International conference ‘Variation within and across Jewish Languages’ 26-28 June 2013 University of Antwerp

Abstracts

Keynote lectures

Distinctive Jewish Repertoires: A Research Agenda for Comparative Jewish Linguistic Analysis

Sarah Benor, Hebrew Union College

Much work in Jewish linguistics has focused on definitional questions: what is a Jewish language? How different must Jews' speech be to consider it a separate Jewish language? I argue that this debate is unproductive, and I offer an alternative approach. Rather than seeing a given Jewish community's language as a 'Jewish language' or 'Jewish dialect', I see it as the use of a local language in conjunction with a distinctive Jewish repertoire: the linguistic features to which Jews have access that distinguish their speech or writing from that of local non-Jews. This repertoire could be limited to the addition of a few words from Hebrew or another language, or it could be as extensive as vast differences in syntax, phonology, and lexicon. Jews in any given time and place make selective use of their distinctive repertoire as they present themselves as Jews and as certain types of Jews. Eastern Yiddish and Judezmo/Ladino/Judeo-Spanish are exceptions in the linguistic history of the Jewish Diaspora, as they were maintained for centuries away from their original neighboring non-Jewish languages. Even so, they can be included in some elements of comparative analysis.

This paper expands on the construct of "distinctive Jewish repertoires," using language data from contemporary American Jews, modern Eastern European and Ottoman Jews, and other communities. And it offers a comparative research agenda incorporating linguistic questions with socio-historical ones. By investigating in a comparative way how Jews throughout history have distinguished themselves linguistically, we can gain a better understanding of Jewish history, of language and ethnicity, and of the fascinating phenomenon known as "Jewish languages."

Variation in the Hebrew Component of Judeo-Arabic dialects

Aharon Maman, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

The diversity in Arabic dialects goes from west to east, form North Africa to Iraq and Yemen in the south. Similarly, Judeo-Arabic dialects varied enormously in the same way just as Western Yiddish is different from Eastern Yiddish and Judezmo (Judeo-Spanish spoken in Greek and the Balkans) from Haketiyya (Judeo-Spanish spoken in Morocco). This difference not only reflects the cultural gap between the Mashreq and the Maghreb, but each of these areas show quite a wide range of variation, that is, we are dealing here with dialects and sub-dialects. For example, Morocco's Jewish Arabic is very different from the Jewish Arabic of its neighbors to the east in Algeria, Tunisia, and Libya; moreover, inside each of these countries, different dialects evolved.

This diversity holds true for the Hebrew component of those dialects. The diversity is reflected in both the geographical-lateral dimension and in social stratification. Speakers who were familiar with Hebrew texts added to their spoken language a richer Hebrew vocabulary than did laymen; and women had a special vocabulary of their own, different than that of men. Because the Hebrew component was alive and led a dynamic life as if it were an independent living language, and since the creative force of the speakers was great and the formation of these dialects lasted centuries, the Jewish element developed in different directions throughout the ages and was different from place to place. Innovations for the most part were based on local culture.

The lecture will present distinctive features, demarcation lines and varied examples, mainly from the realms of vocabulary, phraseology and semantics, and to a limited extent, from some other linguistic areas as well. To track this diversity, the focus will be placed on certain semantic fields. Examples are drawn from a research project in progress entitled *A Synoptic Dictionary of the Hebrew Component in Jewish languages of the Mediterranean Basin* and from studies in this field.

Variation and the Jewish languages
Frank Alvarez-Pereyre, French National Center for Scientific Research

Variation is not an easy issue for general linguistics, be it when dealing with its representation or when coping with its causes and effects. Do the Jewish languages help clarify the debate, considering the wealth of the material at hand, the research work which is undertaken and the knowledge that has been acquired about these languages ?

As is the case for all languages, variation is partly induced throughout the Jewish languages. At the same time, variation is partly an object for negotiations - covert or overt ones -. At any rate, on both sides of the phenomena, different factors and processes have to be listed. Do they parallel what is commonly witnessed in the field of linguistics ?

The proposed survey might tend to show that different reasons would have led to a maximum degree of variation within the Jewish languages. At the same time, we shall admit the fact that a maximum degree of variation did not provoke an ever ending movement of separation ? Should we then inquire about the status of variation within the Jewish culture in order to come to a coherent picture ?

Jewish Languages and the Hebrew Language
Moshe Bar-Asher, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

When examining the relationships between Jewish languages and the Hebrew language it is important to focus on a number of issues. Here are a number of them:

1. The role of the Hebrew language and the role of the Jewish language in each Jewish community.
2. The distinction between ancient and modern Jewish languages.
3. The special position of Aramaic as a Jewish language for a period of over two thousand years, from antiquity until the modern era.
4. The extent of the Hebrew component in Jewish languages: its use among the educated and among the uneducated; its use by men and women.
5. The immersed Hebrew component and the embedded Hebrew component.
6. The different levels of the Hebrew component and the semantic fields within which it is used.
7. The contribution of the Hebrew component to the traditions of the Hebrew language – early and late traditions.
8. Hebrew as a language of culture and as a living language alongside Jewish languages.
9. The place of Jewish languages in the revival of spoken Hebrew.

Session I: Bilingualism and Registers of Judeo-Arabic: Past and Present
Convener: Yehudit Henshke
Chair: Ofra Tirosh-Becker

The Place of Judeo-Arabic in Contemporary Hebrew: A Lexical Consideration

Yehudit Henshke, University of Haifa

In the course of my research of Judeo-languages I discovered that, to date, the assessment of their weight in the formation of Modern Hebrew has not received comprehensive, systematic study. Where studied, attention has been directed mainly to the influence of Yiddish on Modern Hebrew. My examination of the relationship between Judeo-languages and Modern Hebrew underscores the place of Judeo-Arabic in particular. In this context I recently turned to the study of the Hebrew spoken by residents of the periphery in Israel, asking whether what is often considered substandard Hebrew may actually reflect the Judeo-Arabic substratum of their speech.

The diglossia between Judeo-Arabic and Modern Hebrew, and the influence of the former, is in my opinion an important criterion for the characterization of the Israeli Hebrew of the periphery. This linguistic substratum exercised decisive influence on all aspects of language: phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, discourse, and lexicon. Although often described as substandard or ungrammatical in the scholarship, this lecture has a different perspective on this language, training the spotlight on its underlying linguistic background and examining the link between Judeo-languages (Judeo-Arabic) and this socio-geographical dialect.

Based on a long-term field study, this lecture directs its attention to the Judeo-Arabic lexicon as reflected in Modern Hebrew, as drawn from a corpus of conversations with speakers of Israeli Hebrew from development towns and the urban periphery, second- and third-generation descendants of the large North African aliyah. The lexical analysis showed these words to belong defined categories: concepts (*shḥur*); food (*matbuxa*); holidays and ceremonies (*mimuna*); nicknames (*ʿzizi*); and insults (*bash*), among others. This study's contribution lies in the identification of this sociolect, its description as an outgrowth of known sociolinguistic processes, and determination of its historical-linguistic roots.

Remnants of Maghrebi Judeo-Arabic among French-born Jews of North African descent

Cyril Aslanov, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Nowadays, almost 90% of French Jewry is of North African descent (at least through one of the parents) with a clear-cut repartition between the old generations born in North Africa and the young generations born in France in the early sixties and later. The lost of the ancestral language — Maghrebi Judeo-Arabic in its various diversifications — already started in French-ruled North Africa, especially as far as Algeria is concerned. Yet, some remnants of the lost language subsisted in the French usually spoken by French-born Jews of North African descent.

At a first stage, I would like to classify those markers of ethnical self-awareness according to their respective origin in an attempt to map the various sources of the Judeo-Arabic component in the specific variety of French used by French-born North African Jews. Then I would like to compare this specific Arabic-French code-mixing with another kind of code-mixing that characterizes the descendents of Maghrebi Arab immigration in France. Whereas

in Jewish milieus, one can speak of code-mixing rather than code-switching, the young Muslims of North African descent generally combine the two modalities of language hybridization. Now, a code-mixing that is backed by an occasional code-switching allow to preserve the authenticity of the Arabic component in the French ethnolect whereas in the first case, when the active knowledge of Arabic is close to zero, the Arabic component generally undergo a process of strong adaptation to the morphophonemic schemes of the hosting language.

