while others do not.

$$5. \begin{array}{l} [E \Rightarrow DD] \\ |OL \Rightarrow (DD) + [E ]| \\ [ \quad \quad \quad [OL ] ] \end{array}$$

Rule 6, then, will account for the rest of our predictable non-English markers. These last markers have only the names (N) to consider: are the names written in English or in German or Czech? If in English, we have a bilingual marker--because rule 2 already wrote the monolingual English markers.

$$6. \begin{array}{l} [E \Rightarrow N] \\ [OL \Rightarrow N] \end{array}$$

Rule 7 will account for the hodgepodge of unpredictable appearance of occupation (O), birth place (BP), and death place (DP). We use a comma to separate E from OL, because no matter which language we choose, the unpredictablness remains the same.

$$7. E,OL \Rightarrow (O) (BP) (DP)$$

Our last rule converts the Other Languages to German (but will not accept German data after 1928) and Czech (but will not accept Czech data after 1960). All leftover OL choices that the rules generated will be destroyed by the insertion of the third

option: OL  $\Rightarrow$  0.

8. OL  $\Rightarrow$  [G\* ]  
                  |C\*\*|  
                  [0 ]

\*only between 1902 and 1928, inclusive

\*\*only between 1902 and 1960, inclusive

### **Theories of Language Change: Options**

The Variable Rule theory of language change accounts for all of the Taylor Cemetery language phenomena except the unpredictablness of information concerning occupation, place of birth, and place of death. Variable Rule 6 recognizes the problem, but does not address it in any significant manner.

The seven variable rules account for (1) the presence of both diachronic and synchronic data--no German after 1928, no Czech after 1960, (2) the presence of all three languages today, (3) the sequencing of five semantic items on all markers, monolingual or bilingual, and (4) the sequencing of English writing on bilingual markers.

Sociolinguists have, however, other theories--Family Tree (or biological theory), Wave; Continuum; Cluster; Diglossia; and Network--that give insight into understanding such language change phenomena.<sup>23</sup> Understanding the viability of Variable Rule theory suffers unless one compares it to the other theories.

### **Family Tree**

Most language scholars have worked with and understand the

Family Tree or Biological Theory.<sup>24</sup> This theory underlies the diagrams of Indo-European languages that we can find in most modern dictionaries. The theory has helped illustrate the development of Indo-European languages into Roman, Germanic (and so forth), "families" or "trees." It has, however, never explained **how** those languages developed. It most certainly adds little insight into the Taylor City Cemetery data--other than to verify that the languages involved came from the Indo-European family.

### **Wave**

Pater Schmidt, addressing the inability of the Family Tree theory to explain how languages changed, proposed Wave theory.<sup>25</sup> Basically, this theory suggests that if you have three languages in one geographical space--such as in Taylor City Cemetery--the three languages will affect each other. They will cause changes in each other. If one language is dominant, it will affect the biggest changes.

In the case of Taylor City Cemetery, Wave theory would add to our understanding of the importance of the three languages. English dominates because it still survives after 98 years; German was the weakest because it ceased in 1928, as opposed to the Czech presence until 1960. The Variable Rule theory only accounts for the disappearance of German and Czech; it does not explain why.

### **Continuum**

In the early 1960s, David DeCamp reported on dialect work

**Baird - Taylor, Texas, Cemetery - p. 18**

with Jamaican English. He suggested that Creole languages might best be understood if one looked at varying language abilities along a continuum.

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.<sup>26</sup>

DeCamp's concept of the continuum has become an established measuring tool in Creole studies.<sup>27</sup> All of the work on gravemarker sequencing--name, death date, birth date, kinship terminology, epitaphs--displays this same concept of a continuum. Markers may be monolingual English, German, or Czech. Or they have a mixture of English/German or English/Czech. The mixtures, though, result in scale on the continuum of languages.

While the concept of the continuum has, indeed, come from Creole studies, the ability to incorporate that concept into Variable Rules has added power to the continuum's analytic value.

**Cluster Analysis**

Cluster Analysis theory focuses on individual speech communication. Each individual exhibits patterns of language behavior that reflect that individual's varying degrees of group identity.<sup>28</sup> When at the beach, we talk like other people that go

to the beach; when at a formal dinner party, we talk differently than we do with the group at the beach--even though some of the individuals in the group may be the same people. And when we communicate in cemeteries, we adjust our speech to those in the group.

