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Introduction

This paper deals with the development of linguistic markers of changing concepts of ethnicity in one particular branch of the Anabaptists, i.e. the Swiss Brethren and their successors in parts of Europe and in North America.

Broadly speaking, "ethnicity" is here seen as an open set of traits such as shared and distinctive values, common ancestry, a collective consciousness and a self-perception as being different from others, "all of which are implied in 'a sense of peoplehood'" (cf. Rose 1988: 168). For the purposes of this preliminary sketch we resort to Fishman's definition who uses the term "ethnicity" to denote "a bond (self-perceived and/or ascribed by others, with or without objective justification) to a historically continuous authenticity collectivity" (1983: 128). In order to illustrate what ethnicity means and does in collectivities in which ethnicity is a salient focus of perception, the passages following Fishman's definition are helpful.

Thus, ethnicity assists individuals in coping with the existential question of "Who am I?" and "What is special about me?" by contextualizing these questions in terms of putative ancestral origins and characteristics. These questions are therefore illuminated in terms of "Who are my own kind of people?" and "What is special about us?" and come to be answered at the level of peopleness being (biological continuity and, therefore, triumph over death), peopleness doing (behavioral fealty even in the course of behavioral change) and peopleness knowing (i.e. ethnicity includes not only native philosophy but historiosophy and cosmology: a Weltanschauung or world view). (1983: 128)

Ethnicity is thus co-terminous with the awareness of membership in, and affiliation with an ethnos, the awareness of which is based on a sense of sharing those traits in and through which a given ethnos constructs its identity and its history.

In order to become socially effective the imperceptible awareness of membership in, and affiliation with an ethnos must be projected in perceptible signals. It is true that the sense of ethnicity can be (unintentionally) signified and/or (intentionally) communicated by any perceptible behavior that is subject to cultural constraints such as eating habits, clothing customs, hair and beard styles as well as modes of transportation. All these signaling systems permit the projection of some modicum of ethnicity. The specific design features of human language (Hockett 1960a, 1960b; Hockett and Altman 1968; Thorpe 1972) make linguistic performance the prime medium (also) for the projection of ethnicity. No other signaling system has the design feature of displacement which permits, for example, reference to absent phenomena (such as the past) and the construction of abstract configurations such as cosmologies. No other signaling system has a combinatory mechanism that permits the production of indefinitely long texts which may be extensive reports of ethnicity or folk tales of ethnic origins (cf. Beck 1990), for example. Conversely, even the smallest segment of the speech chain or an intonation contour suffice to evoke - in an all or nothing fashion - the full set of ethnic attributes in the mind of the hearer (Giles et al. 1973; Giles 1973), irrespective of whether the speaker intends to communicate (i.e. to "give") his ethnic identity or whether he (unintentionally) signifies and thus "gives-off" (Goffman 1959: 14-16) his identity, even against his intention. The following quote formulates this view succinctly.
In language however we are offered, by the society we enter, and we offer to others, a very overt symbolization of ourselves and our universe, not only in the various grammars and lexicons and prosodies we can create for various domains of that universe, but also through the social marking which each occasion of use carries. Language is not only the focal centre of our acts of identity; it also consists of metaphors, and our focussing of it is around such metaphors or symbols. The notion that words refer to or denote 'things' in 'the real world' is very widely upheld, but quite misplaced; they are used with reference to concepts in the mind of the user; these symbols are the means by which we define ourselves and others (Le Page and Tabouret-Keller 1985: 248).

In Goffman's terms, whenever people interact they convey not only the content of their message, but also an image of their "selves" (1959) by a combination of nonverbal and above all verbal means including both linguistic items and ways of speaking.

On the basis of these assumptions and definitions this paper seeks to reconstruct the development of linguistic markers of changing Anabaptist profiles of ethnicity from the Zurich of 1525 to present-day North America. Since the earlier markers of Anabaptist ethnicity have attracted less attention than the more recent ones, the former will here receive broader treatment. The conclusion will suggest some principles of change in the realm of ethnicity marking which may apply to more than just the one case under examination in this paper.

1. Linguistic Markers of Peoplehood during the Founding Phase

According to Giles "one important source of variance existing between different ethnic groups contexts is the baseline linguistic repertoires of the groups concerned" (1979: 253). However, during the founding phase of the Swiss Täufer [Baptists] movement in the Zurich of the fifteen-twenties, the Täufer did not - and could not - have a distinct linguistic repertoire. The "Brüderliche Vereinigung" of 1527 - better known as the "Schleitheim Confession of Faith" - codified the distinct value system of the Täufer movement (nonresistence, nonconformity with the world, adult baptism preceded by the experience of conversion) and marks the transition from the territorial people's Church (ecclesia) to the small free church (ecclesiola) and thus the retreat into a particular and separate brotherhood of believers. From a Mennonite perspective Redekop concluded in 1984 that in points three and four of the Schleitheim Confession of 1527 "the peoplehood idea is implied" (Redekop 1984: 133). Redekop supports his assessment by quoting from another Mennonite author: "To us then the command of the Lord is clear when he calls upon us to be separated from evil and thus will be our God and we shall be his sons and daughters" (Wenger 1947: 209). Friedmann (1963) catches this idea of Anabaptist peoplehood in the doctrine of the two kingdoms which coexist side by side in this world. Ever since its founding phase the Täufer movement [Ms existed in a theology-based dual-value situation, i.e. a dionisia-situation.

The earliest ethnicity profile of the Täufer can be described by slightly modifying the definition of ethnicity which Rose gives for Mennonite ethnicity. The definition that best fits for the early Täufer is one that is exclusive ly based on value disensus (that is, the pursuit of major values not shared by others) plus an in-group ideology of shared values and beliefs and a collective consciousness through which purposive actions are possible. This ideology, which is encompassed in Anabaptist theology and differentiates them from other Christians, includes a belief in personal responsibility that participants translate as discipleship; freedom of conscience or conscientious objection to war; adult baptism and the individual responsibility and choice therein implied; and practical piety that manifests itself in mutual aid, stewardship and a simple
lifestyle. Thus the identity of the early Anabaptists - their ethnicity - is exclusively defined by ideas and ideology (cf. Rose 1988: 169).

In more general terms, we have an early case of what Gumperz and Gumperz-Cook - with reference to Glazer and Moynihan's *Beyond the Melting Pot* (1975) - call "new ethnicity" that is based on differences which distinguish one newly-emerging group from another. New ethnicity depends upon a process of reactive group formation whereby a group reasserts selectively certain historically established, yet neglected distinctions within the common polity shared with the other groups. Individuals build upon residual elements of shared culture to revive common sentiment upon which to found ethnically based interest groups. Ethnic identity thus becomes a means of eliciting political and social support in the pursuit of goals which are defined within the terms of reference established by the society at large. Because of the complex communicative environment in which individuals must exist, the cohesiveness of the new ethnic groups cannot rest on co-residence in geographically bounded or internally homogeneous communities (Gumperz and GumperzCook 1982: 5-6). All of the values which constitute the ethnicity profile of the emerging Täufer ethnos are values of early Christianity which had been lost or deemphasized in the course of church history. Their foregrounding in the emerging Täufer thought created the dinomia situation.

During the founding phase this dinomia-situation was not reflected in distinct linguistic repertoires of the two kingdoms. The leaders of the traditional spiritual forces as well as of both the Zwinglian reformers and its radical wing, i.e. the (proto-)Anabaptists were highly educated theologians and humanists with a thorough knowledge of Latin, Greek and Hebrew (cf. Horsch 1950: 30-33). Conrad Grebel, for example, spent one year (1514) at the University of Basel, three years at the University of Vienna (1515-1518) and two more years at the University of Paris. "Altogether he spent six years in the best universities of his time, receiving a thorough training in humanistic studies and becoming a master of Latin and Greek" (Bender/Smith 1976: 26). Part of Grebel's correspondence with Dr. von Watt (Vadianus) of St. Gall - his brother-in-law - was in Latin. Balthasar Hubmaier, who played an outstanding role in the so-called Second Disputation of October 1523 in Zurich, was a doctor of theology. Felix Mantz, the first Anabaptist martyr (d. 1527) also had a university education. Michael Sattler, who supposedly drafted the Schleitheim Confession, was a former prior of a monastery in the Black Forest and he knew the Scriptures in the original languages (cf. Bender/Smith 1976: 26-29). Clasen (1965: 145) states that up to 1528 there were at least 40 intellectuals in the Täufer communities in Switzerland. Furthermore, various documents show that in the 1540s a discussion of doctrinal principles between Täufer from Saloniki and a "schweitzer Gemein" in Pausrom/ Moravia was conducted in Latin (cf. Kadelbach 1971: 36-38). From the sources it is not clear whether Latin served as a *lingua franca* or whether it was selected as the appropriate language for the traditional disputatio of theological issues. Thus not only the leaders of the ecclesia, but also of the ecclesiola can be assumed to have used Latin plus "oberlendisch deutsch" on formal occasions, certainly in the written mode. The Zurich Bible, also called the Froshauer Bible, of 1536 (first 1524) attests to the use of a distinct variant of German on formal occasions, as do contemporary letters, tracts, pamphlets and the records of the City of Zurich. Since the middle of the thirteenth century German had begun to replace Latin in legal documents, and the cities of Zurich and Basel had taken the lead of this development (cf. Lötscher 1983: 52). Furthermore, it can be assumed that in the oral discourse of informal situations a vernacular prevailed among the Täufer and their Reformed neighbors. Since the contemporary writings against the Täufer - as for example those of Zwingli and Bullinger which accuse the Täufer of all kinds of differences, for
example in dress - do not mention any linguistic distinctness of the group on the level of language systems, one may - in an argumentum e silentio - conclude that the Täufer shared their linguistic repertoire with that of their neighbors as described by Studer (1981). The cultural and linguistic situation of this phase of the Täufer movement can - with some confidence - be hypothesized as suggested in table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Situation</th>
<th>Linguistic Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>+Diglossia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Dinomia</td>
<td>varieties shared between our and their group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+Multilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of our and their educated elites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latin, (Greek, Hebrew)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper German / Schwytzerdytsch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>+Bilingualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Biculturalism</td>
<td>of our and their average member:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upper German / Schwytzerdytsch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to values, the Täufer and the mainstream culture were distinct, yet they shared one identical linguistic repertoire. Their shared repertoire reflected the educational stratification of that society as a whole, but it did not distinguish the brotherhood-ethnos from mainstream culture. The brotherhood-ethnos was a representative cross-section of the society as a whole (cf. Kreider 1953), and its linguistic repertoire mirrored that of mainstream culture. In order to distinguish this linguistic repertoire from the one which was to emerge in the course of the migration of the Täufer to other language areas, we will call the above pattern a pattern of stratificational diglossia which reflects the educational strata of one social body rather than the cultural differences of majority and minority co-existing in the same social body.

