

Paul Wexler

How a new kind of etymological dictionary can reveal that Yiddish has a mixed Old Sorbian/Kiev-Polessian grammar with a German lexicon

In 1991a and 1991b I proposed that Yiddish was not a Germanic but rather a West Slavic language whose vocabulary had been largely replaced by (i.e. “relexified to”) High German. I speculated that Jews speaking Old Sorbian (i.e. the languages of the Milčeni and Lusaci) between the 9th–12th centuries had resisted the pressure to switch to German language and Christianity as Germans migrated into the Slavic lands. While most of the local Slavs eventually shifted to Christianity and German, the Jews – mainly a local new Slavic proselyte population with a minority older, possibly partly Palestinian (or more broadly, Eurasian) Jewish population (see Wexler 1993b) – made only a partial language shift to German, one that entailed keeping Sorbian grammar, phonology and phonotactics, while replacing most of the Sorbian lexicon with German phonetic strings in a process known as *relexification* (see Wexler 1990, 1991a, 1991b, 1993a, 1993b; on relexification in general, see Lefebvre 1986 and Horvath and Wexler 1994, 1997).

In 2002b, it became necessary to propose a second process of relexification, this time from an Eastern Slavic substratum to Middle High German and the Yiddish created in the first process of relexification. The second phase apparently took place in the Kiev-Polessian dialect areas (contemporary South Belarus’ and North Ukraine; see details in Šerech 1953) by the 15th century at the latest when Jewish speakers of Kiev-Polessian, primarily descended from Khazars, relexified their language to Yiddish and High German; conceivably, the speakers of Kiev-Polessian could have relexified even earlier when Khazar Jews first settled in Central Europe, possibly by the 8–9th century (see Wexler 2001a, 2001b, 2002a, 2002b). The basis of the expanded hypothesis is that Belarusian/Ukrainian often motivate Yiddish facts more smoothly than Sorbian, Yiddish has unique East Slavic and Turkic(-Iranian) lexicon, and, more importantly, East Slavic grammatical features whose presence in Yiddish cannot be motivated by bilingual interference. For example, Yiddish pluralizes German nouns with *-(e)n* in violation of German norms, but often in imitation of the Belarusian and Ukrainian “pseudo-dual”. This suggests that Yiddish once had a dual category (see also point 7 below).

Many Slavic(ized) descendants of the Khazar Jews settled in the Kiev-Polessian principality both before and after the collapse of their Khaganate in the late 10th century. At the time that the Sorbian Jews brought Yiddish into the East Slavic domain – by the 1400s – the indigenous Jews were still speaking Kiev-Polessian. The second relexification phase meant that Kiev-Polessian speakers continued to use their grammar, while adopting Yiddish (and new High German) vocabulary. Thanks to the grammatical similarities between Old Sorbian and Kiev-Polessian, few radical changes are expected in Yiddish grammar. *Contemporary Eastern Yiddish can thus be described as the product of two relexification processes from West and East Slavic. The Sorbs, Avars, Khazars and Eastern Slavs who converted to Judaism in the first twelve centuries or so of this millennium (the evidence for this is both direct and indirect) must have been the major if not sole players on the stage of the “Ashkenazic” ethnogenesis and the prime initiators of the relexification processes.*

It is important to emphasize the differences between largescale bilingual interference and relexification. Unlike massive bilingual interference, where the target language usually uses loans according to the semantic parameters of the source language, relexification means that the language providing the lexicon (the “lexifier”) only provides phonetic strings, while the (“relexified”) substratum language determines the selection and use of the superstratal lexifier strings. In Yiddish, the German lexicon acquired in relexification is calibrated according to Upper Sorbian and Kiev-Polesian (Belarusian and Ukrainian) rules. Thus Yiddish Germanisms often differ semantically and derivationally from their German surface congeners. There are several “diagnostic tests” which suggest that Yiddish is a relexification-based language, but let us consider just the two major tests here – both of which apply positively to Yiddish:

1. Crucially, the grammar and phonology of a language are derived from one source, while the bulk of the lexicon has a different source. In the case of Yiddish, the grammar and phonology are predominantly of Slavic origin, while approximately 75% of the vocabulary is High German; the remaining lexicon is split roughly between Hebraisms (and innovative Hebroidisms) and Slavisms – only a small part of which can be derived now with certainty from Sorbian.
2. By comparing the lexicons of the putative unrelexified substratal and superstratal lexifier languages, it is possible to *predict with extremely high accuracy* which Germanisms will be acceptable to Yiddish, and therefore, where Yiddish will acquire Hebraisms, Hebroidisms and/or retain unrelexified Slavisms. No other model of Yiddish genesis can make predictions about the component structure of the language. Failure to accept a Germanism will be due to a combination of internal Slavic derivational patterns and their overlap with the corresponding German derivational patterns.

Consider one example:¹

G (a) *Bad* n ‘bath; spa’, *baden* ‘bathe’, *Badezimmer* n ‘bathroom’, (der) *Badende* m ‘bather’, (archaic) *Bader* ‘owner of a bathhouse; barber-surgeon’ (< MHG *badære* m, also ‘person who draws blood by the application of a cupping glass’) are related to (b) *backen* ‘to bake’, *Backfett* n ‘shortening’/ (c) *Bäcker* m ‘baker’, ♠*Bäckerei* f ‘bakery; baking’. Of the German terms, Yiddish is receptive to (a¹) *bod* f ‘bath(house)’ ~ n ‘spa’, *bodn* (zix) ‘bathe’/ (a²) *beder* m ‘bather’/ (b) *bakfec* m ‘shortening’, *bakn* ‘to bake’, *bakre(je)r* m ‘baking oven’/ (c) ♠*beker* m ‘baker’, *bekeraj* f ‘bakery’ ~ n ‘baking’.

The ability of Yiddish to acquire the two allomorphs of German (b-c) ‘bake’ was motivated by the consonantal alternation in similar-sounding but unrelated (a) USo *pjec*

¹ Symbols used with examples are ▲ = a Hebraism; ▲ = a unique Yiddish Hebraism; ■ = a Slavism; ■ = a unique Yiddish Slavism; ♠ = a post-Middle High German term or post-relexification element in Yiddish (i.e. after c. 1500); ♥ = a German element unique to Yiddish (apparently not motivated by Slavic); ♣ = a unique Yiddish Germanism, patterned on Slavic norms. Hebrew examples are transliterated and transcribed in Modern Hebrew pronunciation. Abbreviations used with examples are Aram – Aramaic, Bav – Bavarian, Br – Belarusian, C – Common, c(c) – century (pl), f – feminine, G – German, gen – genitive, He – Hebrew, J- – Judeo-, Lat – Latin, m – masculine, MH – Middle High, n – neuter, O – Old, pl – plural, Pol – Polish, R – Russian, Rtw – Rotwelsch, sg – singular, Sl – Slavic, So – Sorbian, U – Upper, Uk – Ukrainian, W – West, Y – Yiddish. Examples without a gender marker have the gender of the next marked example.

‘to bake; roast’, Uk *pekty* (*peču* 1st sg)/ (b) USo *pjekar*, Uk *pekar(ka)* m (f) ‘baker (baker’s wife)’, USo *pjekarnja*, Uk *pekarnja* f ‘bakery’, USo *pjekarjenje* n ‘act of baking’ (note that the opposition in Sorbian between ‘bakery’ and ‘baking’ is continued by gender opposition in Y *bekeraj* f ‘bakery’ ~ n ‘baking’), Uk *pečinka* ‘liver’, *pič* f ‘stove, oven, furnace’, *prypičok* m ‘hearth, niche of a clay oven (in a peasant’s cottage)’. The formal and semantic similarity may have initially led to some blocking of Germanisms, to judge from other Slavic terms for ‘oven’ in Yiddish, e.g. Y *plite* ‘range’, *hrube* ‘oven (for heating)’ < Uk *plyta* (also ‘plate, slab; flagstone’), *hruba* f. Related to the Upper Sorbian and Ukrainian roots for ‘bake’ are (archaic) USo *pječa* ‘care’, *pječēn* ‘joint, roast’, (archaic) Uk *pečal’* f ‘sorrow, grief, sadness, affliction’, *pečalyt(sja)* ‘afflict, sadden, grieve’; not surprisingly, most of these concepts find non-German expression in Yiddish since there is no German pair with similar semantic properties, e.g. *dajge* f, *klapot* m ‘care’, *car* m ‘sorrow, grief’, *mecaer zajn* (*zix*) ‘grieve, worry’, *acves* n ‘sadness’, *acvesdik* ‘sad’, *core* f ‘affliction’ (< He *d’gh* /deaga/, Br *klopat* m ‘trouble; embarrassment’, *klapotny* ‘troublesome’, He *c’r* /car/, *mc’r* /mecaer/, *c’vut* /acvut/, *crh* /cara/). A clue to initial blockage of German ‘bake’ is that Y has *lexem* ‘bread’, and *laxme* f ‘large piece of bread’ (< He *lhm* /lexem/, JAram *lhm* /laxma/ ‘bread’) while Rotwelsch has compounds of He *lhm* (attested since 1450), though not very old, see e.g. Rtw *lechemschieber* (1754), *lemer* ‘baker’ (1820: Wolf 1956, #3170); Y *bakfec* has its un-German gender < Uk *žyr* m. See also Y WY *ofene* ‘to bake’, Rtw *ofe* m ‘baker’ (< He *wfh* /ofe/ ‘he bakes, baker’: Klepsch 2004, 1: 1130; Western Yiddish was spoken mainly in German-speaking, Dutch, Hungarian and Czech territories and still survives to some extent in Szitserland, Alsace and Holland).

