DIALECTS OF THE YIDDISH LANGUAGE

Edited by
DOVID KATZ

Winter Studies in Yiddish

Volume 2

Pergamon Press

in cooperation with the
Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies

DIALECTS OF THE YIDDISH LANGUAGE

Winter Studies in Yiddish Volume 2

Papers from the Second Annual Oxford Winter Symposium in Yiddish Language and Literature, 14–16 December 1986

Editor: Dovid Katz

Wolf Corob Fellow in Yiddish Language and Literature at the Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies and Leslie Paisner Fellow at St Antony's College, Oxford

Published in cooperation with the Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies

LANGUAGE & COMMUNICATION
an interdisciplinary journal

CONTENTS

DIALECTS OF THE YIDDISH LANGUAGE

ORIGINS OF YIDDISH DIALECTOLOGY

DOVID KATZ

I. Introduction

The Rumanian linguist Lazăr Saineanu (1889) and the Austrian philologist Alfred Landau (1896) are justly credited with bringing to Yiddish dialectology the methods and goals of nineteenth century comparative Germanic studies (cf. M. Weinreich, 1940b, p. 103; Katz, 1986b, p. 31). In our own century, Uriel Weinreich (1954) brought the discipline into the forefront of modern theoretical linguistics (cf. Malkiel, 1967; King, 1988). The earliest efforts at Yiddish dialectology, however, are to be found in the legalistic writings of medieval European rabbis. The first conscious Yiddish dialectologist was an eighteenth century convert to Christianity, who earned his living teaching French.

II. Rabbinic scholars

Medieval European rabbis made incidental comments in their Hebrew and Aramaic legal treatises on regional differentiation in Yiddish. Hebrew, Aramaic and Yiddish interacted in a unique situation of internal Jewish trilingualism in the European Jewish civilization known as Ashkenaz (cf. Katz, 1985, p. 98). Yiddish, everybody's native language, was used for men's and women's popular literature. Hebrew, nobody's native language, was used for sociologically 'high' genres (including men's formal correspondence, communal documents, Bible commentaries). Aramaic, likewise nobody's native language, was used for sociologically 'higher' genres still (including Talmudic and Kabbalistic literature).

The rabbis concerned themselves with internal linguistic differentiation in Yiddish where it happened to be relevant to the point of law in question. As it happens, the most frequently commented-upon difference is that between the Yiddish speakers of the Rhineland (= Western Ashkenaz) and those of the more easterly Danube basin settlements (= Eastern Ashkenaz in medieval times; in more recent centuries, both the Rhineland and Danube regions were realigned as Western Ashkenaz vs the *new* Eastern Ashkenaz in the Slavonic and Baltic lands of Eastern Europe; cf. Katz, 1987b, p. 55). The Rhineland westerners, centred in Speyer, Worms and Mainz, merged classical Semitic [ḥ] in the Semitic Component of their Yiddish with plain [h], and were therefore known in older Yiddish folklore as *bney hes* [bnej hɛs] 'the children of *hes*', i.e. those who realize the Yiddish letter *khes* [xɛs] (⟨ classical Hebrew *ḥēθ* = [ḥ]) as *hes* [hɛs], a fictitious letter coined to denote the [h] pronunciation of historical [ḥ]. The historical grapheme for [h] is *hey* [hej] (⟨ classical *hē* = [h]). The Danube easterners, centred in Regensburg, Rothenburg and Nürnberg, had [x] for *khes*, apparently via the merger of [ḥ] with historical [x], itself the phonetic value of *khof* [xɔf] (⟨ classical *xɔf*, a reflex of *kɔf* = [k] via Northwest Semitic postvocalic spirantization). The easterners were therefore known as *bney khes* [bnej xɛs] 'the children of *khes*'. The term apparently derives from a humorous reference to the *bney Khes* (⟨ *bənēj*

Correspondence relating to this paper should be addressed to Dr Dovid Katz, Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, 45 St Giles, Oxford OX1 3LW, U.K.

ḥēθ) 'children of Heth' of Genesis (23:3) who assisted Abraham in his bid to purchase a family burial place following upon Sarah's death. All varieties of modern Yiddish follow the *bney khes,* although a handful of *bney hes* relics, mostly proper names, has survived. The issue of *bney khes* and *bney hes* in earliest Ashkenaz has recently become a focus of discussion on the origins of Yiddish (cf. Katz, 1985, pp. 99–100; 1987b, p. 57). Many of the rabbinic references were first collected and summarized by Güdemann (1888, pp. 75–77; cf. Shtif, 1922, pp. 58–59, 208). Max Weinreich (1958b), in a major study, mapped out the medieval isogloss, confronted the facts with Yiddish evidence and documented a number of intriguing *hes* relics.

The Maharil (= Mahari Segal = Yankev Segal = Mahari Molin = Yankev ben Moyshe Haleyvi Moellin/Molin, c. 1360–1427), in his responsa, deals with a query on the laws of donning the traditional phylacteries (*tfiln*). He remarks on a difference in placing the phylactery strap between *bney Estraykh* 'the children of Austria' and his own people, the *bney hes.* Phonetics are not at issue, but the isogloss had by then come to symbolize two distinct culture areas (Maharil, 1556, p. 6a, section 30 where typography is faulty; see Güdemann, 1888, p. 76 and Satz, 1979, p. 22 for correct reading). Indeed, it seems possible that in the popular dialectology of the day, *bney khes* was used almost interchangeably with *bney Estraykh,* either of which could be used in opposition to *bney hes,* itself sometimes synonymous with *bney Rinus* 'the children of the Rhine'. It is clear from some references, however, that the terms *bney khes* and *bney hes* covered a larger area than their geographic based variants. Zalmen of St Goar, the Maharil's faithful pupil who published a classic work containing his master's explanations and comments on customs, uses the notion *'bney Rinus* and several [additional] lands where *khes* is pronounced like *hey'* (Zalmen of St Goar, 1556, p. 111a; cf. also p. 110b).

The Maharil also dipped into medieval Yiddish social dialectology. The question before him was whether the name of the River Danube, in a writ of divorce, should be spelled with the letter *vov* word-finally (giving *Donou* or *Donau*) or with double *yud* (yielding *Donay*). Zalmen of St Goar recalls the Maharil showing him a writ of divorce written in Austria, in which the name of the river had *vov*. Another, sent from Regensburg to Prague with double *yud* was sent back to Regensburg with the following query: 'I have seen that the great men of Austria would write *Donou*. What shall be written on the writ of divorce you have sent me?' The rabbis of Regensburg returned it, confirming that the local spelling tradition (based on pronunciation?) had double *yud* 'as we have written it'. The Maharil ruled in their favour, on the grounds that 'the Children of Regensburg have a more pure language than the Children of Austria' (Zalmen of St Goar, 1556, p. 89b). The prestige of old of the Yiddish of Regensburg may be related to the role ascribed to that city, by some, in the emergence of Yiddish (cf. Katz, 1985, p. 87; King, 1986, p. 13; Katz 1987b, p. 55).

Isserlin (= Yisroel ben Pesakhye, c.1390–1460) turned to phonetics *per se* in his classic *Terumas hadeshen.* Because Jewish law prescribes that a person's name in a writ of divorce must be written in accordance with the way the person is actually called in everyday life, spelling became an issue in the validity of a document. The question Isserlin cites is: In the lands where *khes* is pronounced as *khof* (i.e. *bney khes*), should *khof* be used in writs of divorce as is done in Austria (on *bney khes* territory) in writing the everyday (i.e. Yiddish) forms of classical Hebrew names, e.g. Yiddish *Mikhl* [mixl] ⟨ classical [mīxɔ2ēl]? Isserlin replied with a traditional rabbinic chain of argument and counterargument, each negating the previous. In that chain, Isserlin, himself an easterner born in Regensburg, notes that

it would *a priori* be preferable to use *khes* which is univalent, always representing the same sound, rather than multivalent *khof* which shares its grapheme with plosive *kof* [kɔf] (⟨ classical *kɔ̄f* = [k]) in unpointed texts. Here Isserlin invokes the one-sound-for-one-symbol argument in orthographic standardization that still prevails in Yiddish spelling. As evidence he cites the (Yiddish) tradition of using univalent *tes* [tɛs] (⟨ classical *ṭēθ* = [ṭ]) for [t], rather than the homophonous multivalent *tof* [tɔf] (⟨ classical *tɔ̄w* = [t]), which shares its grapheme in unpointed texts with *sof* [sɔf] = [s] (⟨ classical *θɔ̄w* = [θ], a reflex of *tɔ̄w* via Northwest Semitic postvocalic spirantization). Isserlin goes on to reject this *prima facie* analogy on the grounds of dialect geography: 'Amongst the children of the Rhine and the other lands where *khes* is similarly pronounced like *hey,* the word would not be read correctly. One should therefore use *khof* so it may be read by all. There is no analogy with *tes* and *tof* for in those cases, by contrast, no mistake would result for any person' (Isserlin, 1519, section 231). The general use of *khof* for [x], which Isserlin lays down, remains standard Yiddish practice to this day, except in the Semitic Component, where etymological *khes* spellings are generally preserved.

