

Gravemarkers: Affirmation of Life Within Two San Antonio Communities

Linguists are united in a quest to understand LANGUAGE. We are united in our efforts to study the limited reproductions of individual languages in our own lives and to look beyond these limited reproductions to discover linguistic universals. We seem to be united in our belief that once we agree on some considerable number of universals we can better understand LANGUAGE. And we are united in our discussion of these universals in terms of phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic and pragmatic constructs.

We propose, in this paper, to discuss LANGUAGE as it is found on gravemarkers in South Texas. We are particularly looking at the semantics of "territory." Territory is indicated through gravemarker language as geographical location--places of birth and of death. The written account of birth and death places on gravemarkers is unpredictable. We will argue that the unpredictability can be explained by a linguistic universal in pragmatics. In short, the pragmatics of territory information on a gravemarker is not determined by culture but by biological, perhaps sociological, rites of passage.

Linguists and Data

Before we present data from South Texas graveyards, we need to justify that data. While linguists are indeed united in their quest for linguistic universals, they are notoriously diverse in their approaches to organizing their individual quests. One of the best explanations of this division among linguists is found in Trevor Pateman's 1987 book, Language in Mind and Language in Society.

According to Pateman, linguists are divided on where they think LANGUAGE exists. Some think it exists in people's minds; others think it exists in society. Both of these types of "naturalists," however, tend to discuss LANGUAGE as linguistic facts that fit together in predictable patterns to fit varying sets of social conventions. Linguists are also divided on how to recognize LANGUAGE once they find it. Some think it is something natural, something biological. One set of speech patterns might be called English, another Spanish, another Chinese. Again, the conventions and the facts can either be in ones mind or in society. Still other linguists think LANGUAGE is something abstract; something psychological, something

that native speakers say is theirs. These "philosophers" tend to discuss LANGUAGE as a social set of conventions that are not linguistic facts. Again, the social set of conventions can be individual or societal. Pateman argues that the "philosophers" are more correct than the "naturalists."

We agree with Pateman. Linguists, even with their differences, agree that separate languages--like English, German, French, Chinese, Greek, or Spanish--cannot be distinguished unequivocally by linguistic description alone. Usually these languages are defined politically. Westerners speak of Mandarin, Cantonese, Shanghai, and Fukien dialects of Chinese--even though these linguistic codes are incomprehensible to the speakers of the other codes (Pei, 51). On the other hand Americans speak of Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, and Icelandic *languages*--even though these linguistic codes can be understood by speakers of the other varieties (Pei, 88). Thus even the simple notion of intelligibility among languages cannot determine what is a language and what a dialect of language.

South Texas

Let us illustrate. The two continents of the Americas, the two separated at the Isthmus of Panama, are often referred to in Geographical terms: North America and South America. Linguistically, they can be referred to as Latin America (Spanish-speaking America) and Anglo America (English-speaking America). In previous research Baird has shown that Latin America has a Spanish speaking population of about three hundred million people; Anglo American has an English speaking population of about two hundred million (Baird, 1989b). Thus on the combined continent, English speakers are outnumbered by Spanish speakers by about three to two.

The South Texas area, where San Antonio is located and where Baird and his colleagues have been studying LANGUAGE for over two decades, is located in the center of a huge cushion or border where these two languages--English and Spanish--merge. The cushion is, conservatively speaking, over two hundred miles wide. Linguistic evidence shows that three major reproductions of LANGUAGE are spoken in this cushion: English, Spanish, and Spanglish. English and Spanish are considered "natural," or real languages. Spanglish is considered "deviant." At worse Spanglish is bad Spanish; at best it is a Creole.

In earlier research we showed that during the past one hundred years South Texas versions of German, French, Chinese, and Greek varieties of LANGUAGE all assimilated into (or are in the process of assimilating into) the English variety of the cushion. In contrast, the South Texas version of Spanish is showing signs of permanent diglossia--thus the presence of the Creole-like Tex-Mex (Baird, 1989a).

Tex-Mex and Creoles.

Tex-Mex is not unique. The variety of LANGUAGE that we now so fondly refer to as English was itself Creole-like—an extremely complicated mixture of Germanic, Celtic, and Romance varieties of LANGUAGE (McCrum, Cran, and MacNeil, 51; Williams, 56-64; Pyles and Algeo, 98). When speakers of one variety of LANGUAGE find the need to communicate with speakers of a different variety a third variety emerges. Linguists refer to that third variety, known for its linguistic simplicity, as a PIDGIN. If children learn the pidgin as a "native" language, linguists refer to the slowly emerging variety as a CREOLE.

