CLS 42: Main Session (2006); 1-15

The Unexpected Survival of German Discourse Markers in Texas German

HANS C. BOAS AND HUNTER WEILBACHER
The University of Texas at Austin

0. Introduction[1]

Discourse markers (DMs) have attracted considerable attention over the past years because of the meta-linguistic functions they serve in regulating conversation (see Schiffrin 1985, Brinton 1990, Jucker 1993, Schourup 1999, Fuller 2003, among others). Typically, DMs signal the speaker's intention, directing the dialogue in a way that establishes its parameters in terms of meaning, mood, or acceptable topicality. More recently, a number of studies (e.g. Brody 1987, Maschler 1998, Serra 1998) have analyzed DMs in language contact situations in order to determine what types of DMs are borrowed and why. In some cases, depending on the intensity and length of contact between languages, only selected DMs are borrowed. In other cases, entire discourse-marking systems can be borrowed from one language into another (cf. Salmons 1990, Matras 1998, Fuller 2001). To illustrate, consider the following examples from Texas German, where the English DMs *you know* and *well* have been borrowed from English.[2]

(1) Was ist das Wort wo die punished 'em you know.
what is the word where they punished them you know
'What is the word that they used to punish them, you know.' (1-1-1-6)

(2) Well ... die leben keiner von mehr.
well ... they live no-one of anymore
'Well, none of them is still alive.' (1-55-1-3)

[1] Many thanks to Hans U. Boas, Bob King, and Marc Pierce for comments and discussion. Parts of the research reported here were supported by a fellowship from the National Endowment for the Humanities (FA-5200).

[2] The Texas German data cited in this paper come from the web-based Texas German Dialect Archive (TGDA), which is located at the following URL: [http://www.tgdp.org/archive.php]. The citation format following each example lists the particular file in the on-line archive from which the example is taken.

While new DMs may be borrowed, other DMs may simultaneously be lost in the recipient language. For example, Salmons (1990) reports a drastic decline of German-origin DMs in his Texas German and Indiana German data:

> German modal particles and other discourse markers which do not overlap with the English ones appear to have been lost or radically reduced in function and frequency for even the most fluent speakers in central Texas and southwestern Indiana. (Salmons 1990:462)

However, recent data collected by the Texas German Dialect Project (Boas 2003) does not show such a drastic decline of German DMs in Texas German. In contrast to Salmons' observations, German-origin DMs such as *doch* 'however, still', *aber* 'but', *noch* 'still, yet', *eben* 'even, just', and *ja* 'yes' are still in use in present-day Texas German. In this study, we examine the degree to which the German-origin discourse marking system is still alive in Texas German (TxG), despite the dialect's imminent death and the fact that previous studies such as Salmons (1990) and Fuller (2001) have claimed that the original German DM system is virtually non-existent in Texas German and other German-American dialects.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 1 presents a brief classification of five Standard German DMs found in present-day German-American dialects. Section 2 summarizes previous research on German-origin DMs in German-American dialects and sets the stage for our investigation of their distribution in present-day Texas German. Section 3 discusses the distribution of German-origin DMs in present-day Texas German and shows that despite the borrowing of English DMs the German-origin DMs have not dropped out of use as suggested by Salmons (1990) and Fuller (2001). Section 4 offers some details to explain the divergent distribution of German DMs in previous studies and our own data. Section 5 summarizes our findings and presents directions for further research.

1. Classification of Modal Particles in Standard German

Traditional German grammars characterize particles as uninflected lexical categories, e.g., adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, interjections, negation particles, focus particles, and modal particles, among others (see Hentschel & Weydt 1989 for an overview). Modal particles (*Abtönungspartikel*, *Modalpartikel*) typically lack lexical meaning and as such do not contribute any factual information to an utterance. Instead, they are used for conversational marking, normally expressing the speaker's stance towards a statement he makes. As such, modal particles may be used as DMs to establish consensus, introduce evaluations, identify with others, and modify propositional contents, among other things (see Weydt (1969, 1989) and König (1991)). In what follows we discuss the distribution of five different DMs in Standard German in order to set the stage for our discussion of DMs in German-American dialects.