The difference in the distribution of (a) in Yiddish and German finds a simple explanation in Uk *vanna*, *kupal’nja* f ‘bath’, *kupaty(sja)* ‘bathe’ vs. *vanna kimnata* f ‘bathroom’. The commonality of ‘bath’ and ‘bathe’ in Ukrainian reflects itself in Yiddish, while ‘bathroom’ requires a different root in both languages (Y *vašcimer*, *vanecimer* m ‘bathroom’). The failure of Yiddish to express (a²) ‘bather’ by a participle, as in German, also finds motivation in Uk *kupal’ščyk* m. These facts thus suggest that the relexification to G *Bad*, etc. may have taken place in the second relexification phase, or else the results of the first relexification phase were partly altered in the Kiev-Polesian lands. The presence of Y *merxec* n for ‘bathhouse’ (< He *mrhc* /merxac/) could support acquisition in the first relexification phase, except that the neuter gender of the Hebrew masculine noun points to a borrowing in the second relexification phase; though perhaps only the neuter gender is post-relexificational (see Wexler 2002b, chapter 4.5.1). In the specific meaning of ‘ritual bath(house)’, Yiddish requires *mikve* f (< He *mqvh* /mikve/ m, also ‘pool of water’); the change of gender of the Hebraism from masculine > feminine has both internal Yiddish as well as substratal Slavic motivation – since Yiddish nouns in *-e* are usually feminine, but so is Uk *kupal’nja* < CSI **kupaty* (*se*) ‘bathe ritually’. Another possible reason for the acquisition of Hebraisms may have been another Ukrainian term for ‘bathhouse’, *lajnja* f, related to Uk *laznyk* m, *lajnycja* f ‘bather’, which may be related to Uk *laz* m ‘crawl(ing); pathway through a forest’, Uk *lazyty* ‘to climb’ – a semantic set without a German match (G *Badeanstalt* f ‘bathhouse’ is a late 18th-century innovation).

The possible genetic relationship between CSI **kupaty* (*se*) ‘bathe’ and **konopja* f ‘hemp’ (Trubačev 1983, 10: 188–193), unknown to German, can also motivate the Yiddish acquisition of *merxec* n ‘bathhouse’ and *mikve* f ‘ritual bath’. Common Slavic originally distinguished between **myti* (*se*) ‘bathe’ and **kupati* (*se*) ‘bathe ritually’, where the latter involved the use of intoxicating herbs (Trubačev 1985, 12: 65–66).

According to Machek (1971: 285), North WBr *kupac* 'bathe' also denoted 'ritual bathing'; see also Uk *kupalo* n 'St. John the Baptist's day on 24 June', Br *kupalle* n 'pre-Christian Eastern Slavic holiday celebrated on the night between 23 and 24 June, old style' and Br dialectal *kupala* f '(camp)fire; spirit of fire' (*Histaryčny slovník belaruskaj movy* 1989, 5: 161; see also Gimbutas 1967: 754–755). The large number of insect names derived from this root (imbued with the spirits of the dead) also attests to the ritual connotations of the term (see Filin 1980, 16: 96–98 as well as the use of the Slavic root for 'grandmother' to denote 'insect', discussed in Vážný 1955). If Slavic relexifiers had needed to preserve the opposition of 'bathe' and 'bathe ritually', G *baden* would have been only partially useful, hence, the attractiveness of Hebraisms – especially if it was deemed necessary to Judaize the Slavic practice of using hemp in the ritual bath. Y *mikve* f indeed is attested in Talmudic Hebrew, but I suspect that the term may not have been in use uninterruptedly in early non-Palestinian Jewish communities, since only Yiddish has the term (on the different Hebrew terminology of Judeo-Spanish, see Wexler 1996: 172, 207). While Yiddish may have replaced the Slavic term for 'ritual bath' with ▲*mikve*, it retains ■*kanop(l)je* f (usually only pl) (~ *hanef* m < MHG *hanef* f > G *Hanf* m) < Uk *konoplja* f (usually only pl). On the appearance of the latter Slavism in 13th-century Judeo-Western Slavic texts, see Wexler 2002b, chapter 4.5.

The rules of blockage of Germanisms involve four parameters: (i) German morphophonemic alternations and derivational morphology are blocked in Yiddish unless they enjoy Upper Sorbian and/or Kiev-Polesian parallels. German derivational sets rarely surface in Yiddish *in toto*. The few examples of German *Ablaut* relationships that are accepted by Yiddish are invariably matched by an Upper Sorbian pair, see e.g. G *Schweiß* 'sweat' / *schwitzen* 'to sweat' > Y *švejs/švicn*, since a single root (also with alternations) is used in Upper Sorbian to express the noun/verb pair, see e.g. USo *pót/so poćić*. (ii) German roots are blocked in Yiddish if Slavic translation equivalents do not broadly overlap semantically. (iii) Yiddish tends to select German synonyms in accordance with the lexical inventory of Slavic. *If Yiddish were in fact a variant of German that had undergone widespread attrition as a result of many centuries of interference with Slavic, then the Yiddish acquisition of Slavic (and Hebrew) lexical enrichment should be haphazard and entirely unpredictable. This is not the case.*

(iv) German roots which match roots with similar form and meaning in Slavic (the words in question may or may not be cognates) were usually blocked in Yiddish, since they were apparently perceived as Slavic elements. There are four types of common lexicon: (a) German words > Slavic; (b) Slavic > German; (c) cognates; (d) non-cognates with chance similarity in form and meaning. Examples that fall under headings (a) and (c-d) are blocked for relexification; only examples in (b) are potential Yiddish words (usually in their German form, e.g. Y *bajč* 'whip', *blince* 'pancake' < G *Peitsche* f, *Plins[e]* m [f]). Would this mean that relexifiers no longer could recognize Slavisms? German words under headings (a), (c) and (d) that are rejected by Yiddish in the relexification process can be replaced in four ways: by Hebrew words; where Hebrew terms are lacking, Yiddish creates Hebrew words or ascribes new meanings to existing Hebrew words (i.e. forms "Hebroidisms"); by retaining substratal Slavisms and by using acceptable Germanisms. For example, G *Witwe(r)* 'widow(er)' would be expected to be blocked in Yiddish because of the existence of a close cognate USo *wudowa* f, *wudowc* m. Thus Yiddish uses ▲*almone* f, ▲*almen* m (< He 'l^{mn}[h] /alman[a]/). Drosdowski 1989 believes G *Witwe(r)* may be related to *Waise* 'orphan'; Yiddish offers support for this hypothesis since both Germanisms are absent in Yiddish, which suggests relexifiers may have regarded the two allomorphs as related. Slavic lacks a paral-

lel, though USo *syrota* f, Uk *sirata* m, f ‘orphan’ are ultimately related to Li *šeirȳs* ‘widower’ m (Schuster-Šewc 1978–1996: 1402). Hence, Yiddish acquired ▲*josem* m, ▲*jesojme* f ‘orphan’ (< He *jtwm*/h/ /jatōm, jetōma/, and invented ▲*almen* m ‘widower’ < OHe *’lmn* /alman/ which meant ‘alone, forsaken’). Another example of cognate blockage is G *Schwein* ‘pig’ and derivatives, due to Slavic cognates, see e.g. USo *swinjo*, Uk *svynnja*; Yiddish has instead ▲*xazer* m < He *ħzjr* /xazir/ and ◻*ljoxe* < Uk *l’oxa* f (see the second dictionary entry below).

A major clue to the Upper Sorbian Jewish relexifiers’ sensitivity to German derivational processes comes from the use of Hebrew terms. For example, G *widerspenstig* ‘obstinate’ and *Gespent* ‘ghost’ are related to *Gespinst* ‘spun yarn, web’ and *spinnen* ‘to spin’. Of these Yiddish has only *gešpin(s)*, *špinen*. The fact that ‘obstinate’ and ‘ghost’ are frequently expressed in Yiddish by Hebraisms suggests that the relexifiers were aware of the historical links, and rejected Germanisms whenever Upper Sorbian used unrelated roots to denote the meanings of the four German terms (see also point 13 below).

In addition to the two major diagnostic tests, there is a variety of additional support in Yiddish morphology and lexicon for the two-tiered relexification hypothesis in the genesis of Yiddish:

3. A great many terms in the realm of Jewish culture and religion are of Slavic origin, e.g. Y ◻*praven* ‘conduct (religious ceremony)’, ◻*trejbern* ‘remove the forbidden parts of the meat to render it kosher’ ~ Uk *pravyty* ‘celebrate a religious ceremony’, *terebyty* ‘to peel, shell; eat avidly; clear a field’; see also Uk *treba* ‘Orthodox church ceremony’ (see also point 10 below).

4. Yiddish has a strikingly reduced German component (and is especially poor in synonyms and homonyms of German origin, given the absence of Slavic parallels) compared to the native component of any single German dialect. A much reduced superstratum lexicon is also typical of many relexified creole languages, see e.g. Haitian. German homonyms and near-homonyms are rarely fully acceptable in Yiddish, e.g. G *Aal* m ‘eel’ (< MHG *âl*) is blocked in Yiddish (which prefers ◻*venger* < Pol *węgorz* m) but *Ahle* f ‘awl’ (< MHG *âle*) is used in Yiddish as *nol* f (the /n/ comes presumably from an accreted indefinite article). On the other hand, (MH)G *arm* ‘poor’ and (MH)G *Arm* ‘arm’ both > Y *orem*; the use of Hebraisms for both concepts raises the suspicion of initial blockage of one or both Germanisms, especially since G *Arm* is cognate with USo *ramjo* ‘shoulder’, and, on cognate grounds alone, should have been blocked. While Y *orm* ‘arm’ also means ‘hand’ (see Wexler 2002b: 202–206), *hant* f ‘hand’ is possible in Yiddish but final /t/ points to a recent borrowing from G *Hand*, since Eastern Yiddish dialects lack a final consonant devoicing rule.

Conversely, Slavic homonyms and near-homonyms also trigger blockage of Germanisms in Yiddish, e.g. USo (i) *wosa* f ‘wasp’/ (ii) *wosa* f ‘poplar’ > Y (ii) ◻*topolje* f. Note that Yiddish uses a different Slavic root, in keeping with the fact that it has a relatively reduced lexicon compared to both its Slavic and Hebrew substrata and German superstratum, which is true of relexified languages in general; Y ◻*topolje* f might have replaced the original USo *topol* m from the first relexification phase.