A transcribed dialogue between Isserlin and his pupil Yosselin (= Yosef ben Moyshe, c.1423–1490) reveals a tolerance for dialect variation. Yosselin compiled the *Leket yoysher* (MS Cod. München 404/405, dated 1475), which comprises his master's teachings. Yosselin, a native of *bney hes* territory, apparently ran into some difficulties over in *bney khes* country where he studied with Isserlin. He relates that Isserlin told him 'You don't have to pronounce *khes* although it is the custom to do so in our city [Wiener-Neustadt?]' (in J. Freimann, 1904, p. 40). Whatever the exact phonetic situation, this one line may have explosive implications for medieval Yiddish dialectology. It could be inferred (a) that the *khes* poor Yosselin tried to emulate was after all not identical to *khof,* which is assumed to have been retained as [x] universally, and which he would have had in his own *bney hes* inventory, albeit in a different set of lexical items; or (b) that Rhineland *khof* (at least regionally) followed the fate of *khes* (possibly through an intermediate stage of *bney khes*-like merger of *khes* with *khof*) and merged with *hey* giving plain *h* from three historical sources ([ḥ], [x] and [h]). Either possibility presumes the passage refers to phonetic inventory (as assumed by M. Weinreich, 1958b, p. 103). It may just be that the real issue is lexical distribution, i.e. that Yosselin was used to using [h] in *khes* words in accordance with his native *bney hes* dialect, and his master was telling him that he needn't bother realigning *khes* words from *hey* ([h]) to *khof* ([x]).

Elsewhere, Yosselin, like the Maharil, refers to the isogloss in a nonphonetic context, confirming that the phonetic criterion had become an ethnographic shibboleth within old Ashkenaz. Yosselin relates that when the holy day of Yom Kippur fell on a Monday at the beginning of the (lunar) month, Isserlin would say the blessing over the new moon on the preceding Saturday night, so as to have fulfilled an additional commandment before the Day of Judgement (= Yom Kippur). Yosselin recalls Isserlin remarking that such was the practice of the rabbis of the *bney khes,* whereas by contrast, the *bney Rinus* did not wish to bless the moon before the Day of Atonement (in J. Freimann, 1903, p. 70). Analogously, the custom for reciting a certain prayer is ascribed to *medinoys bney khes* 'the lands of the *bney khes*' (in J. Freimann, 1903, p. 159).

The Maharam Mintz (Moyshe ben Yitskhok, fifteenth century), in his responsa, discusses the spelling of the Yiddish female forename *Rekhlin* (modern Yiddish *Rokhale*), a morphological diminutive of *Rokhl* (⟨ classical Hebrew *rɔ̄ḥēl* 'Rachael'). There would be no question of tampering with the classical Hebrew spelling (with *khes*) of the base form

of the name, but diminutivization gives way to a new name that is synchronically YIDDISH. Accuracy in the legal document is paramount, superseding preservation of the sacred Hebrew stem in the orthography. The Maharam Mintz, a native of Mainz ( ) Mintz), himself therefore a Rhineland westerner, writes that he is in doubt because 'in Saxony, where *khes* is read as *khof* [i.e. *bney khes* territory] they read *Rekhlin* with *khof* as they would *Rekhlin* [with *khes*]', the point being that in Saxony preservation of the etymological spelling with *khes* would not lead to mispronunciation. He concludes that 'one should write *Rekhlin* [with *khof*] in our lands as well', apparently to prevent erroneous pronunciation of [h] in a name that had [x] universally. He adds that 'people don't realize that the name derives from *Rokhl'* (Maharam Mintz, 1617, p. 32b, section 19).

The rabbinic contribution, in terms of modern Yiddish dialectology, may be summed up as follows. The rabbis posited an isogloss running north to south somewhere between the Jewish cultural centres of the Rhineland to its west and to the Danube basin to its east. The classificatory feature chosen was the rendition of classical [ḥ] (*khes*), which had merged with [h] (*hey*) in the western dialect region, but was preserved as [x] in the east where it merged with historical [x] (*khof*).

Curiously, the one great Ashkenazic Hebrew grammarian, Elijah Levita, who was also a leading sixteenth century Yiddish poet, seems not to have taken note of the dialectal differentiation which the rabbis before him had so clearly described. In his lexicographic compendium *Tishbi*, Levita derives Yiddish *mɛkn̩* 'erase' from the Hebrew root *mḥq*, explaining that 'they didn't pronounce the *khes,* as is the way of the Ashkenazim' (Levita, 1541, p. [96]). He didn't distinguish two kinds of Ashkenazim. Incidentally, if Levita is correct that *mɛkn̩* results from *khes*-lessness, the derivation demonstrates that *khes* on *bney hes* territory went all the way to Ø in environments where [h] cannot occur. More likely, modern Yiddish *mɛkn̩* isn't a *bney hes* relic at all. It probably just lost its *khes* by way of good old fashioned assimilation to the following velar plosive, i.e. *xk* ⟩ *k*. Cf. the parallel *šɛxtn̩* 'slaughter (ritually)'; **šɛtn̩* does not occur; it could only be reconstructed for the *bney hes* of old. Genuine *bney hes* relics in modern Yiddish are hard to come by (cf. Katz, 1987b, pp. 54–55).

III. Buxtorf's one-liner

Christian scholars, driven by a number of motives, began to research Yiddish in the early sixteenth century. Orientalists in the humanist tradition studied Yiddish as a supplement to Hebrew and Aramaic studies. Missionaries, anti-Semites and writers of business manuals had rather more practical goals in mind. A few scholars, whose point of departure was one of the foregoing, developed an intellectual interest in the language *per se* (cf. Katz, 1986b). On the whole, Christian scholars described features of the local variety of Yiddish with which they were familiar as 'Yiddish' generally, which may or may not be the case for any given feature. Almost never did the earliest Christian Yiddish scholars dip into variation internal to Yiddish. The 'almost' accounts for Johann Buxtorf the Elder (1564–1629), the celebrated professor of Hebrew at Basel, whose *Thesaurus* (Basel 1609) includes a chapter on Yiddish (pp. 648–671) which has earned him the title 'father of Yiddish linguistics' (Borokhov, 1913, p. 4, no. 6; but cf. Katz, 1986b, p. 24). In that chapter, Buxtorf (1609, p. 652), alluded to the distinction between Western Yiddish (largely coterritorial with German), which he regarded as more 'correct' (from the viewpoint of German) and Eastern Yiddish (coterritorial with the Slavonic and Baltic languages). His remark was

echoed by Chrysander (1750, p. 3). Finally, Buxtorf noted (1609, p. 658) that Polish Jews have *ejŋk* for 'you (objective plural/formal)'.

To sum up the progress of Yiddish dialectology through the early seventeenth century: The rabbis documented the existence of two known dialect groups within old Ashkenaz in terms of a phonological isogloss that defined two distinct dialect areas. Both territories lie within what modern Yiddish linguistics calls Western Yiddish. Christian orientalist Buxtorf remarked on the difference between Western and Eastern Yiddish in the modern sense, and cited one word specific to Poland within Eastern Yiddish.

IV. Carl Wilhelm Friedrich

The conscious founder of Yiddish dialectology, as fate would have it, was a Jew turned Christian, Carl Wilhelm Friedrich, whose *Unterricht in der Judensprache, und Schrift. zum Gebrauch für Gelehrte und Ungelehrte* was published in Prenzlau in 1784. The work comprises the customary Privilegium (pp. [i]–[ii]) followed by a dedication to *seiner Excellenz dem hochwohlgebornen Herrn, Herrn Karl Abraham Freyherrn von Zedlitz* (pp. [iii]–[vii]), an introduction (pp. [ix]–[xiv]), a guide to spelling and pronunciation, with titles for addressing people (pp. 1–11), a Yiddish-German dictionary of the Semitic Component (pp. 12–45), numerical values (pp. i–ii in 'Anhang zum Ersten Theil'), months (p. ii), samples of letters (pp. iv–xv), proper Yiddish names (p. xvi), a dialectological classification (pp. 48–52), grammar (pp. 53–67), Friedrich's German–Yiddish dictionary (pp. 68–332) which takes up the largest part of the book, sample dialogues (pp. 333–354) and his announcement of plans for a monthly periodical (pp. 355–356). The book is well known to bibliographers (cf. Meusel, 1796, p. 437; Fürst, 1849, p. 304; Avé-Lallemant, 1862, pp. 225-226; Landau, 1897, no. 129; Steinschneider, 1904, p. 760; Borokhov 1913, no. 42; A. Freimann, 1915, p. 98, no. 358; Habersaat 1962, p. 363; 1965, p. 429).

Friedrich, who writes that the idea for the book came to him a dozen years earlier when he had lived in Königsberg, was a French teacher at the Prenzlau *Lyceum* at the time of writing (Friedrich, 1784, pp. [i], [ix]). He advocated research into Jewish laws and customs, noting that it seemed only natural to him to study aspects of a people living right on Christian soil when it is of acknowledged interest to study remote and exotic cultures. He mentions that he was a Jew until the age of 36, and announces plans for a monthly publication dedicated to publishing excerpts from Hebrew literature—citing specific traditional texts on Jewish customs, laws and legend—in German translation. He tells potential subscribers to his monthly journal (of which nothing more was apparently heard) that subscriptions would be accepted until the end of February 1785, and assures readers that his selections and translations would be scientifically neutral, and that he would not seek to disparage the people among whom he lived for so long (Friedrich, 1784, pp. [355–356]).