The first DM is *mal* 'once', which often serves as an indicator of the degree of intensity or frequency of the subject matter the speaker would like to obtain from the listener. In Standard German, *mal* does typically not appear clause-initially and when used with requests it usually indicates that the speaker's intention is to present a one-time-only request, usually asking for a small favor, as in (3). When used to elicit a particular type of information, *mal* signals that the speaker has heard the information before, but has forgotten it, and needs to be reminded as in (4). A more general meaning of *mal* indicates a single occurrence of an event, as in (5).

(3) Kannst Du mir mal helfen?
can you me once help
'Can you give me a hand?'

(4) Wie war das gleich noch mal?
how was that right again once
'How did that go (again)?'

(5) Wir haben das mal gesehen. (Weydt et al. 1983:167)
we have that once seen
'We've seen it once.'

The second DM is *halt* 'just', which often marks an utterance as an assertion as in (6).[3] In (7), *halt* is used to prompt the hearer to do something. Syntactically, *halt* can appear as an emphasis particle in commanding and asserting contexts, but it does not appear at the beginning of a clause.

(6) Ich hab halt keine Zeit.
I have actually no time
'Actually, I don't have any time.'

(7) Dann bleib halt zu Hause! (Weydt et al. 1983:165)
then stay just at home
'Just stay at home then!'

The third DM is *ja* 'yeah, really', which apart from its obvious function as the affirmative 'yes'-word has an anaphoric use that refers to a word, phrase, or to the sentence men-

[3] *Halt* is also a homonym of the imperative form of *halten* 'to stop'. In addition, *halt* is very similar in function to *eben*, and the two particles may be used interchangeably in colloquial speech. See Weydt et al. (1983) for details.

tioned before.[4] More than a mere affirmative, *ja* as a DM carries an assertion or an element of emphasis and serves several other functions. One of the functions is to express marveling and astonishment as in (8). Other functions include warning and threatening as in (9), assertion as in (10), and short commentary as in (11). As a DM, *ja* does usually not appear clause-initially in Standard German.

(8) Du hast ja ein neues Auto!
you have really a new car
'You really have a new car!'

(9) Mach das ja nicht noch einmal!
do that really not again one-time
'Don't think of doing that ever again!'[5]

(10) Du weißt ja, dass ich morgen Geburtstag habe.
You know surely, that I tomorrow birthday have
'Of course you know that my birthday is tomorrow.'

(11) Soll ich dir mal '*La Paloma*' vorsingen? Ja nicht! (Weydt et al. 1983:166)
should I to-you once '*La Paloma*' for-sing absolutely not
'Should I sing '*La Paloma*' for you once? Absolutely not!'

Next, consider *eben* 'even, just', which appears as a DM in declarations as in (12) and in prompting contexts as in (13).[6] *Eben* can also form one-word commentary clauses as in (14), but cannot function alone as the answer to a question.

(12) Ich habe eben kein Geld.
I have really no money
'I really don't have any money.'

(13) Dann lass es eben!
then leave it just
'Just leave it then.'

[4] *Ja* as a particle has the obvious homonym of *ja* 'yes', as well as some archaic other uses. See Hentschel (1986) for details.
[5] In (9) and (11) *ja* must be stressed, in other examples it is unstressed.
[6] Homonyms of the particle *eben* are the adjectives *smooth, flat, even*, and *equal*, as in *eine ebene Fläche* 'a level surface'. *Eben* also has a temporal adverb meaning of a very short duration of time: *Er war eben noch hier* 'He was just here'. For more details, see Weydt et al. (1983:162).

(14) Wir wollen doch Freunde bleiben. – Eben! (Weydt et al. 1983:163)
we want really friends to-stay of-course
'We really want to stay friends. – Of course!'