5. The high number of Yiddish loan translations of Slavic patterns of discourse presupposes a fluent knowledge of Slavic languages. While loan translations of Slavic could, in principle, be ascribed to bilingual interference, there are too many other suspicious

signs of relexification from Slavic in Yiddish. Furthermore, there is much that is original in the German component in Yiddish. This stands in sharp contrast to the relatively few innovative forms and meanings in the Slavic component of Yiddish (most unique Yiddish Slavisms are probably unrelexified substratal elements or come from Judeo-Slavic). Hebroidisms outnumber original Slavisms (or Slavoidisms) since they are the optimal replacements for blocked Germanisms. These facts suggest that Slavic was a substratum of Yiddish, and that perhaps many Hebraisms/Hebroidisms themselves were already known in the (Judeo-)Slavic substrata.

6. There is evidence of formally “modernizing” Germanisms. This fact points to widespread bilingualism which often accompanies (cyclical) relexification.

7. The German plural marker *-(e)n* is used in Yiddish far more frequently than in German. Curiously, the unique distribution of the suffix in Yiddish can almost always be correlated with the use of the “pseudo-dual” in Belarusian and Ukrainian, where the singular stress pattern is combined with the Slavic plural marker, e.g. Y *tejl* f, m ‘part’ < G *Teil* m, n (the feminine option is undoubtedly a reflection of the gender of the Slavic counterpart, e.g. USo *časéc, častka* f, now ‘piece of meat’, Uk *čast’* f ‘part’) but Y *tejln* pl with *-n* = Uk *čast’* f, *časty* pl, *dve časty* dual (with obligatory expression of the numeral ‘two’) vs. G *Teil* m, n, *Teile* pl. Presumably, Yiddish originally retained the dual as part of its Sorbian substratum, but its use was reshaped by subsequent (and lengthier) contact with Eastern Slavic (nowadays, Y *[-e]n* is unambiguously a plural marker: see Wexler 2002b, chapter 4.5.4).

8. There are quite a lot of minimal pairs in Ukrainian that differ in stress position, and it is highly significant that Yiddish fails to relexify one or both members of each pair to a Germanism; the unrelexified form is expressed alternatively by Slavisms or Hebraisms (or other acceptable German roots). *This sensitivity to Slavic lexico-phonological relationships is strong evidence that Yiddish was relexified from Kiev-Polessian* (see also points 10–15 below). For example, Uk (i) *várennja* ‘boiling, cooking; food’/ (ii) *varénnja* n ‘jam’ > Y (i) *koxn* ‘cooking’, *zidn* n ‘boiling’/ (ii) *■varenje*, *■povidle* f (‘prune jam’) (< Uk *povyldo* ‘plum jam’), *ajngemaxc* n. Y *■varenje* f is related to Uk *varenyk* ‘boiled dough stuffed with cheese, potatoes, fruit or sauerkraut’ which Yiddish retains as *■varenik* m ‘cheese or jam filled dumpling’. The retention of the latter in Yiddish may be due to the use of the food as a ritual dish, as it was among Christian Slavs (e.g. on the day of the Forty Martyrs) or its use in fortune telling (Agapkina 2001: 340). Another Ukrainian baked object with ritual implications that is retained in Yiddish is Uk *mlyn*, diminutive *mlynec*, (Polessian) *blynec* m ‘pancake made from rye, buckwheat or wheat flour’; the latter is made on the eve of the New Year and is a part of the ritual feeding of cattle (*ibid.* 346). The latter is preserved in Yiddish as *■blince* f ‘blintz’. This Slavic food term was also borrowed by German (Bellmann 1971: 123, 150–151, citing Sorbian as the source language). The Yiddish feminine gender suggests (i) interference with G *Plinse* f or (ii) an internal back formation when the morpheme boundary shifted from *■blinc||es* > *■blince||s* pl (in all Slavic languages other than Yiddish the word is masculine). The original cult functions of the pastry (see also Wirth 1933: 98 for Sorbian and Petrova 1987: 101 for Gor’kij Russian) may have protected substratal USo *blinc* ~ *plinc* m in Yiddish from relexification. The Slavism is found in Polish Yiddish but is not normally used in Polish (see Wexler 1987: 167). Zdancewicz notes that Polish dialects in contact with Belarusian have *bl’inek* < Br *blin(ec)* m (1964: 242), but the

latter could not be the source of PolY **blince** f. The Slavic root is also found in Modern Hebrew in the form *blinčes* (sg, pl), either reflecting diminutive Br *blinčyk* m or the sibilant confusion typical of North Belarusian, Lithuanian and Northeast Polish.

Another example is Uk (i) *múka* 'pain'/ (ii) *muká* f 'flour' > Y (i) **jesurim** plt 'pain' (< He *jswrjm* /jesurim/), *tirxe* f **▲**'pains' (< He *tjrřh* /tirxa/ 'burden, toil'), **mučen** 'to torment' (< Uk *mučyty*). An example of a near-minimal pair involving a vocalic alternation is Br (i) *różnica* f 'difference'/ (ii) *raznica* f 'abattoir' > Y (i) **xilek** m (< He *řjlwq* /xiluk/)/ Y (ii) **šexthojz** n, **bojne** f (< He *řřř* /řaxat/ 'he slaughtered', Br *bojnja* f 'abattoir; bloodbath, massacre'). See also Br, Uk *múzyka* f 'music', *muzyka* m, f 'musician' in the third dictionary entry below.

9. There are a considerable number of pairs of words in Ukrainian and Belarusian that are distinguished by a single vocalic alternation (usually *i* ~ *o*). In almost all cases Yiddish requires a non-Germanism for one or both of the terms in question (below I ignore Yiddish Germanisms); very often the retained Slavicisms are original to Yiddish. These facts also suggest that relexifiers were sensitive to Slavic lexical relationships and sought to retain these relationships during relexification. Such data are important evidence for the existence of relexification in the genesis of Yiddish.

Examples of minimal pairs involving /i/ vs. /o/ in often related words usually show blockage of Germanisms, e.g. Uk (i) *holivka* f diminutive 'head'/ (ii) *holovka* f 'head (of a vegetable, pin)' > Y (i) **mojex** m 'head; brains' (< He *mwh* /moax/ 'brain')/ (ii) Y **kačn** 'head (of a vegetable)' (< Uk *kačan* m). Uk (i) *xvorost* m 'dry branches, small sticks, brushwood'/ (ii) *xvorist* f 'illness, infirmity' > Y (i) **xvorost** m 'branches'/ (ii) **x(v)arobe**, **xorobe** f 'illness', **xaroben** 'be ill', **xvoren** 'be sickly', **xojle** 'sick man', **xojle-mesukn**, **shxivmera** m 'dangerously sick man', **nojte-lomes** m 'critically ill person', **xalajen**, **xol(a)jen** 'be in bid, ill', **xojlevate** 'sickly', **xerljak**, **xirljak** m 'sickly person' (< Br *xvaroba*, Uk *xoroba* 'illness', Br *xarobic*, Uk *xvoryty* 'be ill', He *řwlh* /xole/, *mswkn* /mesukan/ 'dangerous', JAram *řxjv-mrh* /řxiv-mara/ 'bed-ridden' + 'bitter', He *nřth lmwt* /note lamut/ 'inclined to die', *řlh* /xala/ 'was ill', Uk -vatyj 'ish, -ly', Uk *xyljak*).

10. There are many pairs of words in Ukrainian and Belarusian that are distinguished by the addition of a suffix, e.g. in minimal pairs with and without the suffix Uk -ka (which are often semantically distinct), Yiddish attempts to retain the Slavic lexical relationship by instituting partial or full blockage of Germanisms: Uk (i) *dohad* m 'supposition, surmise, conjecture'/ (ii) *dohadka* f 'conjecture' > Y (i-ii) **hašore** 'supposition, conjecture', **svore** f 'conjecture' (< He *hřřh* /hařřara/, *svřh* /svara/); Uk (i) *dokaz* m 'proof, argument, evidence'/ (ii) *dokazka* f 'false accusation, defamation' > Y (i) **vehoiraje** 'and here is the proof', **tajne-umajne** f 'argument, reproach', **kal-vexojmer** m 'a fortiori argument', **ojstajnen zix** 'present one's argument' (< [JAram] *wh-r'jh* /vehoraja/, He *řnh-m'nh* /ta'ana-ma'ana/, *ql-wřwmr* /kal-vexomer/)/ (ii) **bilbul** 'false accusation', **zilzl** m 'defamation' (< He *blbwl* /bilbul/, *zlwł* /zilzul/).

Yiddish lacks Germanisms when Ukrainian has a minimal pair involving the suffix Uk -a, e.g. Uk (i) *dotyk* m '(sense of touch), touching'/ (ii) *dotyka* f 'reproach, reproof' > Y (i) **xuř-hamiřeř** m 'sense of touch' (< He *řwř-hmjřwř* /xuř-hamiřuř/)/ (ii) **tajne** f 'reproach, complaint, claim, contention', **tajne-umajne** f 'argument, reproach', **hobn tajnes (cu)** 'to reproach', **nezife** f, **muser** m 'reproof' (< He *nřjřh* /nezifa/, *mwsr* /musar/); Uk (i) *neljud* m 'cruel person'/ (ii) *neljuda* f 'unsociable person' > Y (i) **axzer** 'cruel man', **recejex** m 'cruel man; murderer, assassin' (< He *xřrj* /axzar/

‘cruel’, *rwch* /roceax/ ‘murderer’)/ (ii) ▲*xavrusedik* ‘sociable’ (< JAram *hvrwt* /xavruta/).