Variation and the periodization issue: a comparative perspective
Frank Alvarez-Pereyre, French National Center for Scientific Research

As does every Jewish language, Judeo-Arabic has known different periods in its development. Yet, the criteria for establishing the successive periods of the different Jewish languages are not strictly equivalent. In such a context, two questions will be raised: How do change and variation tell us more specifically on the issue of periodization? How far can we account for the similarities and the differences between the Jewish languages from this point of view?

Jerusalem Arabic in Communal Perspective: New Evidence
Ori Shachmon, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

By the turn of the 20th century, the Jewish community of Jerusalem was linguistically multi-faced. It consisted of Yiddish speaking "Ashkenazim", Ladino-speaking "Sephardim", and Arabic-speaking "Mizrahim" of Yemenite, Iraqi, and North-African (Maghribi) origin. In addition, there was an indigenous Jewish community in Jerusalem, whose mother-tongue was the local Arabic. Many of these Jews were bilingual or even multilingual. Ladino-speakers, for example, were in many cases fluent in the local Arabic dialect, which they used for daily communication with their Arab neighbors.

During the last year, with the help of two of my students, I have managed to locate and record several elderly Jews who are natives of Jerusalem and speak Arabic fluently. While, the Arabic of these speakers is clearly of the Levantine type (i.e. not Yemenite, Iraqi or North-African), the new recordings bring to the fore a surprising number of phonological and morphological features which differentiate this variant from what is regularly considered "Jerusalem Arabic". It thus becomes clear, that parts of the old Jewish community of Jerusalem spoke Arabic as first or second language, but this Arabic was not the same as that of their next door neighbors.

The assumption that a distinct Jewish variant exists - or existed - in Jerusalem has been presented in the works of the late Prof. Moshe Piamenta, himself born in Jerusalem in 1921 and a native speaker of Jerusalem Arabic. Piamenta pointed to several linguistic traits which distinguish the Jewish variant from what he identified as "standard Jerusalem Arabic", yet these differences were apparently taken to exemplify a sub-standard variety of Jerusalem Arabic, characteristic of one or two specific informants but not necessarily of the whole Jewish community of the city. Other studies by Piamenta concentrated mainly on differences in the fields of lexicon and Semantics.

In my talk I shall present samples of the Arabic used by old Jewish Jerusalemites and point at the differences between this variant and the known Muslim one, according to phonological,

morphological and lexical features. I would hope to stimulate discussion as to whether the variant used by these speakers may actually be accounted for a distinct Jewish sociolect, viz. a Jerusalem Judeo-Arabic.

Bibliography

Cooper, R.L. and Spolsky, B. *The Languages of Jerusalem*. Oxford : Clarendon Press.

Elyachar, E. 1983. *Living with Jews*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

Piamenta, M. 1979. "Jerusamen substandard ArabicL linguistic analysis of an idiolect", in: *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 1: 263-285.

— 2000. *Jewish Life in Arabic Language and Jerusalem Arabic in Communal Perspective.* Leiden: Brill.

Tamari, S. 2004. "Ishaq al-Shami and the Predicament of the Arab Jew in Palestine", *Jerusalem Quarterly,* issue 21.

Session I: New Perspectives in Yiddish Studies
Chair: Marion Aptroot

The Corpus of Modern Yiddish - a new tool not only for linguistic research

Denis Kirianov, Saint Petersburg State University
Björn Hansen, Universität Regensburg
Sandra Birzer, Universität Regensburg

One of the most rapidly progressing fields of modern linguistics is corpus linguistics. "A corpus of a language is, roughly speaking, a collection of texts in this language, represented in electronic form and provided with scientific definitions [translation – D. K.]" (Plungian 2005: 6). More precisely, a corpus is a database of texts with metatextual annotation (author, year of publication, place of publication, affiliation to dialectal and orthographic varieties of the language etc.), whose words are annotated morphologically. Via an electronic interface corpus users may search the corpus for wordforms, lexemes, collocations or (syntactic) constructions. Thus a corpus is a very versatile and convenient tool that may be used for linguistic research (in lexicography as well as grammar), but also for language teaching.
The Corpus of Modern Yiddish, a joint project of scholars from Moscow, Regensburg and St. Petersburg, is the first online corpus of Yiddish available. The aim is to compile a balanced corpus of Yiddish that will finally contain 10 million tokens, i.e. word forms. Balanced means that the corpus represents all text genres, all dialects (i.e. *Litvish*, *Poylish* and *Ukrainish*) and varieties of Yiddish (e.g. North American Yiddish), as well as the different orthographies. The CMY will cover the time period from 1850 until today. The allocation of word forms to time periods will be the following:
- 2 million word forms for the period 1850-1900
- 6 million word forms for the 1901-1939
- 2 million word forms for the period 1940 – today

Since the period between 1901-1939 is considered the heyday of Yiddish, for which all text genres are available and all sociolinguistic may be paid attention to, it is possible to balance the corpus for this period according to text genres (Table 1) and geographic areas (Table 2).
At the moment, a toy corpus of roughly 4 million word forms is already available online, whose search possibilities will be presented in our talk.

Table 1. Allocation of word forms to text genres (period 1901-1939)

fictional texts, including poetry and drama	3 million word forms
newspapers	1.5 million word forms
scientific texts, schoolbooks, functional texts (*Gebrauchstexte*: instruction manuals, promotion materials etc.)	1 million word forms
handbooks, official domain	0.5 million word forms
memoirs, personal narratives and letters, journals and diaries	depending on availability

Table 2. Allocation of word forms to geographic areas (period 1901-1939)

Poland and rest of Eastern Europe	2.25 million word forms
Northern America, including Canada	1.5 million word forms
Southern America	0.75 million word forms
Soviet Union	0,75 million word forms
Western Europe and rest of the world	0.75 million word forms

Reference: Plungian 2005 – Plungian, Vladimir. What do we need the Russian National corpus for? An informal introduction. // In: *Russian National Corpus. 2003-2005*. Moscow: Indrik. Pp. 6-25. (In Russian)

Tense and Aspect System of modern-day Yiddish revisited: a corpus-based study

Malgorzata Kozyra, Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich / Jagiellonian University Cracow

This paper presents preliminary results of an on-going research project whose aim it is to provide a corpus-based, synchronic analysis of Aspectuality (A), Temporality (T) (here defined as functional-semantic categories; cf. e.g. Bondarko 1982, Czarnecki 1998) in modern-day Yiddish.
Up to date, a coherent, corpus-based investigation of Yiddish TAM is still lacking, even though Yiddish Aspectuality and Temporality has received a significant amount of attention (cf. Aronson 1985; Gold 1999; Shaechter 1951[1996]; Weinreich 1956).
In this paper I will first outline the structure and content of my corpus (written and spoken sources, from 1945 up to present). Subsequently, I will illustrate the patterns that emerge in my corpus by looking at characteristic TA phenomena and provide frequency counts to show how the TAM markers are distributed. Then, using these findings, I will address the following research question:

- Where is Yiddish located on the axis of aspect- vs. tense-prominence (as defined by Bhat 1999)?

References

Aronson, H. I. (1985): Aspect in Yiddish. General Linguistics, 25**,** pp. 171-188.
Auwera van der, Johan/ **Plungian**, Vladimir A. (1998): Conclusion. In: Auwera, van der J.,

Donall P.O. Baoill (ed.): Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe, pp. 813-836. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter
Bhat, D. N. S. (1999): The Prominence of Tense, Aspect and Mood. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Bondarko, A. V. (1967): K problematike funkcjonal'no-semantičeskich kategorij (glagol'nyj vid i <aspektual'nost> v russkom jazyke). In: Voprosy jazykoznanija 2, pp. 18–31.
Czarnecki, T. (1998): Aspektualität im Polnischen und Deutschen. Bedeutungen und Formen in einer konfrontativen Übersicht. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo UG.
Dickey, S. (2000): Parameters of Slavic Aspect. A cognitive Approach. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
Gold, E. (1999): Aspect, Tense and the Lexicon: Expression of Time in Yiddish, University of Toronto.
Schaechter, M. (1951 [1996]): Aktionen im Jiddischen. Ein sprachwissenschaftlicher Beitrag zur Bedeutungslehre des Verbums. Universität Wien. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International 1986.
Weinreich, M., (Ed.) (1956): Yiddish-Knaanic-Slavic; The basic relationships. For Roman Jakobson, Essays on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday, The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter.
Kiefer, U. (1994): Die Tempusformen im Jiddischen. In: Thieroff, R., Ballweg, J. (Ed.), Tense Systems in European Languages. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.