Finally, consider the distribution of *doch* 'really, only, anyway', which can be found in various syntactic positions. The emphasized (stressed) form is only used to answer questions of decision. The unstressed form only appears in answering determining questions and determining clauses and in interjections. In declarative and imperative statements both forms are found. Usually, neither the stressed nor unstressed form appears utterance initially (as a DM). Example (15) illustrates the use of *doch* as a part of a supposition, and in (16) *doch* is used to object to or to contradict a previous statement. In (17), *doch* is used to make an assertion, while in (18) it is used for summoning and in (19) to express wishful thinking.

(15) Er wird doch das Licht ausgemacht haben?
he will really the light out-made have
'Has he really switched off the light?'

(16) Und die Erde dreht sich doch. (only when *doch* is emphasized)
and the earth turns itself anyway
'And the earth is turning anyway.'

(17) Du weißt doch, dass ich zur Arbeit muss.
you know well, that I to work must
'You know very well that I have to go to work.'

(18) Komm doch mal her!
come just once here
'Just come over here (for a moment).'

(19) Wenn es doch nicht so viel regnen würde! (Weydt et al. 1983:162)
if it only not so much rain would
'If only it wouldn't rain so much.'

With this overview of some of the basic functions of the five DMs in Standard German in hand (see Hentschel 1986 for more details), we now turn to their distribution in German-American dialects as described by Salmons (1990) and Fuller (2001).

2. Previous analyses of German DMs in German-American Dialects

Previous research into German DMs in Texas German and Indiana German by Salmons (1990) yielded the following results: (1) Language contact between German and English

has resulted in a shared system of discourse marking including borrowed English surface forms; (2) At numerous points in the conversational-marking systems of these two languages there are preexisting similarities between German and English (i.e., before they came into contact with each other), for example in the use of *you know/weisste*; (3) This shared feature was part of both systems before contact. As such, one might better characterize this shared system as 'overlap' to distinguish it from the established diachronic term 'convergence'.

Based on these observations, Salmons suggests that these German-American dialects have only one DM system, which is basically the American English system, having lost all but traces of the German system. In particular, modal particles such as *ja*, *doch*, *noch*, and *mal* (as well as other native German discourse-marking strategies) are almost entirely absent from Salmons' corpus. Based on his interviews with speakers of TxG, Salmons (1990:464) maintains that because of occasional attestations of some of these modal particles in his corpus, the "... loss of modal particles is relatively recent and not yet entirely complete, although the modal-particle system can no longer be considered functional for any of the speakers I have worked with."

He suggests that the loss of at least one major set of DMs which help to regulate discourse in German has been accompanied by the appearance of English DMs. This newly acquired English-based system "that performs some of the functions of the modal particles" exhibits characteristics of borrowing and convergence, but does not fit definitions of code switching, according to Salmons (1990:474). While the loss of German DMs and simultaneous acquisition of English DMs such as *well* is explained in terms of mutual convergence, Salmons points out that DMs such as *you know* and *weisst du/weisste* served similar functions before English and German came into contact with each other in Texas and Indiana. One of the elements of Salmons' study that will be of great importance for the analysis of our own present-day TxG data is his assertion that

> while many particles and other markers have been completely lost, as is the case with *doch* in my corpus, some German markers have not been entirely lost but have clearly come to play an extremely marginal role for the speakers under study, for instance the particle use of *aber*. (Salmons 1990:475)

Fuller's (2001) research on Pennsylvania German (PG) discourse markers has the same goals as Salmons' (1990) study, namely to determine the mechanisms leading to the formation of bilingual DM systems. Based on Matras' (1998) pragmatic detachability scale, Fuller establishes three levels of pragmatic detachability for bilingual DMs in PG: (1) DMs that have counterparts in both languages; (2) DMs from English that do not have semantic/pragmatic equivalents in German; and (3) German DMs that do not have semantic/pragmatic equivalents in English. Table 1 displays her classification of English and German DMs, which is based on interviews with 18 PG speakers, totaling approximately 36 hours of conversation. Her results illustrate that *well* and *so* have been borrowed into PG from English because they are highly pragmatically detachable. *You know* and *but*, which are ranked lower on Fuller's scale, are also of English origin and are used in variation with their German counterparts. *You know* is frequently used in a turn-related fashion, which makes it high enough on the pragmatic detachability scale to be borrowed into PG. *Ja* and *mol* are at the lowest level of Fuller's hierarchy. These are relatively infrequent DMs in PG and thus signal a loss of German discourse markers in PG, according to Fuller.