In regard to the Taylor City Cemetery data, some, not all, of the 1902 Czechs and Germans clustered their language behavior around groups of Czech and Germans, respectively. Their gravemarkers were written for members of their ethnic groups--not for outsiders. Other Czechs and Germans, however, clustered with Taylor citizens with Danish, Swedish, Irish, Polish, and English surnames--by writing their gravemarkers in English.

The Variable Rules written above do not explicitly name the potential clusters: Danish, Swedish, Irish, Polish, and English. They could be fine-tuned to do so; but the rules would then be limited in scope. And since the ultimate objective of sociolinguistic theory--as in any theory for any discipline--is to account for as much data as possible, such limitations do not seem warranted.

Nonetheless, the insights of cluster analysis theory do become incorporate within the Variable Rules, just as did the insights of continuum theory.

**Network:**

Network theory affirms Cluster Theory's emphasis upon the effect of group affiliation upon individual language behavior.<sup>29</sup>

The difference, however, lies in the attempt of network theory to ascertain which groups exert the most influence on an individual's behavior. Which group attracts an individual the most--the beach group, the formal dinner group, or the cemetery group?

Again the Variable Rules incorporate this information. One cannot accept any German language data after 1928, nor any Czech language data after 1960. The English language group clearly holds the most influence on Taylor City Cemetery language behavior--at least in this one subsection.

### **Linguistic Generalizations**

Sociolinguist Suzanne Romaine argues that "A viable social theory of language must present a coherent account of how particular uses, functions, and kinds of language develop within particular speech communities. This will require the testing of methodology on new and different kinds of data."<sup>30</sup>

The Taylor City Cemetery data certainly fits the description of being new and being different. While limited in scope, the data do allow for the testing of various sociolinguistic theories. The various sociolinguistic theories--especially the Variable Rule Theory--certainly do "present a coherent account of how particular uses, functions, and kinds of language develop within" the particular speech community, as we have defined it within this one subsection of Taylor City Cemetery. The various theories have shown, in fact, that the limited language data

accounts for a complex system of sociolinguistic communication.

The insights into language use within cemeteries, however, do not stop at the border of this one subsection. Readers of this essay, for example, have already heard and understood William Seymore's friends complain of his 1911 murder. That communication originated outside the subsection being studied, but still within the larger Taylor City Cemetery speech community.

Extending our data pool from 103 markers in the subsection to the 10,000 markers in Taylor City Cemetery, in fact, offers little challenge to the Variable Rules we have already developed.

We do need to extend the Other Language (OL) time limitations in Rule 8. Josef Mikus, who died in 1893, can thus be included among the Czech language markers. See Figure 13. Josef's marker, patched and worn and standing near John Miller's 1878 marker, Figure 3, still communicates to us from the old, northwest section of City Cemetery.

The subsection with our 103 markers still contains the oldest and most recent of the German markers discovered so far. But if German language markers exist outside the parameters of the 1902-1928 time span, Variable Rule 8 can be adjusted easily.

Rule 8 also needs one major addition. As mentioned earlier, large numbers of Spanish language markers also exist and must be included in any meaningful discussion of the Taylor City Cemetery speech community. Jose Salinas's monolingual Spanish marker has

participated in City Cemetery discourse since 1916, see Figure 14, and Daniel Robles's bilingual Spanish/English marker, see Figure 15, started communicating as recently as 1993.

The Spanish language participation, moreover, deserves special attention. While the Spanish speaking citizens of Taylor itself did not constitute a large cluster until after the Mexican Revolution of 1910, the cluster continues to flourish and grow; unlike the German and Czech. From the viewpoint of network theory, the importance of this language group may even increase in importance in the future.