This indistinctive pattern of stratificational diglossia does, however, not mean that the Täufer did not act out their knowledge of peoplehood, or, more precisely, their knowledge of a religious brotherhood in and through linguistic means altogether. A good deal of evidence shows that even in seemingly homogeneous speech communities people use linguistic means in order to locate themselves in multidimensional social space. The early Täufer were no exception. Their group membership was not mediated through a distinct linguistic repertoire, but rather through a distinct speaking system. In this respect we will seek to provide descriptive evidence for a position taken by Hymes.

My contention is that people who enact different cultures do to some extent experience different communicative systems, but not merely the same natural communicative condition with different customs affixed. Cultural values are in part constitutive of linguistic reality. (Hymes 1966: 166)
The validity of this contention becomes clearest on the level of performative speech acts. Central doctrinal points of the Täufer belief system such as adult baptism and the rejection of oaths modified traditional performative speech acts and established distinctive variants of these acts. The total rejection of any oaths as formulated in article seven of the Schleitheim Confession ("... Christus, der die volkummenheit des gesatz leer t, der verbüt den synen alles schweren ... Sichend zu, darumb ist alles schweren verbotten..." (Jenny 1951: 12)) deleted this performative speech act from the speaking economy of the Täuffer. In terms of semiotics, it created a significant zero-sign which contrasted with the performative speech act of mainstream culture. In terms of pragmatics, the significant absence of this speech act had dire perlocutionary consequences. In a society which required oaths of allegiance to the temporal lords every year, the Täufer disqualified themselves from the status of full citizens and from all offices requiring the taking of an oath. Social boundaries began to emerge.

While the rejection of oaths excluded the Täufer from the political community, the replacement of infant baptism by adult baptism excluded them from the religious community. The rejection of the doctrine of the original sin permitted the postponement of baptism to later years; the idea that baptism had to be preceded by the deliberate separation from a worldly life and the concomitant declaration for a deliberate renewal of life necessitated the postponement of baptism to adulthood. Again, the Schleitheim Confession of 1527 formulates this doctrine and sets it as the felicity condition of this performative speech act: "Der touff so[ll] geben werden allen denen, so gelehrt sind die buß und endrung des lebens und glouben in der warheit, das ire sünd durch Christum hin weg genommen sigent, und allen denen, so wollen wandlen in der ufferstannung Jesu Christi" (Jenny 1951: 10). In regard to the theory of speech acts it should be noted that the performative act of baptizing (into the Name of the Lord) is here separated from the act of performative nomination. Nomination takes place right after birth, while baptism into the faith takes place during adulthood as a fully-fledged rite of passage - which Zwingli had already postulated. Again, the perlocutionary consequences were exclusion, now from the territorial church.

In the present context it is worthy of note that membership in the ethnos as understood at that time, i.e. the religious brotherhood of believers, was an acquired status exclusively. It was acquired by the demonstration of a godly life, the explicit rejection of worldly life and by the declared intention of sealing the transition to a new life by deliberately applying for and by accepting baptism into the religious brotherhood.

The acquired membership in the religious brotherhood and the boundary between the brotherhood and the rest of the world were acted out linguistically not only in the domain of ritual, but also in everyday life, and that in various ways. Apparently the ways of speaking in non-ritual and non-ceremonial domains of life were soon distinctive enough to make speaking an identity badge of the Täufer. Sebastian Franck's *Chronica of 1536* makes the separatist motivation of their distinct speaking rules explicit. "Etliche gerathen dahin/dz sy nichts mit den Heyden gemein woellen haben/ ... Und haben wie die münche regel in essen/trincken/schweigen/reden/kleyderen" (1536/1969: CXCIIB). These (unidentified) normative regulations appear to have had their analogs on the plane of speaking behavior, at least in the beginning of the seventeenth century. Bossert summarizes the 1608 report of a priest from Göppingen as follows: "Dann etliche Jahre hernach sei ein Bote aus Östereich gekommen, den er für keinen Wiedertäufer gehalten habe, denn weder Kleider noch Rede seien wiedertäufisch gewesen" (Bossert 1930/1971: 806). Since this messenger later turned out to be a Täufer (cf. Clasen 1965: 86), we seem to be dealing with the attempt of a Täufer at passing for somebody
else (Goffman), an understandable communicative strategy at times of persecution. In any case, both documents attest in a general way to the existence of distinctive rules and ways of speaking among the Täufer.

Other documents reveal the material differences between the mainstream and the Täufer system of speaking. A particularly sensitive realm for choosing between speaking and silence - the two linguistic phenomena mentioned by Sebastian Franck (cf. above) - is the initial face-to-face contact. With few exceptions (cf. e.g. Basso 1972; Hymes 1966) all cultures have rules for either uttering some routinized formula with greeting function (or some gesture, or both) and thus promote the co-present to a social with, or for remaining silent and thus leave alter in the status of a co-present who is (also) denied access to talk and interaction generally. The so-called "Zürich Kinderzucht" of 1539 (first printed by Eust. Froschauer in Zürich; cf. Weiß 1933) shows that offering a greeting was the expected behavior when coming face-to-face. Also the fact that the deletion of any tokens of acknowledgement of alter as a with is worth topicalizing and attests to the existence of such expectations. With regard to the Täufer, Johannes Keßler notes in his Sabbata written between 1519 and 1539:

Derglichen woltend sy niemat mer, der in begegnet oder wohin sy wandlend, grutzzen nach grutzend lassen, sunder schlichend hin mit beschlossnem mund; vermeintend, diwil sy undüchtig und onkreftig zu allen dingen und das, so sy wünschend, nit fergen noch geben kundend, wellend sy on grutz und gewünscht lassen; es möcht villicht einer am ainen guten tag wünschen, Gott welt im villicht den nit gonnen, so könne er den im nit geben; sam christenliche liebe nit so gescheffig sy: was sy (nit) mit worten und werken nach mit vermügen lassen mag, begere und wünsche doch von dem geben werden und verlangt, der sy gnug mächtig und gwaltig ist; sam Paulus in sinen briefen im anfang und end kaines grutz.ends beflissen hab, der och weder gnad nach frid fergen mocht, begert aber von Gott dem vatter und unserm hailand Jesu Christo verlichen werden. (Fast 1973: 617)

Keßler explains the deletion of the greeting formulae by the Täufer in two ways. The first reason relates to the fact that the act of greeting very often takes the (surface) form of a wish (with a first person subject). Whereas one might take this as an instance of an indirect speech act - which "says" one thing while it "does" another- the Täufer take the literalism-stance. If the fulfillment of the (surface) wish is beyond the power of the speaker, and potentially against the will of God, the use of the formulae violates the sincerity condition. To speak the truth is, however, a supreme value, and where one cannot speak the truth, one must not speak at all. The insistence on the sincerity of greetings is confirmed, from an insider-perspective, in Peter Riedemann's (d. 1556) Rechenschaft, an early Hutterer defense of their variant of the Täufer faith.

Es soll aber des Herrn Gruß nicht allein mit den Lippen und leicht-fertigem Herzen gegeben werden, sondern mit ganz völligem Herzen und im festen (Glauben und mit solchem Vertrauen, daß Gott gewiß solche Worte und guten Wunsch erstatten werde, Mark. 13; Luk. 12; ja also als ob es Gott selbst durch ihn redet. Das Andre aber soll es auch wiederum in solchem Vertrauen und herzlichem Begehren aufnehmen, so wird Gott, der Herr das Gedeihen geben, und solchen Gruß und Wunsch (daß der Herr mit ihnen sei) erstatten, Richt. 6; Matth. 28, und ihnen allezeit bewohnen, daß ihnen auch solcher Gruß (wie der Gruß Maria der Elisabeth) zu Freuden geraten wird. Wo es aber mit leichtfertigem Herzen oder Unaufmerken geschiehet, da ist es Sünde, Luk. 1; 2. (Riedemann 1988: 118)

This insistence on the sincerity condition is particularly important in social bodies which reject oaths and in which simple statements are the strongest acceptable form of assertions. The
use of such formulae violates, second, the principle of humility; its use is a sign of arrogance or pride insofar as it interferes with the will of God (cf. Bauman 1983 with regard to seventeenth-century Quakers).