Table 1. *Discourse Markers in PG and their discourse functions* (Fuller 2001:256)

Discourse marker	N	Discourse function
well	106	indicates that the subsequent utterance may not be what is expected by the hearer
so	193	links two utterances or assumptions causally
y'know	215	emphasis/focus; presents information as shared, creating common ground
weescht	154	emphasis/focus; presents information as shared, creating common ground
but	224	contrastive conjunction
aber	201	contrastive conjunction
ja	1	contrast an emphasis
mol	15	indicates the limited duration of the action referred to in the utterance

We now turn to a brief discussion of Matras' (1998) approach to get a better understanding of Fuller's (2001) analysis of DMs in PG. Matras (1998) proposes that in language contact situations the donor language is often pragmatically dominant, which typically leads to a mixed DM system where DMs of the donor and recipient languages converge. Alternatively, language contact can result in the complete borrowing of the DM system of the donor language. To predict what types of DMs are borrowed when languages are in contact Matras discusses three types of scenarios. In the first scenario the donor language is pragmatically dominant. In the second scenario we find a situation in which the change leading to convergence is both gradual and gradational. Finally, when there is a hierarchy of pragmatic detachability, in which those DMs that are at the top of the hierarchy (i.e., pragmatically more detachable) will be borrowed earlier. Central to the concept of pragmatic detachability is Matras' claims that DMs can be classified according to three different scales of "borrow-ability," each of which determines whether a DM can be borrowed into the recipient language.

Matras' first scale is the so-called *pragmatic detachability scale*, a method of characterizing the elements that organize a speech event which are perceived as gesturelike, situation-bound devices and are therefore detachable from the content message of the

utterance (Matras 1998:309).[7] Such elements are more turn-related (e.g. *well*) and are borrowed before more content-related ones such as *but* (which functions to contrast the meanings of clauses). Matras' second scale is the *category-sensitive scale*, according to which elements that are more lexical or deictic are borrowed last. This means that elements that are not easily analyzed in terms of lexical meaning such as *well* are predicted to be borrowed more easily than more highly lexical items such as *you know*. Finally, Matras' *semantic scale* claims that DMs which mark contrast, restriction, or change are more easily borrowed than those which mark addition, elaboration, or continuation. Therefore, contrastive *but* is more likely to be borrowed than the additive conjunction *and*.

Based on Matras' approach, Fuller proposes that PG exhibits a gradual turnover from the DM system of the recipient-language to that of the donor language. She suggests that DMs high on the detachability scale (*well*) are borrowed more easily than those that are lower (*you know*) (cf. Table 1) (Fuller 2001:363). This turnover is gradual and gradational, adhering to Matras' (1998) hierarchy of pragmatic detachability. With respect to the DMs that exhibit low frequency levels, Fuller argues that the

> German-origin DMs that persist in these PG data are vestiges of a former discourse-marker system. They are all low on the pragmatic-detachability scale, indicating that not only does pragmatic detachability lead to early borrowing, but it also may lead to early loss of a DM from the recipient language in a language-contact situation. (Fuller 2001:367)

Based on Salmons' (1990) and Fuller's (2001) proposals we would expect to find only very few instances of German-origin DMs in present-day TxG and also because they are low on the pragmatic detachability scale. Such a relatively low frequency of German-origin DMs could then be taken as evidence that the DM system of TxG exhibits the same type of gradual turnover to an English-dominant system as the DM system of PG. This result, in turn, could then be regarded as supporting Matras' detachability scale. To test this hypothesis we now turn to a discussion of the present-day TxG data.