11. Examples of ambiguous masculine and neuter Ukrainian and Belarusian nouns which can be disambiguated by the choice of genitive singular or plural case markers also permit non-German expression in Yiddish (but with no case distinctions): Uk (i) *akt* m, *akta* gen sg ‘document’/ (ii) *akt* m, *aktu* gen sg ‘act’ > Y (i) ¶*dokument* m (< Uk *dokument* m vs. G ¶*Dokument* n 16th c < Lat *documentum*)/ Y (ii) ▲*majsim* pl only ‘acts’ (< He *m’sjm* /ma’asim/ pl); Uk (i) *bal* m, *bala* gen sg ‘dance, ball’/ (ii) *bal* m, gen sg *balu* ‘mark, number’ > Y (i) ▲*sude* f ‘repast, feast, banquet’ (< He *s’wdh* /seuda/)/ (ii) Y ▲*simen* ‘mark’, ¶*cil* m ‘mark (aim)’ (< He *sjmn* /siman/, Uk *cil* f ‘mark, target, aim’ < G *Ziel* n); Br, Uk (i) *bunt* m, gen sg *bunta* ‘bale, pack, bundle’ (< G *Bund* n)/ (ii) *bunt* m, gen sg *buntu* ‘revolution, sedition, rebellion’ (< Pol *bunt* < MHG *bunt* m ‘union, bond, agreement’) > Y (i) ¶*kopice* ‘stack’, ¶*skirde* f ‘haystack, pile’, ¶*kojp* ‘pile, heap’, ¶*bunt* ‘bundle’, ¶*stojg* m ‘pile of hay’, ¶*tlumik* ‘bundle’, ¶*bintl* n ‘bundle, batch, bunch’ (< Uk *kopycja* ‘stack of hay, heap’, *skyrda*, *skyrta* ‘stack of grain, haystack, cornstalk’, *kupa* f ‘heap, pile, hoard; great number; crowd, throng, mob’, *stih* ‘stack, cornstalk’, *tlumok* m ‘bundle, parcel’)/ (ii) ¶*revoljucje* ‘revolution’, ¶*kramole* ‘sedition’, ▲*ojfhecung* (in *bgide*) ‘inciting to riot’, ▲*meride* ‘revolt, rebellion, insurgency’, ▲*mojred* ‘rebel’, ▲*mojred zajn* ‘to revolt, rebel’, ¶*bunt* m ‘mutiny, rebellion’ (< Uk *revoljucija*, *kramola* ‘political intrigue, subversive movement’ < Old Church Slavonic < Medieval Lat *carmula* < OBay *karmala* ~ Uk *koromola* ‘rebellion, mutiny, rebellion, sedition; faction’, He *bgjdh* /begida/ ‘treason’, *mrjdh* /merida/, *mwrđ* /mored/).

12. A unique reflection of the Upper Sorbian substratum is the parallel lexical gaps in Yiddish, Polabian and Upper Sorbian: where Yiddish used Hebraisms in place of Germanisms, Upper Sorbian and Polabian tended to borrow Germanisms. The parallelism between the distribution of Hebraisms in Yiddish and Germanisms in Upper Sorbian and Polabian finds no match even in Czech and Polish, which were also very widely receptive to German enrichment, see e.g. Y ▲*recejex* ‘murderer’ and ▲*hargenen* ‘to kill’ < He *rwch* /roceax/, *hrg* /harag/ ‘he killed’ ~ USo *mordar* ‘murderer’, *mordowac* ‘to murder’ (since 1597) < G *Mörder*, *morden*, respectively. Originally I believed that Hebraisms were intended to “block” Germanisms (see Wexler 1991a, 1991b); it is now apparent that a great many Yiddish Hebraisms were required to “replace” Germanisms blocked by relexification.

13. Awareness of links among allomorphs in a paradigm strongly suggests prior relexification. Such paradigmatic awareness can be established when Yiddish speakers (a) chose to transfer a meaning from one blocked German allomorph to another member of the allomorph set that was accepted in Yiddish, and (b) have Hebraisms and retained Slavisms in the allomorph set. Compare G (a¹) *dicht* ‘thick, firm, dense, compact’, ¶*Dichte* ‘density’ (16th c), *dichten* ‘make tight, seal’ (15th c) + (a²) *dick* ‘thick, swollen, corpulent, stout’, *Dicke* ‘thickness, corpulence’, *dicken* ‘thicken’, ¶*Dickicht* ‘thicket’ (17th c)/ (b²) *gedeihen* ‘prosper, thrive’ and Y (a¹) *dixt* (¶) ‘plywood’ (this unique meaning seems to have been stimulated by the use of G *dicht* ‘thick’ in Slavic languages, see e.g. Uk *dykuvaty* ‘fill up the cracks of a cottage with reeds and clay’ < [archaic] Pol *dychtować*), *diklex* ‘chubby’, *gedixt* ‘thick, dense, close, heavy’, ¶*gedixtkejt* ‘consistency; density’, *gedixteniš* ‘thicket’ (< G [a²]) + (a²) *dik* ‘thick, fat, stout’/ (b²) *gedajen*

‘prosper, thrive’. Cognate (**a²-b²**) are not historically related to (**a¹**), despite similarity in sound and meaning, but the two paradigms appear to be partly joined in Yiddish due to Slavic considerations. Thus the two allomorphs exist in Yiddish, but not in the same distribution as in German. For (**a²**) G *Dicke* ‘thickness’ Yiddish uses *greb* < *grob* ‘thick, fat, coarse, rough, crude, rude, gruff, obscene’ ~ G *grob* ‘coarse, rough; rude; thick’. The late chronology of G *dichten* and *Dickicht* suggests that the corresponding Yiddish terms may also be recent (for ‘tighten’, Yiddish uses other Germanisms). Whereas German uses (**a²**) to form ‘thicket’, Yiddish selects (**a¹**). The changed distribution could be due to the underlying Upper Sorbian substratum, e.g. *husty* covers both: (**a¹**) G *dicht* ‘thick’ = USo *husty* (also means, unlike German *dick*, ‘often’), G *Dichte* ‘density’ = USo *hustota*, *hustosć* f and (**a²**) G *dick* ‘thick’, etc. = USo *husty*, G *dicken* ‘thicken’ = USo *zhusćić*, *hustnyć*, G *Dickicht* ‘thicket’ = So *husćina*, *husć*. On the other hand, German also reveals paradigmatic merger, e.g. (**a²**) MHG *dicken* ‘become thick’ is now expressed by ModG (**a¹**) *verdichten*.

14. If Upper Sorbian has a meaning missing in the Ukrainian cognate, Yiddish tends to use a non-German term for that meaning; the converse is also true, though there are far fewer examples. This fact suggests that Sorbian was known to the Jews who migrated into the Ukraine at least for a period of time. Bilingualism in Sorbian and Eastern Slavic would guarantee sensitivity to the semantics of cognate pairs in the two languages vis-à-vis German. For example, USo *lěk* ‘cure’ has a parallel in cognate Uk *lik*, but USo *polěkować* ‘to favor, encourage’ lacks a Ukrainian parallel; for the Sorbian meanings lacking in Yiddish, Yiddish uses Hebraisms, e.g. ▲*mezake zajn mit* ‘favor with’, ▲*gefinen xejn*, ▲*nojse-xejn zajn*, ▲*mojce-xejn zajn* ‘favor’, ▲*untergebn xejshek* ‘encourage’ (< He *mzkh* /mezake/ ‘compensates’, *hn* /xen/ ‘charm’, *nws* /nose/ ‘bears’, *mwc* /moce/ ‘finds’, *hšq* /xešek/ ‘desire’ + Germanisms < *sein* ‘be’, *mit* ‘with’, *finden* ‘find’ – the latter kept bimorphemic in Yiddish perhaps because of parallel Uk *najty* ‘to find’ < *na-* + *ity* ‘to go’ – and the unique Y ♣*untergebn* ‘render’, based on the componentially identical Uk *piddaty* ‘suggest’ < *pid-* ‘under’ + *daty* ‘give’).

15. The gender assignment of many German and Hebrew nouns in Yiddish follows that of the Upper Sorbian/Kiev-Polesian translation equivalents rather than that of German and Hebrew; also, as the second component of compounds, these nouns often change gender according to the gender of the Belarusian and Ukrainian translation equivalents.

Why would Slavic-speaking Jews have wanted to relexify? The most compelling explanation is that the confrontation of Germans and Slavs was resulting in the widespread erosion or extinction of Upper Sorbian language, religion and culture, leaving the Jews increasingly isolated from the Christianizing Slavs. Relexification rather than shift to German might have struck the Jews as a good way to avoid Christianization – a concomitant factor in the Germanization process. Furthermore, Judaism might have been attractive to pagan Sorbs because no political commitments were involved (unlike Christianity which required espousal of German language, culture and political hegemony), and because Judaism offered Sorbs an opportunity to escape the status of slaves which was being imposed by German settlers. I suspect that the desire of the Turkic Khazar ruling class to preserve neutrality vis-à-vis the Byzantine Christians and the Baghdad Arab Caliphate, and the desire to participate in international trade, at the time monopolized by Jews who alone could travel freely between Christian and Muslim lands, made Judaism popular. It is widely assumed that the Ashkenazic Jewish im-

migrants from the Germano-Slavic lands vastly outnumbered the indigenous Eastern Slavic-speaking Jews, but the facts of Yiddish suggest a Slavic-speaking majority. Relexification is always motivated by a desire to create a new ethnic identity, i.e. by *identificatory* rather than communicative needs. Hopefully, future genetic studies could determine whether the origins of the bulk of its speakers parallels the origins of Yiddish itself.