During the past thirty years linguists have found pidgins and Creoles extremely useful in the quest for universals (Bickerton; DeCamp; DeCamp and Hancock; Dillard; Kay and Sankoff; Romaine; Valdman).

Graveyards help illustrate the what-is-language problem even further. Crucial to all attempts to discover language in society is the concept of speech community. Baird argues in a separate paper that graveyards provide perfect speech communities. They meet all standard definitions (they have definite borders and may contain either one language, or several, or Creolized mixtures). And while the language is written, not spoken, the past two decades have seen an increasing number of linguists incorporating written data in their own quests for linguistic universals (Baird 1989a). In other words, a graveyard that has a mixture of language varieties on its markers is a speech community whose LANGUAGE is realized in these many varieties.

In no way should the linguist's search for language universals detract from serious scholarship in individual language description. Baird has, in fact, isolated three distinct English-language dialects in San Antonio, where previously scholars thought only one existed (Baird, 1985). We are aware of, and indebted

to, previous language studies using gravemarkers for data (Graves; Halporn). Baird co-authored such a study on the German language in Texas (Baird & Duncan). However such studies are basically descriptive in nature. They were not and are not directly addressing issues in theoretical linguistics.

Proxemics in Linguistic Theory.

Which bring us back to the issue of universals in proxemics, or rules of discourse. In today's paper, we are arguing that the rules regulating the presence of birthplace language data on gravemarkers is linguistically unpredictable. We are further arguing that the reason for this unpredictability lies within sociobiological rites of passage, associated with concepts of territory.

Two assumptions lie behind these arguments. One is that other language data on gravemarkers appear in a linguistically predictable sequence. The second is that linguistic signals of the rites of passage are unpredictable.

Semantic Bits and Predictability of Linguistic Sequencing.

Let us address the predictability-of-linguistic-sequencing assumption first. The main finding in our South Texas graveyard research is that eleven semantic bits--or pieces of information--can be found on gravemarkers (Baird & Duncan; Baird 1989a; Baird 1989b). These eleven bits are (1) name of the deceased; (2) date of death; (3) age at death; (4) kinship terminology; (5) creative epitaphs; (6) stylized epitaphs; (7) occupation; (8) place of birth; (9) place of death, (10) means of death; and (11) lodge or religious affiliation. The first five semantic bits appear in a linguistically predictable sequence.

Gravemarker language data from San Antonio's oldest cemetery—a Catholic cemetery known as San Fernando #1 aptly illustrate this sequence. Of the 1,646 Spanish language markers, 24 have only one semantic bit and that bit contains the deceased's name.

[SLIDE Carrillo] [SLIDE Lopez]

On 21 of the Spanish language markers, two of the basic five semantic bits are present--the deceased's name and death date.

[SLIDE name, death date: Casanova]

On 358 of the Spanish language markers three of the basic five semantic bits are present--the name, death date, and age at death.

[SLIDE, name, death date, age: Marroquin]

On 135 of the Spanish language markers four of the basic semantic bits are present—the predictable name, death date, and age, plus some type of kinship terminology.

[SLIDE, name, death date, age, kin: Jimenez]

On 973 of the Spanish language markers all five of the basic semantic bits are present—the predictable four plus a creative epitaph.

[SLIDE, name, death date, age, kin, creative epitaph: Patino]

In other words, this predictable linguistic sequence of name, death date, age, kinship terminology, and creative epitaph occurs on all but 135 of the Spanish language gravemarkers. Clearly that 92% predictability reveals statistical relevance.

The presence of this linguistic sequencing is not limited to Spanish, however. The English language data show the predictable linguistic sequence (of the five basic semantic bits) on 89% of 1,416 markers; the Italian language on twenty of twenty-two (91%) markers; French on 100% of its markers twelve markers; German on 100% of its seven markers; and the single Polish language marker contains the sequence. (See Table 1: Totals of Monolingual Gravemarkers)

Semantic Bits and the Absence of Linguistic Predictability.

Outside of the purview of the universal discourse of grief are six semantic items that defy linguistic prediction. What we cannot predict within any consistency are (6) stylized epitaphs; (7) occupation; (8) place of birth; (9) place of death, (10) means of death; and (11) lodge or religious. The focus of today's essay ignores stylized epitaphs, occupation, means of death, and lodge/religious affiliation. We do, however, find ourselves attracted to an interesting phenomenon related to places of birth and places

of death. That phenomenon pertains to the gradual disappearance of these semantic items after 1920.