Our Variable Rules, then, can account for the language diversity, usage, and growth in the entire Taylor City Cemetery--with changes made in only one rule. That changed rule, Rule 8,

now should read

8. OL  $\Rightarrow$   $\begin{bmatrix} G^* \\ |C^{**}| \\ |S^{***}| \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$

\*only between 1902 and 1928, inclusive

\*\*only between 1898 and 1960, inclusive

\*\*\*only since 1916

These rules, of course, should apply to other cemeteries. The languages, in fact, have little relevance to the communication process in any cemetery. I can, for example, envision the rules accounting for the same communication among the citizens of Bridgetown, Barbados, West Indies and the markers in the Jewish cemetery--which utilizes Hebrew, Portuguese, and English.<sup>31</sup>

The discussion of language communication within the Taylor City Cemetery should not end without one caveat. The real significance of gravemarker language lies in its unique social creation. Most markers result from the efforts of small groups of people. Unlike death records that result from the writing of one trained and educated individual, gravemarker language involves input from family and friends of the deceased, from the monument merchants, and from the engravers. Gravemarkers evolve from a group, in almost all cases.

The predictability of the sequencing of information, therefore, rests upon a pattern--a pattern with many exceptions. As a reminder of those exceptions, observe Figure 16. The Zak family erected this monument in the Taylor City Cemetery in memory of Jiri Zak, who died in 1937. All of the information on the marker is written in English--except *Jiri* and *Zak*. Only the names are written in Czech; the exact reversal of the predicted pattern.

If nothing else these cemetery data validate the venerable cliché: The exceptions prove the rule.

#### FIGURES

- Figure 1 William Seymore.
- Figure 2 Distribution of Texas's four major language codes.
- Figure 3: John Miller: Oldest marker in City Cemetery.
- Figure 4 Taylor City Cemetery by ethnicity of surnames.
- Figure 5 Taylor City Cemetery by language on markers.
- Figure 6: P.S. Lundsford, 1902, English language.
- Figure 7 Ida Geldmacher, 1902, German language.
- Figure 8 Wilhelmine Haverland, 1902, German language.
- Figure 9 Veronyka Mikus, 1902, Czech language.
- Figure 10 Wilhelmine Haverland, 1928, German language.
- Figure 11 Johanna Pokorny, 1960, Czech language.
- Figure 12 Johanna Pokorny, 1960, Czech language.
- Figure 13 Josef Mikus, 1893, Czech language.
- Figure 14 Jose Salinas, 1916, Spanish language.
- Figure 15 Daniel Robles, 1993, Spanish/English.

**Figure 16 ZAK, 1937, 1951 Czech/English bilingual.**

**NOTES**

1. A rough estimate made by curator Ben Zak, while perusing the cemetery directory with Scott Baird in July, 1994. In 1984, Mr. Zak more deliberately counted about 17,000 entries.
2. According to R.L. Murray, who has worked at City Cemetery for twenty-seven years, records indicate that the first burial spot is located either in lot 2 or 4 and remains unmarked today. The directory perused by Mr. Zak had an entry that was marked 1860--again in an unmarked location. While Taylor, then known as Taylorsville, did not incorporate until 1876, the Republic of Texas did establish Fort Block House at the location in 1836. Europeans had lived in the area, moreover, since Spain established the nearby San Gabriel Missions, in 1746.
3. *Progress '94*, supplement to the *Taylor Daily Press*, February 25, 1994, "Taylor, Texas" insert by Taylor Chamber of Commerce, p. 2.
4. Linguists, as disciplined and trained scholars, all study vernacular language usage. We disagree, however, on what constitutes the best language data: do we rely

upon the universal language intuitions all humans possess as a result of their naturally acquired language abilities (internal linguistics)?--or do we rely upon external language data acquired through meticulous field methods (external linguistics)? More by default than reason, all linguists now consider the difference crucial enough that we tend to use the terms *theoretical linguistics* to refer to internal language research and *sociolinguistics* to refer to external language research.

Since the data in this essay are clearly external data, I use the terms *sociolinguistics* and *sociolinguists* when referring to the scope of the Taylor City Cemetery research. For a more explanation, see Richard Hudson *Sociolinguistics* (Cambridge:1980) 3-5. For a detailed discussion, see Noam Chomsky *Knowledge of Language: Its structure, origin, and use* (New York:1986)

5. For a discussion of this lack of research, see Scott Baird, "Language Codes in Texas German Graveyards," *Markers IX*, 1992, 217-255. Since that publication, Eva Eckert has conducted two in-depth studies: "Language Change: Testimony of Czech Tombstone Inscriptions in Praha, Texas, in Eva Eckert (editor), *Varieties of Czech* (Atlanta:1933) pp. 79-121 and "The Language of Tombstone Inscriptions: The Issue of Authorship," *Studies in*

*Slavic Sociolinguistics*, Special issue of *Slavic and East European Journal* (in Press).