3. German-origin DMs in Present-day Texas German

3.1. Data Collection and Analysis

Since its inception in 2001, the Texas German Dialect Project (TGDP) has interviewed more than 190 fluent speakers of TxG, collecting several types of data including open-ended sociolinguistic interviews, elicitation tasks which involve translating phrases and sentences from English into TxG, and written biographical questionnaires (see Boas 2003 and Boas 2005b). The TxG data are first transcribed and translated and then stored in the

[7] *Gesturelike*: In the area of conjunction and focus particles, it is hypothesized that gesturelike properties go together with the semantics-pragmatics of contrast, change, and restriction. In the domain of sentence particles, hesitation markers, fillers and tags, it can be assumed that the less lexical content an expression has and the less analyzable it is to the speaker, the more gesturelike and situation-bound it is likely to be (Matras 1998:310).

on-line Texas German Dialect Archive (TGDA) [http://www.tgdp.org/archive.php] (see Boas (forthcoming)). The web-based TGDA is searchable using a concordancer interface, which we used to extract every instance of the five German-origin DMs *mal*, *halt*, *ja*, *eben*, and *doch* in the transcripts of the sociolinguistic interviews. Each search returned a list that we sorted through by hand in order to identify their uses as DMs.

As we have a significant data backlog at this point, we were able to analyze the transcripts of interviews of only 60 of the TxG informants, totaling 305,429 TxG words. The following sub-section summarizes our findings on the distribution of these five DMs. We then compare and contrast the present-day TxG data with those reported by Salmons (1990) and Fuller (2001) to determine whether there is evidence for a turnover towards English in the DM system of present-day TxG.

3.2. Distribution of German-origin DMs in present-day TxG

The TGDA transcripts contain a total of 115 tokens of the DM *mal*. The examples are similar to those discussed for Standard German in section 1 in that they refer to a one-time request as in (20), reminding someone as in (21), and indicating a one-time occurrence of an event as in (22).

(20) Die Weiber haben mia werschinlich gesagt, ja willste mal mitkomm?
The women have me probably said, yeah want-you perhaps come-along
'The women probably said, you want to come along?' (1-97-1-14)

(21) Un mein Vater hat sagt, "Guk mal auf'm Thermometer, wie kalt es ist."
And my dad has said look there at the thermometer how cold it is
'And my dad said, "take a look at the thermometer, how cold it is."' (1-27-1-14)

(22) Und dann hat jeder Verein mal gesungen und haben sie ein Tanz gehabt.
And then has every club once sung and have they a dance had
'And then every club sang once and they had a dance.' (1-38-1-13)

Next, consider the use of the DM *halt* in present-day TxG. The 305,429 word corpus yielded a total of 150 tokens. Parallel to its use in Standard German, we found instances where *halt* marks assertion as in (23) as well as prompting, as in (24).

(23) Un – un ich wusste es halt nicht anders – you know.
And and I knew it really not different you know
'And I really didn't know any different, you know.' (1-25-1-7)

(24) Denn wo sie geheirat haben sie halt dann werdnse Amerikaner.
then where they married have they actually then became-they Americans
'Then when they married they actually become Americans.'(1-51-1-15)

While the distribution of *mal* and *halt* in TxG is similar to that found in Standard German, *ja* does not appear to exhibit the same range of uses in TxG as in Standard German. The TGDA transcripts contain a total of 142 tokens of *ja*, but only cases where *ja* is used to express wonder or astonishment as in (25) and assertion as in (26). We did not find any cases where *ja* is used to indicate warning or threatening (as in (9) above) or to mark a short commentary as in (11) above.

(25) Und ich sag ja ich hab hier in Texas geboren, …
and I say sure I have here in Texas born
'And what I'm saying is that I was born here in Texas, …' (1-134-1-2)

(26) Die Kleinste musst mir ja noch dragen und alles.
The smallest had-to we actually still carry and everything
'The smallest we actually had to carry and everything.' (1-28-1-3)

Of all five DMs, the use of *eben* in TxG exhibits the fewest parallels to Standard German. We found only 17 tokens of *eben* in the corpus, all marking a declaration as in (27) and (28), but not prompting as in (13) above or a short commentary as in (14) above.