The term relexification has, to the best of my knowledge, never been mentioned in the Slavic linguistic literature; the concept hardly ever (see Jenč 1959: 288, Dahms-Meškank and Oschlies 1993: 25, Thomas 1996). Other Slavic and non-Slavic languages which owe their genesis to relexification are forms of contemporary Upper Sorbian and Old Church Slavonic, which utilize a German and Greek grammar, respectively, with native lexicon. Non-Slavic examples include Angloromani (English grammar + Romani lexicon), Media Lengua (Quechua grammar + Spanish lexicon in Ecuador). Relexification is the only model that can explain how scribes, utilizing their native grammars with a Hebrew, Latin lexicon, respectively, invented unspoken Medieval Latin and Hebrew, given the absence of native speakers. The Ashkenazic Jews have committed altogether six acts of relexification over the last eleven centuries: five acts of relexification of a Slavic language (a, b, d, e, f) and one act of relexification of Old (Semitic) Hebrew (c); → means “became relexified to”; = means “resulted in”:

(a) Old/Upper Sorbian → High German + Hebrew + Hebroid vocabulary = Slavic Yiddish I (9th–12th cc). (b) Yiddish → Old Hebrew + Yiddish Hebroidisms = written Ashkenazic Hebrew (12th–19th cc, if not earlier), a bizarre dialect of Slavic. (c) Biblical Hebrew → High German vocabulary = literal Yiddish Bible “translations” (14th–18th cc), bizarre dialects of Old Semitic Hebrew whose syntax and derivational strategies are followed faithfully. (d) Kiev-Polessian (South Belarusian, North Ukrainian) → Yiddish + High German + Hebrew + Hebroidisms = Slavic Yiddish II (by the 15th c at the latest). (e) Yiddish → Old Hebrew vocabulary + new Hebroidisms (minus most Yiddish and Ashkenazic Hebrew Hebroidisms) = Modern Hebrew (late 19th c), a bizarre dialect of Slavic. (f) Yiddish → Latinoid vocabulary = Esperanto (late 19th c), a bizarre dialect of Slavic (invented by Ludwik Zamenhof, a native speaker of Yiddish).

Before we look at three entries in the forthcoming Yiddish etymological dictionary, we must add a word of caution about the methodology and the interplay of the two Slavic substrata in the genesis of Yiddish. We suppose that chronologically the relexification from Old Sorbian to Middle High German preceeded the relexification of Kiev-Polessian (Old Northern Ukrainian and Old Southern Belarusian); this is borne out by the fact that Yiddish grammar and lexicon reveal a number of facts which point specifically to an Eastern Slavic substratum. With both events, we are at a disadvantage due to the state of historical lexicology. There are no etymological or historical dictionaries of Yiddish and the existing synchronic dictionaries are usually unsatisfactory since they fail to distinguish between authentic Yiddish lexicon and relatively recent German borrowings (the best is Weinreich 1968 which marks unrecommended Germanisms as such, but his coverage is incomplete). While there is an excellent etymological dictionary for Upper and Lower Sorbian (Schuster-Šewc 1978–1996), we lack native Sorbian texts before the 16th century; the situation in Eastern Slavic is not much better from the point of view of colloquial texts and worse from the point of view of etymological dictionaries (which are still in progress). The lack of old attestations of the relevant Slavic languages means that we cannot usually know the age of specific Slavic words, though comparative evidence permits us to reconstruct to some extent the Common Slavic

lexicon. We can partly compensate for this state of affairs by noting that the presence of Hebraisms and Hebroidisms (pseudo-Hebraisms invented by Yiddish speakers) strongly suggests when Germanisms were blocked, which is circumstantial evidence for the existence of Slavic words.

After the termination of the two relexification processes, Yiddish could borrow from all its original component sources (as well as from new sources like Polish and Russian), without substratal Slavic considerations; post-relexificational acquisitions can often be identified by formal/semantic clues. Positing relative chronologies for the acquisition of Hebrew elements in Yiddish is very often possible, since most Hebroidisms are by definition coinages motivated by relexification. For instance, Y *mojre* ▲‘fear; ▲danger’ continues OHe *mwr* ‘/mora/ ‘fear’, but the second meaning must be attributed to USo *strach* ‘fear; danger’ which was required to replace the blocked G *Gefähr* ‘danger’. Other Yiddish Hebraisms, such as ▲*ejme* and ▲*paxed* ‘fear’ (< He *’jmh* /ema/, *pħd* /paxad/) do not also mean ‘danger’, probably because they were acquired during the second Kiev-Polessian or post-relexificational period, and thus could not be affected by Sorbian (and/or Ukrainian) lexico-semantic parameters. It is also possible to posit cautiously the relexificational stage during which a Germanism was likely to have been acquired, e.g. G *Anker* ‘anchor’ > Y *anker* m probably in the Sorbian lands, since USo *kótwica* f would have presented no problem to relexify; however, in the Kiev-Polessian area G *Anker* might have been blocked by the surface cognate, Uk *jakir* m < Scandinavian (also available to Yiddish). We can sometimes also determine whether Germanisms accepted by Yiddish in the first relexification phase were dropped in the second relexification phase, in order to conform to the requirements of the Kiev-Polessian substratum. For example, USo *chować* provides no particular reason why G *bergen* ‘to save, secure’ was not acquired by Yiddish in the first relexification phase; yet, in the Kiev-Polessian context, Belarusian does offer a similar cognate *berahčy* (with *h* < *g), thus providing grounds for the actual blockage. Most Hebrew verbal material reaches Yiddish in the form of an indeclinable masculine singular participle, which must be combined with an inflected German auxiliary verb. This conjugation is used in Islamic languages to integrate Arabic elements. A Judeo-Belarusian example from c. 1600 reads (in transcription): *ja tebjā èstim mekadeš byl* ‘I have sanctified you with this (ring)’ (literally ‘I you by this [ring] sanctifying was’) (see Wexler 1987: 98–99). Hence, this Yiddish grammatical rule may be from the Turkic-Iranian or Eastern Slavic substratum of Yiddish, i.e. it dates from the second relexification phase.

Yiddish can assist (a) in reconstructing aspects of German and Slavic linguistic prehistory, and (b) in positing the relative chronology of the diffusion of German words into Slavic. For example, USo *-mohwić* ‘speak, talk’, is now restricted to compounds with different, but related, meanings, e.g. USo *wotmohwić* ‘answer’, *wotmohwa* ‘answer’, *so zamohwić* ‘apologize’, *zamohwity* ‘responsible’, *so (wu)zamohwić* ‘excuse (oneself); defend’. The Yiddish data suggest that these are not original in Upper Sorbian, but later calques of German compounds formed from *Wort* ‘word’. If USo *wotmohwa* f ‘answer’, *wotmohwić* ‘to answer’ and *zamohwity* ‘responsible’ had existed at the time of the first relexification phase, then there would have been no problem for Yiddish to relexify to G *Antwort* f, *antworten* and *verantwortlich*, respectively – with identical component structure. Since Yiddish uses primarily Hebraisms, ▲*čuve* (or *entfer* < G *Antwort*, significantly, with morpheme distortion) ‘answer’, ▲*axrajesdik* ‘responsible’, ▲*xajev* ‘responsible’, ▲*memune* m ‘responsible person’ (< He *tšwvh* /čuva/, *’hrjw* /axrajut/, *ħjv* /xajav/, *mmwnh* /memuna/). Upper Sorbian probably was not yet following German practice in using a single root for these concepts at the time of the first relexification

phase (Yiddish also does not follow the contemporary Ukrainian practice of using *povidaty* ‘tell’ for this set, as in Uk *vidpovid* ‘answer’, *vidpovidaty* ‘to answer’ and *vidpovidal’ny* ‘responsible’).

If German has a single translation equivalent of several Slavic terms with various gender assignments, then relexification requires the selection of one of the underlying Slavic genders; no single Yiddish noun can have the genders of all the Slavic equivalents. Hence, the choice of underlying Slavic gender may cast light on the inventory and meanings of the Slavic substratal lexicon at the time of relexification. For example, ‘belly’ in Ukrainian is now *žyvit*, *šlunok* m or *čerevo* n. The feminine gender of Lithuanian Y *bojx* (~ masculine in other dialects) ‘belly, abdomen’ suggests the original substratal term prior to relexification was Kiev-Polessian (Uk) *čerevo* n (Slavic feminine, neuter gender > Yiddish feminine exclusively during relexification).

Germanisms that are blocked in Yiddish need not always be expressed by Hebrew (Hebroidisms) or by unrelexified Slavisms. A further option is to use other relexified Germanisms. For example, in place of the blocked G *abtrünnig* ‘disloyal, unfaithful; apostate’, Yiddish uses Germanisms with innovative meaning, see e.g. ♥*felčér* m ‘apostate’, ♥*felčn* ‘betray’ < G *falsch* ‘wrong, false’, *Fälscher* ‘forger’, *fälschen* ‘forge’ (also > Y *falš*, *felšn*). Thus, the distribution of Germanisms in Yiddish often comes to differ substantially from that of the German source etyma.

Relexification to Hebrew differs radically from relexification to German, since there was no interest in accepting a whole Hebrew paradigm. For example, G *Haß* ‘hate’ and related *Häßlichkeit* ‘ugliness’ were both blocked in Yiddish, but the replacements are two separate Hebrew roots. This means relexification to Hebrew was piecemeal. It is rare to encounter Hebrew antonym sets in Yiddish.

Currently I am preparing the first etymological dictionary of Yiddish (see Wexler ms), which will also be the first etymological dictionary to recognize the unique nature of a relexified language. The authors of published etymological dictionaries of Caribbean Creole languages (relexified African languages) see as their primary task the collection of unique vocabulary, especially substratal African relics and regional or archaic elements from the European lexifier languages. The bulk of the lexicon of these languages, which is of coterritorial origin, is simply omitted from the dictionary as “non-native”. This approach creates the erroneous impression that the distinctive feature of creoles lies in their use of lexicon that is unknown or not current in the European lexifiers.

The common assumption of creole and Yiddish lexicographers is that there is little point in etymologizing the vocabulary shared by each language with its lexifier source language(s). For example, what could one say about Y *frage*, *freg*, (archaic) *frog* ‘question’ that has not already been stated about G *Frage* f in a German etymological or dialect dictionary? I agree. However, the job of an etymological dictionary of a relexified language is to explain *why* Yiddish borrowed MHG *vrēge* f (see also G dialectal *frägen*) and MHG *vrāg(e)* ‘question’ – as G *Frage* f, and why the latter coexist with ▲*šajle*, ▲*kaše* < He *š’lh* /še’ela/, JAram *qšj* /kašja/, i.e. *to show how a substratal grammar selects and calibrates a superstratal lexicon*. In addition, the preoccupation with reconstructing a “Proto-Yiddish” is misplaced, since the latter simply tends to be the original German input. The answers to questions of selection can only come from a look at root sets rather than individual words. In addition to dealing with the distinctive features of creole languages enumerated above, an etymological dictionary of a relexified language would have to provide information not normally expected in the historical-etymological dictionary of a non-relexified language. For instance, alongside the

etyma of the German/Germanoidisms and Hebrew/Hebroidisms in Yiddish should appear (i) the Slavic terms that determined the selection and calibration of German and Hebrew phonetic strings during the two relexification phases, and (ii) all related German roots blocked in Yiddish. The citation of “non-existing” (in our case Middle High or Modern German) vocabulary should be a distinctive feature of an etymological dictionary of any relexified language.