6. Richard Hudson, *Sociolinguistics* (Cambridge, England:1980) 25-30.
7. Hudson (note 5) 29.
8. Scott Baird, "Tombstone Talk: Names as Evidence for South Texas Diglossia," presented at the American Name Society's annual meeting, Washington, D.C. (December, 1989).
9. Murray (note 2) estimates that 30 percent of the 20,000 burials in the City Cemetery have no markers. In addition, many of the markers memorialize more than one person.
10. *Taylor Texas City Map*, a publication of the Taylor Chamber of Commerce, 1993. Perhaps the best known way Taylor shows its pride in its ethnic diversity occurs every October, when the city holds its annual International Barbecue Cookoff.
11. For illustration purposes one can safely assume that both Spanish and English exist throughout most of Texas. Glenn Gilbert discusses the German language distribution in "The German Language in Texas: Some Needed Research," in Glen E. Lich and Dona B. Reeves, editors, *German Culture in Texas* (Boston:1980) 230-31. Clinton Machann and James W. Mendl,

Jr., editors, discuss the Czech language distribution in *Czech Voices* (College Station, Texas:1991) xix.

12. For discussion of the German language codes in Texas cemeteries, see Scott Baird (notes 4 and 7); Scott Baird and Analise Duncan, "Tombstone Talk: Variation in a German Dialect," *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Methods in Dialectology*, W. Werkentyn, editor (Vancouver, Canada:1984) 93-106; and Terry Jordan, "Chapter 5: The Texas German Graveyard," *Texas Graveyards* (Austin:1983). For discussions of the Czech language codes in Texas cemeteries, see Eva Eckert (note 4) and Timothy Anderson, "Czech-Catholic Cemeteries in East-Central Texas: Material Culture and Ethnicity in Seven Rural Communities," *Material Culture* 25:3 (1993) 1-18.
13. Jordan, Terry G., with John L. Bean, Jr., and Willam M. Holmes *Texas: A Geography* (Boulder & London:1984), p. 91. See also Chapter 5 "Linguistic Geography" (pp. 95-113) This chapter ends with a solid, bibliography on Texas-specific research in linguistic geography.

For more information on the vast world-wide scholarship in linguistic geography, see Craig M. Carver, *American Regional Dialects, A Word Geography* (Ann Arbor:1989) Lawrence Davis' *English Dialectology: An Introduction*

(University, AL:1983); Hans Kurath's *Studies in Area Linguistics* (Bloomington, IN:1974); James B. McMillan, *Annotated Bibliography of Southern American English* (Coral Gables, FL:1971); and Hans Kurath's *Handbook of the linguistic Geography of New England* (Providence, RI:1939).

14. For a discussion of these various fields of study within linguistics, see Scott Baird, "Language Codes in Texas German Graveyards," *Markers IX* (1992) 216-255.
15. Since the amount of language data available for research is, literally, infinite, sociolinguists do not use random selection for their data. We use instead what we call *judgmental* (sometimes *stratified*, sometimes *quota*) selection. For a general introduction to this type of sampling, see Davis (note 13), 69-84; Hudson (note 5) 138-190; or Ronald Wardhaugh, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (New York:1986) 145-154. For a more detailed discussion, especially as it relates to gravemarker research, see Baird (note 4) footnote 22.
16. To illustrate the complexities of using multilingual cemetery data to illustrate the complexities of multilingual language communities of all kinds, I have elected not to translate the German, Czech, and (later) Spanish data into

English. Participants in multilingual language communities vary in their abilities to participate. For scholars interested in translations of these data, however, please contact the author.