Beside these religious motivations of deleting greetings the social effects of such behavior are worthy of note. In cultures whose rules of speaking require that the act of greeting be expressed in some form, the deletion of any perceptible form in that slot is marked behavior. It is a significant zero-signifier given bald-on-record with the pragmatic force of ‘impoliteness’. Clasen, for example, states for 1540: "Der Heilbronner Wiedertäufer Endris Wertz, z. B. danke plötzlich nicht mehr, wenn ihm jemand auf der Straße einen seligen Morgen oder Abend wünschte" (Clasen 1965: 84). This Täufer adopted a new pattern insofar as he ceased to return a greeting. Not to return a greeting, i.e. withholding the second-pair part of a strict adjacency pair, is marked behavior. In the case of withholding the expected 'normal' second part of a greeting pair, the behavioral zero threatens the other's face and comes close to an overt insult. The behavioral zero is responding with an insult to what may have been intended as a friendly acknowledgement of a co-present as a social "with". In his "Geschichte der Straßburgischen Wiedertäufer in den Jahren 1527 bis 1543" Röhrich quotes the sixteenth-century Alsatian Knight Eckard zum Trübel as follows: "Die Täufer vermeinen ihre Heiligkeit in Den vor der Welt zu beweisen, daß sie Niemand grüßen, danken und wie stettige Ochsen in aller Unfreundlichkeit gegen andere menschliche Creaturen Gottes leben" (Röhrich 1860: 9). In this respect, Bauman's analysis of the greeting practices of the seventeenth century Quakers (1983: 44-46) also applies to the sixteenth century Täufer. Bauman notes that the Quakers' refusal to use formulae such as "good morning", "good evening", etc. was seen as a serious lack of civil courtesy. Furthermore, he adduces seventeenth century evidence for their refusal to exchange any greeting formulae at all: "... they will go or ride by them as though they were dumb, or as though they were beasts rather than men, not affording a salutation, or resalutation though themselves saluted" (Higginson 1653: 28; quoted from Bauman 1983: 44). The general analyses of greeting behaviors which Bauman adduces for the Quaker case also apply to the early Täufer:

Greetings and salutations are part of the social duty of fully socialized people; to fail to use them is the mark of someone not fully human, either lacking the ability to speak at all or a beast. They are also ceremonial acts (Goffman 1967: 54), conventionalized means of communication by which an individual expresses his own character and conveys his appreciation of the other participants in the situation. To refuse to greet someone, especially someone who has offered a greeting first, is not only to mark oneself as unsocialized, but a lack of social regard for the other person, a serious face-threatening act (Brown and Levinson) in a society and a period in which much emphasis was placed on elaborate etiquette. (Wildeblood and Brinson 1965: 177) (Bauman 1983: 44-45)

While those arguments interpret the deletion of greetings within the framework of the normative institution of social etiquette, closer scrutiny of deleted greetings may reveal their religious motivation and their effect for acting out ethnicity conceived of in terms of the religious brotherhood. A large set of historical documents shows that the Täufer did not delete greetings in general (as one may assume on the basis of the above quotes) but that they rather applied greetings selectively. Some alters are not greeted and remain thus in the status of co-presents, while others are greeted and thus promoted to social withs (cf. below when forms of address are discussed). In his Sabbata Keßler states:
Es warend etliche von den ersten widergetouf ten, die nit mit so vil manungen befleckt, sunder hieltend an den artikeln allain, die sy von dem Cunradt Grebel erlernet. Die grutzend och kainen unwiedergetouften; aber nit u(3 ietz erzeltem grund, sunder wie Joannes in **siner epistel leret**; dann sy uns für unglobile haiden hieltend; woltend sich mit irem grutzen unserer sünden nicht teilhaftig machen. (Fast 1973: 617)

The spiritual basis of this rule of speaking is the Second Letter of John 10: "If any one comes to you and does not bring this doctrine, do not receive him into the house or give him any greeting; for he who greets him shares his wicked work." In his account concerning the separation of the Täufer from the world, which the Schaffhausen Täufer Martin Weninger (called Lincki) wrote (before 1535), we find a paraphrase of this Biblical position: "Wer nit die ler Christi bringt, den nehmend nit ze huß und grutzend inn nit (2. Jo. 1: 10 f.). Wer inn gruetzt, hatt gmainschaft mit sinen bösen wercken" (Fast 1973: 111). Riedemann, a Hutterer "Vorsteher" (d. 1556), also restricts the exchange of greetings:

Grüßen ist an ihm selber Gutes wünschen, datum man denen allen, so des Guten begehren, auch Gutes wünschen soll. So nun in der Kirche ein Glied derselbigen zum andern kommt, soll es ihm auch den guten Wunsch, die holdselige Gabe, Luk. 1; Matth. 10; Luk. 10; Joh. 14, den Frieden des Herrn, den Christus hier gelassen und gegeben hat, anbieten, denn also lehret er auch seine Ringer Wo ihr in ein Haus kommt, so spricht: Der Friede sei mit euch. Ist jemand darinnen euch gemäß so wird sich euer Friede wieder zu euch wenden. Aus diesen Worten lernen wir, daß der so grüßet und der so gegrüßet wird beide des Friedens Kinder sein müssen, soll anders Gott das Gedeihen geben. Denn welcher dem Evangelium nicht gemäß ist oder zu sein von Herzen begehret, da kann der Friede Christi nicht haften. (Riedemann 1988: 117-118)

What is interpreted as impoliteness with reference to the norms of social etiquette can be explained as a religion-based, meaningful enactment of the theme of separation of the religious brotherhood from the rest of the world. Peter Riedemann's "Rechenschaft" is an exposition and a defense (of the Hutterer variant) of the Täufer faith. Martin Weninger's "Rechenschaft" is thematically focused on the separation of the two kingdoms, and one of the instruments of doing separation is "not greeting" outsiders. To be regarded as impolite is the social price to be paid for living up to one's faith. The scriptural rule of speaking provides for the socially effective communication of the doctrine of the two kingdoms in a frequent everyday situation. It has, furthermore, the perlocutionary effect of a) preventing the opening of an interaction across the boundary of the brotherhood ethnos, and of b) creating a social gap between 'us' and 'them' generally.

Further documents show that this selective greeting pattern was not limited to the particular type of Täufer in Appenzell, to whom Keßler refers in the above quote. In his Chronica of 1536 Sebastian Franck states with regard to the Täufer: "Wer aber jr er Sect nit war / den gruelthen sy kaum / boten auch dem sein handt / ..." (Franck 1536/1969: CXCIIY). Laurenz Boshart's chronicle of 1529 to 1532 contains the following description of the Täufer: "Sy ... reden mit nimant und gruetzend kein, der nit ir sect ist..." (Fast 1973: 714). This document topicalizes not only the deletion of the greeting formulae, but also its discursive consequences, i.e. the abstention from any verbal interaction. This is more than Article Four of the Schleitheim Confession had set as a norm. While there we find an itemized list of prohibited kinds of interaction, this document maintains the general abstention from verbal interaction with anybody outside the brotherhood.
The assumption that greetings were applied selectively to members of the brotherhood is supported by the wealth of documented greeting formulae (plus their second-pair parts) for brotherhood-internal use. In this respect we have to present evidence which appears to be in conflict with a document and its interpretation presented further above. It was argued that the Täufer refused to use greetings which have the surface form of wishes. In the light of the following data, we will have to modify this statement. If one goes by Neff (1937) and Clasen (1965: 85), the Täufer appear to have developed and canonized distinct and elaborate greeting formulae (in the surface form of wishes and adjacency pairs) for group-internal interaction. Neff notes that the formulae (pairs) served the mutual identification of the Täufer, and were even meant to serve this purpose. While the regional variation is considerable, the format of the wish is a prototypical characteristic (cf. table 2, p. 36).

The last pair appears to be the most widely used, whereas the others had rather local or areal currency. The widespread use of formulae topicalizing the wish of God's peace is also attested in a report of the inquest of Nikolaus Guldin in 1529: "Sie haben kain warzeichen, dabi si ainander kennen, sondern si wunschen ainander den friden gots" (Fast 1973: 439).

It is interesting to note that article eleven of the Straßburg church discipline (Ordnung) of 1568 sets a norm for greeting behavior. It reads as follows:

> Ein Bruder oder Schwester soll je eins das andere empfangen mit dem Kuss des Herrn, die aber nicht aufgenommen sind, die soll ein Bruder oder Schwester nicht mit dem Kuss empfangen, sondern sagen, der komme dir ru Huelfe. (Bender 1927: 61)

Both the holy kiss and the verbal formula are alloforms of the act of greeting, and both fulfill the function of establishing some social relationship. However, the complementary distribution of the alloforms over membership categories makes a distinction in the relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Pair Part</th>
<th>Second Pair Part</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Gott grüße dich in dem Herrn&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Ich danke dir in dem Herrn&quot;</td>
<td>Franconia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(after doffing the hat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Lieber christlicher Bruder&quot;</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Northern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thuringia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(with a handshake and a hug)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Der Friede des Herrn sei mit dir!&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Amen&quot;/&quot;Das sei wahr&quot; (then: handshake plus kiss of peace)</td>
<td>Friesland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Der Friede des Herrn sei mit dir!&quot;</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Der Friede Gottes sei mit dir!&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Das muß Amen sein&quot;</td>
<td>Friesland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Die Gnade des Herrn sei mit uns&quot;</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Neckar valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Got gries dich, bruder im hem&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Danck dir got, mein bruder im herm&quot;</td>
<td>Augsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Got sei mit mir&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Der fried sei mit uns&quot;</td>
<td>Augsburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Greeting formulae in group-internal use
which obtains between ego and alter, i.e. religious peers vs. non-peers. Furthermore, it can be claimed that the verbal formula "Der Herr komme dir zu Huelfe" also has meaning beyond the mere social meaning: it is a wish which is directed at the seeker who needs God's help in finding her/his way into the true church.