Our hypothesis has been that the presence of these semantic items relates to a socio-biological rite of passage. If we can assume that a cemetery provides a sense of community, then the socio-biological rite of passage would be birth into and death-removal from any given community. What we cannot predict is the presence of intruders into a cemetery-community. We cannot predict the movement of someone from outside that community, in other words, into a new community. Nor can we predict the sense of helplessness on the part of family members who must preside over the rite of passage—i.e. death—in a cemetery-community that represents a location other than the community in which the deceased was born. Two assumptions lie behind these territory/community arguments. One assumption is that some language data on gravemarkers appear in a linguistically predictable sequence. The second assumption is that, in contrast, linguistic signals of the rites of passage are unpredictable.

All gravemarker place names, be they birth or death place names, refer to a geographical location. In some cases either the birth or death place name will refer to San Antonio, but never both place names. That is, the families of the deceased declare that the birthplace and the death place are not the same. For that reason, we argue that each graveyard is a speech community—and that outsiders fell out of place in these communities.

These cemetery speech communities are, moreover, easily identified because they have physical borders or boundaries. According to the social anthropologist Anthony Cohen boundaries, like those around cemeteries, enclose certain "elements...considered to be more like each other than they are different. But they also mark off those elements from those which differ" (Cohen, 14). The boundary is not to be taken lightly. In fact, says Cohen, "The reality and efficacy of the community's boundary--and therefore, of the community itself--depends upon its symbolic construction and embellishment" (Cohen, 15).

We will leave for now the discussion of just what a community might be. I have my definition (Baird 1989b). Cohen has his. But as Cohen says so wisely, any such definition "...when imported into the discourse of social science, however, causes immense difficulty" (Cohen, 11).

Territory and Biology.

The graveyard speech communities, though, do reveal clumps of names or groups of names that are either the same name or similar. Onomasticians do, in fact, refer to these clusters as "Family Names." The zoologist Donald Broom notes this clustering as biologically common: "Certain social groups may therefore exist because they provide the opportunity for individuals to help their relatives. (Broom, 193).

[SLIDES: Layfels; Pfeiffer; Rudinger; Hoffman; Cheusse; Cook]

The history of Texas, especially Central and South Texas, is a continued story of non-Texans moving in with their relatives. Famines and political persecution abroad brought to Texas the Fretelliers, Girauds, and Chieuses from France. The same territory brought the Ngs from China; the Reyes, Sotos, and Garcias from Mexico. And those families who could afford to do so wrote their places of birth on their markers within language codes of their birth territories, not the Texas territory. The Kretekos and the Vapessiuses came from Greece and wrote their birthplaces in a mixed code of Greek and English. The Pappas, Coliases, Kaplanises also came from Greece, but wrote their birth territory names in English.

English was also the code used by the Lemburgs, Barbecks, Dusches from Germany; the Seffels from Bohemia and Poland. The home code language for the Cannons, McMahons, Leonards, Lyons, McDermotts, Henfeys, Twohigs, and McCloskeys was English, but they still wrote their Ireland territory names on their gravemarkers. As did the British immigrants, the Martyns.

To the entomologist Timothy Myles such signaling of family clusters within a new territory is more than common; it is quite significant. "Wherever people have derived a living off the land the specific resources upon which the livelihood is based form the basis for territorial allotments or restricted use privileges (usufructs), and these territories or privileges are guarded by a kinship group through which inheritance passed" (Myles, 408). In other words, this new speech community is *territory allotment*, *inherited* through generations, and in need of being *guarded*..

In 1966, Robert Ardrey, the playwright/biologist advocated for the theory of evolution in an extremely provocative book, Territorial Imperative. . Ardrey's thesis is that the concept of territory is characteristic of humanity and that we have that sense of belonging through evolutionary inheritance. The

study of evolution "has presented us with a means to demonstrate that our attachment for property is of an ancient biological order," he argues (Ardrey, 102). Environment and experience may shape that sense of belonging, but does not cause it. "The territorial imperative is as blind as a cave fish, as consuming as a furnace, and it commands beyond logic, opposes all reason, suborns all moralities, strives for no goal more sublime than survival" (Ardrey, 236).