Friedrich's *Unterricht* was sharply attacked by Avé-Lallemant (1862, pp. 225–226, 285–286), the German police chief and criminologist who dedicated nearly half his four-volume magnum opus to Yiddish. Despite Avé-Lallemant's vast knowledge of sources, and the great fame his work achieved, his talents as a linguist were infinitely lesser than Friedrich's. Avé-Lallemant did manage to find the one ludicrous sentence in Friedrich's *Unterricht*—the contention (p. 49) that the dialects of Yiddish result from diverse settlement following upon the Babylonian exile (!). Max Weinreich in his Marburg dissertation (1923a, pp. 188–243) crowned Friedrich with the deserved title of 'first Yiddish dialectologist' (M. Weinreich 1923a, II, pp. 188–243; cf. also 1940b, p. 103).

V. Friedrich's dialectology

Friedrich's major contributions are (a) the first proposed classification of Yiddish dialects and (b) an outstanding synchronic description of the lost Yiddish of Prussia. The classification now current in Yiddish dialectology may conveniently serve as the point of departure (cf. Katz, 1983, p. 1021; 1987a, p. 3). Virtually all of present-day spoken Yiddish is EASTERN YIDDISH, which comprises NORTHEASTERN YIDDISH (popularly 'Lithuanian'), MIDEASTERN YIDDISH (popularly 'Polish') and SOUTHEASTERN YIDDISH (popularly 'Ukrainian'). The now defunct dialects of Central Europe are collectively known as WESTERN YIDDISH which comprises NORTHWESTERN YIDDISH (in the Netherlands and Northern Germany), MIDWESTERN YIDDISH (in central Germany) and SOUTHWESTERN YIDDISH (in Switzerland, Alsace-Lorraine and parts of southern Germany). This classification is the result of a century of intensive Yiddish dialectological research, starting with the spadework of Saineanu (1889) and Landau (1896) and proceeding through the actual classificatory isoglosses proposed by the twentieth century masters—Birnbaum (1918, p. 16; 1979, p. 95), Prilutski (1920, p. 79) and M. Weinreich (1940a, pp. 69–71), among others. Friedrich (1784, pp. 48–52) divided the speech territory of Yiddish into four dialect areas as follows, using German geopolitical concepts current in the late eighteenth century. Friedrich's forms are cited in their original German-based orthography (but minus upper case letters for nouns and variations in typography to mark Semitic stems) in angle brackets ⟨ ⟩ followed by a proposed phonemic interpretation in //. Friedrich introduced italicized *ch* (actually Latin characters to contrast with his German type) to mark Yiddish *x* which corresponds with German *ç*. Friedrich's sample sentences are 'What shall I give you for your trouble?' and 'What do I care? Do it or let it be'. His four dialect areas are:

(1) *Kingdom of Prussia* (excluding Halberstadt which is described as an island of dialect no. 2), *Kingdom of Denmark, Two Duchies of Mecklenburg, Electorate of Hanover,* and the *Duchy of Braunschweig.* The sample sentences appear as ⟨Woes soll ich âch far ahr mih (terche) geben?⟩ /vōəs zɔl iç āx far ār mī (tɛrxə) gēbṇ/ and ⟨Woes geits mich oen, thuts odder losst es blâben⟩ /vōəs gajts miç ōən, tuts ɔdər lɔst əs blābṇ/. It is this dialect, Friedrich's native variety, that constitutes the vast corpus of unmarked forms in the *Unterricht* (cf. below section VI). He remarks that the Yiddish of *Great Poland* (i.e. northwestern Poland—Posen, Kalisch, etc.) is similar but has longer vowels and is spoken with 'singing intonation'.

(2) *Swabian district,* spoken also in *Halberstadt.* The sample sentences appear as ⟨Was soll ich euch für eure mih (terche) geben?⟩ /vās zɔl iç ɔjç für ɔjrə mī (tɛrxə) gēbṇ/ and ⟨Was gehts mich an, thuts oder lasst es bleiben⟩ /vās gēts miç an, tuts ōdər last əs blajbṇ/. The sample sentences, and an explicit remark (p. 50) demonstrate that the reflex of Middle High German short *a* lengthened in open syllable, is unrounded *ā*. In its Eastern guise, rounded and merged with the reflexes of Middle High German *â*, it was used by Birnbaum (1918, p. 16) to subdivide Eastern Yiddish into a '*u* dialect' (= Southern Eastern Yiddish = Mideastern plus Southeastern Yiddish) and an '*o* dialect' (= Northeastern Yiddish). I have used the vowel, known as vowel 13 to Yiddish linguists, to subdivide Western Yiddish into Southern Western Yiddish (= Midwestern plus Southwestern Yiddish), which has *ā*, and Northwestern Yiddish, which has rounded *ō*, merged with the reflexes of the originally long vowel 12 (cf. Katz, 1979a, pp. 67–71; 1979b; 1986c, pp. 245–246). Friedrich also notes the disappearance of final -*n* in the dialect (cf. Katz, 1983,

pp. 1026–1027; 1986a, pp. 21–22, 25–26). The features of Friedrich's dialect no. 2 match Southern Western Yiddish well.

(3) *Holy Roman Empire.* The sample sentences appear as ⟨Woes soll ie*ch* â*ch* fâr âr mih (terche) geben?⟩ /vōəs zɔl īəx āx fâr ār mī (tɛrxə) gēbn̩/ and ⟨Woes geits mie*ch* oen, thuts odder lossts blâben⟩ /vōəs gajts mīəx ōən, tuts ɔdər lɔsts blābn̩/. The extent to which the features provided match with Southern Transitional Yiddish (e.g. in Bohemia) needs to be investigated. Except for failing to note the *u* ⟩ *i* and *o* ⟩ *u* shifts so characteristic of all of Southern Eastern Yiddish, the sample sentences match Mideastern Yiddish quite well. Modern Mideastern Yiddish would have (as one of a number of variants) /vūəs zɔl īəx āx fâr āər mī (tɛrxə) gejbn̩/ and /vūəs gajtəs mīəx ūən, tītəs ɔdər lɔst əs blābn̩/. Cf. comments at (4).

(4) *Little Poland, Russia* and *Lithuania.* The sample sentences appear as ⟨Woes soll e*ch* â*ch* far âr mih (terche) geben?⟩ /vōəs zɔl ɛx far ār mī gēbn̩/ and ⟨Woes geits me*ch* oen, thuts odder lossts blâben⟩ /vōəs gajts mɛx ōən, tuts ɔdər lɔsts blābn̩/. The isogloss provided to distinguish 3 from 4—⟨ie*ch*⟩, ⟨mie*ch*⟩ /īəx/, /mīəx/ vs ⟨e*ch*⟩, ⟨me*ch*⟩ /ɛx/, /mɛx/, is in fact *internal* to Southern Eastern Yiddish (cf. M. Weinreich 1965). If Friedrich's dialects nos 3 and 4 were 'relabelled' accordingly they would make general sense. Additional interesting variants, ⟨eche⟩ and ⟨iche⟩ are offered on p. 187. The occurrence of any of these variants for Lithuania (Northeastern Yiddish), his no. 4, is preposterous. The Northeastern Yiddish variants of the two sample sentences would be /vɔs zɔl ix ajx far ajər mi gɛbn̩/ and /vɔs gejt mir ɔn, tut əs ɔdər lɔst əs blajbn̩/. The further east from his native Prussia, the weaker Friedrich's knowledge.

Setting aside, then, Friedrich's efforts at an internal classification of Eastern Yiddish dialects, his major classificatory contribution, retrospectively measured, is his overall correct vision of an East–West divide with three major areas: WESTERN YIDDISH (comprising his no. 2), EASTERN YIDDISH (comprising his nos 3 and 4) and his own native NORTHERN TRANSITIONAL YIDDISH (his no. 1), which lies between East and West (cf. below sections VI, VII). Not too bad, coming well before the rise of modern dialectology in the nineteenth century (for a different point of view, cf. M. Weinreich, 1958a, p. 166). To Friedrich, the Yiddish of Prussia was the point of departure, its forms dialectologically neutral, with eastern and western dialects at roughly equidistant linguistic poles in either direction. It is an irony of history and an example of the relativity of linguistic analyses that in the twentieth century, those 'poles' are 'the' Yiddish dialects; Prussian Yiddish would have been lost almost without a trace were it not for his own book.

Friedrich's dialectological variants are scattered through the book, with localization frequently provided. In many cases, whether or not localization is provided, twentieth century corroboration is available for the cited variation. For others, Friedrich is the only source. For others still, Friedrich's information changes the accepted picture considerably. The following is a modest sampling; unmarked forms may be assumed to reflect Prussian Yiddish.

⟨a⟩ /a/ ~ ⟨e⟩ /ə/ 'a' (p. 53); cf. Beranek, 1965, p. 13.

⟨amtman⟩ ~ Swabian ⟨poked⟩ 'steward' (p. 75).

⟨auberster⟩ ~ Polish ⟨rosch⟩ 'head of a regiment' (p. 232).