(27) Die haben uns eben gefragt, wo komm Sie her in Deutschland?
they have us even asked, where come you from in Germany
'They even asked us, where in Germany we were from.' (1-71-1-10)

(28) Und denn welche von den einer - ma sagt vielleicht eben was oder
and then which of them one once says perhaps so something or

was en einer denn fragen so kannst du Deutsch sprechen?
something and one then asks like can you German speak

'And then one of them says something just like that or something and then one of them asks, "can you speak German?"' (1-118-1-24)

The last DM under discussion, *doch*, has 108 attestations in the TGDA corpus. Similar to its use in Standard German, TxG *doch* is used to indicate assertion as in (29) and (30), summoning as in (31), objection and contradiction as in (32), and supposition as in (33). We did not find any instances where *doch* is used to mark wishful thinking as in Standard German (see (19) above).

(29) Aber mir sind doch mitgegange und denn haben wir die beide immer aufgepasst.
but we are really with-gone and then have we the both always out-looked
'But we still went along and then we looked out for the two of them.'(1-118-1-24)

(30) Weil das war doch alles anders gewesen.
because that was really everything different been
'Because everything was really very different.' (1-83-1-5)

(31) Und denn sag ich immer, well denn bleib doch hier und gib mi meine Pill.
and then say I always well then stay really here and give me my pill
'And then I always say, well, then stay here and give me my pill.' (1-85-1-4)

(32) Aber wir ham doch immer Deutsch gesprochen.
But we have nevertheless always German spoken
'But nevertheless we always spoke German.' (1-85-1-7)

(33) Alle unsere Verwandten sind doch eigentlich hier in die Gegend, huh?
all our relatives are really actually here in the area huh
'All of our relatives are actually here in the area, huh?' (1-51-1-24)

Our analysis of the TGDA corpus shows that all five German-origin DMs are used in present-day TxG. While *mal* and *halt* exhibit the full range of uses as in Standard German, *ja*, *eben*, and *doch* exhibit a limited range of uses when compared with Standard German. It is important to observe that while the five DMs are represented in our data, they are not used with similar frequency by all 60 speakers in all of their uses as listed for Standard German in Section 1 above. To this end, Table 2 summarizes our findings so far, including the number of speakers who actually employ the German-origin DMs.

Table 2: *Summary of German-origin DM use by 60 TxG speakers*

Discourse Marker	Number of tokens in TGDA	Number of speakers	Number of uses compared with Standard German
mal	115	26	3/3
halt	150	25	2/2
ja	142	19	2/4
eben	17	13	1/3
doch	108	38	3/4

The distribution of German-origin DMs demonstrates that contrary to Salmons' (1990) and Fuller's (2001) analyses of TxG and PG, present-day TxG has a well-functioning, if somewhat limited system of German-origin DMs. The fact that present-day TxG does not exhibit the drastic loss of German-origin DMs suggested by Salmons (1990) also indicates that it does not exhibit as strong of a turnover to the English DM system as described by Fuller (2001) for PG. To determine the possible causes for the discrepancies

between Salmons' (1990) and Fuller's (2001) data and our own data we now turn to a number of factors that we believe may explain the differences.

First, consider Matras' (1998) account which explains the borrowability of DMs in language contact situations based on different levels of detachability. We suggest that it is problematic to apply the same mechanisms used to explain the borrowing of English DMs to account for the retention or decline of German-origin DMs. In other words, while one might explain the borrowing of donor-language DMs into the recipient language based on pragmatic detachability (among other factors), it is unclear how these same mechanism influence the retention of German-origin DMs. Such an explanation does not appear to hold water since the German-origin DMs are not borrowed, i.e., they are simply used less frequently. In this context it is also important to re-consider the idea of how far we should apply the same standards in comparing the DM systems of language varieties that are in contact with other languages with their standard varieties which are not in contact with other languages. The crucial point here is that the newly evolving variety certainly has its own system of discourse marking resulting from new socio-pragmatic realities unfamiliar to the standard variety. We thus suggest that comparisons based on standard varieties are only of limited use and that alternative methods must be found to describe DM systems of such newly evolving varieties.