"Yidish", regional peculiarities and "linguistic integrity" among prewar-born native Yiddish speakers in contemporary Eastern Europe

Dov-Ber Kerler, Indiana University Bloomington

During the last 10 years over 20 expeditions to Eastern Europe were undertaken by the Indiana University AHEYM project (AHEYM meaning "homeward" in Yiddish is the acronym of Archives of Historical and Ethnographic Yiddish Memories). As a result close to 900 hours of footage and interviews in Yiddish with some with approximately 360 people from Ukraine, Moldova, Romania, Hungary, Slovakia, and Latvia most of whom were born between 1900 and 1940. Naturally in addition to linguistic, ethnographic and oral history documentation the entire project was especially tuned to collect data on Yiddish dialects and regional variations.
This presentation will aim to concisely outline the following three issues:

(1) Certain "new" or "lesser known" dialectal features that were recorded in the Central Southeastern region (Podolia)

(2) Some observations pertaining to the normally unsolicited local native-speakers' perceptions and attitudes to Yiddish

(3) The overall phenomenon of the remarkable of " linguistic integrity" of most of the speakers interviewed even though many of them mostly stopped using it on a daily basis for many years (in some cases many decades). The notion of "linguistic integrity" does not exclude code-switching which is characteristic in most of the interviews (especially in Ukraine) and was in some cases more pronounced than in others.

The presentation will be accompanied by a few brief video snippets from some of the interviews.

Is the current classification of Yiddish dialects linguistically appropriate?
Alexander Beider, independent scholar (Paris)

The first scholarly classification of modern Yiddish varieties was suggested in 1895 by Landau. He distinguished Eastern Yiddish (EY) and Western Yiddish (WY) according to the reflexes of MHG diphthongs *ei* and *ou*. During the following decades, others linguists (including such important contributors as Boroxov, Birnbaum, Bin-Nun, Weinreich, and Katz) proposed other classifications. Differences between them are partly terminological and partly substantial dealing with the history of the development of Yiddish. Because of the fundamental influence of writings by Weinreich to Yiddish studies, his classification became the standard in this domain. As a result, one generally distinguishes WY and the following subdivisions of EY: Northeastern Yiddish, Southeastern Yiddish and Central Yiddish. The main formal criteria used by these scholars are similar enough: all of them deal with reflexes of one or several stressed vowels. It was Manaster Ramer who provided in 1997 arguments showing that the oldest dialect division within Yiddish was not between WY and EY (defined according to the criterion known since Landau), but rather along or west of the Elbe, that is, internally to the territory of WY. Consequently, he suggested distinguishing Westerly Yiddish versus Easterly Yiddish, the former covering only a part of the WY territory and the latter covering the remaining (eastern) part of WY together with all of the EY area.

The paper questions the adequacy of criteria used by other authors. Indeed, without any detailed analysis of genetic links that can exist between Yiddish varieties, various classifications suggested appear in many aspects rather conventional. For example, it is not clear in which way isoglosses associated with reflexes of various MHG vowels are so significant that they can serve as appropriate criteria for separating Yiddish dialects. We can postulate that the two Yiddish varieties are placed in the same group if and only if German dialects underlying them (that is, the linguistically structural elements according to the language tree model) as well as their non-German substrata are the same. The detailed analysis shedding light on these questions, not limited to the consideration of reflexes of a few stressed vowels, but addressing other phonological features, as well as other parts of the language too (such as morphology and basic vocabulary) shows several inadequacies in the standard classification. Firstly, it appears that EY and WY varieties in western German-speaking territories do not descend from the same ancestor. As a result, in a purist approach one can speak about two different Yiddish languages. Secondly, Yiddish dialects that were spoken in Czech lands, eastern Germany and former East Prussia can be considered to be subdialects of EY. Thirdly, the Dutch Yiddish represents a mixture of WY and EY.

Session II: Jewish Communities
Chair: Dalit Assouline

Jewish languages and languages of the Jews
Bernard Spolsky, Bar-Ilan University

During the last 20 years, there has been continued research into Jewish varieties of language. In Spolsky & Benor (2006), it was noted that the recognition of Jewish language varieties began with Mieses (1915) but is better dated from the 1970s with such publications as Birnbaum (1972), Weinreich (1980) and collections like Fishman (1985). These studies have involved an acceptance of the fact that around the world and throughout history, Jews have spoken and written somewhat differently from the non-Jews around them. Yiddish or Judeo-Arabic, Judeo-Spanish or Jewish English, Jewish language varieties have had much in common, and this conference will continue to explore similarities and differences. From the point of view of a sociolinguistic ecology of Jewish speech communities, there have been and remain niches filled by varieties that are generally not used outside the community. Labeling them as distinct varieties or even languages depends on the demonstration of distinguishing features (borrowed lexicon or special pronunciation, for example) as well as perception of difference from inside or outside the community. There are cases which test the phenomenon (e.g., the German village dialects with borrowings from Hebrew and Yiddish or the use of Israeli Hebrew by non-Jews). There are also problems in deciding when a language spoken by Jews actually became Jewish, such as when did the Aramaic adopted during the Babylonian Exile become Judeo-Aramaic, or when did Yiddish become differentiated from the German dialect or dialects it was based on. Using linguistic features to answer this question is made difficult by the fact that these varieties emerged in speech of which we have no record – written records are much later; and the labeling of the varieties is also a much more recent practice. Rather we need to understand that they were created in situations of multilingualism, when Jews spoke several varieties and lived with the kind of code-switching common in much of the ancient world as well as in modern urban societies.

References

Birnbaum, Salomo A. (1972). Jewish languages. In C. Roth & G. Wigoder (Eds.), *Encyclopedia Judaica* (Vol. 10, pp. 66-69). Jerusalem Israel: Keter.

Fishman, Joshua A. (Ed.). (1985). *Readings in the Sociology of Jewish Languages*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Mieses, Matthias. (1915). *Die Entstehungsursache der jüdeschen Dialekte*. Vienna: R. Lőwit.

Spolsky, Bernard, & Benor, Sarah B. (2006). Jewish languages. In K. Brown (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (Second ed., Vol. 6, pp. 120-124). Oxford: Elsevier.

Weinreich, Max. (1980). *History of the Yiddish language* (J. A. Fishman & S. Noble, Trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Secret language in the Jewish Community of the Eastern Caucasus
Vitaly Shalem, Independent

The small Jewish community of the Eastern Caucasus (the so called *Mountain Jews*) used to live in Northern Azerbaijan, Daghestan, and some regions of the Northern Caucasus before the major demographical changes in the late 20th century. Their native language is usually

called *zuhun imu* "our language", *zuhun juhur* "Jewish language", or simply *Juhuri* "Jewish" by speakers and referred to as *Judeo-Tat* among scholars. The latter term indicates the similarity between Juhuri and another language spoken in the same region by the larger Muslim group of Iranian origin, usually referred to as Tat. Judeo-Tat belongs to the south western subgroup of the Iranian languages and can be roughly divided into four main dialects (Zand 1982, Nazarova 1996, Gordon 2005).

A special jargon, used to create a barrier in understanding between two partially intelligible languages, is a well known phenomenon in various Jewish communities. Such artificial languages were created and used in the Jewish communities of Iran (Yarshater 1977, Gindin 2003), Kurdistan (Mutzafi 2010), North Africa (Maman 1999), and Georgia (Ben-Oren & Moskovitz 1986). Apparently the Jewish community of the Eastern Caucasus was no exception. In his paper from 1929, prof. B. Miller mentions that one of his informants told him about the existence of a "secret" language in this community, known as *zuhun 'ymromi*. He briefly describes his findings: possible origin, fields of usage, a couple of lexical examples, as well as a short discussion about the name itself. So far Miller is the only reference that provides any information about this phenomenon in this community. This special jargon seems to have almost disappeared during the 20th century and not much has been preserved.