⟨aw⟩ /āv/ = 'father', noting that in Swabia and Halberstadt ⟨aw⟩ is also 'Av', name of

the eleventh month of the Jewish calendar, and occurs in ⟨tische beaw⟩ /tišə bəāv/ 'the Fast of Av' (literally 'the ninth of Av'). He writes that the rest of the Yiddish speaking world (known to him) has ⟨aw⟩ for the month but ⟨tische bow⟩ for the name of the fast day (pp. 15–16, Anhang, 45, II). Friedrich hit upon a series of phonological developments (cf. Katz, 1978b, p. 22) and a discrepancy in the pronunciation of the month and the fast day which includes its name that has survived into parts of modern Southeastern Yiddish (*uv* but *tišəbɔv*). The discrepancy was again discovered by modern Yiddish dialectology (cf. U. Weinreich, 1965, p. 44). The difference was caused by the failure of certain sound shifts, whose structural description included [+ stress], to apply to the name of the month in posttonic position. Modern Standard Yiddish has *ɔv, tišəbɔv*, with the same vowel.

⟨asse⟩ ~ ⟨assussje⟩ 'Bless you (upon sneezing)' (p. 229); cf. U. Weinreich, 1965, pp. 18, 38.

⟨bal milchome⟩ ~ Galician ⟨selner⟩ 'soldier' (pp. 198, 267).

⟨behten⟩ ~ Swabian ⟨breien⟩ 'invite' (p. 201).

⟨bôbe⟩ ~ Swabian ⟨babe⟩ 'grandmother' (pp. 75, 163); cf. Prilutski, 1920, p. 61; 1921, p. 295; Beranek, 1965, pp. 204–205; Guggenheim-Grünberg, 1973, pp. 112–113.

⟨berchess⟩ ~ ⟨barchess⟩ ~ ⟨chale⟩ 'Sabbath bread; challah' (p. 102); cf. Beranek, 1965, pp. 150–151; Guggenheim-Grünberg, 1973, pp. 118–119.

⟨chaule naufel⟩ ~ Swabian ⟨tipel⟩ 'epilepsy' (pp. 134, 175).

⟨chotsche⟩ ~ ⟨chotschek⟩ 'although' (pp. 160, 232).

⟨dawenen⟩ ~ Swabian ⟨oren⟩ 'pray' (pp. 76, 77, 94); cf. Beranek, 1965, pp. 188–189; Guggenheim-Grünberg, 1973, pp. 48–49.

⟨fleisch⟩ ~ ⟨flâsch⟩ 'meat' (p. 137).

⟨geig⟩ ~ Swabian ⟨fiedel⟩ 'fiddle' (p. 150).

⟨haant⟩ ~ ⟨haat⟩ ~ ⟨hânt⟩ ~ ⟨heit⟩ ~ ⟨heut⟩ ~ ⟨hajem⟩ 'today' (pp. 142, 174, 186).

⟨hak⟩, ⟨trenn⟩ ~ Galician ⟨ohrfeige⟩ 'blow; smack' (p. 174).

⟨hôben⟩ ~ Swabian ⟨habe⟩ 'have' (p. 60).

⟨hausen⟩ 'trousers' ~ Galician ⟨pludern⟩ 'trousers' (p. 183).

⟨Jahkew⟩ ~ ⟨Jahnkew⟩ ~ ⟨Jokew⟩ 'Jacob' (p. 185); cf. U. Weinreich, 1965, pp. 40–41.

⟨klesmer⟩ (Polish) ~ Swabian ⟨leizem⟩ 'musician' (p. 189).

⟨kutsch⟩ ~ Polish ⟨karete⟩ 'coach' (p. 200).

⟨lokschen⟩, ⟨lekscher⟩ ~ Galician ⟨lekschlech⟩ 'noodles' (p. 231).

⟨mame⟩ ~ ⟨meme⟩ ~ ⟨em⟩ 'mother' (pp. 221, 264); cf. Beranek, 1965, pp. 168–169; Guggenheim–Grünberg, 1973, pp. 112–113.

⟨matoness hakale⟩ ~ Swabian ⟨ziwlauness⟩ 'gifts to the bride' (p. 179); cf. Guggenheim-Grünberg, 1973, pp. 132–133.

⟨mechile beten⟩ ~ Swabian ⟨breien/bereien⟩ 'ask forgiveness' (pp. 68, 115, 117, 208).

⟨nedunje⟩ ~ ⟨nedan⟩ 'dowry' (pp. 28, 100); cf. U. Weinreich, 1965, pp. 12–13, 37–38, 39; Beranek, 1965, pp. 160–161.

⟨nor⟩ ~ ⟨ocker⟩ ~ Great Polish ⟨ockerscht⟩ 'just' (p. 231).

⟨puthoen⟩ ~ Polish ⟨indek⟩ 'turkey' (p. 232).

⟨rosch hakoel⟩ ~ Prague ⟨primuss⟩ 'head of the Jewish community' (p. 24); cf. Beranek, 1965, pp. 110–111; Guggenheim-Grünberg, 1973, pp. 44–45.

⟨row⟩ ~ Swabian ⟨raw⟩ 'rabbi' (pp. 34, 91, 106, 140, 229, 239); cf. U. Weinreich, 1965, p. 39; Beranek, 1965, pp. 132–133.

⟨seide⟩ ~ Swabian ⟨herle⟩ 'grandfather' (pp. 75, 163); cf. Beranek, 1965, pp. 206–207; Guggenheim-Grünberg, 1973, pp. 112–113.

⟨tabeck⟩, ⟨tubeck⟩ ~ Galician ⟨tetun⟩ 'tobacco' (p. 275).

⟨trockene obst⟩, ⟨bakaubst⟩ ~ Swabian ⟨hutzel⟩ 'dried fruit' (p. 185).

⟨voter⟩ ~ Swabian ⟨ete⟩ 'father' (pp. 76, 298); Friedrich's usual term is ⟨tâte⟩ (e.g. p. 76); cf. Beranek, 1965, pp. 166–167; Guggenheim-Grünberg, 1973, pp. 112–113.

⟨weib⟩ ~ ⟨wab⟩ ~ ⟨frah⟩ 'wife' (p. 114).

⟨zahke⟩ ~ ⟨zeke⟩ ~ ⟨gezehke⟩ 'scream' (p. 260); cf. U. Weinreich, 1965, p. 42; Beranek, 1965, pp. 26–27.

⟨zerore⟩ ~ Polish ⟨poretz⟩ 'nobleman' (pp. 32, 73).

⟨zider⟩ ~ Swabian ⟨tefile⟩ 'prayer book' (pp. 94, 179); cf. Beranek, 1965, pp. 158–159.

VI. Friedrich's dialect

Friedrich preserved for posterity the features of a lost Yiddish dialect. It is one of the two distinct dialect areas between the huge historical blocks of Western and Eastern Yiddish. The southern intermediate area, which I have called SOUTHERN TRANSITIONAL YIDDISH (Katz 1979b; 1983, p. 1028), comprises parts of Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Although it was overrun by the culturally aggressive Mideastern Yiddish in this century, enough features survived long enough into the twentieth century for modern Yiddish linguistics to document much of it (cf. Fischer, 1936, pp. 91–93 = Bin-Nun, 1973, pp. 91–93; Beranek, 1936; U. Weinreich, 1964). Some of its salient Western features had even made inroads into modern Mideastern Yiddish (cf. Prilutski, 1920, pp. 72–73, 152; 1921, p. 401). A far more complete extinction befell the northern regions situated between Western and Eastern Yiddish. That area, which I have called NORTHERN TRANSITIONAL YIDDISH (Katz 1979b; 1983, p. 1028) has scarcely been documented at all (cf. Berliner, 1898, pp. 176–180; M. Weinreich, 1958a, pp. 165–167). It is fortunate that the first Yiddish dialectologist copiously described a variety destined for extinction.

Stressed vowels

Bearing in mind Friedrich's transcriptions, based on German orthography with modifications, his stressed vowel system seems to me to be as follows (using the accepted system for numbering each historical vowel; cf. Katz, 1983, pp. 1021–1024).