Ardrey, moreover, agrees with Myles that with that sense of belonging is the need to defend it. "The disposition to possess a territory is innate. The command to defend it is likewise innate. But its position and borders will be learned" (Ardrey, 24).

Thus we argue that the territory of a cemetery, symbolically extended to the community that incorporates the cemetery, has its own somewhat fuzzy borders. Broom refers to this extended area as a "home range." But Broom is not quite sure that the extended territory demands defense or not. "Those animals which restrict their movements to a discrete area are said to have a *home range*. "This may or may not be a territory but it is often difficult for an observer to be sure whether or not there is defense, or has been defense, of an area" (Broom, 197).

The sociobiologist Edward Wilson has no such reservations. "I am convinced that this time the majority [of scholars] is right for practical reasons, that defense must be the diagnostic feature of territoriality. More precise, territory should be defined as an area occupied more or less exclusively by animals or groups of animals by means of repulsion through overt aggression or advertisement. We know that the defense varies gradually among species from immediate aggressive exclusion of intruders to the subtler use of chemical signposts unaccompanied by threats or attacks" (Wilson, 261).

We now return to the San Fernando gravemarkers with territory (Place Names) marked on them. We more-or-less implied that the early settlers were the ones who placed their own territory names as *signposts* on the new Texas territory. Some of them did. The first Giraud was buried in 1853, the first Lemburg in 1856, the first Henfy and the first Twohig in 1876.

Even a century later, new signposts appear. The first Bapessius was buried in 1966, the last in 1973. The first Pappas was buried in 1969. The first Colias as late as 1984--she was born in Anhalos,

Greece. If the early settlers were marking new territory, then what were these latecomers marking? Our argument is that they were simply posting signposts to indicate a lack of hostility and to note they were NOT members of the new community.

Ardrey thinks that such behavior in newcomers is acceptable and common. He also thinks it is easily understood, if we do not think of 'community' in the usual sense. He replaces the concept of community, in fact, with his own term Noyau.

“Noyau [means] the society of inward antagonism. It has seemed to me wise...to get as far away as possible from all those English words like "community" or "society" which inevitably bear connotations of co-operation. Noyau--meaning, roughly, a nucleus--is correct in that it implies a primitive evolutionary step toward societies characterized by mutual aid. But more important to this inquiry than its precision is its lack of connotation for the English-thinking mind, and that is what we shall need if we are to build up an appreciation for those groups of individuals held together by mutual animosity, who could not survive had they no friends to hate" (Ardrey, 167).

In other words, the kinship grouping is less altruistic than antagonistic. Ardrey puts the thesis even stronger: "What territory promises is the high probability that if intrusion takes place, war will follow" (Ardrey, 244).

War, of course, is the ultimate defense of a territory. And war, of course, brings out an obvious outpouring of heroes who are proud of where they were born and where they died. The following markers were found scattered throughout San Fernando Cemetery #1; the only cemetery present when the Alamo became the symbol for Texas' becoming its own territory:

Capt. Jose Antonio Menchaca

A Veteran of San Jacinto

Born in San Antonio 1797

Don Juan Ximenes

Born in San Antonio de Bexar 1810

Veteran in the Texas War

For Independence, 1835-1836

One of the storming party at Bexar

December 5, 1835

An Honored Citizen, Soldier and Ranger
of Texas

Died July 22, 1877

ERECTED BY THE STATE OF TEXAS

Jose Antonio Navarro

A signer of the Texas

Declaration of Independence

Born in San Antonio

February 27, 1795

Died January 13, 1871

His Wife

Margarita de la Garza Navarro

Born October 17, 1804

Died July 8, 1861

ERECTED BY THE STATE OF TEXAS

1936

Rites of Passage

When modern researchers walk through South Texas graveyards, they are impressed with how few of the markers have either birth or death places marked on them. Their presence is unpredictable. On the majority of markers, those with no territory marking, we tend to think that the deceased belong here. This is their territory; their stories we are reading; their lives we are trying to reconstruct.

However when the place names appear, we must pause to think of territory itself. Some of the

deceased were proud defenders of the territory, as we saw above. Some were early settlers and proud of that: I died here and I was born in San Antonio in 1809 ("Natural de San Antonio de Bexar"). Some of the San Antonio folk draw attention both to their death in San Antonio and their San Antonio home-range roots: San Antonio; McNeil, Texas; Texas; Mexico; En Mier Tamps, Mex.