In my fieldwork among the community members in Israel, I managed to discover some traces of the secret language used by the Mountain Jews. Even though there are not that many examples, they provide a general description of the phenomenon, its nature, and ways of usage. In this paper I would like to present my findings and compare them to other similar cases described in literature.

Disappearing Jewish Languages of New York: A Field Report

Ross Perlin, Daniel Kaufman, Habib Borjian, Endangered Language Alliance / University of Bern

The New York metropolitan area, home to over two million Jews, is a microcosm of Jewish diversity and a globally significant, strangely under-researched site for Jewish languages. Here, we present ongoing work from the Jewish Language Initiative of the Endangered Language Alliance, a non-profit organization based in New York City. We examine the present-day status of five endangered languages still represented in New York: Judezmo (Ladino), Judeo-Arabic, Judeo-Persian, Juhuri (Judeo-Tat), and Bukhori (Judeo-Tajik). The first stage of the Jewish Language Initiative is focused on rich audio-visual documentation in the vein described by Himmelman (1998).

All of the communities are experiencing language loss, but at different rates and to different degrees, but what domains are disappearing fastest and what factors, if any, are driving language maintenance or conservatism? For instance, Juhuri- and Bukhori-speakers have carried on in New York a shift to Russian that began in the USSR, with the youngest generation now embracing English, but many also consider themselves inheritors of classical Persian culture. Judezmo is beginning to show signs of a familiar "post-vernacularity", following in the footsteps of "secular" Yiddish (Shandler 2006). Crucial in attempts at language maintenance is the work of highly motivated younger community members, often taking the form of evening classes. We report here on the motivations of the teachers and the students in the case of the Bukharian community.

We also look at how the New York communities fit into the global picture and how these increasingly globalized diasporas are navigating ethnic identity despite language loss. We'll present original data on these languages in an attempt to understand their evolving "Jewish" component, thus approaching the fundamental question of the field: to what extent are these simply languages spoken by Jews and to what extent are they uniquely Jewish languages (Rabin 1981, Fishman 1985 *inter alia*)? In particular, our data will speak to the conflict between the spoken and literary varieties in the case of Bukhori and Juhuri.

Crucially, we aim not only to present our progress in documenting the Jewish languages of New York but to spur a conversation about what elements of these languages are most critical to document in what may unfortunately be the final stage of their existence. The Jewish Language Initiative in New York, as we envision it, can only be successful with the input and collaboration of other scholars and community members across the diaspora as well as in Israel.

References:

Fishman, J. 1985. The sociology of Jewish languages from a general sociolinguistic point of view. In Fishman (ed.), pp. 3-21.

Himmelmann, N. 1998. "Documentary and descriptive linguistics", *Linguistics* 36: 161-195.

Rabin, C. 1981. What constitutes a Jewish language? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 30: 19-28.

Shandler, J. 2006. *Adventures in Yiddishland: Postvernacular Language and Culture*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Hasidic Yiddish print in New York: main problems and possible solutions

Tatiana Panova, Saint Petersburg State University

1. The term "Hasidic Yiddish".
   a. There are different variants of one language in different surroundings (in Israel, Canada, England, USA) with different sources of linguistic material, and there is just one term to mark them. Suggestions: to distinguish the variants of the language of different religious groups (*G. Jochnowitz 1968, S. Krogh 2013*) or to distinguish them according to the language, which is dominant in the environment (*M.H. Safadi, 2000*).
   b. How to set a boundary between Yiddish and English in NY? Hasidic Yiddish, Yeshivish and Jewish English (*Ch. Weiser, 1995*; *S. Steinmetz, 1981*).
   c. Variation within the Yiddish language in print. We can try to find a continuation of the chain of different orthographic traditions of Yiddish. If there is no unification, does the language need a compulsory normalization? May the editorial institute fill up this gap?

2. Orthography.
   a. There are several orthographical features, that are characteristic for Hasisdic Yiddish, but vary from text to text and even within one text, e.g. missing diacritics, "silent alef" that marks morphological border ect. (*S. Krogh 2013*).

b. A general germanization of the orthography of the American Yiddish, that was noticed even in the first half of the 20th century (*J.H. Neumann 1938*)
c. There is also no unification of solid/separate writing compounds or wordforms with clitics. Some attempts to analyze the frequency of the solid, separate writing and writing with hyphen have been made (*D. Katz 1992*), but it is interesting to study it from the grammatical point of view: it can indicate the grammaticalization of some lexemes (e.g. pronouns, adverbs).
d. Loanwords present a lot of particular characteristics in their spelling which differs a lot from one text to another.

3. Lexis and phraseology
   a. Yiddish in New York as a Jewish language has several components of the lexicon. Thus lexis of the spoken language should be more affected by English, than the language of print (*A. Fader 2009, M.H. Safadi 2000*).
   b. New English loanwords and phraseology (e.g. *in fakt – faktish*) may either substitute lexis with different origin (Germanic, Hebrew-Aramaic etc.) or designate new conceptions of life. What are the sociolinguistic and pragmatical reasons for that? Probably, different parts of speech are substituted with different frequency?

4. Grammatical features.
   a. There is a trend to mark plural forms with *-s* ending.
   b. The confusion in the system of grammatical genders and the declination system may be a result of phonetic unification of the definite articles and adjective endings.

Fader A., Mitsvah girls. New Jersey, 2009.
Jochnowitz G., Bilingualism and Dialect Mixture among Lubavitcher Hasidic Children // American Speech. 43, 1968. 182–200.
Katz D., Klal-takones fun Yidishn oysleyg. Oxforder Yidish: Oxford, 1992.
Krough S., The foundations of written Yiddish among Haredi Satmar Jews // Yiddish Language Structures. Empirical Approaches to Language Typology. Berlin, New York 2013 (in press).
Neumann J. H., Notes on American Yiddish // The Journal of English and Germanic Philology. 37, 1938. 403–421.
Safadi M., Yiddish: Its survival in an English-dominant environment. LA, University of California, 2000.

Session II: Jewish Languages in Written Texts
Chair: Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald

A Journey Eastward – Linguistic Variation within an Early Nineteenth Century Yiddish Travelogue

Marion Aptroot, Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf

In the wake of the Haskalah, the Jewish Enlightenment, didactical literature was published in Hebrew and Yiddish. One such text is *Onia soara* (The Storming Ship), a Hebrew and Yiddish adaptation (ca. 1815) of Johann Heinrich Campe's German children's book about a ship's voyage from Europe to the Dutch East Indies around the African continent. This book, in turn, was indirectly based on Willem IJsbrand Bontekoe's international bestseller

describing three eventful journeys to the East, which was first published in Dutch in 1646. The first edition in Hebrew characters was bilingual, Hebrew and Yiddish. It is undated, the title page and beginning of the unique copy (National Library of Israel) are missing. The Yiddish version was never reprinted, the Hebrew twice.

The paper describes and analyzes variation in syntax and lexicon within the Yiddish version. This source is a rich document of variation within early nineteenth century Yiddish in Eastern Europe at a time of major changes in the written language. The use of both 'typically' Western and Eastern Yiddish words and constructions offers evidence of the search for a new literary idiom. This idiom is based on spoken Eastern Yiddish, more precisely South Eastern Yiddish, while the influence of older written Yiddish and contemporary German is present. Lexical variants are often printed next to each other (e.g. *ind* and *khvalye* 'wave'), one apparently functioning as the explanation of the other, whereby either the Western or Eastern variant can be presented as the gloss.

With its internal variation, the text wavers between what Weinreich named written Yiddish A and B (Max Weinreich, *History of the Yiddish Language* New Haven [1973] 2008, also: Dov-Ber Kerler, *The Origins of Modern Literary Yiddish*, Oxford 1999). Interpretation of the patterns emerging from the analysis has to be undertaken with caution, not least because the translator, a possible editor and the inexpert typesetter(s) remain anonymous and may all have put their stamp on the printed text.