Friedrich's Vocalism: Northern Transitional Yiddish

$$\bar{\imath}_{32} \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \bar{u}_{52}$$
$$i_{31} \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad u_{51}$$
$$\bar{e}_{25} \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \bar{o}_{12/13}$$
$$\varepsilon_{21} \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \mathfrak{o}_{41}$$
$$a_{11} \quad \bar{a}_{34(-24/?44)} \quad aj_{22/24} \quad au_{42/44/54}$$

The Yiddish dialectologist will recognize characteristic features of Mideastern Yiddish, notably $\bar{a}_{34}$ and the retention of distinctive vowel length. But Friedrich's vocalism shows

not a trace of any of the characteristic Mideastern sound shifts ($u \rangle i$, $\bar{u} \rangle \bar{\imath}$, $\bar{o} \rangle \bar{u}$, etc.). The stressed vocalism of Mideastern Yiddish is as follows:

<div align="center">

Mideastern Yiddish Vocalism

</div>

$\bar{\imath}_{32/52}$ $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\bar{u}/u_{12/13}$
$i_{31/51}$
ej_{25} $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $ou/\bar{o}_{54}$
ε_{21} $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\mathfrak{o}_{41}$

$$a_{11} \quad \bar{a}_{34} \quad aj_{22/24} \quad \mathfrak{o}j_{42/44}$$

Indeed, the vowel *qualities* in Friedrich's Yiddish are closer to modern Northeastern Yiddish, which has, however, lost the long/tense vs short/lax opposition, giving the following configuration:

<div align="center">

Northeastern Yiddish Vocalism

</div>

$i_{31/32}$ $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $u_{51/52}$
$ej_{22/24/42/44}$
$\varepsilon_{21/25}$ $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\mathfrak{o}_{12/13/41}$

$$a_{11} \quad aj_{34} \quad \mathfrak{o}j_{54}$$

But the salient characteristics of Friedrich's vocalism include a number of Western-like features, notably $\bar{o}_{12/13}$, $\bar{e}_{25}$, $\bar{u}_{52}$ and $\mathfrak{o}u_{42/44/54}$. The merger of 12 and 13 facilitates comparison with the Western dialect that exhibits that crucial merger, Northwestern Yiddish, where the following system obtains:

<div align="center">

Northwestern Yiddish Vocalism

</div>

$\bar{\imath}_{32}$ $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\bar{u}_{52}$
i_{31} $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ u_{51}
$\bar{e}_{25}$ $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\bar{o}_{12/13}$
ε_{21} $\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\mathfrak{o}_{41}$

$$a_{11} \quad \bar{a}_{24/44} \quad \varepsilon j_{22} \quad aj_{34} \quad \mathfrak{o}u_{42/54}$$

In historical terms, Friedrich's Northern Transitional Yiddish retains the conservative vowel qualities of Northeastern Yiddish, and the conservative vowel quantities of Mideastern Yiddish, a combination unknown to modern Eastern Yiddish but typical of older forms of Western Yiddish. Although there is clearly Western Yiddish impact on Northern Transitional Yiddish, the system is on the whole structurally characteristic of Eastern Yiddish. There are barely any traces of $\bar{a}_{24/(?44)}$, and the characteristic pan-Eastern mergers 22/24 and 42/44 are documented. Most of the Western Yiddish lexical items are marked 'Swabian', i.e. using Friedrich's designation for (Southern) Western Yiddish (cf. above section V), distinguished from the bulk of unmarked forms that characterize his native variety. In short, we have in Friedrich's book substantial and reliable DOCUMENTATION of a dialect that approaches and serves to verify the major features of modern RECONSTRUCTION of Proto Eastern Yiddish (cf. U. Weinreich, 1958, pp. 239, 254; Herzog, 1965, pp. 163–164; Katz, 1978a, p. 35; 1982, p. 84). For recent debate on the status of proto languages and the role of Yiddish in that debate, cf. Marchand 1987 and Katz, 1987b, 48–50.

The following are samples of select vowels.

Vowel 12 is /ō/, as in Western Yiddish and Proto Eastern Yiddish, e.g. ⟨frogen⟩ /frōgṇ/ 'ask' (p. 140); ⟨kabole⟩ /kabōlə/ 'Kabbalah' (p. 22); ⟨schlôfen⟩ /šlōfṇ/ 'sleep' (p. 256); ⟨scholem⟩ /šōləm/ 'peace' (p. 142).

Vowel 13 is /ō/, as in Northwestern Yiddish and Proto Eastern Yiddish, in both cases merged with 12, e.g. ⟨buchstôb⟩ /būxštōb/ 'letter (of the alphabet)' (p. 104); ⟨schlôgen⟩ /šlōgṇ/ 'hit' (p. 256); ⟨sôgen⟩ /zōgṇ/ 'say' (p. 97); ⟨tog⟩ /tōg/ 'day' (p. 276).

Vowel 22 is /aj/, as in Mideastern Yiddish, e.g. ⟨eibek⟩ /ajbək/ 'forever' (p. 132); ⟨cheilek⟩ /xajlək/ 'part' (p. 277); ⟨neitigen⟩ /najtigṇ/ 'force' and 'invite' (p. 230)—in modern Yiddish the item survives in the reflexive construction *nejtikṇ zix* 'require'; *nejtṇ* is 'force', and not a trace remains of 'invite'; ⟨meilech⟩ /majləx/ 'king' (p. 26).

Vowel 24 is likewise /aj/ as in Mideastern Yiddish, e.g. ⟨elein⟩ /əlajn/ 'alone' (p. 117); ⟨heilig⟩ /hájlik/ 'holy' (p. 167); ⟨nein⟩ /najn/ 'no' (p. 226). Friedrich documents some variation with Western Yiddish *ā*₂₄, e.g. ⟨fleisch und flâsch⟩ /flajš ~ flāš/ 'meat' (p. 137); ⟨kleid und klahd⟩ /klajd ~ klād/ 'dress' (p. 194); ⟨klein und klahn⟩ /klajn ~ klān/ 'small' (p. 194).

Vowel 25 is /ē/, as in Western Yiddish and Proto Eastern Yiddish, e.g. (gewesen, gewehn) /gəvēzṇ, gəvēn/ 'was' (p. 60); ⟨lebedik⟩ /lēbədik/ 'alive' (p. 204); ⟨mechuteness⟩ /məxutēnəs/ 'female relative by marriage' (Anhang zum Ersten Theil, vi); ⟨Schwebel⟩ /švēbḷ/ 'match' (p. 263); ⟨tewe⟩ /tēvə/ 'habit; nature' (p. 38).

Vowel 34 appears as /ā/, the reflex that was thought to be unique to Southern Eastern Yiddish (Mideastern *ā* ‖ Southeastern *a* via loss of distinctive vowel length). Friedrich formulates rules generalizing the cognates of German prefix *bei-* as Yiddish ⟨baa⟩ (p. 97), and of German *ein-* as Yiddish ⟨ahn⟩ (pp. 116, 121). Samples include ⟨ahsen⟩ /āzṇ/ 'iron' (p. 122); ⟨beschnâden⟩ /bəšnādṇ/ 'circumcize' (p. 93); ⟨lahle⟩ /lālə/ 'night' (p. 116); ⟨tenah⟩ /tənā/ 'condition' (p. 149). A bit of variation with the *aj* realization characteristic of Western Yiddish and Northeastern Yiddish is documented, e.g. ⟨kreid und krahd⟩ /krajd ~ krād/ 'chalk' (p. 197).

Vowel 42 appears as ⟨au⟩ (/au/ or /ɔu/), as in Western Yiddish, e.g. ⟨apikauress⟩ /apikaurəs/ '(Jewish) non-believer' (p. 13); ⟨grauss⟩ /graus/ 'large' (p. 163); ⟨schaute⟩ /šautə/ 'fool' (p. 225); ⟨waunen⟩ /vaunən/ 'dwell' (p. 328).

Vowel 44 appears as /au/, characteristic of the reconstructions of Proto Eastern Yiddish, e.g. ⟨aug⟩ /aug/ 'eye' (p. 84); ⟨rauch⟩ /raux/ 'smoke' (p. 242); ⟨taub⟩ /taub/ 'deaf' (p. 276). Western Yiddish has *ā* as the reflex of Middle High German ⟨ou⟩, hence *āk, rāx, tāp*.

Vowel 51 appears consistently as /u/, with not a trace of the characteristic Southern Eastern Yiddish /i/ or Southern Transitional Yiddish /ü/ realizations, e.g. ⟨chuzpe⟩ /xucpə/ 'insolence; chutzpah' (p. 306); ⟨hund⟩ /hund/ 'dog' (p. 184); ⟨kummen⟩ /kumən/ 'come' (p. 195); ⟨putter⟩ /putər/ 'butter' (p. 105); ⟨summer⟩ /zumər/ 'summer' (p. 267).

Vowel 52 appears as /ū/, with not a trace of the characteristic Southern Eastern Yiddish /ī/ or Southern Transitional Yiddish /ü/ realizations, e.g. ⟨gewure⟩ /gəvūrə/ 'strength' (p. 270); ⟨newue⟩ /nəvūə/ 'prophecy' (p. 28); ⟨Schul⟩ /šūl/ 'synagogue' (p. 262); ⟨stub⟩ /štūb/ 'room' (p. 274).

Vowel 54 appears as /au/, characteristic both of Western Yiddish and of the now defunct Kurland variety of Northeastern Yiddish (cf. M. Weinreich, 1923b, p. 200). Typical items

are ⟨auer⟩ /auər/ 'ear' (p. 233); ⟨bauch⟩ /baux/ 'stomach' (p. 88); ⟨faul⟩ /faul/ 'lazy' (p. 134); ⟨maul⟩ /maul/ 'mouth' (p. 215); ⟨taub⟩ /taub/ 'dove; pigeon' (p. 276).