However, others leave strong signals that they died in San Antonio, but were born outside even the home-range: Charleston, S.C.; Marietta, Ga.; Pine Bluff, Ark; Pinesville, La.; Kentucky. Others let the presence of the marker itself proclaim the place of death (i.e. in South Texas), but place their place of birth: New York; Shannon, Il.; Chicago, Il.; Morgan Co. Ind.; Tennessee.

Our argument is that these markers are not the result of cultural predictability but of biological rites of passage. Some defenders, in many cases not the defenders but the defenders' kin, feel no qualms at all in informing readers of gravemarkers that the territory they are stalking has been bought at a price. Others, intruders to the territory, feel obligated to mark their intrusion. They were just passing through—but deceased before they could move back to their own territory. The defenders are advertising their rites of denying passage; the intruders are advertising their rites of passage.

Ardrey apparently finds this mixture of rites normal within his understanding of territory and the imperative to defend and cross it: "An innate compulsion to defend one's property lies, of course, at the heart of the territorial principle; but just as close to its heart lies recognition of the rights of the next animal" (Ardrey, 249).

Wilson also recognizes the sociobiological tension between stable coexistence and elimination: "Interspecific competition is one of the prime movers of social evolution. When two ecologically similar species first meet, either they coexist stably or one eliminates the other from the zone of overlap" (Wilson, 276).

The Dutch social anthropologist Jeremy Boissevain even suggests that the movement of outsiders into a territory is, itself, normal social behavior: "Instead of looking at man as a member of groups and institutional complexes passively obedient to their norms and pressures, it is important to try to see him as

an entrepreneur who tries to manipulate norms and relationships for his own social and psychological benefit" (Boissevain, 7).

Arbrey finds that the territorial imperative is the realization of three biological needs: security, fun and excitement at the border, and identity: "I find it useful to define the three needs in terms of their opposites: to think of security as the opposite of anxiety, of stimulation as the opposite of boredom, of identity as the opposite of anonymity."

The three needs, he thinks, "...complete a psychological pattern common to all higher animals, and perhaps to many lower animals as well (Ardrey, 170).

The social psychologists Sommer and Becker use the term *marker* instead of *signpost*. We find the meshing of that terminology with the term *gravemarkers* only a coincidence. Nonetheless we find the coincidence helpful in relating sociobiological causes to the presence of place names on certain gravemarkers and not on others. "...[territorial] markers reserve space and receive their legitimacy from people in the area (neighbors) and potential intruders. Psychologists have paid little attention to boundary markers in social interaction, perhaps because such markers were regarded as physical objects relegated to the cultural system (the province of the anthropologist) rather than an interpersonal system which is the true province of the social psychologist" (Weitz, 261).

While the term "rite of passage" is ours, the study of physical markers to measure such an unpredictable constraint as the presence or absence of place names on gravemarkers is not limited to our work. Boissevain definitely thinks that "Pattern, process and momentum must be viewed as the cumulative result of decisions made by persons interacting with each other who are faced by similar constraints. These can be analysed" (Boissevain, 9). As for the presence of such markers even during the past decade, Arbrey has his own opinion: "You must live in a [community], I suspect, for ten or twenty generations before you find yourself equal to it" (Ardrey, 187).

Proxemics and Linguistic Universals.

Benjamin Whorf, the anthropological linguist, was the first theoretician to relate culture to the

proxemics of linguistic reproduction. In the weak version of his famous hypothesis on the relationship between language, thought, and reality he wonders if our own language limits our ability to discuss reality. In the strong version, he wonders if our own language experience controls our vision of the world (Whorf).

A second anthropological linguist, Edward Hall, wrote two widely used books on cultural differences in the use of time (Hall 1959) and of space (1966). Hall's latter book, on space, was devoted entirely with the theory of proxemics. He refers this own work as "the anthropology of space" (Hall 1966, 95).

In a cursory analysis of a dictionary, Hall found almost five thousand terms that referred to space. "This is [20 percent] of the words listed in the pocket Oxford dictionary. Even deep familiarity with my own culture had not prepared me for this discovery" (Hall, 87).

Hall's theory of proxemics proposes three proxemic levels. The *infracultural* level is biological. The *pre-cultural* level is physiological. The *microcultural* level is culture specific and varies from culture to culture and within a culture over time.

The physiological realizations can be of three types: fixed features, like buildings; semifixed features, like moveable furniture in a room; and informal features, like the distance we use in conversations or passing each other on the sidewalk.