The second factor causing the differences between the TxG and the PG data may be found in the different donor dialects that formed the basis for TxG and PG. Some uses of German DMs, such as those of *doch*, have evolved after German emigrants left for Pennsylvania in the 17th century (see Hentschel 1986), but before other Germans left for Texas in the mid-19th century. This means that the different German donor dialects coming to Texas from the 1840s onwards appear to have had more extensive meanings. To substantiate this claim further research is needed on the DM systems of the individual German donor dialects. Additionally, the length and intensity of language contact with English varied greatly between PG and TxG. Only since the early 20th century has there been extensive contact between speakers of TxG and English, while contact between English and PG dates back to the early 18th century.

Finally, the three studies are based on different sample sizes. While Salmons' study is based on data from only 6 informants and Fuller's (2001) study is based on data from 18 informants, our account is based on data from 60 informants. Differences in sample size (as well as sample locations) may be one of the reasons why the two prior accounts have found only relatively few German-origin DMs in their corpora in comparison with our own investigation.

Our discussion of the various possible causes underlying the differences in the data of the three studies shows that it is difficult to clearly identify one particular factor as the main cause. We would like to propose that it is very likely that the differences are caused by some combination of all three factors. In addition, it is important to keep in mind that just because we do not find attestations of certain uses of German-origin DMs in our corpus does not mean that they do not exist. Some situations in which these DMs are

used (e.g. summoning and threatening) are not part of the interview protocol used to elicit data, and as such, cannot be expected to show up in the corpus.

4. Summary and Conclusions

Contrary to Salmons' (1990) observations, German DMs such as *ja*, *mal*, *doch*, *halt*, and *eben* appear frequently in our TxG data. This suggests that they have not dropped out of use in TxG as suggested by Salmons (1990). After comparing the data from our TxG corpus with the data by Fuller (2001), we argue that the pragmatic detachability scale (Matras 1998) may not be a suitable tool for predicting the outcome of bilingual DM systems in language contact situations. More specifically, we have shown that there is little evidence of a gradual turnover to English DMs in TxG that would simultaneously entail the loss of German-origin DMs (see also Boas & Weilbacher 2005). Perhaps the largest difficulty is the problem of classification: how can we use a hypothesis with a uniform scale (pragmatic detachability) to explain the presence of DMs in TxG or PG when either the donor language (English) does not have straightforward translation equivalents (*ja*, *mal*, *doch*, *eben*), or the recipient language (German) lacks straightforward translation equivalents (*well*)? Can we then still talk about "turnover"? These observations suggest that the study of bilingual DM systems should follow an item-based approach. This alternative method first considers the use of individual DMs by themselves before attempting to arrive at broad-scale generalizations that use the same principles to predict both the borrowing of donor language DMs and simultaneous loss of recipient language DMs.

This is by no means a completed study. In the future, we will expand our analysis to also cover other DMs discussed by Salmons (1990) and Fuller (2001) (see, e.g., Boas and Weilbacher (2005) for an analysis of *you know* and *weisst(e)* in present-day TxG). One important aspect of such studies will be the as of yet little understood motivations for borrowings of DMs. To this end, Clyne (2003:232) observes that "the transference of English DMs fulfills particular needs in communicative behavior related to cultural values, and the abandonment of the German system indicates that another need is no longer great." This point can only be arrived at through an integrated sociolinguistic analysis, and the evidence for this is stated by many of the informants in the interviews. There may be a larger pragmatic or communicative need for the retention of the German DM system or its replacement with the English system. We expect that further studies will help us understand the degrees to which all of these elements influence the evolution of the TxG DM system.

References

Boas, Hans C. 2003. Tracing Dialect Death: The Texas German Dialect Project. In J. Larson and M. Paster, eds., *Proceedings of the 28th Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society,* 387-398. University of California, Berkeley: Linguistics Department.

Boas, Hans C. 2005a. Texas German Dialect. In T. Adam, ed., *Germany and the Americas*, 1029-1035. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.

Boas, Hans C. 2005b. A Dialect in Search of its Place: The Use of Texas German in the Public Domain. In C. Cravens and D. Zersen, eds., *Transcontinental Encounters: Central Europe Meets the American Heartland*, 78-102. Austin: Concordia University Press.