17. Wilhelmine Haverland, the woman memorialized by this marker, was married to a man named Fritz Haverland. A different Wilhelmine Haverland--memorialized in one of the original 1902 markers (see Figure 8)--was the daughter of a Fritz Haverland. If Fritz Haverland is the same person mentioned on both markers, then his daughter Wilhelmine was born in 1865--eleven years before his wife.
18. For the latest summary of that research, plus an update with Texas German gravemarker data, see Baird (note 4). Note also the additional affirmation in the research by Eckert (also note 4).
19. See Scott Baird, "From Territory to Tombstone: Language, Culture, and Rites of Passage," paper presented at the annual meeting of the Cemeteries and Gravemarkers Section of the American Culture Associating, Toronto, Canada, March 7-10, 1990.
20. See Baird (note 18) for a discussion of the aberration involving these three types of information--why they may or

may not appear at all.

21. Scholars invite trouble in any academic discipline, of course, when they limit themselves to a given number of theories. The seven I discuss here have established reputations with many current publications and applications. As this essay will clarify, though, sociolinguists still have no theory that will handle all the language phenomena we wish to understand. Thus we continue to experiment with new theories. See Suzanne Romaine, *Sociolinguistic Variation in Speech Communities* (London:1982) for a collection of innovative studies. See also *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* and *Language in Society*--two journals that contain current experimentation.
22. For detailed discussion of this theory see P. Kayo, "Variable rules, community grammar and linguistic change" in D. Sankoff, ed., *Linguistic Variation: Models and methods*. (New York:1978) 71-82; William Labov, *The social stratification of English in New York City*. (Washington, D.C.:1966) as well as William Labov, *Sociolinguistic patterns* (Philadelphia:1972); Suzanne Romaine, "The status of variable rules in sociolinguistic theory." *Journal of Linguistics* 17 (1980), 93-121; and Roger Shuy and Ralph

Fasold. *Studies in language variation*. (Washington, D.C.:1977).

23. For a general discussion of these various theories see Richard Hudson, *Sociolinguistics* (Cambridge:1980); Suzanne Romaine. *Sociolinguistic Variation in Speech Communities* (London:1982); Peter Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics* (Harmondsworth, England:1974); and Ronald Wardhaugh, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* (Oxford, England:1986).
24. The scholar who formulated the theory initially was August Schleicher, *Laut- und Formenlehre der polabischen Sprache* (St. Petersburg, Russia:1871). American structural linguist Leonard Bloomfield, discusses the theory in *Language*, (Chicago:1933) 311-18. For application of the family tree and wave models to the Indo-European languages, see H. Pedersen, *Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century*, translated by John Spargo (Cambridge, MA:1931).
25. Pater Schmidt. *Die Sprachfamilien und Sprachenkreise der Erde*. (Heidelberg, Germany:1926)
26. David DeCamp, "Social and geographical factors in Jamaican dialects," in R.B. Le Page, ed., *Creole Language Studies II* (London: 1961), 61-84. DeCamp later clarified his arguments

- with mathematical modelling, in "Implicational scales and sociolinguistic linearity," *Linguistics* 71 (1971) 30-43
27. See, for example D. Bickerton, *Dynamics of a Creole system*. (Cambridge, MA:1975; Dell Hymes, ed., *Pidginization and creolization of languages* (London, England:1971); and A. Valdman and A.R. Highfield, eds. *Theoretical Orientations in Creole Studies* (New York:1980).
28. See B.S. Everitt, *Cluster analysis* (London:1974). For explicit adaptations to language research see Damian McEntegart and R.B. LePage, "An appraisal of the statistical techniques used in the Sociolinguistic Survey of Multilingual Communities" in Suzanne Romaine (note 23) 28-39.
29. For general accounts of network theory, see J. Boissevain, *Friends of friends: networks, manipulators and coalitions* (Oxford, England:1974); E. Bott, *Family and Social Network* revised edition (London:1978); and P.H. Gulliver, *Neighbours and networks* (Berkeley, CA:1971). For adaptations of network theory to sociolinguistic theory, see Leslie Milroy, *Language and Social Networks* (Oxford, England:1980).
30. Suzanne Romaine (note 23) p. 4.
31. See Robert W. Keeler, "The Jewish Cemetery in Bridgetown,

**Baird - Taylor, Texas, Cemetery - p. 34**

Barbados, W.I." paper read at the twenty-fifth annual  
Society for Historical Archaeology Conference on Historical  
and Underwater Archaeology, Kingston, Jamaica, W.I., January  
1992.