In this paper, we are arguing that the South Texas gravemarkers indicate the presence of all three of Hall's levels of proxemic levels. One cannot predict which markers will or will not have a place name on written them. However, when place names do occur they articulate the awareness of territory. This awareness, whether it is to defend or pass through, is the realization of a biological, infracultural level of proxemics. The gravemarkers themselves and the spaces around them realize the physiological, or pre-cultural level of that biological need. Since the need is so unpredictable, the proxemics cannot be cultural. The various languages, the various codes, provide a microcultural variation that "culturally" is predictable. Simply put, if a language code is present on a marker with a place name on it, the place name will match the code—be that English, German, Polish, Czech, Spanish, French, Italian, Chinese, Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, or Creole.

San Fernando and Outsiders.

Approximately four percent of the gravemarkers in San Fernando Cemetery #1 have places of birth and/or places of death inscribed upon them. (See San Fernando #1, Table 2: Percentage of markers that contain death/birth place semantic bits.) In addition to the 72 English, the 48 Spanish, and the 10 French language markers displayed in Table 2, San Fernando #1 also has one Spanglish marker, one mixed-code Spanish/English marker, one mixed-code French/English, and one German language marker that imply that the persons being memorialized are non-San Antonians. At the very least, these 134 individuals' families/friends felt that the presence of these bodies were outsiders; people who, perhaps belonged in a different territory/community.

Our attempts to find a statistical pattern among the inclusion of birthplace (only) or the inclusion of death place (only) or the inclusion of both death-and-birth places yielded no insights whatsoever—other than the obvious expectation that the death places (San Antonio) were not inscribed as much as birthplaces. (See Table 3: Distribution of Birth Place only, Death Place only, and combined Birth and Death Places by Language.) Birth places ranged from San Antonio and D'Hanis in Texas; to Los Angeles, South Carolina, and Kentucky, in the United States; to real “outsider” places such as Mexico, Italy, Ireland, and France. Death places included San Antonio, France, Kentucky, Rio Grande City.

Our attempts to find a statistical pattern among the death dates, however, produced a significant concentration of Place Names during the forty-year period with the turn of the twentieth century in the middle: from 1840-1920. (See Table 4: Occurrence of birth/death place info between 1880-1920.) Among the 130 English/Spanish/French markers, 96 (or 74 %) of the Place Name markers bear death dates during these four decades. Only 20 (15%) of the markers were erected during the thirty years before 1880; only 14 (11%) have been erected during the eighty years since 1920. None have been erected during the last forty years, that is none since 1960.

The statistical pattern only raises questions, of course. It does though raise questions about our theory that the intrusion of outsiders into a cemetery community counters innate biological/sociological instincts. Certainly the forty-year span from 1880-1920 would bolster the cemetery-as-community theory,

with the 96 markers and their Place Names. What, however, happened to this territory imperative after 1920? Or before 1880?

The Before 1880 question may have to await further inquiry. At present, we are assuming that the actual number of burials in San Fernando was sparse until the 1880s. We have not, however, run a statistical analysis to test that assumption.

During this pre-1880 time, nonetheless, according to sociologist Michael Kear, the funeral profession was emerging—basically as a merging of “...sideline activities of a number of occupations (Kearl 275)” . The stonecutters, cabinet makers, liverymen, and preachers began working with specialists, the “Undertakers,” who began perfecting “the laying out, the coffining, and the transporting of the body to the grave” (Habenstein and Lamers 249, in Kearl 176). The Civil War brought about the beginnings of the practice of embalming bodies for transporting purposes. Before the war, embalming was used sparingly to avoid the spread of some types of epidemics. For those families, though, who could afford the cost, the “fluids and methods for their injection were improved upon and employed to ship soldiers’ remains home” (Kearl 276).

We suspect that gradually, in San Antonio, the expense of embalming bodies and the expense of transporting those bodies back to birthplaces—especially transporting the bodies via railroad—became more and more affordable. Thus by the 1920, families resorted to transporting bodies back to their homelands for burial. Such a practice that would bolster the territorial imperative argument, in that people could now easily return to the place of birth for burial.