Post-relexification loans from Hebrew, Slavic and German should present no special problem for the historical lexicographer of Yiddish, though no dictionary of Yiddish distinguishes between relexifications and loans from these three sources. Unfortunately, all Hebrew dictionaries also subsume native and non-native Hebrew elements under a single heading, which seriously reduces their value. The on-going publication of Medieval Latin dictionaries according to the native language of the scribe is a model that Hebrew lexicographers ignore at their own peril. Unspoken Medieval Polish, Hungarian Latin, etc. are relexifications of Polish, Hungarian, etc. to Latin lexicon and thus are genetically distinct from native spoken and written Latin. What is needed are separate dictionaries of “native (Semitic) Hebrew” (obsolete since the 3rd c. A.D.) and “non-native Hebrew” (such as “Modern Hebrew” which is a Slavic language or the unspoken Hebrew written by Arabic-speaking Jews, which is an example of “non-native Semitic Hebrew”, see Wexler 1990).

As the three entries from the projected Yiddish etymological dictionary below show, an etymological dictionary is an ideal way to present the evidence for the claim of double relexification in Yiddish. The major differences between an etymological dictionary of a relexified and non-relexified language are as follows: An etymological dictionary of a non-relexified language (a) reconstructs a proto-form; (b) lists cognates; (c) treats only and all the extant forms of the language in question; (d) arranges root entries alphabetically. An etymological dictionary of a relexified language has (a) no reconstructed proto forms (the user is referred to an etymological dictionary of the superstratum and substratum languages); (b) does not need to list cognates; (c) examines the *entire* corpus of the German relexifier dialect(s) postulated at the time of the relexifications, i.e. both blocked and accepted Germanisms and not just the superstratum German corpus found in Yiddish, and attempts to explain why German vocabulary was blocked and to posit the underlying pre-relexified Slavic words; (d) often arranges entries according to sets of genetically or semantically related roots (synonyms, antonyms). (e) By identifying the three major components of the Yiddish lexicon as pre-/post-relexificational and relexificational (and also by citing unspoken Ashkenazic Hebrew innovations – also relexified from the same Slavic languages as Yiddish; these are omitted here to save space), the Yiddish etymological dictionary will make a major contribution to historical Hebrew lexicography.

Lack of space prevents presenting more than three entries from my Yiddish etymological dictionary, currently in progress, but these should suffice to demonstrate the new type of etymological dictionary that is being proposed here – where the lexifier source, German, is taken as the point of departure, while Upper Sorbian, Belarusian and Ukrainian provide the motivation for most of the lexical corpus of Yiddish – of all component origins.²

² The order of each main heading is: Yiddish allomorphs of a German root set + Germanisms not recommended for Yiddish + Hebraisms/Hebroidisms + Germanoidisms + Slavisms/Slavisms + other Germanisms/Germanoidisms. The symbol / separates cognates; the symbol + separates non-cognates. In this way, the reader can see at a glance how small the German

1. (German) **farkiln zix**, **fiber(dik)**, **fibern**, **hejs**, **hicn (zix)**, **kalt**, **kater**, **kelt**, **kil(kejt)**, **kiln** + (Hebrew/Hebroid) **▲krire**, **▲xmime** + (Germanoid) **♣(ba)hejcn**, **♥cehcn (zix)**, **♣farkiln**, **♣farkilung**, **♣hic(n)** + (Slavic/Slavoid) **(♠)cejaxmern zix**, **(♠)cejaxmert**, **(♠)nervirn zix** [+ (other German/Germanoid) **♥cekoxn zix**, **jomern**, **koxn zix**, **♥oncindn zix**]

G: (a) **heiß** 'hot' / (b) **heizen** 'heat (up)' / (c) **Hitze** f 'heat', **sich erhitzen** 'get excited' + (d) **Fieber** n 'fever', **fiel(e)rig** 'feverish', **fiebern** 'be feverish' + (e) (archaic) **erkälten** 'grow cold; cool down', **¶sich erkälten** 'catch cold', **Kälte** f 'cold' / (f) **kalt** 'cold', **erkalten** 'become cold' / (g) **G kühl** 'cool', **Kühle** f 'coolness', **kühlen** 'to cool, chill; refresh', **sich verkühlen** 'catch cold' + (h) **¶Katarrh** m '(nose) cold' (16th c) >

Y: (a) **hejs** 'hot' / (b) **(♣)(ba)hejcn** 'to heat, make a fire in' / (c) **hic** f 'heat'; **♣** 'fever' ~ **♣hicn** pl 'hot weather', **♣hicn** 'to heat' (the latter meaning < G [b]), **♣hicn zix** 'get excited continually, be excited', **♥cehcn** 'excite', **♥cehcn zix** 'get excited' + (d) **fiber** m 'fever', **fiberdik** 'feverish', **fibern** 'be feverish' + (e) **kelt** f 'cold' / (f) **kalt** 'cold' / (g) **kil** 'cool', **♣kilkejt** f 'coolness; aloofness, detachment', **kiln** 'to cool', **♥farkiln** 'to jell', **farkiln zix** 'catch cold', **♥farkilung** '(nose) cold' + (h) **¶kater** m '(nose) cold'.

Y (c) ♥hicn pl 'hot weather' coexists with **▲xmime** f 'extreme heat'. The second term was needed to match the variety of USo *horcota*, *ćopłe wjedro*, *hěca* 'warm weather' (< German), *ćopłota* 'warmth' or Uk *mljava* 'heat; sultry air', *teplin* 'warm period, place', WUk *horjač* 'suffocating, burning heat'. Yiddish also differs from German in the word for 'fever'. Besides (d) **fiber** m, Yiddish also has (c) **hic** f in this meaning. The use of the root for 'heat' to denote **♣** 'fever' in Yiddish parallels Uk *harjačka* 'fever' < *harjačyj* 'hot'. USo preserves the original Slavic practice in its cognate *horcota* (now rarely, in favor of *zym[n]ica*, *temperatura*, *hěca*) but, curiously, has also recalibrated *zyma* 'winter' > 'cold' > 'fever' (on the model of G **¶sich erkälten** 'catch cold' ~ non-Umlauted in **erkalten** 'become cold').

Yiddish accepts (b) with some reluctance. The simplex verb corresponding to (b) **G heizen** 'to heat' can be either **(♣)(ba)hejcn** 'to heat, make a fire in' or **♣hicn** (imperfective) 'to heat' (< [c]), patterned on Uk *harjačyj* 'hot', *rozharjačaty* 'to heat'; but **Y ♥hicn zix** 'get excited continually, be excited', **♥cehcn** 'excite' ~ **G sich erhitzen** are probably post-relexificational acquisitions. See also **Y koxn zix**, **(♠)nervirn zix** 'be excited' (< Uk *nervuvatysja* 'be nervous, irritable'), **♥cekoxn zix**, **♥cehcn zix**, **♥oncindn zix** 'get excited' and **(♠)cejaxmern zix** 'get excited, upset'. **(♠)cejaxmert** 'excited, upset' (possibly a cross of Uk *xmurytysja* 'to frown; become angry' + **G jammern** 'to moan, lament', though the latter > Yiddish in the form **jomern**). The partial acceptance of the German morphophonemic alternation in (b) ~ (c) could be explained by Upper Sorbian where there is a change in root, see e.g. **G heiß** = USo *horcy* 'hot', **G Hitze** = *horcota* f 'heat' vs. **G heizen** = USo *tepić* 'to heat' (see in folklore *horić* 'to burn', as well as *rozhoric* 'to anger').

component of Yiddish is (i.e. what was blocked) compared to any dialect of German and how important the role of Hebrew and Slavic is in Yiddish. Though most Yiddish Germanisms have Middle High German cognates, for convenience, I mainly site only Modern German forms. Where either Upper Sorbian or Kiev-Polesian could have provided the substratal input for relexification, I will usually cite only Modern Belarusian and/or Ukrainian forms since the latter often induce changes in Yiddish Sorbianisms and Upper Sorbian tends to be heavily Germanized. German terms created after c. 1500 are not cited unless they entered Yiddish as post-relexification loans.

The treatment of German ‘cold/cool’ in Yiddish resembles that of ‘hot/heat’, in that Yiddish has invented **▲krire** f ‘bitter cold’ < He *q-r(-r)* ‘cold’ as an antonym of **▲xmime** f ‘extreme heat’; to the best of my knowledge, there is no **qrjrh* /krira/ in any stage of Hebrew. The basis for Y **▲krire** cannot be found in German (see instead *grimmige Kälte* f ‘bitter cold’), but there is a precedent in USo *třěskaňca* (from a root meaning ‘crackle’), Uk *ljut* f ‘extreme cold’ (also ‘fury, rage’); Y **▲krire** f might, therefore, date from the first relexification phase. The creation of a Hebroid antonym set **▲xmime/▲krire** f reflects the requirements of the Slavic substratal lexicon; ordinarily, Yiddish is not receptive to Hebrew antonym sets.