At this point two conflicting kinds of documentary evidence of the greeting patterns of the early Täufer require attention. First, the wealth of the greeting formulae used for group-internal purposes conflicts with the sweeping statement (of some documents) that the Täufer did not at all participate in the then extant greeting patterns. Second, the fact that the greeting formulae (as well as the leave-taking formulae not topicalized here) have the prototypical surface-forms of wishes appears to conflict with Keßler's assessment that the Täufer refrained from greetings for this very reason. Let us take the second issue first. Closer scrutiny reveals that the Täufer greeting formulae taking the surface form of a wish do not have the propositional format of 'I wish you x', but 'May God grant you x'. The decanonization of the traditional wish format of the greeting and the apparent re-canonization of a new wish format reflected and enacted in everyday life the theological distinctness between the brotherhood and "them" out there. Second, the dual pattern of refraining from greeting when meeting outsiders and of using a wealth of greeting formulae in group-internal interaction is associated with the dual function of greetings. Here we follow Bauman's argumentation in regard to seventeenth-century Quakers. 1) Greetings are instances of phatic communion insofar as they are almost devoid of referential meaning and have only the pragmatic force of raising spatial co-presents to the status of social withs. 2) They have the function of opening access to talk. "It follows naturally that if one has not real need to talk to another person, greetings are to that extent rendered unnecessary..." (Bauman 1983: 45). We suggest that the conflicting statements concerning the use and the non-use of greetings can be reconciled when one considers them as motivated in their complementary) distribution over meeting Täufer and outsiders, respectively. With regard to outsiders, both the phatic and the talk-opening function of greetings are dysfunctional:

not only are they redundant, but they are even in conflict with the value system of the Täufer. On the other hand, greeting other Täufer is not only functional within the conversational machinery, but it is even mandatory in view of the value system. Greetings are confirmations of
the intra- and intergroup encounters is another mode of acting out the themes of `strengthening the true church, i.e. the body of Christ' on the one hand, and of `separation from the world' on the other. This boundary marking of the particular religious ethnos by a selective application of (any) greeting is supported by the prototypical format of invoking god's grace in group-internal interaction and the particular formulation used when applied to outsiders "Der Herr komme dir zu Huelfe".

Before we leave the linguistic marking of ethnicity through greeting patterns we will dwell for a moment on one document which provides explicit insights into the early concept of Täufer ethnicity. The specific ethnic profile of the Täufer in the sixteenth century becomes clear from the description of the opening of an encounter of 1578: "Meinen (halb)bruder Sebastian hab ich auch bei dem brauhaus angetroffen, der mir aber, wie auch der Christmann (whom the chronicler had met before; W.E.) die hand nit geben wollen. Seine erste worte waren: ich sei ein falscher prophet; darumb dörf er mir die hand nicht bieten." (Bossert 1930/1971: 1107). While the refusal to shake hands is stated and explained, the absence of a verbal greeting must be inferred from the statement "seine erste worte waren...". Thus without a verbal greeting or its non-verbal analog of a handshake and without a mitigating preface Stephan Gerlach's half-brother Sebastian opens the encounter with the hearer-costly statement that Stephan (the addressee) is a false prophet and that any signifiers of a relationship must be avoided, because they are no brethren in faith. Taken together with other evidence presented above, this document grants insight into both conversational strategies and the ethnicity concept of the early Täufer. First, in intergroup communication bald-on-record contributions appear to supersede off-record ones. The former threaten both the negative face (the need to be left alone) and the positive face (the need to be approved by others) of the outside interactant. Here conversational directness appears to be preferred to indirectness. Broadly speaking, impoliteness is used as a boundary marker of the ethnos. The document shows, second, that religious ties supersede blood relationship. In the present context this underlines that initially peoplehood was exclusively defined on the basis of the deliberately acquired status of membership in the religious brotherhood. Complementarily, ascribed statuses of kinship were explicitly excluded from the defining criteria of ethnicity. The basic questions of "Who are my kind of people?" and "What is special about us?" were answered in terms of religious brotherhood with membership exclusively based on adult baptism and confession of faith.

Before we follow up the development of different profiles of ethnicity, we must dwell on other markers of the earliest profile of ethnicity. Of all, we will focus on forms of address, because they reflect almost exclusively the relationship obtaining between speaker and hearer. Pragmatics and conversational analysis have taught us that the interactional partners do not function as individual speakers and hearers, but as incumbents of social positions and roles of their respective social worlds. The relationships to in-group and to out-group interactants, respectively, are therefore likely to be marked by alternative choices of address-forms, which choices thus become linguistic boundary markers of an ethnos.

The background against which the address system of sixteenth century Täufer may be put into profile is provided by Metcalf (1938: 11-63). At the beginning of the sixteenth century abstractive honorifics or designatory markers such as Majestät, Gnade, Liebde as well as Ihr were in use among the highest ranks of society; for polite address, Ihr was given to, and received by the nobility and the upper middle class (including the artisans) except where honorifics were in use. Du was exchanged by persons of the lowest ranks, but also among intimate friends, even among the highest classes. Furthermore, Du remained the sole means of addressing supernatural
beings; but Du was also used to express anger or contempt (cf. Brown and Gilman 1960: 274-276 for the "thou of contempt"). During the century the frequent use of Ihr caused it to lose its value for polite address so that it began to give way to a nominal construction with Herr and a third person plural form Sie. The Zurich book of etiquette of 1539 quoted above (p. 30), Trümpy (1963: 158-159) as well as many contemporary documents (cf. Fast 1973) support the validity of Metcalf's findings also for Switzerland.

In the following we will, first, compare the actual choices among the nominal and pronominal options as reflected in letters in order to show how each letter writer used the address system in order to locate himself in social space. This comparison will, at the same time, show the emergence of addresseeorial ethnicity markers among the Täufer. The first example is a letter of Stefan Zeller, Landvogt at Adelfingen to the City of Zurich (dated 28 February 1535). It illustrates the addressorial extremes to which an inferior might resort when writing to his superior. Both, addressor and addressees belong to mainstream authorities.

\textit{Fromen, vesten, fursichtigen, ersamen, wyßen herrn, sunders günstig, genedig, lieb herren, uver wyßheit sye min underthänig Ghorsam, willig dienst und, was ich eeren und gut vermag, nach schuldigen pflichten allezit bereit zu vor. Gnedigen lieben heren ... Ever wyßheit gib ich hiermit in underthänigkeit zu erkennen, das... (Fast 1973: 77)}

The above complimentary opening has its formal analog in the equally complimentary closing. Deictically, the use of Du would be inappropriate, because Zeller addresses more than one person. The use of Ihr would be appropriate deictically, but it is avoided throughout the letter, probably because Ihr, when used to address more than one person, is the form which is used to address both, inferiors and close equals as well as distant superiors. Zeller avoids this ambiguity by resorting to what Metcalf calls "abstractions" incorporated into the sentence structure: \textit{Euer wyßheit gib ich hiermit...} Social propriety dictates, and the inferior's motivation to fulfill the superior's expectation of tokens of positive face-work suggests both the selection of the most deferential options and the accumulation of honorific attributes and titles in the opening of letters to superiors in the (mainstream) power network. At first sight, a letter written by the Täufer leader Felix Mantz to the Council of Zürich written in December 1524 follows the same pattern. We will select only those passages from a modern German version which are relevant for the discussion of locating oneself in social space through choices of address forms.

\textit{Weise, fürsorgende, gnädige, liebe Herren und Brüder! Eure Weisheit wissen wohl, daß viele ungewöhnliche Gepräche stattgefunden haben ... Da man mich nun (wenn auch ohne Grund) so einschätzt, halte ich es für notig, Euch, meinen gnädigen, lieben Herrn, Rechenschaft ... zu geben. ... Zum folgenden will ich Eure Weisheit ... gebeten haben: Bitte hört ohne Ansehen der Person...; ermeßt wohl, was da angeführt ist, und laßt Euch die kurze Zeit nicht leid sein! ... Deshalb will ich Eure Weisheit freundlich und auf das allerdringlichste gebeten haben: Bitte nehmt mein Schreiben im besten Sinne auf.... Ich mochte Eure Weisheit auch ermahnt haben, daß Ihr Euch an den Streit über die Götzen erinnert ... Ich möchte Eure Weisheit auch daran erinnert haben, daß ... Deshalb möchte ich aufs fleißigste gebeten haben: bitte besudelt Eure Hände nicht mit unschuldigem Blut}
und meint, Ihr tut Gott einen Dienst, wenn Ihr einige tötet oder verjagt...
Ich möchte Eure Weisheit auch um folgendes gebeten haben. (Fast 1962: 28-35)

In the opening address Mantz uses unintegrated designatory markers, but unlike Zeller in the preceding letter, he does not accumulate them to the extreme; the difference is one of degree, not of kind. In a letter to the authorities, the term Brüder seems unusual. Fast (1962: 28) takes the use of this term as an indicator of the fact that at that time Mantz acknowledged the later persecutors of the Täufer still as brethren, although Zwingli and the Täufer had been drifting apart since the October disputation of 1523. Thus the initial address reflects Mantz's dual relationship to his addressees: citizen to magistrates in the power network vs. brother to brethren in the solidarity network. In the body of the letter he uses both, abstractions integrated into the sentence structure ("Eure Weisheit wissen wohl ... Ich möchte Eure Weisheit auch um folgendes gebeten haben") and Ihr, also in oblique cases and implicitly, as in the imperative nehmt. While the former expresses deference owed to superiors, the latter - when used to address more than one person - is neutral with regard to power and solidarity. In comparison with the Zeller letter (which does not contain any token of Ihr), the alternation between deferential and neutral forms of address indicates that Mantz is thoroughly aware of his dual, and probably ambiguous relationship with the addressees. His address forms locate him in just this double-faced position between the two (emerging) social worlds.

The famous letter from Konrad Grebel (and associates) to Thomas Müntzer of September 5, 1524 indicates the general direction in which the Täufer forms of address were to develop in the intra-group network.