From Valladolid to Istanbul: syntactic phenomena in Jewish written texts
Maria Rita Castaldi, Università degli Studi "L'Orientale", Naples

There are two main different hypotheses regarding the chronological starting point of Judeo-Spanish. While Haïm Vidal Sephiha posits it beyond the date of the Expulsion from Spain, nevertheless other important scholars support the possibility of dating back the start of Judeo-Spanish earlier. My aim is to investigate the role of syntax in this debate. According to Laura Minervini, Judeo-Spanish has a pure Ibero-romance syntax, not affected by any further influences. Nevertheless, a slightly different opinion appears much more fruitful for research.
Alberto Varvaro, for instance, examined two legal documents from Aguilar de Campò, written in Northern Castile at the beginnings of XIII century, reaching the following conclusions: in their legal and economic documents, Jews made use of style and syntax derived from Hebrew: in particular, they made use of synonymic dittologies, based on the same word root, for instance: "[*uendida*] *affirmad e affirmada*". Dittologies were also present in the Castilian of the Christian speakers, but they were not based on the same root and didn't occur with frequency.
Actually, in his paper, Varvaro didn't adhere to any particular theoretical frame. Nevertheless, since I was inspired by his remarks, I decided to apply the valency analysis to two well-known documents: the Laws of Valladolid and the acts of a trial held in Zaragoza during 1465. I have analyzed the valency of the following verbs: *Dar*, *pagar*, and *pechar*, belonging to the semantic field "giving"; *decir*, *enseniar*, and *ordenar*, belonging to the semantic field "communication". I divided the verbs following the number of their arguments. Then, I described the semantic features of these arguments. Finally, I recorded prepositions marking the second and the third argument. By collecting these kind of data, it will be possible to compare the Jewish documents with the Christian ones of the same period. I expect to discover syntactic differences and similarities and, in addition to this, it will be possible to compare these data with those obtained from the first occurrences of Judeo-Spanish in the

Ottoman Empire. In particular, I am interested to the first queries directed to the rabbinic courts in the Ottoman Empire and their *responsa*. Obviously, these documents could not reflect the daily language, nevertheless they are distant from the Ladino fixed norms.

Maqre Dardeqe and the Jewish Italian Bible- and *Siddur* translations: tradition and changes in the Roman component of the Jewish Italian between 15th and 16th centuries

Michael Ryzhik, Bar-Ilan University

Maqre Dardeqe is well-known three-language (Hebrew-Italian-Arabic) dictionary of the Biblical Hebrew, printed in Napoli in the 1488. It's Italian part was discussed by M. Schwab (Le Maqré Dardeqé, Paris 1889), by G.Fiorentino (JQR XLII [1951-52], pp. 57-77) and by L. Cuomo (Actes du XVIII Congrès International de Linguistiques et de Philologie Romanes, Tuebingen 1988, pp. 159-167), it's Arabic was described by O.Tirosh-Becker (Italia 9 [1990], pp. 37-77). This dictionary was composed to help to Jewish students to read and understand the text of the Bible.
Two main topics will be discussed in this paper:

1. The ancient and meridional traditions conserved in the *Maqre Dardeqe*. For example, the word *gulio* [גוליאו] which translates the Hebrew תאב 'desire' is found only in the deep South Italian dialects; the verb *ingrottao* [אנגרוטאו], which translates the Hebrew חלה 'to be ill' is documented only in ancient Italian sources, such as Ruggieri Apugliese or Guittone d'Arezzo.

2. The comparison between the *Maqre Dardeqe* and the Bible and Siddur translations of the 15th and of the first half of 16th centuries. This comparison shows the initial steps of the change from the 'classical' Jewish Italian of the medieval translations to the standard Italian. So, the mentioned verb *ingrottao* 'to be ill' is found only in the ancient *Cantico dei Cantici* translation and in the 15th century manuscripts of the Siddur translations; in the first printed edition of the Jewish-Italian Siddur (Fano 1506) it is changed to the common Italian word *malato* 'ill'. Here and in other cases we can see that the changes in the 'standard Italian' direction are connected with the beginning of the print. This is one of many indications that the processes in the Jewish Italian development in this period were parallel to the analogical processes in the common Italian with its '*questione di lingua*'. The comparison between these two developments, the Jewish Italian one and the common Italian, may help us to understand their mechanisms. The central role in this research belongs to the comparison between *Maqre Dardeqe*, printed on the eve of the epoch of the printing and the Jewish-Italian translations.

Desirably, the final aim of such a research will be the compilation of the dictionary of the *Roman* component of the medieval (pre-ghetto) Jewish-Italian, which will represent the Jewish-Italian dialects in their diachronical development and diatopical connections with other dialects of Italy.

Secular Šarḥ? The Curious Case of the Marquis's Daughter

Slavomír Čéplö, Institute of the Czech National Corpus, Charles University

In the study of written Maghribī Judeo-Arabic, the main focus of linguistic research has so far been directed at the šurūḥ, the translations of sacred writings. Other written production of the Arabic-speaking Jewish population of North Africa – original prose (whether religious in nature or not), journalism, poetry (especially qinot), translations of Christian New Testament[1] and secular translations[2] – has received comparatively little attention as a subject of linguistic analysis. Of these text types, secular translations are a particularly fascinating avenue of research: for one, linguistic analysis of translations of texts of non-religious nature[3] can be compared with that of various šurūḥ and its conclusions regarding the description of their grammatical system and stylistical or dialectological composition. Such analysis can thus contribute to the description of written Judeo-Arabic as a whole. Additionally, while most šurūḥ have Hebrew as the source language[4], secular translations were primarily made from other languages (such as French). This distinction can be used for comparison of various translation strategies and the degree of influence of the original language on the process and the result.

The present paper offers a linguistic analysis of one secular translation, a 73-page booklet titled "בנת אלמרכיז ונקקאש פאריז" (*The Marquis' Daughter and the Sculptor of Paris*) published in Tunis by Uzan Père & Fils ca. 1930. This work is a Judeo-Arabic version of the story "Le Buste" from the collection *Les Mariages du Paris* by Edmond About, originally published in Paris in 1856, with the translation itself done by יוסף די אברהם ביג'אוי. Major linguistic aspects of this translation will be examined, with special attention paid to the mixing of various varieties / registers of Arabic (Modern Standard, Classical Judeo-Arabic, dialectal Judeo-Arabic etc.), the relationship between the communicative function of the text and the choice of variety / register and the relationship between this translation and various šurūḥ. Additionally, the paper will evaluate the applicability of some of the methods used in corpus linguistics and natural language processing to the analysis of the relationship between the original and the translation[5] (in šurūḥ and beyond) and to the analysis of written Judeo-Arabic in general.

---

[1] Such as those published by the British and Foreign Bible Society in London like the 1900 אלבשארא אלמקדשא עלא לסאן לוקס ובו or those from French North Africa like *Evangile selon Saint-Matthieu en Judéo-Arabe de l'Afrique du Nord* published in 1924 in Algiers.

[2] For some examples, see: מיכל שרף, " דניאל חג'אג' וחיבורו על תולדות הספרות הערבית-יהודית בתוניסיה (1862-1939)", פעמים 30, (תשמז) 41-59.

[3] The question of what counts as secular is obviously a complex one. The classification of, say, a šarḥ of the Targum to the Canticles versus the Judeo-Arabic translation of *The Three Musketeers* would be quite straightforward. The Judeo-Arabic translation of *Josippon*, on the other hand, straddles the fence in more ways than one.

[4] There are at least two categories of šurūḥ of works originally written in Aramaic: portions of the Haggadah (as preserved in countless editions) and the aforementioned Targum to Canticles (such as the one from the collection of the present author, published in Livorno in 1854-55). To our knowledge, neither has been subjected to linguistic analysis to date.

[5] For some of the applicable methods, see P.S.F. van Keulen and W.Th. van Peursen, *Corpus Linguistics and Textual History* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2006).