A look at the commercial advertising for present-day Funeral Homes and Directors confirms erases any doubt about the huge business in trafficking bodies: In the Greater San Antonio Yellow Pages, for Southwestern Bell, 2000-2001, are found: *Shipping* (Hilcrest Funeral Home; *International Arrangements* (Loewen Group Int. Inc); *Shipping Services* (Memorial Funeral Home); *Traslados a Mexico \$1,250.00 (Incluye Ataud)* [Transportation to Mexico \$1,250.00 (including coffin)] (Castillo Mission Funeral Home); *Shipping* (The Angelus Funeral Home); *Global Shipping* (Hillcrest Funeral Home); *Shipping (Transportaciones)* (M.E. Rodriguez Funeral Home).

Michael Kearl has a delightful description of caskets that are especially made for aircraft transportation: “One learns that burial occurs in a coffin equipped with an exhaust-pipe-like *burper valve* (so that the casket does not explode in a depressurized aircraft compartment)—not in a body bag or burial shroud.”

A second major development in allowing for the return of bodies for burial in home-territory cemeteries has occurred in the increased popularity of an old means of removing bodies from sight—cremation. According to Kearl, “On the West Coast, for example, more than a third of deaths are cremated” (Kearl 282). Ashes could easily be placed in any convenient container and left for years, if necessary, before the family could transport the remains back to the home territory for burial.

Another quick appraisal of the San Antonio Yellow Pages, reveals that three-fourths (18 of 24) block advertisements for Funeral Homes and Directors promise the ability to perform *cremations* and/or to have *crematories*. Included in those yellow-page advertisements is Puente & Sons Funeral Chapels, *Direct Cremation \$495.00 “San Antonio’s Cremation Specialist”*

Clearly by the 1920s the need to bury a person in alien, “hostile” soil no longer matched that need which San Fernando Cemetery #1 so clearly demonstrated with the large number of Place Names during the turn of the nineteenth into the twentieth century.

Affirmation of Life in a Non-Catholic Cemetery

When we began our study into the use of Place Names, the question often arose concerning our sole use of data from a Catholic cemetery, San Fernando #1. No one had any specific objections. Yet a raised eyebrow here, an askance glare, and lots of direct questions “Oh, but you’re only using Catholic data?” raised enough doubt in our own minds that we decided to sample comparable data from a non-Catholic cemetery.

San Fernando Cemetery #1, located a half mile west of downtown San Antonio, is separated from a series of thirty-two City Cemeteries, located a half mile east of downtown San Antonio. While among those thirty-two cemeteries one can find St John’s Lutheran Catholic Church cemetery, the rest of the cemeteries are either Protestant or are Lodge affiliated or are San Antonio public Cemeteries.

We chose to collect our data from City Cemetery #2. Purcell had already documented the 538 markers for another project, so was familiar with the data.

[Slides: Smith; Harrison; Crate; Brutshe; Wilson; Cunningham]

The 538 markers have two languages written on them: 17 in German and 521 in English. Among those 538 markers, we found 22 with Place Names. (See Table 1: Percentage of markers that contain death/birth place semantic bits). The four percent (4%) coincided exactly with the four percent (4%) of markers with Place Names, located in San Fernando #1.

The largest number of Place Name markers were erected during the same forty-year period as were the largest number of Place Name Markers erected in San Fernando #1—1880-1920. (See Figure 1: Occurrence of birth/death place info between 1880-1920.) In fact, in City Cemetery #2, no Place Name markers were erected before 1884 (the oldest marker among the 538 bears a death date of 1872). Only two Place Name markers have death dates later than 1920.

Therefore, the affirmation of life within the non-Catholic City Cemetery #2 complements coexists with the affirmation of life with its companion Catholic cemetery across San Antonio, just three miles away. Outsiders marked their status consistently in both San Antonio cemeteries during a forty-year period at the turn of the nineteenth into the twentieth century. (See Table 2: Comparison of San Fernando (Catholic) with City Cemetery #2 (Protestant).)

Only one anomaly mars a perfect match. (See Figure 2: Comparison of earliest and latest “Place” markers, by cemeteries.) No Place Name markers in City Cemetery #2 bear a death date later than 1922; whereas the latest death date on a Place Name marker in San Fernando #1 shows a date almost forty years later: 1960.

While our explanation may prove to be too simple, we place one possible reason for that difference on the Catholic Church’s stance on cremation. Cremation, as argued above, has allowed for easier transporting of remains to home communities than has embalming. The Catholic Church, however, did not grant approval of cremation, at least in the United States, until the late 1970s (Kearl 282).

At any rate, for the past 40 years, Place Names have not appeared on any of the markers in the

Catholic San Fernando #1 nor on any of the markers in the non-Catholic City Cemetery #2—both cemetery/communities located in San Antonio, Texas. Both cemeteries, in other words, continue to affirm life within the San Antonio community—with no sign of outsiders.