Dem wahrhaftigen und getrüwen deß evangelli Tome Müntzer zu Altstett am Hartz, unserem getrüwen und lieben mitbruder in Christo etc.
Frid, gnad und barmhertzikeit von Gott unßerem vatter und Jesu Christo unserem herren sy mit unß allen, Amen. Lieber bruder Toman, laß dich umb Gotz willen nit wunderen, daß wir dich ansprechend on Titel und wie ein bruder ursachend hinfür mit unß zehandlen durch gschrift, und daß wir ungeforderet und die unbekant habend gedörfen ein gmeinkünftig gsprech ufrichten. (Franz 1968: 437)

In a period, in which the address systems was characterized by "a gradual but constant tendency to veer off farther and farther from the familiar form Du: first to the second person plural (in addressing one person), next to the third person singular, finally to the third person plural" (Silverberg 1940: 510), Grebel moves in the opposite direction. He addresses Müntzer without title and with Du, although they had never met before. The comment (on the meta-level) shows that Grebel and associates are aware of the expectations which they violate: laß dich umb gotz willen nit wunderen, daß wir dich ansprechend on Titel und wie ein bruder. Throughout the letter Grebel and associates use consistently tokens of TU (du, dich, din; implicit TU in finite verb-forms such as wellist, berichte, lere) in order to address Müntzer. Ihr forms occur only where Grebel et al. address more than one person, i.e. Müntzer and Karlstadt. Throughout the letter there is not one token of deferential Ihr or of any "abstractions". Thus this letter is not only the earliest summarizing statement of doctrinal points of the Swiss Täufer (who reject some of Müntzer's views), but at the same time the letter documents the emergent marking of the emergent brotherhood ethnos through an invariant Du for singular address. How radical this
innovative use of the invariant _Du_ for singular address inside the religious brotherhood was becomes clearer by its contrast to the maintenance of the traditional address forms between brothers-in-law. The same Conrad Grebel who on 4 September 1524 addresses Müntzer, his (half-) brother in faith with _Du_, on 23 November and on 15 December of the same year 1524 addresses his brother-in-law (Vadian) with honorific _Ihr_ and title:

> Min schwagerlichen grutz zwar. lieber herr doctor, wüssend mir üwer brief.... So ir aber nut vernommen hettind ... will ich üch schriben.... (Muralt/Schmid 1952:28-29)

> Lieber herr doctor und schwager, daß ir mich gebetten hand, kond ich nit leisten... (Muralt;'schmid 1952: 29)

Both letters use _ir/üwer_, i.e. tokens of VOUS consistently. Thus while religious ties came to be signaled by solidary _TU_ (and significantly absent honorifics), certain family ties continued to be reflected in polite VOUS plus honorifics. Not only in addressed written communication (personal letters, corporate epistles etc.), but also in group-internal face-to-face encounters tokens of pronominal _TU_ appear to have been the rule. The list of greeting-formulae (cf. above) attests to that. Clasen (1965: 87; Jacobs 1899: 484-485, 505) confirms the view that TV forms were the unmarked option of intergroup pronominal address. Outsiders perceived this usage as so marked that it roused their suspicion:

> Die Stuttgarter Regierung wurde schon argwöhnisch, als man ihr meldete, daß die Täufer einander duzten und Schwester und Brüder nannten. (Clasen 1965: 111)

This quote shows that the nominal equivalent of pronominal _Du_ in the _Täufer_ intra-group network was _bruder/schwester_. An abundance of documentary evidence from, for example, Sebastian Franck's Chronica (die Täufer hießen einander Brüder), Wappler (1913: 396, 399, cf. below), Nicoladoni (1893: 224), Jacobs (1899: 484-485, 504-505) gives credence to Clasen's generalization: "Die Täufer selbst redeten sich nach ihrer Bekehrung nur noch als Brüder und Schwesten an" (1965: 84). This standard form of address appears to be optionally followed by the qualifier "im Herrn", as in the opening and concluding addresses which frame the "Schleitheim Confession": _brüder und schwester, Lieben brüder und schwestern, Lieben brüder und schwestern im Herrn ; Lieben brüder_ (cf. Jenny 1951). The qualifier explicitly selects the subsense 'related in faith' of the otherwise polysemous _bruder/schwester_, i.e. `sibling' versus `related in faith'. Since all of the above addresses are co-referential, the qualifier-free form must be referential-semantically compatible with the qualified address. As in the case of the selective greeting behavior, we are again made aware of the fact that during the founding phase the ethnicity of the _Täufer_ was based on shared beliefs alone, and that to the explicit exclusion of the criterion of relationship in blood. The perceptual foregrounding of faith before family is evidenced in the records on the arrest of _Täufer_ Orlamünde in Thuringia on 21 November 1535: "Als sie nun gefenglichen vorfast, hat der muller Hans Poßker zu seinem weibe geredt und sie schwester geheißen.... hinwidder inen das weib bruder geheissen" (Wappler 1913: 399). The same tendency is repeated a few pages later. "(Martha...) saget, Gott hat sie underweist, das sie sich zu den brudern halden sollte, welche auch den vatern einen brudern und der vater sie
widderumb eine schwester genannte" (Wappler 1913: 399). If the definition of ethnicity in terms of faith - and not in terms of family ties - needed a confirmation which also reflects the bald-on-record conversational strategies the document contains one:

Item sie wollen von iren freuntschaften und blutsfreunden nichts hoeren, sagen, sic haben auf erden keine freundschaft, begeren nicht irer hulf noch rat, weniger irer vorbitt, und sunderlich ist der wechter einer des mullers Hansen Poißkers gefatter, der inen im gefenknus gefatter geheißen, der er geantwort, er wußte von seiner gefatterschaft gar nichts, er were des teufels gefatter. (Wappler 1913: 399)

Further distinct rules of speaking could be discussed as linguistic ethnicity markers during the ethnogenesis of the Täufer cosmos. Limitations of space, however, prevent discussing the function of rules for the topicalization of speech content in general or constraints on identifiable speech acts (such as slander, libel, derision (cf. Jacobs 1899: 485), litigation, talking-back, etc.) as linguistic markers of emergent "new ethnicity". In view of the growing importance of speaking rules in the Täufer cosmos, the pertinent documents deserve further attention in separate studies as for example Dietrich Philip's Enchiridion or Hand Book (repr. 1978; first 1569), Johann Arndt's Paradies Cartlein (first 1612) or the anonymos Lust=Gdrlein Frommer Seelen (repr. 1970; first c. 1770), which on pages 219-241 anticipates the core content of Grice's maxims of quantity, quality, relation and manner (cf. Enninger et. al. 1989: 162-165). Instead, section 1 has exclusively focused on rules of greeting and address in their function of ethnicity marking, and has not even covered this realm exhaustively. The 'thou' of contempt as for example documented in Muralt/Schmid (1952: 39), Bossert (1930/1971: 1050), Clasen (1965: 104) deserves attention also in regard to its role in (aggressive) boundary marking of the emergent ethnos. As a more recent study of the variable use of one address system by two co-territorial Mennonite groups (Howell and Klasen 1971) shows, ways of addressing are worthy objects of research beyond the ethnogenesis of the Täufer cosmos.

This and the fact that rules and ways of speaking have been continually topicalized in the doctrinal writings of the Täufer leads us to assume that distinct conversational strategies have continued to play a role in the linguistic marking of Täufer ethnicity beyond the founding phases. Instead of following up pertinent leads we will in the following focus on other linguistic markers of ethnicity.

2. Linguistic Markers of Peoplehood during the Post-Foundation Phases

Section 1 dealt (selectively) with the emergent linguistic marking of peoplehood, of "new ethnicity" during the ethnogenesis of the Täufer. The following section will deal with concepts of peoplehood and their linguistic marking in the post-foundation phases. The end point of what is meant by "post-foundation phases" is clearly the present - which includes also the migration to other language areas. The consequences of this migration for the linguistic marking of ethnicity are here disregarded and will be treated in section 3. Instead, we will here focus on an additional component in the concept of ethnicity and its linguistic marking, both of which are independent of migration to other language areas. Admittedly, the weak point of the following section is the exact point in time at which the new concept of ethnicity began to take shape. Only for the sake of convenience the year 1550 is suggested, because by that time harassment and persecution had
forced the originally aggressively proselytizing urban movement to withdraw to a quietist rural movement which turned inward on itself.

As was repeatedly stated in section 1, the dissensus was initially based on religious values exclusively. From the studies of religious-based schisms it is well-known that sometimes the differentiation, though at first defined in religious terms, broadens to include a whole way of life (cf. Petersen 1980: 241). This is particularly likely to happen, if the central doctrinal positions are to be lived out in life - as is the case in the existential Christianity of the Täufer (cf. Friedmann 1973: 31). In such a context membership can no longer be based exclusively on the acceptance of a closed list of doctrinal points in baptism, but also (or rather) on an ethnic sentiment which can only be absorbed in an extended socialization process within both the family and the closely-knit social network in which like-minded people interact frequently or even regularly. The group's separate religious past is reinforced in the present by physical-geographic proximity as well as occupational, political, friendship and familial ties. Such a group is likely to turn inward, and encourage or even enjoin endogamy as a boundary-protecting instrument. These considerations account for the inclusion of common ancestry and endogamy into most definitions of ethnicity: "... and common ancestry or place of origin ... Endogamy is usual" (De Vos 1975: 9). With the exception of a shared and distinctive linguistic past, we are here faced with the ensemble of components which are, as a rule, considered to constitute ethnicity, or - more precisely - "old ethnicity" (cf. Gumperz and Gumperz-Cook 1982: 5). In the case of the Täufer this turning inward did not only develop from internal motivations but it was at the same time enforced by outside powers. They were first forbidden to proselytize, then complied with the pertinent legislation, and ultimately some (conservative) branches canonized non-proselytizing as one of their norms. In due course, the brotherhood became co-extensive with a kinship-network and a new concept of ethnicity emerged. In analogy to Rose (1988: 168 who, in turn, refers to Francis 1955: 25) one can say: Within a few generations the Täufer passed from an exclusively religious brotherhood based on adult baptism and confession of faith to a society identified additionally by characteristics of descent and shared cultural traits. This means to say that the primary locus of identification remains the system of Täufer beliefs, but that the medium of their transmission, i.e. parentage/ancestors develops into a second locus of identification. In such a cultural context exogamy is likely to be considered an indicator of assimilation into the dominant culture and "marriage out" might endanger the unbroken transmission of the Täufer belief system to the following generations. In fact, endogamy has remained the rule, - as one can infer from two linguistic markers of ethnicity alone. To the extent in which the proselytizing outreach receded the Täufer ecclesiola became almost coextensive with an endogamous race. Family names attest to that. Hard-core linguists may hesitate to include onomastics into their discipline, because the semantics of the various kinds of names (family names, first names, nick-names; Enninger 1985a) gives them a particular status among words which makes them peripheral to the language system. On the other hand, it is equally clear that names do not only identify individuals, but that they - given their inherited status or their anchoring in traditional first-naming patterns - are markers of ethnicity that cannot very well be assigned to non-verbal markers of ethnicity. Above all family names reflect a group's distinctiveness and they should therefore be included into the (verbal) vehicles of ethnicity (cf. Epstein 1978: X).