Session III: Linguistic Variations in Early Ladino Books
Convener: Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald
Chair: Dorit Ravid

Judeo-Spanish and the study of language variation and change

Josep M. Fontana, Aldina Quintana: Universitat Pompeu Fabra, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Due to the special circumstances in which it evolved, Judeo-Spanish has some characteristics that make it an especially interesting candidate for the study of a wide range of linguistic phenomena. Judeo-Spanish presents us with the paradox of being rather conservative in some areas while also having undergone many more changes in its structure due to language contact than have the varieties of Peninsular Spanish from which it diverged. The lack of contact with other varieties of Spanish together with the absence of a normative standard created a situation that is uncommon for modern European languages. Judeo-Spanish thus affords an excellent opportunity to study the effects of such conditions on the development of a language. Traditionally, research on Judeo-Spanish has concentrated mainly on the study of its lexicon and of the influences that languages that it has been in contact with (especially Hebrew, Turkish, Italian and French) have had on its composition and mechanisms of word formation. More recently, the phonetic and phonological properties of Judeo-Spanish have also been the focus of some attention, e.g. Bradley (2009, 2011). Very little research has been conducted, however, on other aspects of this linguistic variety, such as its syntax, information structure or evolution over time.

This situation started to change recently with studies such as Romero (2008, 2011) or Montoliu and van der Auwera (2004) which suggest that Judeo-Spanish is rich in morpho-syntactic phenomena that clearly differentiate it from contemporary standard varieties of Spanish. The goal of our work is to pursue the exploration of syntactic variation and change in Judeo-Spanish even further.

We describe the initial stages in the development of a linguistically annotated (POS tagged and syntactically parsed) diachronic corpus of Judeo-Spanish. We also present a preliminary study using this corpus that shows that Judeo-Spanish displays a number of phenomena that are relevant for many ongoing debates in theoretical linguistics. Among other facts we will discuss are the differences in word order and information structure and in the licensing of overt pronouns with respect to standard contemporary Spanish, clitics and the development of object agreement morphology, and diachronic and synchronic variation in the use of the subjunctive. We hope this sort of work will yield valuable insights not only into Judeo-Spanish but also eventually into the nature and structure of language as well as the mechanisms and causes of language change.

References

Bradley, T. G. (2009). On the Syllabification of Prevocalic /w/ in Judeo-Spanish. In P. J. Masullo, E. O'Rourke & Ch.-H. Huang (eds.), *Romance Linguistics 2007: Selected Papers from the 37th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)* (pp. 51-67). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bradley, T. G. (2011). Mid Front Vowel Lowering before Rhotics in Ibero-Romance. In J. Herschensohn (ed.), *Romance Linguistics 2010: Selected Papers from the 40th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)* (pp. 63-78). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Montoliu, C. & J. van der Auwera (2004). On Judeo-Spanish conditionals. In O. M. Tomic (ed.), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics* (pp. 461-474). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Romero, R. (2008) Turkish Word Order and Case in Modern Judeo-Spanish Spoken in Istanbul. In M. Westmoreland, & J. A. Thomas (eds.). *Selected Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics* (pp. 157-161). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Romero, R. (2011). Variation in Balkan Judeo-Spanish final clauses. *Ianua. Revista Philologica Romanica, 11*, 89-99.

Linguistic Variation as a Discourse Topic in the Judezmo Press

David M. Bunis, Hebrew University of Jerusalem

From the rise of the Judezmo (or Judeo-Spanish) press in mid-19th-century Izmir, linguistic variation was a frequent topic of discourse on its pages. The literal Ladino translation variety, literary varieties such as the archaizing language of the ballad, social varieties such as the language of women, tradesmen, and yeshivah students, and regional varieties such as the dialects of Istanbul, Edirne, Sofia and Monastir (Bitola)—all received attention by journalists sensitive to differentiation in speech and writing. The lecture presents an overview of this discourse, which also serves as a taxonomy of linguistic variation in modern Judezmo.

Linguistic Variations in Early Ladino Translations

Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald, Bar-Ilan University

Several Ladino translations were published in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, most of which from Hebrew. This study concentrates on a few of these books and demonstrates how they vary linguistically. The variations discussed pertain to orthography, morphology, syntax, lexicon, and a number of discourse phenomena. Orthographic variations are evident in the representation of *ǧ, ž, š, λ,* and *β-v,* in the definite articles of some nouns and their verbal conjugations, in sentence structure, in the choice of lexemes (including the frequency of Hebrew word usage), and in the coherent structures of the texts. The origin of these variations can be attributed to the target populations to which the texts were addressed and to the author's degree of reliance on Hebrew sources along with his linguistic background.

Session IV: The Ultimate Judaic Language: Modern Hebrew at the Crossroads of History and Current Contexts

Convener: Dorit Ravid

Chair: Steven Gillis

Homography in the development of Hebrew reading: an ancient challenge in new contexts

Amalia Bar-On, Tel Aviv University

A prominent property of the non-voweled Hebrew orthography is homography. For example, the homographic string מדבר MDBR stands, inter alia, for *midbar* 'desert', *medaber* '(is) speaking', and *mi-davar* 'from-thing'. Subsequently, accurate identification of words in a non-

voweled Hebrew text requires semantic and syntactic contextualization. 130 Hebrew-speaking pupils in six grade levels and 20 adults were administered the Homographic Garden Path Reading Task in order to determine how and to what extent novice, experienced and proficient readers rely on contextual linguistic processes while decoding non-voweled Hebrew words. Results indicate that successful reading of target words in a facilitating context is under way at the beginning of 2nd grade, while erroneous reading in misleading contexts occurred in all age groups. This study demonstrates the developmental path to skilled Hebrew reading, which requires making full usage of the semantic / syntactic context in order to map written onto spoken units.

Derivational morphology in schoolage Hebrew: development in the shadow of language disorder and low socio-economic status
Ronit Levie, Tel Aviv University

Learning processes of Hebrew content words were studied in a series of morphological experiments across the school years. Four groups of participants were targeted: Typically-developing children and adolescents from mid-high and low SES respectively, and language-impaired peers, also from mid-high and low SES, altogether 728 participants. They were administered tasks of deriving nouns, verbs and adjectives. Results indicated a consistent hierarchy in the findings, with the typically-developing students from mid-high SES scoring the highest, the language disordered students from low SES scoring the lowest, and the two other groups lying in-between. For all groups, verbs were the easiest category while derived nominals proved to be very difficult, with adjectives most affected by population type. The Semitic root was found to be the most robust morpheme in all groups, whereas non-linear patterns were most vulnerable in the three disabled groups.

Conjunct constructions in Hebrew narratives: modern usage and echoes of the past
Liat Hershkovitz, Tel Aviv University

The study investigates the distributions and discourse functions of Conjunct constructions – paratactic units with similar syntactic functions, attached to a single syntactic unit – in over 120 written Hebrew narratives. 4th grade, 7th grade and 11th grade students, young adults of mandatory military service and university students were each asked to write personal-experience stories about emotional themes, which were consequently analyzed for numbers and types of conjunct constructions. Findings indicated usage of such constructions across age groups, with increasing numbers and diversification of functions in older groups. Structures often echoed similar constructions in Classical Hebrew, as in the case of a 7th grader writing "ואת חברה שלי היא לא הזמינה", echoing the Cain and Abel Biblical formulation **"ואל קין ומנחתו לא שעה".** We explain the widespread usage of conjunct constructions and the frequent echoes of the past based on Hebrew speakers' familiarity with Classical scriptures and their derivatives.

Spoken and written organization in Hebrew narratives
Dorit Ravid & Yehudit Har Zahav, Tel Aviv University

Both spoken and written discourse needs to be cohesive in order to achieve coherent representation by readers. However cohesion works differently the writing and speech

modalities work differently, due to differential processing conditions and to the presence / absence of the interlocutor in the discourse event. The current study compares 20 personal-experience narratives produced in speech and writing by Hebrew-speaking adults (Berman, 2005). For each pair of stories, 'shadow story' was constructed out of the content of the two stories, and divided into content units. This enabled us to compare each of the content units across the two modalities in terms of (i) discourse function, (ii) morpho-syntactic usage, (iii) cohesion and information flow, and (iv) discourse stance (Du Bois, 2007). Findings indicate that adult Hebrew speakers treat narrative production in clearly differential, modality-specific ways.

Berman, R.A .2005. Introduction: Developing discourse stance in different text types and languages. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37, 105-124.