Breaking

Southern Eastern Yiddish 'Breaking'—insertion of a shewa following certain long vowels in certain environments, leading to diphthongization or triphthongization (cf. Kovács, 1947), thought to be unique to that area, especially to Mideastern Yiddish, occurs in full force in Friedrich's Yiddish, in virtually the same environments. The vowels processed by Breaking, however, are Friedrich's Northern Transitional vowels, e.g. ⟨aues⟩ /auəs/ 'out (verbal prefix)' (p. 65); ⟨buech⟩ /būəx/ 'book' (p. 165); ⟨joer⟩ /jōər/ 'year' (p. 185); ⟨noes⟩ /nōəs/ 'nose' (p. 225); ⟨wôer⟩ /vōər/ 'true' (p. 95). Cf. the Mideastern Yiddish variants *ouəs, bīəx, jūər, nūəs*. The Breaking rule spills over into Ashkenazic Hebrew, where Friedrich has ⟨ier⟩ /īər/ 'city', homophonous with ⟨ier⟩, name of the eighth month of the Jewish calendar (p. 21). Breaking has processed the first form (from classical Hebrew *ʕīr*). In the second, ə is the expected reflex of a posttonic vowel historically processed by stress shift and then by posttonic reduction (cf. classical *ʔijjṓr*). Modern Yiddish dialects usually preserve the contrast *ir* vs *ijər*. The application of Breaking to Northern Transitional Yiddish gives ⟨bal boess⟩ /balbōəs/ 'boss; head of household' which rhymes in the dialect with ⟨moess⟩ /mōəs/ 'money', hence the rhyme ⟨Host du moess, bist du e bal boess⟩ /hostu mōəs | bistu ə balbōəs/ 'If you have money, you're a big shot' (p. 87). The related rule of Shewa Epenthesis, prominent in Mideastern Yiddish, where it breaks up consonantal clusters, is likewise documented in Northern Transitional Yiddish, e.g. ⟨starek⟩ /štarək/ 'strong' (p. 140). Cf. Mideastern Yiddish *štarək*.

Lowering

Lowering of vowels preceding *r*, characteristic of Mideastern Yiddish, occurs frequently in Friedrich's Yiddish, e.g. ⟨chorwe⟩ /xɔrvə/ 'ruin' (p. 313); ⟨dorech⟩ /dɔrəx/ 'through' (p. 113); ⟨kerje⟩ /kɛrjə/ 'city' (p. 23). Cf. the unlowered Northeastern cognates *xurvə, durx, kirjə*. Occasionally, variation is reported between semi-lowered and fully lowered forms, e.g. ⟨e Berst und e Barst⟩ /beršt/ ~ /baršt/ 'brush' (p. 105).

Unstressed vowels

Historical pretonic *a* is usually reduced to ə, a pattern often evident in Western Yiddish, e.g. ⟨egole⟩ /əgōlə/ 'wagon' (p. 19); ⟨elein⟩ /əlajn/ 'alone' (p. 117); cf. Northeastern *agɔlə, alejn* ‖ Mideastern *agūlə, alajn*. Occasionally ahistorical (hypercorrect?) *a* appears, e.g. ⟨kadusche⟩ /kadušə/ 'name of a prayer; sanctity' (p. 22); cf. Northeastern *kədušə* ‖ Mideastern *kədīšə*. Occasionally, ə for *a* appears in posttonic position. Friedrich has Western style ⟨aschkenes⟩ /aškənəs/ 'Ashkenaz' (p. 14), cf. Eastern /aškənaz/). Ever a variationist, Friedrich records ⟨mazeiwe, und mezeiwe⟩ /macajvə/ ~ /məcajvə/ 'tombstone' (p. 162). Before final *k*, the Eastern Yiddish reduced vowel tends to *i*, possibly under impact of the Slavonic-derived suffix *-nik*. Friedrich has a Tuesday—⟨diensteg⟩ /dīnstəg/ (p. 111) reminiscent of Western Yiddish, and a Thursday—⟨donnerstik⟩ /dɔnərštik/ (p. 112) identical to the present day Eastern Yiddish form.

Affrication

Word-initial *s* is affricated to *c* (*t͡s*), e.g. ⟨zaufer⟩ /caufər/ 'scribe' (p. 39); ⟨zechaure⟩ /cəxaurə/ 'merchandise' (p. 39); ⟨zeifer⟩ /cajfər/ 'book' (p. 39). Cf. Northeastern *sejfər*,

sxejrə, sejfər || Mideastern Yiddish *sɔjfər, sxɔjrə, sajfər*. The nonadmissibility of word initial *s* is evidently a result of German impact. Much of Western Yiddish, spoken on German language territory, retained initial *s* in Semitic Component lexical items.

Diminutivization

Diminutives are formed via historical fricatives generally characteristic of northern Western Yiddish (cf. e.g. Beranek, 1965, pp. 92–93). Friedrich has ⟨che⟩ = /çə/ (possibly /jə/ or even /šə/), rather than the *l* and *ələ/alə* forms overwhelmingly but not exclusively characteristic of modern Eastern Yiddish (cf. Landau, 1896; M. Weinreich, 1958b, p. 122). Samples include ⟨bocherche⟩ /bōxərçə/ 'little boy' (p. 259); ⟨briefche⟩ /brīfçə/ 'little letter' (p. 208); ⟨fingerche⟩ /fiŋgərçə/ 'ring' (p. 248). Cf. modern Northeastern Yiddish *bɔxərḷ, brivl, fiŋgərḷ* || Mideastern Yiddish *buxərḷ, brīvḷ, fiŋgərḷ*.

Morphology

Comparative and superlative suffixes *ər* and *stə(r)* are affixed to Semitic Component stems freely, as in Western Yiddish, e.g. ⟨kotener⟩ /kōtənər/ 'smaller' ← /kōtṇ/ 'small', ⟨schofelster⟩ /šōfḷstər/ 'worst' ← /šōfḷ/ 'bad' (all p. 55). Some, e.g. ⟨miesster⟩ /mīəstər/ 'ugliest' ← /mīəs/ 'ugly' (p. 55), have survived into Eastern Yiddish.

Infinitivization of Semitic stems usually follows the Western Yiddish /əln/ pattern rather than the Eastern /lən/ pattern, e.g. ⟨acheln⟩ /axəln/ 'eat' (p. 67), cf. modern Yiddish *axlən* 'stuff oneself grotesquely with excessive amounts of food'. True as always to recording variation, Friedrich cites the Eastern style ⟨ganwenen⟩ /ganvənən/ 'steal' alongside the Western ⟨ganewen⟩ /ganəvən/ (p. 67). In general, the repertoire of synthetic verbs comprising Semitic stem plus Germanic morphological machinery is Western oriented, e.g. ⟨makenen⟩ /makənən/ 'hit', ⟨sarkenen⟩ /zarkənən/ 'throw', ⟨schassienen⟩ /šasjənən/ 'drink' (all p. 67). Sections are devoted to conjugation of auxiliary verbs (pp. 57–64), and to the collapse of objective cases into a single objective case (pp. 34, 188).

Lexicon and semantics

Characteristic items are ⟨chaverlapp⟩ /xavərlap/, an expression used to poke fun at a too-close relationship (p. 153); ⟨e jedie thun⟩ /ə jədīə tūn/ 'let know' (p. 224); ⟨man⟩ /man/ 'only' (p. 213); ⟨maure (ahn)jogen⟩ /maurə (ān)jōgṇ/ 'scare, intimidate' (pp. 71, 117, 129); cf. modern Yiddish *mɔjrə hɔbṇ* 'be afraid'; ⟨soken⟩ /zōkṇ/ 'old', e.g. ⟨e soken malbesch⟩ /ə zōkṇ malbəš/ 'an old garment' (p. 75); modern Yiddish *zɔkṇ* retains the historical sense of 'elderly man'; ⟨zeliche⟩ /cəlīxə/, literally '(divine) forgiveness' occurs as a euphemism for 'prostitute' (p. 33).

Friedrich's ⟨bal boess⟩ /balbōəs/ 'boss' and its feminine ⟨bal boeste⟩ /balbōəstə/, with his usual $ō_{12}$, contrast with ⟨balbus⟩ 'Christian boss' and its feminine form ⟨balbustə⟩ (p. 327). The *u* forms were apparently borrowed from Mideastern Yiddish with the rise of a new semantic distinction between them and the native *ō* forms.

Modern Yiddish *xɔjzək (maxṇ)* 'make fun; mock' continues to baffle etymologists. Friedrich has ⟨chausek⟩ as a noun meaning 'stupidity' and 'fool' (p. 136). Significantly, eighteenth century Prussian Yiddish also has /xauzək/ in the literal sense of 'fortress', e.g. ⟨e chausek ahnnehmen⟩ /ə xauzək ānnēmən/ 'capture a fortress' (p. 128), thus lending support to Hebrew *ḥōzeq* as genuine etymon, albeit by a probably circuitous route involving other items from the same Semitic paradigm (cf. e.g. Rivkind, 1955, p. 24).

Stylistics

Friedrich contrasts formal ⟨bal milchome⟩ /balmilxōmə/ 'soldier' with informal ⟨bal mechome⟩ /balməxōmə/ (p. 198; cf. p. 267). The differentiation, albeit with Eastern Yiddish vowels, survives to this day; cf. formal Northeastern *milxɔmə* vs. informal *mixɔmə*. On other instances of cognate sociolinguistic differences in diverse dialects, cf. Katz, 1980.