The fact that among the 85,000 Amish in 1980 there were only 126 different family names attests to the prevalence of endogamy. Only "forty-three names (33 per cent) are American in origin and represent converts to the Amish faith, but they constitute a small
proportion of the population. At the present time, 18 of the 43 names represent only single households" (Hostetler 1980: 241). In analogous fashion, thorough demographic analysis of one specific Old Order Amish settlement revealed that 1,304 persons living in or born to the 170 families with Old Order Amish household heads had only 20 different family names (Enninger and Wandt 1980). In the present context this means that the second criterion of ethnicity, i.e. kinship and endogamy, is saliently reflected in family names.

While the clustering of family names in a narrow segment of the onomastic potential reflects the biological effects of conceptualizing the religious brotherhood also in terms of an historically continuous and endogamous kinship network (Pennsylvania German: die Freindschaft), the preoccupation of later successors of the Swiss Täufer with genealogies indicates the deliberate attempt to answer the ethnicity questions of Who are my kind of people? What is special about us? (also) at the level of biological continuity. Again, while hard-core linguists would clearly exclude genealogies from their field, our definition of "linguistic markers" of ethnicity is broad enough to include this text-linguistic genre. Its inclusion is even warranted because it helps to distinguish the construction of historical continuity within the concepts of new versus old ethnicity. New ethnicity, we suggest, constructed historical continuity exclusively in religious terms, i.e. in the Nachfolge Christi (the discipleship of Christ): Braght's Martyrs' Mirror (1660) reflects this view:

Gleich wie man zweierlei Volk, zweierlei Versammlungen und Kitchen findet, die eine aus Gott und vom Himmel, die andere aus dem Satan und von der Erde, so findet man auch zweifache Nachfolge und Fortpflanzung derselben. (Braght 1973: 19)

In the transition from new to old ethnicity biological continuity was fore-grounded - and reflected in a small cluster of family names and the salience of family histories among all text types produced by the Täufer descendents. The case may serve to support and to modify Hansen's "deliberately overdrawn" hypothesis of "third-generation nationalism" and its markers. The hypothesis suggests a three-generation typology of ethnic marking, in which the third generation wants to remember their roots, which the second generation - caught in the strange dualism of being a native of foreign extraction - wanted to disremember. Hansen suggests that after approximately 60 years - that is, two generations - the immigrant population makes organized efforts to revive specific elements of its root culture (cf. Petersen 1980: 239). Among the successors of the Swiss Täufer revival efforts did not focus on Swissness or Germanness, but rather on the history of the brotherhood and its transmitters, i.e. the largely endogamous chain of procreation. To what extent the rise of genealogies fits Hansen's 60 years and three-generation cycle remains to be seen. It seems as if the genealogical interest among the Täufer-successors was due to a postponed search for roots - much like the ethnic revival in the US in the seventies and in present-day Europe. As Springer (1972) shows, genealogies and family histories became a major concern in the wider Mennonite world in America during the nineteenth century. The first books appeared in 1858. "From 1870 to the present there has been a continuous growth in American Mennonite genealogical publications with an early peak in the 1890's and a slight recession during the 1930s" (Springer 1972: 457). Springer's analysis of the genre brings to light that the distribution of such hooks over Mennonites in the wider sense on the one hand, and the Old Order Amish on the other varies with time. The increase in the number of American genealogies published between 1952 and 1972 can be attributed largely to the Old Order Amish
(and the Russian Mennonites). In August 1982 no fewer than 460 Old Order Amish genealogies had appeared (Luthy 1982; personal communication). This reflects the present-day concern of the more traditional segments with 'old ethnicity' at a time when more liberal Anabaptist groups have reverted to the original 'new ethnicity' (cf. section 3.2). Together with the absence of other widely produced historical studies by the population at large, this can be taken as an indicator of the fact that in the historical thought of the Täufer successors the procreational chain has been fore-grounded against the implicitly understood and taken-for-granted background of the meanwhile diversified religious brotherhood. Today, there is hardly an issue of the culture-internal papers that does not advertise a (new) family history and/or that does not solicit and publish genealogical information. Also, in oral discourse, genealogy has been "the Mennonite game", as one Mennonite aptly put it. (For further details on doing ethnicity "through specific genres", cf. Enninger 1986b, 1988.) It should be noted, that constructing historical continuity at the level of family history makes sense in a group with extreme horizontal mobility: one's own procreational chain is the most stable historical dimension.

In concluding this section it should be noted that the additional component of the Täufer concept of ethnicity, i.e. the unbroken procreational chain leaves immediate linguistic traces only in onomastics and in the genre of genealogies - and thus those markers should not be omitted, even if they are marginal linguistic phenomena. Since an unbroken procreational chain favors language maintenance, maintained languages may be considered as secondary markers of endogamy. They may become particularly salient markers of ethnicity in general after migration to other language areas where they may become a component of a linguistic repertoire not shared with mainstream society. These questions will be addressed in section 3.

3. Linguistic Markers of Peoplehood during the Migration to Other Language Areas

The social distance between in-group and out-group - at first only actively sought - was as of 1527 increased by severe persecution by state and church. This persecution, later abating to harassment, lasted for almost 200 years. The early migrations were mostly the result of this persecution. Since then most branches of the Täufer movement - even the agrarian branches - have been horizontally mobile groups.

For centuries many of their branches have been in continual transit from one region to another, from one state to the next, and from one language area to another. These migrations created the language-contact situations in which the inherited varieties could and, in fact, did become the most salient linguistic ethnicity markers. It is in these language-contact situations that the basic tenet of Giles unfolds its full heuristic value, namely that "one of the important sources of variance existing between different ethnic group contexts is the baseline linguistic repertoires of the groups concerned" (1979: 253). Giles proposed three types of adjustment strategies leading to different situations: language choice situation, accommodation situation, and assimilation situation (1979: 255). He furthermore suggested four typical ethnolinguistic profiles emerging in language-contact situations: a) monolingualism in the ingroup language, b) monolingualism in the outgroup language, c) bilingualism in the in- and outgroup languages, and d) bilingualism in the ingroup language and a lingua franca. Of these concepts, four are particularly helpful in the description of linguistic ethnicity marking across the Täufer-spectrum through history: linguistic accommodation resulting in bilingualism in the in- and outgroup languages and linguistic assimilation leading (ultimately) to monolingualism in the outgroup language.
Before we discuss these in turn we hasten to add that the above terms stand for prototypes with fuzzy edges rather than for strict categories with clear boundaries.

3.1 Linguistic Accommodation: Diglossic Bilingualism in the Ingroup and the Outgroup Languages

In language-contact situations the assimilative and the isolative forces obtaining within a given ethnos (cf. Kloss 1966) can produce quite different ethno-linguistic profiles and quite different timings of language transitions to the ultimate *terminus ad quem* predicted by the majority of ethnolinguists, i.e. monolingualism in the outgroup language. Thus it comes as no surprise that the particularly strong isolative motivations of some Täufer branches should even today, i.e. sometimes after several hundreds of years of migration through other language areas, exhibit a distinct bilingualism and sometimes even a trilingualism pattern supported by diglossia. Examples are: 1) Täufer-congregations in the francophone Swiss Jura that have maintained their Bernese dialect. 2) The German-speaking Mennonite communities in Paraguay, Uruguay, Belize and Mexico in Spanish-speaking areas, and in Portuguese-speaking Brazil. 3) The Hutterer Bruderhöfe in the US and Canada. 4) The Old Order Amish in the US and Canada. 5) The Old Order Mennonites in the US.

In order to provide a comparison with the largely hypothetical ethnolinguistic profile of the sixteenth-century Zürich presented in table 1 we will here give the linguistic profile of the Old Order Amish (OOA) settlement in Kent County, Delaware, which is representative of most OOA settlements, except those stemming from nineteenth-century immigration from the Switzerland, from the Pays de Montbeliard and Alsace. In those areas (high-) alemannic dialects close to the Bernese dialect takes the place of Pennsylvania German in table 3. Note that AHG stands for Amish High German and AE stands for American English. Note also that this example of linguistic accommodation contains a reflection of linguistic assimilation: "In a single generation in the Palatinate the Zurich and Bernese Anabaptists had completely adopted the speech of the new land" (Gratz. and Geiser 1973: 671). In the context of the above quote this means that the immigrants gave up their Zürich and Bernese dialects for the Palatinate dialect, which later was to serve as the basis of present-day Pennsylvania German.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Situation</th>
<th>Linguistic Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>+Dinomia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ours</td>
<td>theirs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>values</td>
<td>AHG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identity</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prestige</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theirs</td>
<td>PG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identity</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prestige</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their</td>
<td>AE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identity</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prestige</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 reveals that the transit from Switzerland, Alsace and various parts of Germany to America was accompanied by a) the maintenance of Amish High German and the substitution of Pennsylvania German for Schwytzer dytscb and by b) the complementary association of the components of the linguistic repertoire with "our" and "their" values: AHG is associated with high prestige and high identity, PG is associated with low prestige and high identity values. The
latter means that - in contrast to the original Zürich situation, the terminus a quo - the dinomia-
situation is paralleled by or reflected in, a linguistic repertoire which, insofar as it is not shared
with mainstream society, is distinctive of the minority. Both situations are depictable in terms of
diglossia and bilingualism; but whereas in the original situation the plus and minus distinctions
operated on the vertical dimensions or "our" and "their" elite vs. "our" and "their" average
person, they now operate on the horizontal dimension of "us" versus "them": "we" share "their"
variety AE, but "they" do not share "our" varieties AHG and PG. The table thus suggests that in
the transit from Europe to the language-contact situation in America the linguistic repertoire of
the Täufer, which was indistinguishable from that of mainstream culture, "transited" to the non-
shared and distinct ethnolinguistic profile of the OOA today (for further details, cf. Enninger
1986c).