Boas, Hans C. Forthcoming. *Best-practice Recommendations in Documentary Linguistics. Accepted for publication in Language Resources and Evaluation.*

Boas, Hans C., and Hunter Weilbacher. 2005. *Wir haben die car in die garage gemoved, you know? The syntax of bilingual discourse markers in Texas German.* Presentation at the 9th meeting of the Texas Linguistic Society, Austin, Texas. November 2005.

Brinton, Laurie. 1990. The Development of Discourse Markers in English. In J. Fisiak, ed., *Historical Linguistics and Philology,* 45-71. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Brody, Jane. 1987. Particles Borrowed in Spanish as Discourse Markers in Mayan Languages. *Anthropological Linguistics* 29(4): 507-521.

Clyne, Michael. 2003. *Dynamics of Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De Rooij, V.A. 2000. French Discourse Markers in Shaba Swahili Conversations. *The International Journal of Bilingualism*, 4: 447 – 467.

Fuller, Janet. 2001. The Principle of Pragmatic Detachability in Borrowing: English-origin Discourse Markers in Pennsylvania German. *Linguistics* 39: 351-369.

Fuller, Janet. 2003. The Influence of Speaker Roles on Discourse Marker Use. *Journal of Pragmatics* 35: 23-45.

Gumperz, J. and E. Hernández-Chaves. 1971. Bilingualism, Bidialectalism, and Classroom Interaction. In A. Dil, ed., *Language in Social Groups: Essays by John J. Gumperz*, 311-339. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Hentschel, Elke. 1986. *Funktion und Geschichte deutscher Partikeln: Ja, Doch, Halt und Eben*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Hentschel, Elke, and Harald Weydt. 1989. Wortartenprobleme bei Partikeln. In H. Weydt, ed., *Sprechen mit Partikeln*, 3-18. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Jucker, Andreas. 1993. The discourse marker *well*: A relevance-theoretical account. *Journal of Pragmatics* 19: 435-452.

König, Ekkehard. 1991. *The Meaning of Focus Particles*. London/New York: Routledge.

Maschler, Y. 1998. On the transition from code-switching to a mixed code. In P. Auer, ed., *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, 125-149. New York: Routledge.

Matras, Y. 1998. Utterance Modifiers and Universals of Grammatical Borrowing. *Linguistics* 36: 281-331.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Östman, Jan-Ola. 1981. *You Know: A Discourse Functional Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Raith, Joachim. 1992. Dialect mixing and/or code convergence: Pennsylvania German? In K. Burridge and W. Enninger, eds., *Diachronic Studies on the Languages of the Anabaptists*, 152-165. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Salmons, Joe. 1990. Bilingual Discourse Marking: Code Switching, Borrowing, and Convergence in Some German-American Dialects. *Linguistics* 28: 453 – 480.

Serra, C.O. 1998. Discourse connectives in bilingual conversation: the case of an emerging Italian-French mixed code. In P. Auer, ed., *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*, 101-122. New York: Routledge.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schourup, L. 1985. *Common Discourse Particles in English Conversation*. New York: Garland.

Schourup, L. 1999. Tutorial overview: discourse markers. *Lingua* 107: 227-265.

Texas German Dialect Archive. 2005. [http://www.tgdp.org].

Trudgill, Peter. 2004. *New-Dialect Formation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weydt, Harald. 1969. *Abtönungspartikel. Die deutschen Modalwörter und ihre französischen Entsprechungen.* Bad Homburg.

Weydt, Harald., Theo Harden, Elke Hentschel, and Dietmar Rösler. 1983. *Kleine Deutsche Partikellehre.* Stuttgart: Ernst Klett Verlag.

Weydt, Harald. 1989. *Sprechen mit Partikeln.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Woolford, E. 1983. Bilingual Code-switching and Syntactic Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14(3): 520-536.

Hans C. Boas and Hunter Weilbacher
Department of Germanic Studies
The University of Texas at Austin
1 University Station, C3300
Austin, TX 78712-0304, U.S.A.

hcb@mail.utexas.edu
weilbacher@mail.utexas.edu