Du Bois, J. W. 2007. The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (ed.), *Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Session IV: Yiddish Dialects and Beyond
Chair: Steffen Krogh

The linguistic position of Western Yiddish: a comparison of morpho-syntactic constructions with their German and Eastern Yiddish counterparts

Jürg Fleischer & Lea Schäfer, Philipps-Universität Marburg

The status of Western Yiddish is much disputed: some scholars believe that the vernacular of western Ashkenazic Jews is historically related to Eastern Yiddish (above all Weinreich 1973), but others hold that the two linguistic entities have different origins and Western Yiddish is just a sociolect of German (e.g., Simon 1988, Wexler 1991, 2002) and, hence, labeled "Jüdisch-Deutsch", "Judeo-German", "Ashkenazic German" etc.

One reason why assessments of the status of Western Yiddish differ so widely lies in the fact that there is not much Western Yiddish data extant. Many of the old Western Yiddish texts were shaped according to German models or displayed a supraregional variety used in print to serve a geographically disperse readership (Katz 1983: 1025). Data from modern varieties, however, is difficult to come by. As is well known, Western Yiddish was gradually given up in favor of German varieties, beginning probably as early as the late 18th century in connection with historical events such as the Jewish enlightenment (*Haskalah*) and assimilation to German cultural and linguistic norms.

As Max Weinreich (1953/1958) shows, in addition to the scarce sound recordings documenting Southwestern Yiddish (cf. e.g. Fleischer 2005), there exist literary texts written in Hebrew or Latin script from the 18th century onward that are relatively close to the spoken language. As always with historical records, it is difficult to linguistically interpret these texts, which provide us only with "bad data" in the sense of Labov (1994: 11). Therefore, these (potential) sources must be analyzed in a systematic way to enlarge our knowledge about the linguistic structures of Western Yiddish. This is currently done in a research project funded by the German Science Foundation (DFG).[1]

In our talk we will provide a brief characterization of the difficult data situation and will then take a closer look at some morpho-syntactic constructions identified as Western Yiddish, namely, among others, the formation of the diminutive plural, the case used after preposition, and the past tense auxiliary selection of so-called periphrastic verbs (cf. Eastern Yiddish *moykhl zayn* 'to pardon'). These constructions will then be compared to their Eastern Yiddish as well as German counterparts. As it turns out, Western Yiddish has much in common with German and its dialects but displays clear affinities to Eastern Yiddish as well, which provides evidence for a pan-Yiddish genetic entity in the sense of Weinreich (1973).

Synchronic and diachronic variation in adjective endings in Yiddish

Rachel Steindel Burdin, The Ohio State University

Proto-Yiddish had two sets of adjective declensions, strong and weak, whose use depended on the preceding article: the strong forms were used following the indefinite article, and weak forms, following the definite article. It has been noted that, broadly speaking, while Western Yiddish has maintained this dual declension system, Eastern Yiddish has lost it (King 1989).

[1] See http://www.uni-marburg.de/fb09/igs/mitarbeiter/fleischer/forschung/westernyiddish.

However, there has been (1) no work systematically looking at the differences between these dialects' adjective systems, either synchronically or diachronically, and (2) little attention paid to potential contact effects from Slavic languages, which differ typologically from Germanic languages, both in how they decline adjectives, and in the structure of the noun phrase more generally: in Slavic languages, adjectives agree with the noun the modify, with the (in)definiteness of the noun (which is expressed differently than in Germanic languages) playing no role.

This study will compare the adjective systems of Western Yiddish and Eastern Yiddish, both diachronically (using data from an online corpus of Yiddish texts dating back to the 15th century) and synchronically (using data from the Language and Cultural Atlas of Ashkenazic Jewry).

Preliminary results suggest that in the east, while the strong and weak endings seemed to have collapsed into one set of endings early on in more vernacular texts, such as recorded court testimony (see example 1, in which the -n ending, formally a strong ending, is being used as a generic masculine singular accusative ending, in a position that would, in Western Yiddish, call for a weak ending), both the strong and weak endings were being used in literary texts (See examples 2a and 2b). This vernacular/literary split seems to be to be similar to other developments in Eastern Yiddish that may have been brought about from contact with Slavic languages, such as in the generalization of the verb-second constraint (Santorini 1989).

This diachronic data, combined with synchronic data, will not only give a clearer picture of the degree of influence of various west Slavic languages on Eastern Yiddish morphology, but will also give insight into morphological change and variation under contact more generally.

(1) den zelbig-n tag
the-MASC.SG.ACC same-MASC.SG.ACC day-DAY
"The same day"
From an Eastern Yiddish speaker's court testimony, c. 1565

(2) a. der heylig shbt
the-MASC.SG.NOM.DEFINITE holy-Ø[=MASC.SG.NOM.WEAK] Shabbat-MASC
"The holy Shabbat"
b. un' eyn grus-r tal
and a big-MASC.SG.NOM.STRONG valley
"And a great valley"
From a translation of *The Song of Songs,* 1579

King, R. D. 1987. Proto Yiddish morphology. In *Origins of the Yiddish language*: *Winter Studies*
in Yiddish Volume 1. Ed. Dovid Katz. New York: Pergamon Press.

Santorini, Beatrice. 1989. The generalization of the verb-second constraint in the history of Yiddish. PhD. Thesis. University of Pennsylvania.

Gender change in the Southeastern and Central Yiddish dialects

Marina Shcherbakova, Saint Petersburg State University

Variation in the grammatical gender of nouns in Yiddish dialects has been regarded in the linguistics primarily as a phenomenon of the Northeastern dialect (NEY) where the gender

and case system has undergone undoubtedly the most radical transformation. In my study a synchronic analysis of gender change was focused on the Eastern Yiddish dialect area as a whole. The research was based on the sound data of the Central Yiddish (CY) and the Southeastern (SEY) Yiddish published along with the Language and Culture Atlas of Ashkenazic Jewry and from the Eydes-Project. The study was based on the insights about the NEY gender change. The research indicated a distinctive expansion of the gender variation outside of the NEY area. The SEY and the CY data showed the loss of neuter and new gender assignment principles in the historical masculine and feminine nouns. Furthermore the abandonment of the historical neuter lead to the emergence of the clearly definable gender sub-categories ‚intermediate subgender' and ‚mass gender'. The analysis of the SEY and CY sound data raised the point that the gender change didn't refer to any specific structural matters of these dialects. That is, that this innovation arose presumably as a result of the structural and semantic reinterpretation of the supraregional Yiddish gender and case system that was characterized by the lack of transparency in the abstract historical neuter and questioned the functionality of it. The SEY and the CY data revealed a number of variations in the new gender assignment that referred to the initial degree of the transformation process in the gender system of the SEY and CY, which could have started under the influence of the NEY. This model awoke the question about dialect contacts and possible dialect mixing in the Eastern European area and in Diaspora outside of Eastern Europe. Certain narrative passages highlighted the tendency to regression of the historical Yiddish gender system, which was marked by an extremely limited ability to distinguish grammatical genders. When considering the newest condition of Yiddish spoken by the Charedim in the USA, which can be characterized by the complete loss of the grammatical gender, we can assume that the variability in gender assignment of the speakers born between 1900-1920 was a sign of the development towards the abandon of gender, that occurred in the language system of a later generation of Yiddish speakers.

Analytic verb forms of infect tenses in Yiddish and Judeo-Greek. A comparative study

Valentina Fedchenko, Saint-Petersburg State University

The formation of the analytic verb forms is a common feature for the well-developed Jewish languages. The Jewish languages verb system is exposed to certain changes as, from one side, the reduction of the grammatical forms of the host-language and, from the other side, the emergence of new grammaticalized constructions and new grammatical meanings.

This paper presents a comparative study of the analytic verb forms in Yiddish and Judeo-Greek with a special attention to the infect tenses.

Yiddish has a large number of verbs that can enter into grammaticalization and participate at building verbal periphrases as auxiliary verbs. These are in general the verbs that can be used in a wide range of context as *zajn* ʻto be', *gebn* ʻto give', *ton* ʻto do', *hobn* ʻto have', *maxn* ʻto do', *haltn* ʻto hold', *nemen* ʻto take'. Judeo-Greek as a less developed Jewish language has only two auxiliary verbs in infect tenses: *íne* ʻto be', *kámo* ʻto do' and less grammatical meanings that have emerged. In comparison with Yiddish the Judeo-Greek verb system has less aspect forms.