With regard to the signaling of identities in speech this diglossic pattern implies:

1. In the intra-group interaction network `old ethnicity' is signaled by the use of one of the
inherited varieties, either the low-prestige plus high-identity variety of PG, or the high-prestige
plus high-identity variety of AHG in their respective domains.

Two comments are appropriate here: On the part of the speaker, the use of these varieties
is not equivalent with "free choice", insofar as the speaker is subject to the norms of
appropriateness. Therefore, it would not be correct to say that the speaker intentionally
communicates `old ethnicity'. We would rather say that - in following the conventionalized rules
of appropriate variety-use - s/he is socially obliged to signify the societally important `old
ethnicity'. The other point to be mentioned is that the heavy borrowing from AE into PG, as well
as the interference from PG in AHG, and the borrowing from AE into AHG do not endanger the
signification of `old ethnicity' as long as the varieties are perceived as distinct and identified as
their" versus "our" varieties.

2. In the intergroup network the use of AE is again not a question of deliberate choice, but one of
communicative necessity. After all, AE is, as a rule, the only variety shared with group-external
interactants. The fact that AE is used signals the accommodative attitudes to mainstream society
and the co-operativeness with mainstream interactants in secondary roles of power. The way in
which it is used, signifies `old ethnicity' through a minimal amount of learner interferences from
L1 (PG) on L2 (AE) (cf. Enninger et al. 1985). The order in which the components of the L2
(AE) are affected by interferences from L1 (PG) is - as can be expected - the inverse of the order
in which the components of L1 (PG) are affected by borrowing from L2 (AE) (cf. Thomason
1986).

In speech, the AE lexicon of the OOA is not marked by learner interference from PG, i.e.
their speech contains no lexemes which are not also contained in the speech of their socially
comparable territorial monolinguals. Switches to PG words or phrases are no evidence to the
contrary. However, a questionnaire based on Kurath (1949) revealed a preference for originally
German lexemes which have become established areally as AE words by substratum
interference/borrowing, if such items co-exist with indigenous AE options. Thus they prefer
smear case over cottage cheese, thick milk over clabber/clabber milk, sheep buck over ram,
cloak over setting hen, den/over den over loft. The same preference applies for options with a
cognate in PG/HG as in pancake over hotcake, and options which are morphologically
transparent to Pennsylvania Germans: frying pan ( < brotpann) rather than skillet. However,
since the preferred items are also (dispreferred) options in the AE speech of AE monolinguals,
their preferred use by the OOA can be interpreted as a hardly noticeable, and therefore weak marker of 'old ethnicity'.

In view of the well-documented intralingual grammatical ethnicity markers in Black English (cf. Giles 1979: 262-263) the question arises, whether or not the marking of ethnicity is any stronger on the level of morpho-syntax. On this level fourteen types of deviation from the school book-sanctioned norms of AE were found by the Essen Delaware Amish Project Team (EDAPT): 1) loss of plural marker, 2) "those" is replaced by "them", 3) past participle is replaced by preterite, 4) preterite marker is deleted, 5) present perfect and past perfect "have"/"had" are deleted, 6) absence of subject-verb concord, 7) negation after negated verb, 8) negation after/before "hardly", 9) adverb is replaced by adjective, 10) non-standard prepositions, 11) deletion of article, 12.1) deletion of relative pronoun, 12.2) relative pronoun is replaced by "what", 13) deletion of genitive "of", 14) non-standard insertion of "yet", "make", "get". However, a comparison with socially comparable monolingual speakers of AE reveals that - with the exception of type 14 - their speech exhibits the same types of morpho-syntactical deviation from the school-book norm. Thus the morpho-syntactical component reflects areal features (Bynon 1977: 244) or even national features associated with informal registers or less educated speech styles rather than markers of old ethnicity.

On the level of phonology the EDAPT search for ethnicity markers among the OOA of Kent County, Delaware was more successful. On this level the following peculiarities could be observed: sometimes loss of final /r/ and loss of sonority in final [ b, d, g ]; more frequently [ dʒ] was replaced by [tʃ], [ei] by [e:], [n] by [n] or [ɔ], and final [i] by [ɪ], [n], or [ɛ]. None of these features occurred regularly, but rather at a level of low relative frequency; furthermore, these features were not evenly distributed across the OOA population but clustered rather with a few individuals. Given the insistence on "good English" in the OOA parochial schools (which are English language schools and not geared toward the maintenance of the ethnic varieties, cf. Enninger 1985b), and given the fact that a systematic contrastive analysis of PG (L1) and AE (L2) predicts the above peculiarities, we regard them as cases of interference, and thus as instances of (unintentionally) communicating and thus of asserting 'old ethnicity'.

A matched-guise test (reading a text) supported the descriptive results insofar as the informant judgements indicated a slight, but not a straight-forward tendency to identify OOA on the basis of pronunciation alone. What the linguistically naive listeners perceived as the most salient cue for ethnic categorization was an undetermined intuition about "their strange melody", but not so much for segmental units. This is in accordance with the pertinent literature (such as Gumperz; Taylor and Simard; von Rafler-Engel; Lass, Mertz and Kimmel; Dickens and Sawyer; Wächtler). The quality of the tapes, unfortunately, prevented a descriptive analysis like the one which Huffines did in her pioneer work for the less conservative Pennsylvania Germans.

Summary: In general, the above linguistic findings for the Kent County, Delaware OOA confirmed the earlier results of Raith (1981a, 1981b) for Lancaster County, PA and of Huffines (1980a, 1984a, 1984b, 1984c, 1984d, 1986) for various counties of Pennsylvania. In the language-contact situation of the US (and Canada) these fairly conservative descendants of the Täufer have opted for the accommodation paradigm. They signal 'old ethnicity' predominantly through the continued use of two German-based varieties group-internally, rather than through the way in which they use the outgroup variety AE in intergroup encounters, as Huffines had noted before. (Note that all written communication is in English. For ethnicity markers in written texts, cf. Enninger 1984, 1986b, 1987, Enninger et al. 1985.)
3.2 Linguistic Assimilation: towards Monolingualism in the Outgroup Language

In many cases, the transit of the Täufer to other language areas was accompanied by a fast or slow language shift so that the linguistic repertoires of minority and mainstream culture have become, or are becoming, identical. Examples of this linguistic assimilation are: 1) The Zurich and Bernese Täufer in the Palatinate who shifted to the Palatinate dialect within one generation (cf. above). 2) The Dutch to German shift by Anabaptist-Mennonite refugees from Holland settling in Emden, Krefeld, Hamburg, Lübeck, and later in Danzig, Elbing, Königsberg and Graudenz. The transition from Dutch monolingualism through Dutch-German bilingualism to German monolingualism was completed everywhere but in Emden by the end of the nineteenth century (cf. Bender 1973a: 291). 3) The German to English shift by the 18th century Mennonite immigrants from Switzerland and the Palatinate (including subsequent settlements in Ontario, Virginia, and Ohio) and by the immigrants from Switzerland, Alsace, and Southern Germany to the area west of the Allegheny Mountains as far as Illinois. Both groups completed their shift to English monolingualism largely in the second half of the 19th century (cf. Bender 1973a: 291). In all these cases the ultimate terminus ad quem of the immigrant repertoire, namely monolingualism in the language of the country of destination, was reached in a complete linguistic assimilation. In a few other cases this shift has been almost completed, such as in the French (speaking) Pays de Montbéliard (formerly part of the Duchy of Württemberg) where only the oldest generation is still bilingual. The same applies to the Les Bulles and the Pruntrut/Porrentruy congregations in the francophone Swiss Jura (Gratz and Geiser 1973: 671) and the Mennonite enclaves west of the (earlier) French-German language-border following the ridge of the Vosges south across the Sundgau to Biel/Bienne in Switzerland (cf. This 1888; Sommer 1913). Today, the Birkenhof/Altkirch congregation in Southern Alsace supplies simultaneous translations into French for the sake of the younger generations, if the service is held in German - and vice versa. For a close-up picture of the language transition in Kansas, cf. Buchheit 1982. Below we will discuss the case of the more liberal Täufer descendants in Pennsylvania, who are at various points of the transition continuum between bilingualism and monolingualism.

In many cases the linguistic assimilation to the out-group language caused serious friction within the Täufer ethnos, because the conservative segments of the groups involved perceived the linguistic assimilation not only as linguistic de-ethnicization, but rather as religious de-ethnicization. They insisted on language maintenance by making claims of higher spiritual values and forfeiture of group principles and even faith in God in the case of the surrender of the mother tongue (cf. Bender 1973a: 291, Buchheit 1982: 111). To the conservative wing, the inherited varieties were not only linguistic markers of ethnicity or instruments of doing ethnicity (by raising the fence against in-marriage and against outsider participation in intra-group domains of interaction), but the inherited varieties came close to being considered as a component of the ethnicity concept itself. Such considerations played a role during the Amish schism between 1850 and 1880 and the Mennonite schisms between 1870 and 1900. Though the language question was not the sole or even the central cause of the ultimate schism, it certainly did play a role. In order to stay with dem alten Gebrauch (the old custom) and in order to strengthen the isolative orientation, the Old Order Amish and the Old Order or Wisler Mennonites opted for the linguistic accommodation paradigm described above - and implicitly for ‘old ethnicity’.
Bender's little article provides at the same time the key for understanding the emergence of a different concept of ethnicity and - in its wake - the emergence of the paradigm of linguistic assimilation in other branches of the Täufer descendants. After isolating the advantages of maintaining inherited languages in other language areas (separation from the surrounding culture, strengthening the sense of nonconformity and internal solidarity), Bender points out a disadvantage: "On the other hand, the language breach has usually prevented a program of active evangelism and outreach..." (Bender 1973a: 290). For ethnicity the evangelistic programs which were started in the 1870s by some Mennonite leaders in the wake of the revival movement in some protestant churches (Bender 1973b; Bender 1973c) caused the opening of the (then endogamous) ethnos to outsiders with a non-Täufer biological, migrational and cultural history. Biological continuity was deemphasized for the sake of re-conceptualizing the ethnos in terms of a religious brotherhood of believers - as during the foundation phase. This re-conceptualization required the readjustment of the so far distinct ethnolinguistic profile to an indistinct one - as it had existed during the foundation phase. After centuries of linguistic separation the return to the original concept of ethnicity necessitated the deliberate linguistic assimilation, which, however, cannot be equated with de-ethnicization. The Emmental Täufer congregations of today (which never moved to other language areas) and the many Mennonite settlements that in other language areas went through linguistic accommodation and linguistic assimilation attest to the fact that ethnicity - if defined exclusively as a religious brotherhood - is independent of using a separate language. After all, religious principles are not language-specific (cf. Buchheit 1982: 112).