- # -

Scott Baird & Jennifer Purcell
Trinity University
(Draft of paper read at the American Culture Association,
Permanent Session of Cemeteries and Graveyards. April 17, 2001, Philadelphia, PA)

REFERENCES CITED

- Ardrey, Robert. 1966. The territorial imperative. New York: Atheneum.
- Baird, Scott. 1985. *English dialects in San Antonio*. Names, 33:4 (December), 232-42.
- _____. 1989a. *Tombstone talk: names as evidence for South Texas diglossia*. Paper read at the annual meeting of the American Name Society. Washington, D.C., December 29.
- _____. 1989b. *Tombstone talk: predictable variation among non-English dialects*. Paper read at the combined meeting of the Modern Language Association and the American Dialect Society. Washington, D.C., December 29.
- _____ and Annelise Duncan. 1985. *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.
- Bickerton, D. 1977. *Pidginization and creolization: Language acquisition and language universals*. In A. Valdman (ed.) Pidgin and Creole linguistics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Boissevain, Jeremy. 1974. Friends of friends. New York: Martin's Press.
- Broom, Donald. M. 1981. Biology of behavior. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, Anthony P. 1985. The symbolic construction of community. Chichester, Sussex: Ellis Horwood Limited, and London: Tavistock Publications Limited.
- Davis, Lawrence. 1988. *The limits of chi square*. In Alan Thomas, (ed.) Methods in dialectology. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 225-40.
- DeCamp, David. 1977. *The development of pidgin and Creole studies*. In A. Valdman (ed.) Pidgin and Creole linguistics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- _____ & I.F. Hancock (eds.) 1974 Pidgins and Creoles: Current trends and prospects. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

- Dillard, J.L. 1972. Black English, its history and usage in the United States. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Graves, Thomas E. 1987. *Pennsylvania German Gravestones: introduction*. Markers, V: 61-95.
- Habenstein, Robert, and William Lames. 1955. The History of American Funeral Directing. Milwaukee: Buflin.
- Hall, Edward T. 1966. The hidden dimension. Garden City, York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- _____. 1959. The Silent language. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Halporn, Roberta. 1979. Lessons from the dead. Brooklyn: Highly Specialized Promotions.
- Kay, P., & Sankoff, G. 1974. *A language-universals approach to "pidgins and Creoles"*. In D. DeCamp & I.F. Hancock (eds.) Pidgins and Creoles: Current trends and prospects. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Kearl, Michael C. 1989. Endings. New York: Oxford University Press.
- McCrum, Robert, William Cran, and Robert MacNeil. 1986. The story of English. New York: Viking Penguin Inc.
- Milroy, Lesley. 1987. Observing & analysing natural language. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Myles, Timothy G. 1988. *Resource inheritance in social evolution from termites to man*. In C.N. Slobodchikoff (ed.) The ecology of social behavior. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc., 379-423.
- Pateman, Trevor. 1987. Language in mind and language in society. Studies in linguistic reproduction. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Pei, Mario A. 1960. The world's chief languages. Fifth revised edition. New York: S. F. Vanni.
- Pyles, Thomas and John Algeo. 1982. The origins and development of the English language, third edition. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.
- Romaine, Suzanne. 1988. Pidgins and Creoles. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Inc.
- Slobodchikoff, C. N. (ed.) 1988. The ecology of social behavior. San Diego: Academic Press, Inc., 379-423.
- Smith, G. 1984. *Sampling linguistic minorities: a technical report on the adult language use survey*. LMP Working Paper 4. London: University of London Institute of Education
- Sommer, Robert and Franklin D. Becker. 1969. *Territorial defense and the good neighbor*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 11, 85-92. Reprinted in Shirley Weitz. 1974. Nonverbal Communication. New York: Oxford University Press, 252-62.
- Thomas, Alan R. (ed.) 1988. Methods in dialectology. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Valdman, A. (ed.). 1977. Pidgin and Creole linguistics. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Weitz, Shirley. 1974. Nonverbal Communication. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Whorf, Benjamin Lee. 1956. *Language, thought, and reality*. New York: The Technology Press and John Wiley & Sons. Á

Williams, Joseph M. 1975. *Origins of the English language*. New York: The Free Press.

Wilson, Edward O. 1975. *Sociobiology*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University.