The Slavic languages can denote ‘cold’ and ‘cool’ by common roots. Matching G *kalt* ~ *kühl*, see (e)-(g) USo *zymny*, *chlódny* ‘cold, cool’, *zyna*, *chlódnota*, *chlódność* ‘cold, coolness’. In addition, Upper Sorbian also has diminutive *chlódkojty* ‘cool’, *chlódk* ‘shade, shadow’; see also Uk *xolodnyj*, *proxolodnyj* ‘cold’/ *xolodnuvatyj* (diminutive), *proxolodnyj* ‘cool’. The practice of denoting ‘cool’ by a diminutive of ‘cold’ is not attested in Yiddish (which suggests that the diminutive form in Slavic arose after the second relexification phase). Yiddish has (ultimately) accepted both German allomorphs, but not without competition from innovative Hebroidisms. Stern 2000 cites **▲xmime** f in Hessian and Franconian German dialects, which is important for suggesting the original western-most border of Slavic Yiddish vs. Germanic West Yiddish dialects (indeed, many German Hebraisms/Hebroidisms unknown in contemporary Slavic Yiddish itself may be original replacements for blocked Germanisms which were subsequently accepted by Yiddish; Klepsch 2004 provides important data for further study). Moreover, the existence of a single term in Yiddish for ‘cold’ (noun) vs. two in Upper Sorbian probably means that at the time of the first relexification phase USo *zyna*, whose original meaning was ‘winter’ (see cognates in the other Slavic languages), had not yet acquired the meaning of ‘cold’. Y **▲xmime** shares the feminine gender of USo *třěskaňca*. In other Slavic languages, the cognates of USo *třěskaňca* f function as adjectives, see e.g. Uk *triskučyj moroz*, Pol *trzaskący mróz* ‘extreme frost’. Y (g) **♣kilkejt** ‘coolness; aloofness, detachment’ < **kil** ‘cool’ ~ Uk *proxoloda* f ‘coolness’ < *proxolodnyj* ‘cool’.

In addition to the two roots for ‘cold’ and ‘cool’ cited above, Slavic languages have a third root, CSI **studiti* ‘(be) cool’/ **studъ* ‘cold’ > USo *studžeň* ‘well (water)’, *studzić* ‘to cool down’ and WUk *studnja* ‘well (of water)’, Uk *studin* ‘cold, frost’, *prostudytyjsja* ‘catch cold’, etc. Unlike Ukrainian, Upper Sorbian has patterned the concept ‘catch cold’ on German norms, and uses *zyna* ‘cold’ since G *kalt* is the basis of the corresponding G *sich erkälten*: see USo *so nazymnić* and discussion of USo *zym[n]ica* ‘fever’ in Schuster-Sewc 1978–1996: 1771–1772. Yiddish follows only Uk *stud-* (*zastuda*) to form Y **♣farkiln zix** ‘catch cold’ and **♣farkilung** ‘(nose) cold’. Hence, the distribution of G *√kalt* and *√kühl* differs from that of Y *√kalt* and *√kil*.

2. (Hebrew/Hebroid) **▲vald-xazer**, **▲xazeraj**, **▲xazer(-flejš)**, **▲xazer-štal**, **▲xazer(t)e** + (Germanoid) **♣zix** + (Slavic/Slavoid) **▣brone**, **▣brozde**, **▣gare**, **▣kaban**, **▣katux**, **▣ljoxe**, **▣lotke**, **▣rin(v)e** [+ (other German/Germanoid) **baršt(n)**, **♣runclen zix**, **tojbñšlak**, **vald**]

G: (a) *Sau* f ‘sow’/ (b) *säuisch* ‘piggish; obscene’/ (c) *Schwein* n ‘pig’, *Schweinefleisch* n ‘pork’, *Schweinestall* f ‘pigsty’ + (d) *Eber* m ‘boar’ + (e) *Ferkel* n ‘piglet’/ (f) *Furche* f ‘furrow’, *furchen* ‘to furrow’, *furchig*, *zerfurcht* ‘wrinkled, furrowed’ + (g) *Frischling* m ‘young wild boar’ + (h) MHG *lôse* f ‘breeding sow’ + (i) *tocke* f ‘sow’ + (j) G *EGge* f ‘harrow’, *eggen* ‘to harrow’ + (k) *Borch*, *Borg* m ‘castrated boar’

+ (I) (Bav) **alden** f ‘furrow; depression in the field’// MHG *arn*, G *Borste*, (*die Stirn*) *runzeln*, MHG *ern*, G *Taubenschlag*

For German (**a-e**, **g-i**), Yiddish uses **▲xazer** m with innovative **▲xazerte** (with a Judeo-Aramaic feminine suffix *-t’* /*-ta/*) and **▲xazere** f (with a Hebrew feminine suffix < He *ħzjr* /*ħ*/ /*xazir* [a]/), or **◻l’oxe** ‘sow’ < Uk *l’oxa* f (< MHG [h] with characteristic expressive change of /s > x/), **▲xazeraj** n, f ‘filth, mess, dirty trick’ (the basis for Modern He **▲xazirut**), **▲vald-xazer** (with *vald* ‘forest’), **◻kaban** ‘wild boar’ (< Uk [dy-kyj] *kaban* m ‘castrated pig’). Y **▲xazer(-flejš)** n ‘pork’ has optional use of German ‘meat’, following compound G *Schweinefleisch* rather than simplex Uk *svynyna* f ‘pork’. Y **▲xazer-štal** f, **◻m** replaces the blocked German (**c**), with the optional m gender < Uk *xliv*, *svynarnyk*, *svynynec*, *svynjušnyk* m; however, a compound noun in Yiddish matches German rather than Slavic usage. For ‘coop’ (for other animals), see Y **◻katux** ‘chicken coop’ (< Br *katux*), Y **tojbnšlak** ‘pigeon coop’ (< G *Taubenschlag* m). A Hebraism would be appropriate for G (**a-c**) because the German and Slavic terms are cognates, see (a) Uk *svynomatka* f ‘sow’/ (b) USo *swinjacy*, Uk *svynjačyj*/ (c) USo *swinjo* n, Uk *svynja* f. Significantly, Yiddish retains the Slavic practice of using a common root without the morphophonemic alternation and lexical variety of German. German (**d**) is blocked because of cognate Uk *vepr* m; German (**e-f**, **j**) are lacking because the Slavic lexicon requires multiple roots, see (e) USo *proso*, Uk *porosja* n, *porosjuk* m ‘young pig’ (cognates of German [e]) and denotes ‘furrow’ and ‘harrow’ by related and formally similar roots: (f) USo *brózda*, Uk *borozda* ‘furrow’; the latter has a variant with *-n-* in Uk *borozna* f/ (j) USo *bróna*, Uk *borona* ‘harrow’. If relexifiers were aware of the fact that G *Ferkel* and USo *proso* were cognates, this knowledge would also have strengthened the blockage of the Germanism. For German (**f**) ‘(to) furrow’, see Y **◻brozde** ‘furrow’, **gare** ◻ ‘furrow; groove’, **◻rin(v)e** ‘groove; eaves’, < Uk *borozda* ~ *borozna* ‘furrow’ (with deletion of the initial unstressed syllable, unless < Upper Sorbian), Uk *gara* ‘groove; socket’, *rynva* f ‘gutter-pipe, eaves’; for German (**j**), see Y **◻brone** f (with deletion of the initial unstressed syllable in Yiddish [f, j]), unless < Upper Sorbian). If Y **◻brozde** ‘furrow’ is a cognate of G *Borste* f ‘bristle’, the semantic distance would have been too great to cause blockage of the Germanism. German (**f**) ‘wrinkled’ is unacceptable to Yiddish, since no Slavic root denotes both ‘furrow’ and ‘wrinkled’, but see Y **♣runcleñ zix** < G *runzeln* ‘to wrinkle, pucker’, *die Stirn runzeln* ‘frown, knit one’s brow’ (Y reflexive **♣zix** ~ Uk reflexive *-sja* in *morščyty[sja]*). German (**k**) could have been blocked by cognate Pol *browek* m ‘boar’. Bav (I) **alden** f ‘furrow; depression in the field’ was blocked by cognate Uk *lodka* ‘boat, canoe’ (> Y **◻lotke** f ‘boat’); the Germanism is related to MHG *arn*, *ern* ‘to plow’.

3. (German) **muzik(aljš)**, **muzikant**, **muziker** + (Hebrew/Hebroid) **▲bale-zemer**, **▲klebajes**, **▲klezajen**, **▲klezmer**, **▲/◻leceven**, **▲lec(ones)**, **▲negine**, **▲nigele**, **▲nign**, **▲nigundl**, **▲zemer** + (Slavic/Slavoid) **◻eve-**, **◻melodje**, **◻muzikantke** [+ (other German/Germanoid) **-er**]

G: (a) **Musik** ‘music’ (< MHG *mûseke*, *mûsic* f), G **¶musikalisch** ‘musical’ (early 16c), **¶Musikant** ‘musician (player)’ (c. 1600), **¶Musiker** m ‘musician (artist)’ (c. 1800) + (b) MHG **sancmeister** ‘cantor, musician’, **sengermeister** ‘head of a choir’, **spil(man)** m ‘roving singer, musician’ + (c) **¶Plinse** f ~ **¶Plins** m ‘pancake’ (16c)// MHG *arche*, *arke*, G *Bord*, *Bort*, *Bund*, Rtw *gaue*, *kaff*, *kaffljer*, OBav *karmala*, G *Reliquenschrein*, *Schrein*, *Speichel*, *speien*, MHG *spil*, G *Spott*, *spucken*, MHG *warm*, *werme* >

Y: (a) **muzik** f ‘music’, **muzikališ**, **muzikant** ‘musician (player)’, **muziker** m ‘musician (artist)’.