In Judeo-Greek an analytic form of Imperfectum has emerged. The form is built with the auxiliary *íne* ʻto be' + a phonetically reduced form of the present infinitive, for example (Gen 4:2, Belléli 1890: 301):

1) íton	voskí	2) íton	δulévγi
3Sing.Imperf. ʿto beʾ	Inf. Praes.Act. ʿto feedʾ	3Sing.Imperf. ʿto beʾ	Inf. Praes.Act. ʿto workʾ
ʿhe fedʾ		ʿhe workedʾ	

The auxiliary verb *kámo* ʿto doʾ is used in Judeo-Greek in the expressions with borrowed lexemes from Turkish or Hebrew, for example (Schwab 1911: 157):

1) kámo	gajreti	2) kámo	meraxameti
1Sing.Praes. ʿto doʾ	Turk. gayret ʿeffortʾ	1Sing.Praes. ʿto doʾ	Hebr. meraxem ʿmercyʾ
ʿI tryʾ		ʿI have mercyʾ	

The emergence of these forms will be analyzed in my paper and compared with the typologically similar verbal periphrases in Yiddish. The analytic forms will be studied as a result of the internal structural evolution of the language, taking into consideration the influence of language contacts. I aim at revealing the polygenesis of the analytic verb forms in both Jewish languages.

Bibliography

Belléli L. 1890. Une version grecque du Pentateuque du seizième siècle // Revue des Études Grecques, 3. 289-308.
Schwab, M. 1911. Une cantique de liturgie juive en langue grecque // Revue des Études Grecques, 24. 152-167.

Session V: Contemporary Hasidic Yiddish: Empirical Investigations
Conveners: Steffen Krogh & Netta Abugov
Chair: Johan van der Auwera

Convergence and divergence in Haredi Yiddish dialects

Dalit Assouline, University of Haifa

Contemporary Haredi Yiddish dialects, deriving from geographically varying East-European dialects, have become markers of communal affiliation (Isaacs 1999), with some salient dialectal features maintained as a means of denoting specific group membership. This talk describes the main phonological and morphological differences between the major Haredi dialects, while distinguishing between dialectal features of which speakers are aware and others of which they are not aware. Dialect convergence (defined as rise in similarity between dialects) relates mainly to features which are not identified as markers of group affiliation. The analyzed corpus consists primarily of recorded radio interviews in Haredi Yiddish, which offer an opportunity to study short-term as well as long-term manifestations of dialect convergence and divergence (Hinskens, Auer and Kerswill 2005).

Auer P., F. Hinskens and P. Kerswill (2005), *Dialect Change: Convergence and Divergence in European languages*, Cambridge university press, Cambridge.
Isaacs M. (1999), "Contentious Partners: Yiddish and Hebrew in Haredi Israel", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 138, 101-121.

Noun plurals in Antwerp Hasidic Yiddish
Netta Abugov & Steven Gillis, University of Antwerp

Yiddish is a living language spoken by adults and children in Hasidic communities around the world. The current study focuses on contemporary Antwerp Hasidic Yiddish. Yiddish in Antwerp is the home language of most Hasidic families, while co-existing with Dutch as well as French, English and Hebrew.

Our window onto native Antwerp Yiddish is the system of noun plurals (*kind-er* 'child-ren'). The aim of the current study is two-fold: First, since grammatical descriptions of contemporary spoken Yiddish are basically lacking, our aim is to construct the real system of noun plurals used by native adults. Our second aim is to arrive at the basic description of the morphophonological alternations underlying plural formation in contemporary spoken Antwerp Yiddish.

We administered a confrontational naming task to 100 men and women, all native speakers of Antwerp Hasidic Yiddish. Participants (interviewed orally and individually) were asked to name 85 singular nouns from pictures and to provide their singular and plural forms.

Our findings reveal the actual plural system in native Antwerp Yiddish showing how similar it is to its historical roots and thus involves suffixation (e.g. *bal-n* 'ball-s'), stem modification (e.g. *top-tep* 'pot-s') or a combination of the two (e.g. *boim-baimer* 'tree-s'), clearly reflecting the Germanic and the Hebrew origins. At the same time, the system is fraught with variation so that many lemmas have more than one plural form (*dokters* and *doktoyrim* for 'doctors').

Results also provide a basic description of the morphophonological alternations underlying plural formation specifically relating to sonority of the final syllable. For example, monosyllabic nouns ending in a vowel take the plural marker *–(e)n* (*ki-en* 'cow-s') while bi-syllabic nouns ending in a vowel take the plural marker *–s* (*velo-s* 'bicycle-s'). Obtaining the baseline of the adult plural system in the investigated community serves as the basis for studying how children from the same Hasidic community in Antwerp acquire noun plurals. Results will be compared to Israeli Hasidic Yiddish showing how different/similar these Hasidic dialects are.

Time Adverbials vs. Locative Adverbials in the Yiddish of New York Satmar Women
Zelda Newman, Lehman College/CUNY

This paper presents the results of interviews the author conducted in the summer of 2011 in the family camp known as "Adas Yerayim". Sixteen Satmar women between the ages of 30 and 40, all from New York City, were asked to tell a story. All are bilingual English-Yiddish speakers.

Given that sentence-initial time adverbials never trigger subject-verb inversion in English, while locative sentence-initial adverbials occasionally do trigger inversion in English, the author hypothesized that the sentence-initial time adverbials in these Yiddish narratives would behave differently from the sentence-initial locative adverbials.

The results were both expected and unexpected. There were not enough sentence-initial locative adverbials in these narratives to support any generalizations. However, there were in fact many examples of sentence-initial time adverbials. And in these examples, the lack of subject-verb inversion was 40%. More field work, this time with a differently shaped

interview, is necessary before conclusions can be drawn about the differing behavior of the two types of sentence-initial adverbs.

There is a strict gender division in this community. Does the speech of Hassidic men show a similar abandonment of V2 when the sentence-initial element is a time adverbial? That is one outstanding question.

Other questions remain. Do single morphemes behave differently from phrases and/or clauses? And if length matters, why does it matter? Researchers of Yiddish need to compare their findings with researchers working in other Germanic heritage languages in contact with English to see how their findings compare.

It seems obvious that increased usage brings about increased change. On the macro level this translates as: native Yiddish speakers who use Yiddish only sparingly are far more likely to maintain V2 than speakers who use Yiddish in a bilingual context all day long. Now can this observation be extended to a micro level? Can we expect elements that are used more often lead to a faster rate of V2 neglect? Is it the frequency of individual usage that counts, or the frequency of communal usage that matters? These are questions this study raises but does not answer.

How Yiddish is Haredi Satmar Yiddish?

Steffen Krogh, Aarhus University

Due to the number of its speakers, Haredi Satmar Yiddish is likely to become the most visible variety of Yiddish in the 21st century. It is spoken and written by Satmar Hasidim in and around New York City and numerous other cities and towns around the world.

Ever since the founding of the modern Haredi Satmar movement in the late 1940s in New York City, the Yiddish variety spoken by the Satmar Haredim has been subject to considerable influence from coterritorial English. The extent of the English impact on Haredi Satmar Yiddish is evident in the number of borrowed nouns, verbs, geographical designations, and word-formation patterns in the spoken as well as in the written language.

In my talk, I will address an aspect of Yiddish–English language contact that has not been referred to in published linguistic research. That is the question of the extent to which core features of Eastern European Yiddish have survived into present-day Haredi Satmar Yiddish in America. Most significant in this study is whether the features in question have been able to maintain their position in Haredi Satmar Yiddish despite their absence in English. The absence of a given feature in English will in all likelihood favor alternative Yiddish constructions that have equivalents in English, and will eventually trigger the elimination of the feature in Haredi Satmar Yiddish. Such features include:

- formation of the pluperfect with the marker *gehat*
- formation of the passive voice with the auxiliary *vern*
- formation of relative clauses with the relative particle *vos* and a resumptive personal pronoun
- consecutive word order

My survey is based on systematic examination of Haredi Satmar Yiddish texts (novels, newspapers, magazines) published in New York in the last ten to fifteen years and, secondly, recent fieldwork among some of the last speakers of the source dialect of Haredi Satmar Yiddish in Romania. In this case, the language of the latter provides a solid basis for the comparison of European and American Satmar Yiddish.