However, during the shift toward monolingualism in the outgroup language, intralingual markers in the outgroup language resulting from previous or ongoing language contact may, at least for some generations, carry the linguistic distinctness of the ethnos.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century the speech economy of the Mennonites was roughly identical with that of the Old Order Amish today. During the first quarter of the twentieth century one finds several instances of Mennonite scholarly and professional organizations to maintain the Mennonite speech economy in the status quo. By the thirties, however, such voices were hardly heard any more (cf. Buchheit 1982: 112), and more and more communities started on their way towards a monolingual speech economy, i.e. the more extensive use of English for more purposes with concomitant blurring of the boundaries of the domains for the use of each variety and, ultimately, the exclusive use of the outgroup language AE. In such groups which are at various points of the language shift continuum towards ultimate loss of PG and AHG, the question of what language they use is ethnolinguistically less relevant than the way in which they use the language towards which they are shifting, i.e. AE (cf. Huffines 1986).

With regard to segmental phonology, Raith (1981a and 1981b) reports for his sample from Lancaster County that the more liberal Anabaptist groups betrayed almost all of the segmental interferences in AE which might be predicted by systematic contrastive analysis. This scope contrasted with that of the OOA: 1. initial θ > s (thin), 2. final r > Ø (floor), initial v > w (very), 4. u > o (joke), z > s (bells), 6. initial w > v (want), 7. final v > f (leave), 8. dʒ > tʃ (jug), 9. ei > e: (teenager), 10. θ > ð (σ) (jug), 11. final r before s > Ø (teenagers), 12. final b, d, g > devoiced b, d, g (rib, wood, jug). This is more than just a list, it is rather an implicational hierarchy. Speakers who exhibit interference number one are likely to exhibit also all the higher number interferences. Here it should be remembered that the OOA of Kent County exhibited none of the features one to seven, and that they exhibited none of the higher interferences regularly: interferences eight to ten occurred frequently, and interference twelve occurred only
occasionally (Enninger et al. 1985: 5-7). Similarly, in Raith's interference hierarchy the OOA clearly clustered near the low-interference pole. The reduced participation of the Old Orders, and the ample participation of the nonsectarian Pennsylvania Germans in the interference hierarchy was also found by Huffines (1986). In the present context of ethnicity marking this means that the more liberal Anabaptists and nonsectarian Pennsylvania Germans mark ethnicity in their AE speech more clearly through segmental phonetic interferences than the Old Orders do.

Summary: In the context of linguistic ethnicity markers this means that the replacement of 'old ethnicity' (endogamous brotherhood of believers sharing the same socialization process and thus the cultural and linguistic traditions) by the revived original concept of the brotherhood of believers necessitated the disuse of the separate inherited varieties; in turn, their function as ethnicity markers was taken over by the way in which the mainstream language is used. The interference-laden variant of English used by the ethnos evokes on the part of the member the same kind of solidarity and on the part of the outsider the same kind of social distance as would the use of one of the separate inherited varieties. "Nevertheless, it has been found that the use of an outgroup language, but with a distinctive ethnic accent, does not detract from the speaker's perceived ethnicity in the eyes of others" (Giles 1979: 256-257; cf. Giles 1973; Huffines 1986). In most cases, such ethnicity markers will be cases of unintentional signification (interference), but the member of the ethnos who has an interference-free variant of English at his disposal may choose to use it and thus totally converge on the outsider's speech. However, he may also choose to intentionally communicate and thus to assert his ethnicity by diverging from the outsider's speech. Whereas the former speaker will be located in social space by his interference, the latter speaker can locate himself in social space by selecting among his options. He may try to pass for a mainstream person, or he may assert his ethnic identity.

4. Conclusion
This paper sought to show how the ethnicity concept of the Swiss Täufer and its linguistic markers have changed through four centuries. The 'new ethnicity' emerging in the sixteenth century was exclusively defined by a closed set of religious principles not shared by others. Membership was acquired by the deliberate acceptance of the distinctive ideas. Linguistically, the peoplehood idea was not reflected in a separate language, but it was signaled by distinctive ways of speaking and conversational strategies. Within a few generations this original ethnicity concept was complemented by the ascribed criterion of biological descendance and by an open set of cultural traits absorbed in a socialization process within the kinship/brotherhood network. 'New ethnicity' gave way to 'old ethnicity'. Linguistically the ascribed criterion of biological descendance was reflected in an almost closed list of family names. During the (enforced) migration to other language areas 'old ethnicity' was additionally signaled either through the continued use of inherited languages by the side of the outgroup language and the concomitant linguistic interference in the outgroup language if the ethnos opted for linguistic accommodation, or through heavy interference in the outgroup language during language transition, if linguistic assimilation was the choice. In language contact situations linguistic assimilation is the only choice, if the original peoplehood concept of a brotherhood of believers is maintained or revived, as for example among nineteenth or twentieth century liberal Täufer churches in America for the sake of proselytizing outreach. The revived original ethnicity concept, the reversal to the ethnicity concept of the Reformation, required deemphasizing biological continuity of the
ethnos. Beside the language transition to the out-group language, a widening list of family names can be taken as an indicator of the successful implementation of "revived original ethnicity".

This presentation of linguistic markers of Anabaptist ethnicity deviates from the extant publications on the same subject insofar as it includes ways and rules of speaking among the linguistic ethnicity markers. Most other studies appear to be based on the assumption that ethnicity is marked in speech by the use of a separate language or/and by the use of features of a separate language while speaking the language shared by the ethnos and the mainstream group. This line of thought presupposes that ethnicity is associated with the coexistence of different languages in one polity. Such a view is reductive insofar as it disregards the fact that linguistic ethnicity marking is only a specific aspect of locating oneself in social space through speech. Even in seemingly monolingual "language" communities there may be a variety of "speech" communities in the sense that within the one "language" community there may be social differences with respect to what is deemed appropriate to say and how it is deemed appropriate to say it.

It is sharing of conversational strategies that creates the feeling of satisfaction which accompanies and follows successful conversation: the sense of being understood, being "on the same wave length", belonging, and therefore of sharing identity. Conversely, a lack of congruity in conversational strategies creates the opposite feeling: of dissonance, not being understood, not belonging and therefore of not sharing identity. This is the sense in which conversational style is a major component of what we have come to call ethnicity. (Tannen 1982: 217)

Such considerations are, first, particularly relevant for establishing 'new ethnicity' by an ethnos that emerges within its own polity and which therefore shares its linguistic repertoire with outsiders. While in such a context creating a new and distinct language is unrealistic, the creative use of available linguistic items as ethnic distinguishers is not only feasible, but may also be dictated by the distinct value system of the emergent ethnos. Modified or deleted performative speech acts (adult baptism and the oath, respectively), the substitution of ceremonial events by others (Holy Mass by a congregation meeting (Versammlung, Gemeinde, Gemeiny)), the selective application of greetings, distinct greeting formulae and forms of address, distinct constraints on speech acts (derision, applause, talking back etc.) and topics, the handling of speech versus conversational silence, the handling of conversational (in-)directness etc. can be derived from the distinct value orientations of the Täufer. Such ways and rules of speaking and conversational styles are more readily transformed to linguistic distinguishers of ethnicity in a three phase process. First, the deliberate and systematic deviation from established rules of appropriateness. Second, the de-canonization of the established rules of social appropriateness through continued rule-infringement. Third, the recanonization of one's own continued usage (Hahn 1987: 28; Assmann 1987). It bears repeating that this de- and recanonization of rules of speaking is not only quickly feasible, but also mandatory in view of the innovated value system. Religious value orientations help to constitute rules of speaking, whereas religious value orientations are not associated with or reflected in specific language systems.

Tannen's tenet quoted above is, furthermore, of particular importance during and after the final phases of language shift, - in our case - for example during the linguistic "anglicization" of the less conservative descendants of the Täufer in the United States and Canada, because
"conversational style is more resistant to change than more apparent marks of ethnicity such as retention of the parents' or grandparents' language" (Tannen 1982: 230). Tannen supports her contention by citing Seaman's study of language transition among Greek-Americans (1972: 204) who - though their Greek was "practically extinct" in the third generation and will be "totally extinct" in the fourth generation - may not have lost, or not lost entirely, Greek communicative strategies. Unfortunately, the ways of speaking of the liberal end of the Täufer spectrum are even less explored than those of the conservative wing, as for example the OOA. If "anglicization" is not "de-ethnicization", but rather a system-linguistic reflex of revitalized original ethnicity, the religious value system should be intact and it should have its reflexes in the ways of speaking even after completed "anglicization". Even limited observation of the ways of speaking of so-called liberal Mennonites suggests that this is more than an abductive speculation.