Northern Transitional Yiddish contrasts the formal meaning of ⟨mabel⟩ /mabḷ/ 'flood' with 'many' in informal style (p. 26); the formal meaning of ⟨dewasch⟩ /dəvaš/ 'honey' with informal 'sugar' (p. 18); the formal sense of ⟨malchess⟩ /malxəs/ 'kingdom' with informal 'king', in place of the historical agentive ⟨meilech⟩ /majləx/ 'king' (p. 152). Friedrich notes that ⟨chauschech⟩ /xaušəx/ is more frequent than ⟨aufel⟩ /aufḷ/ or ⟨afeile⟩ /afajlə/ for 'darkness' (p. 14); that ⟨jeress [s]chemajem⟩ /jɛrəs šəmajim/ 'fear of Heaven' is principally used in writing, ⟨jeress elauhim⟩ /jɛrəs ɛlauhīm/ 'fear of God', in speaking (p. 144). In a significant general remark, Friedrich reports that when Jews write the way they speak (presumably rather than conforming to the standard written Yiddish then prevalent), this type of writing is mocked by others (p. [xiii]).

Idioms

Friedrich's idioms include ⟨Es is en opere gewên oen zu sehen⟩ /es iz ən ōpərə gəvēn ōəncəzēhən/ 'It was something amazing', lit. 'It was an opera to look at', (p. 233); ⟨er singt kiness⟩ /ēr ziŋgt kinəs/ 'He doesn't stop complaining', lit. 'He's singing the Lamentations [usually recited on the Fast of Av in commemoration of the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem]' (p. 193); ⟨Does mauel steit ihm sau weinek still wie e mielroed⟩ /dōəs mauəl štajt īm zau vajnik štil vī ə mīlrōəd/ 'He doesn't shut up', lit. 'His mouth remains still as seldom as a mill wheel' (p. 220); ⟨Does is Nauechs teiwe⟩ /dōəs iz nauəxs tajvə/ 'What a clumsy big thing!', lit. 'This is Noah's Ark' (p. 200); ⟨Du sehst aus wie der vetter Eissew⟩ /dū zēst aus vī dēr fɛtər ajsəv/ 'You look absolutely dreadful', lit. 'You look like Uncle Esau' (p. 220)—cf. Genesis 25: 29–30; ⟨Der mensch is mir e rechte masse uf mân zawer⟩ /dēr mɛnš iz mīr ə rɛxtə masə uf mān cavər/ 'This fellow is a right pain in the neck', lit. 'This person is a true burden on my neck' (p. 93); ⟨Does is e recht ore miklet⟩ /dɔəs iz ə rɛxt ōrə miklət/ 'What an evil place!', lit. 'This is a true City of Refuge' (p. 141)—cf. Numbers 35: 9–15.

A sprinkling of eighteenth century curses is provided. Among them are ⟨Du solst ahnsinken wie Kaurech⟩ /dū zɔlst ānziŋkṇ vī kaurəx/ 'May you be sunk like Korah' (p. 120)—cf. Numbers 16:32; ⟨E ruech in dahn mames kind⟩ /ə rūəx in dān maməs kind/ 'the devil take your mother's child' (p. 93). Friedrich reports that the Yiddish speakers of Prague and the entire Austrian Empire have ⟨Es soll groes far dahn thier wachsen⟩ /əs zɔl grōəs far dān tīər vaksṇ/ 'May grass grow in front of your door'. A curse reportedly specific to Swabian (Southwestern) Yiddish speakers is ⟨Dass du den tipel kriegst⟩ /das dū dɛn tipḷ krīgst/ 'May you get epilepsy' (p. 81). Ever the dialectologist, Friedrich adds that local (i.e. Prussian) Yiddish speakers have ⟨nachpe⟩ /naxpə/ for 'epilepsy' (p. 81).

VII. Transitional Yiddish

The 'universal Yiddish isogloss' through time and space is the Yiddish alphabet. The composite configuration of the alphabet in its entirety represents a continuum from West to East and from the earliest Ashkenazic Hebrew manuscripts through to the modern era. Friedrich's Prussian Yiddish has ⟨aleph, beis, gimel, dalet, hei, wow, sojen, chess, tess, jud, krumekow, schlechtechow, lamed, offemum, schlossemum, krumenun, schlechtenun,

zamech, ajen, pei, fei, ufei, zadek/krumezadek, schlechtezadek, kuw, reisch, schin, tow⟩ (pp. 4–8; Anhang, p. i). Some of its features, e.g. *aləf* (rather than *ɔləf*) are distinctly eastern; others, e.g. *zɔjən* (rather than *zajən*) are characteristically western. That is only to be expected of a transitional dialect. Further research will determine whether some of its features, and of course, those of Friedrich's Yiddish in general, are characteristic neither of Eastern nor Western Yiddish, but specific to the intermediate dialects. One candidate feature is ⟨ufei⟩ for final *fey* (modern Yiddish *langer fey*). The late Yiddish poet A. N. Stencl (1978), a native of the southwestern corner of Poland where *Southern* Transitional Yiddish features survived, had /ifaj/ with Mideastern Yiddish *i*. TRANSITIONAL YIDDISH— north and south together—may prove to have shared other features that once made it a major dialect of Yiddish, situated between East and West. Some of its features may still be recovered.

REFERENCES

AVÉ-LALLEMANT, F. C. B. 1862 *Das deutsche Gaunerthum in seiner social-politischen, literarischen und linguistischen Ausbildung zu seinem heutigen Bestande,* Vol. 3. F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig.

BERANEK, F. J. 1936 Yidish in Tshekhoslovakay. *Yivo bleter* **9,** 63–75.

BERANEK, F. J. 1965 *Westjiddischer Sprachatlas.* N. G. Elwert, Marburg.

BERLINER, A. 1898 Die mittelhochdeutsche Sprache bei den Juden. *Jahrbuch für jüdische Geschichte und Literatur,* 162–182.

BIN-NUN, J. 1973 *Jiddisch und die deutschen Mundarten. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des ostgalizischen Jiddisch.* Max Niemeyer, Tübingen.

BIRNBAUM, S. A. [1918] *Praktische Grammatik der Jiddischen Sprache für den Selbstunterricht. Mit Lesestücken und einem Wörterbuch* [= *Die Kunst der Polyglottie,* 128]. A. Hartleben, Vienna and Leipzig.

BIRNBAUM, S. A. 1979 *Yiddish. A Survey and a Grammar.* Manchester University, Manchester and University of Toronto, Toronto.

BOROKHOV, B. 1913 Di biblyotek funem yidishn filolog. In Niger, Sh. (Ed.), *Der pinkes. Yorbukh far der geshikhte fun der yidisher literatur un shprakh, far folklor, kritik un biblyografye,* pp. 1–68 [separate pagination at end of volume]. Vilner farlag fun B. A. Kletskin, Vilna.

BUXTORF, J. 1609 *Thesaurus grammaticus linguæ sanctæ hebræcæ.* Conrad Waldkirch, Basel.

CHRYSANDER, W. C. J. 1750 *Jüdisch-Teutsche Grammatick.* Johann Christoph Meisner, Leipzig and Wolfenbüttel.

FISCHER, J. 1936 *Das Jiddische und sein Verhältnis zu den deutschen Mundarten unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der ostgalizischen Mundart. Erster Teil—Lautlehre (einschliesslich Phonetik der ostgalizischen Mundart). Erste Hälfte: Allgemeiner Teil.* Oswald Schmidt, Leipzig.

FREIMANN, A. 1915 Deutsche anonyme Schriften über Juden und Judentum. Erste Reihe. *Zeitschrift für hebraeische Bibliographie* **18,** 73–101.

FREIMANN, J. 1903 *Leket Joscher des Joseph b. Mose. Collectaneen seines Lehrers Israel Isserlein (Cod. München No. 404, 405),* Vol. 1. M'kize Nirdamim, Berlin.

FREIMANN, J. 1904 *Leket Joscher des Joseph b. Mose. Collectaneen seines Lehrers Israel Isserlein (Cod. München No. 404, 405).* Vol. 2. M'kize Nirdamim, Berlin.

FRIEDRICH, C. W. 1784 *Unterricht in der Judensprache, und Schrift. zum Gebrauch für Gelehrte und Ungelehrte.* Chr. Gottf. Ragoczy, Prenzlau.

FÜRST, J. 1849 *Bibliotheca Judaica. Bibliographisches Handbuch der gesammten jüdischen Literatur. Erster Theil.* Wilhelm Engelmann, Leipzig.

GÜDEMANN, M. 1888 *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der Juden in Deutschland während des XIV. und XV. Jahrhunderts* [= *Geschichte des Erziehungswesens und der Cultur der abendländischen Juden* Vol. 3]. Alfred Hölder, Vienna.

GUGGENHEIM-GRÜNBERG, F. 1973 *Jiddisch auf alemannischem Sprachgebiet. 56 Karten zur Sprach- und Sachgeographie* [= *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Volkskunde der Juden in der Schweiz*, 10]. Juris, Zürich.

HABERSAAT, K. 1962 Materialen zur Geschichte der jiddischen Grammatik. *Orbis* **11**, 352–368.

HABERSAAT, K. 1965 Zur Geschichte der jiddischen Grammatik. Eine bibliographische Studie. *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* **84**, 419–435.

HERZOG, M. I. 1965 *The Yiddish Language in Northern Poland. Its Geography and History* [= *Publication 37 of the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics* = *International Journal of American Linguistics* **31**, part 3, Vol. 31, no. 2]. Indiana University, Bloomington and Mouton, The Hague.

ISSERLIN, 1519 *Seyfer terumas hadeshen*. Daniel Bomberg, Venice.

KATZ, D. 1978a Genetic notes on Netherlandic Yiddish vocalism. Unpublished paper, Department of Linguistics, Columbia University.

KATZ, D. 1978b Semantic classes resistant to a Yiddish sound shift. Unpublished paper, Department of Linguistics, Columbia University.

KATZ, D. 1979a Der semitisher kheylek in yidish: a yerushe fun kadmoynim. Metodn un meglekhkaytn. Paper placed before the First International Conference on Research in Yiddish Language and Literature at the Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, 6–9 August.

KATZ, D. 1979b Di ineveynikste klasifikatsye fun di mayrev yidishe dyalektn. Paper placed before the 53rd Annual Conference of the Yivo Institute for Jewish Research, New York, 10–13 November.

KATZ, D. 1980 The wavering Yiddish segolate. A problem of sociolinguistic reconstruction. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* **24**, 5–27.

KATZ, D. 1982 Explorations in the History of the Semitic Component in Yiddish, 2 Vols. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of London.

KATZ, D. 1983 Zur Dialektologie des Jiddischen. In Besch, W., Knoop, U., Putschke, W. and Wiegand, H. E. (Eds), *Dialektologie. Ein Handbuch zur deutschen und allgemeinen Dialektforschung*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin and New York.

KATZ, D. 1985 Hebrew, Aramaic and the rise of Yiddish. In Fishman, J. A. (Ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Jewish Languages*, pp. 85–103. E. J. Brill, Leiden.

KATZ, D. 1986a Yosef Hertses *Ester*. Tsentral-mayrev yidish in Firt. *Israelitische Kultusgemeinde Fürth*, 20–27.

KATZ, D. 1986b On Yiddish, in Yiddish and for Yiddish: five hundred years of Yiddish scholarship. In Gelber, H. (Ed.), *Identity and Ethos. A Festschrift for Sol Liptzin on the Occasion of his 85th Birthday*, pp. 23–36. Peter Lang, New York, Berne, Frankfurt am Main.

KATZ, D. 1986c Hayesod hashemi beyidish: yerusha mimey kedem. Metodot veefsharuyot. *Hasifrut* **3–4 (35–36)**, 228–251 [=translation of Katz, 1979a].

KATZ, D. 1987a On the first Winter Symposium. In Katz, D. (Ed.), *Origins of the Yiddish Language. Papers from the First Annual Oxford Winter Symposium in Yiddish Language and Literature, 15–17 December 1985* [= *Winter Studies in Yiddish*, Vol. 1], pp. 1–5. Pergamon, Oxford.

KATZ, D. 1987b The proto dialectology of Ashkenaz. In Katz, D. (Ed.), *Origins of the Yiddish Language. Papers from the First Annual Oxford Winter Symposium in Yiddish Language and Literature, 15–17 December 1985* [= *Winter Studies in Yiddish*, Vol. 1], pp. 47–60. Pergamon, Oxford.

KING, R. D. 1986 Migration and linguistics as illustrated by Yiddish. Paper placed before the Indo-European Symposium, IREX Conference on Comparative Linguistics at the University of Texas at Austin, 4–6 November. In press in *Journal of Indo-European Studies*.

KING, R. D. 1988 *The Weinreich Legacy. The Fifth Annual Avrom-Nokhem Stencl Lecture in Yiddish Studies*. Oxford Programme in Yiddish, Oxford.

KOVÁCS, L. 1947 Zum Problem der Sekundärdiftonge in der Jiddischen Sprache. In Scheiber, A. (Ed.), *Semitic Studies in Memory of Immanuel Löw*, pp. 268–271. Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, Budapest.

LANDAU, A. 1896 Das Deminutivum der galizisch-jüdischen Mundart. *Deutsche Mundarten* **1**, 46–58.

LANDAU, A. 1897 Bibliographie des Jüdisch-Deutschen. *Deutsche Mundarten* **1**, 126–132.

LEVITA, E. 1541 *Seyfer hatishbi leEyliohu Hatishbi*. Paul Fagius, Isny.

MAHARAM MINTZ 1617 *Sheeyloys uteshuvoys asher ayin loy rooso ad hayoym haze*. Cracow.

MAHARIL 1556 *Seyfer sheeyloys uteshuvoys*. Cremona.

MALKIEL, Y. 1967 Uriel Weinreich (1926–1967). *Language* **43**, 605–607.

MARCHAND, J. W. 1987 Proto Yiddish and the glosses. Can we reconstruct Proto Yiddish? In Katz, D. (Ed.), *Origins of the Yiddish Language. Papers from the First Annual Oxford Winter Symposium in Yiddish Language and Literature, 15–17 December 1985* [= *Winter Studies in Yiddish*, Vol. 1], pp. 83–94. Pergamon, Oxford.

MEUSEL, J. G. 1796 *Das gelehrte Teutschland oder Lexikon der jetzt lebenden teutschen Schriftsteller,* Vol. 2. Verlage der Meyerschen Buchhandlung, Lemgo.

PRILUTSKI, N. 1920 *Tsum yidishn vokalizm* [= his *Yidishe dyalektologishe forshungen. Materyaln far a visnshaftlekher gramatik un far an etimologish verterbukh fun der yidisher shprakh,* 4 = his *Noyakh Prilutskis ksovim,* 10]. Warsaw.

PRILUTSKI, N. 1921 *Dyalektologishe paraleln un bamerkungen* [= his *Yidishe dyalektologishe forshungen,* 3 = his *Noyakh Prilutskis zamlbikher far yidishn folklor, filologye un kultur-geshikhte,* Vol. 2, part 2 = his *Noyakh Prilutskis ksovim,* 9]. Warsaw.

RIVKIND, Y. 1955 Fun mayn verterbikhl (fun der serye 'verter mit yikhes'). *Yidishe shprakh* **15**, 20–30.

SAINEANU, L. 1889 *Studiu dialectologic asupra graiului evreo-german.* Eduard Wiegand, Bucharest.

SATZ, Y. 1979 *Sheelot uteshuvot Maharil.* Machon Yerushalayim, Jerusalem.

SHTIF, N. 1922 *Yidishe kultur geshikhte in mitlalter* [= annotated translation of Güdemann 1888]. Klal farlag, Berlin.

STEINSCHNEIDER, M. 1904 Allgemeine Einleitung in die jüdische Literatur des Mittelalters [part]. *Jewish Quarterly Review* **16**, 373–395, 734–764.

STENCL, A. N. 1978 Taped interview, Whitechapel, 10 November.

WEINREICH, M. 1923a Studien zur Geschichte und dialektischen Gliederung der jiddischen Sprache, 3 Vols. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Philipps-Universität, Marburg.

WEINREICH, M. 1923b *Shtaplen. Fir etyudn tsu der yidisher shprakh-visnshaft un literatur-geshikhte.* Wostok, Berlin.

WEINREICH, M. 1940a Yidish. In *Algemeyne entsiklopedye. Yidn Beyz,* pp. 23–90. Dubnov-fond, Paris and Central Yiddish Culture Organization (CYCO), New York.

WEINREICH, M. 1940b Yidishe filologye. In *Algemeyne entsiklopedye. Yidn Beyz,* pp. 101–108. Dubnov-fond, Paris and Central Yiddish Culture Organization (CYCO), New York.

WEINREICH, M. 1958a Roshe-prokim vegn mayrevdikn yidish. In Mark Y. (Ed.), *Yuda A. Yofe bukh,* pp. 158–194. Yivo: New York [= *Yidishe shprakh* 13 (1953), 35–69 plus addendum].

WEINREICH, M. 1958b Bney hes un bney khes in Ashkenaz: di problem un vos zi lozt undz hern. In Bikl, Sh. and Lehrer, L. (Eds.), *Shmuel Niger bukh,* pp. 101–123.

WEINREICH, M. 1965 On the dynamics of Yiddish dialect formation. In Weinreich, U. (Ed.), *The Field of Yiddish. Second Collection,* pp. 73–86. Mouton, The Hague.

WEINREICH, U. 1954 Is a structural dialectology possible? *Word* **10**, 388–400.

WEINREICH, U. 1958 A retrograde sound shift in the guise of a survival. An aspect of Yiddish vowel development. In Catalán, D. (Ed.), *Miscelánea Homenaje a André Martinét. Estructuralismo e Historia,* Vol. 2, pp. 221–267, Universidad de La Laguna, La Laguna.

WEINREICH, U. 1964 Western traits in Transcarpathian Yiddish. In *For Max Weinreich on his Seventieth Birthday. Studies in Jewish Languages, Literature and Society,* pp. 245–264, Mouton, The Hague.

WEINREICH, U. 1965 *Haivrit haashkenazit vehaivrit shebeyidish: bekhinatan hageografit.* Jerusalem [= *Leshonenu* 24 (1959–1960), 242–252; 25 (1960–1961), 57–80, 180–196].

ZALMEN OF St GOAR 1556 *Maharil.* Sabionetta.