Of the German set, only (a) is accepted, but not without competition from non-Germanisms. There are three reasons for the partial relexification:

(i) Y **klezmer** m (< He *klj-zmr* /kle zemer/, literally ‘instruments of song’, attested in Old Western Yiddish texts, see e.g. Basle 1557: Dreessen 1977), could, theoretically, have been coined in the first relexification phase to replace the originally blocked (i) G *Musik* f, *Muzikant* m, since MHG *mûseke*, *mûsic* f ‘music’ never formed an agentive noun, or (ii) (c) MHG *spilman* ‘musician (player)’ and *sancmeister*, *sengermeister* ‘musician (artist)’ (literally ‘song master’), for which Upper Sorbian lacked parallel constructions (MHG *spil* n ‘music’ was not blocked in Yiddish). Alternatively, Y **klezmer** m could date from the second relexification phase as a substitute for the lack of stress mobility in G *Musik* that characterizes Eastern Slavic. This means that Yiddish might have coined **muzikant** m earlier than German (see also Wexler 2002b, chapter 4.1, paragraph 12). Another Yiddish innovation for ‘music(ian)’ might have originally been He *lc* /lec/ ‘buffoon, clown, prankster; scoffer; evil person’, which > Y **lec** m, along with **lecones** n ‘mockery, buffoonery, clowning’ (< He *lcnwt* /lecanut/), **leceven** ‘to clown, scoff at’ (with **leceve** < Uk *-ova-*, etc., an infix for deriving verbs from nouns and adjectives), since the Hebraism has the meaning ‘music(ian)’ in Rotwelsch, see e.g. *letzer* ‘musician’ (1862), *leethsama* ‘music’ (1791), *lehtsamen* ‘play music’ (1822: Wolf 1956: #3221; see also Klepsch 2004, 2: 931–933).

(ii) The Slavic languages have alternative terms for ‘musician’ < roots meaning ‘emit a dull tone, drone; fiddle’ (see Br *husci* ‘emit a dull tone’, Uk *husty* ‘to sound, clamor’ ~ Uk *husli* pl only ‘zither, psalter’, *hudity* ‘to buzz, sound, hum’, R *gudet*) or ‘play; musical art’ (see USo *herc* m ‘musician, violinist; chorals’ 1721 ~ *hrać* ‘to play; act’: Schuster-Šewc 1978–1996: 276, 356–357). There is no German counterpart for SI ‘musician’ < ‘emit a dull tone’, but note G *spielen* ‘to play (game, musical instrument)’.

(iii) In Ukrainian, the difference between ‘music’ and ‘musician’ can be expressed by stress shift alone, see e.g. Br, Uk *múzyka* f ‘music’ vs. *muzyka* m, f ‘musician’; this is not possible in USo *muzika* f ‘music’, since the stress has been fixed in native and German words since the 14th c (Schaarschmidt 1998: 87–88); hence, the need for USo *muzikant* m ‘musician (player)’. Y **muzik** has final stress, like ModG *Musik* f (the latter since the 17th c, before which it had initial stress).

Innovative Y **klezmer** m ‘musician (player)’ is the only instance in Yiddish where an inanimate compound with He *klj* /kle/ ‘implements’ has assumed an animate meaning (see Y **klebajes** n, pl ‘household furniture’ < He *klj-bjt* /kle-bajit/ literally ‘home instruments’), **klezajen** n ‘weapon, arms’ (< He *klj-zjjn* /kle-zain/ literally ‘instruments of weapons’) and examples in Pereferkovič 1931: 119; an innovative Western Yiddish Hebraism is **bale-zemer** m pl ‘musicians’ < He *b’lj-zmr* /ba’ale-zemer/, literally ‘possessors of song’: Worms 17th c: J. Mark 1958: 129). Birnbaum is probably right to suggest that the animate meaning was facilitated by interpreting the final syllable **-er** as the productive agentive (1922: 39; see also Rtw *gaue* [1597], *kaffffer* [1714], *kaff* [1907] ‘peasant; fool’ < He *kfr* /kfar/ m ‘village’ with reinterpretation of /-ar/ as the German agentive – unless the source is Romani *gāw* ‘village’). The Slavic and German practice of deriving an agentive noun from the name of an instrument could

also have played a role, see e.g. Uk *truba* f ‘trumpet’ ~ *trubač* m ‘trumpeter’. Hebraisms in Yiddish are spelled etymologically, but Y **▲klezmer** m is (now at least) spelled phonetically, as is the case with all non-Hebraisms—thus suggesting that speakers are not aware of its Hebrew origin(?).

Curiously, the second root of Y **▲klezmer** is attested rarely in Old Russian as *zamarā* f ‘musical instrument’ and *zamarъnyj* ‘related to a wind instrument’, which Hendler 1993 ascribes (with no substantiation), along with OR *kaganъ* m ‘Rus’ ruler’, to Khazar influence < Arabic *zamar* ‘wind instrument’ (see also Wexler 2002b, chapter 4.7; *kagan*, *kahan*, in a variety of variants, is also a common Jewish family name limited to Eastern Slavic areas, and hence is probably not derived from Y *koen* ‘priest’ < He *khn* /kojen/: see details in Beider 1993). On the possibility of Jewish influence on Old Russian music, see Yasser 1949. See also Y **▲negine** f ‘(Jewish, especially vocal) music’, **▲zemer** m ‘tune’, **■melodje** f, **▲nign** m ‘melody’ (diminutive **▲nigundl** n), **▲nigele** n ‘light tune’ (< He *nginh* /negina/ ‘tune’, *zmr* /zemet/, Uk *melodija*, He *njgwn* /nigun/). The pair **▲nign**/**▲nigele** diminutive ~ Uk *pisnja* ‘song’/*pisen’ka* f ‘ditty, ballad, little song’. See also Y **■muzikantke** f ‘musician (player)’ (< Uk *-ka* f agentive).

Hopefully, this discussion of Yiddish will stimulate interest among Slavists in relexification and in Yiddish (along with its two Slavic offsprings, Modern Hebrew and Esperanto). If that happens, then the inventory of Slavic languages (already expanded by Slavic “micro-languages”: see Duličenko 1981, 2003), with its rich array of relexification phenomena, can be expected to make a major contribution to the theory of contact-induced change.

References

- Agapkina, T. A. (2001). Xleb. *Vostočnoslavjanskij etnolingvističeskij sbornik. Issledovanija i materialy*, 337–354. Moscow.
- Beider, A. (1993). *A dictionary of Jewish surnames from the Russian Empire*. Teaneck, New Jersey.
- Bellmann, G. (1971). *Slavoteutonica. Lexikalische Untersuchungen zum slawisch-deutschen Sprachkontakt im Ostmitteldeutschen*. Berlin-New York.
- Birnbaum, S. A. (1922). *Das hebräische und aramäische Element in der jiddischen Sprache*. Kirchhain in N.-L.; 2nd edition, Hamburg 1986.
- Dahms-Meškank, W. and W. Oschlies (1993). “DDRSch” mit slawischen Wörtern? *Muttersprache* 103(1), 12–27.
- Dreessen, W.-O. (1977). Zur altjiddischen Synonymik. In: H.-J. Müller and W. Röhl (eds.), *Fragen des älteren Jiddisch*, 63–67. Trier.
- Drosowski, G. (ed.) (1989). *Duden 7. Etymologie. Herkunftswörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Mannheim-Leipzig-Vienna-Zurich.
- Duličenko, A. D. (1981). *Slavjanskije literaturnye mikrojazyki*. Tallinn.
- (2003). *Slavjanskije literaturnye mikrojazyki 1. Obrazcy tekstov*. Tartu.
- Filin, F. P. (ed.) (1965 ff). *Slovník ruskix narodnyx govorov*, 1 ff. St. Petersburg.
- Gimbutas, M. (1967). Ancient Slavic religion: A synopsis. In: *To honor Roman Jakobson* 1, 738–759. The Hague-Paris.
- Hendler, M. (1993). *zamarъnyj* – ein altrussisches hapax legomenon. *Anzeiger für slavische Philologie* 22(1), 97–103.
- Histaryčny slovník belaruskaj movy* (1982 ff), 1 ff. Minsk.

- Horvath, J. and P. Wexler (1994). Unspoken “languages” and the issue of genetic classification: The case of Hebrew. *Linguistics* 32(2), 241–69.
- (eds.) (1997). *Relexification in creole and non-creole languages. (With special reference to Modern Hebrew, Haitian Creole, Romani and Rumanian.)* Wiesbaden.
- Jenč, R. (1959). Inflacija prefiksa do-. *Rozhľad. Časopis za serbsku kulturu* 9(9), 286–288.
- Klepsch, A. (2004). *Westjiddisches Wörterbuch* 1–2. Tübingen.
- Lefebvre, C. (1986). Relexification in creole genesis revisited: the case of Haitian Creole. In: P. Muysken and N. S. H. Smith (eds.), *Substrata versus universals in creole genesis*, 279–300. Amsterdam.
- Machek, V. (1971). *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Prague.
- Mark, J. (1958). Jidiš-hebreiše un hebreiš-jidiše najšafungen. *YIVO-bleter* 41, 124–157.
- Pereferkovič, N. (1931). *Hebreizmen in jidiš*. Riga.
- Petrova, T. Ė. (1987). O proisxoždenii svadebnyx frazeologizmov v russkix govorax gor'kovskoj oblasti. *Vzaimodejstvie vyrazitel'nyx sredstv i semantiki v istorii drevnerusskogo i russkogo jazykov*. Gor'kij.
- Schaarschmidt, G. (1998). *A historical phonology of the Upper and Lower Sorbian languages*. Heidelberg.
- Schuster-Šewc, H. (1978–1996). *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache* 1–24, plus a separate index. Bautzen/Budyšin.
- Šerech, Y. [Shevelov, G. Y.] (1953). *Problems in the formation of Belorussian*. New York.
- Stern, H. (2000). *Wörterbuch zum jiddischen Lehnwortschatz in den deutschen Dialekten*. Tübingen.
- Thomas, G. (1996). Towards a history of Modern Czech purism: The problem of covert Germanisms. *Slavonic and East European Review* 74(3), 401–420.
- Trubačev, O. N. (ed.) (1963 ff). *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov*, 1 ff. Moscow.
- Vážný, V. (1955). *O jménach motýli v slovenských nářečích*. Bratislava.
- Weinreich, U. (1968). *Modern English-Yiddish Yiddish-English dictionary*. New York.
- Wexler, P. (1987). *Explorations in Judeo-Slavic linguistics*. Leiden.
- (1990). *The schizoid nature of Modern Hebrew: a Slavic language in search of a Semitic past*. Wiesbaden.
- (1991a). Jiddisch – die 15te slavische Sprache? *Akten des VIII. Internationalen Germanisten-Kongresses, Tokyo 1990* 11, 530–535. Munich.
- (1991b). Yiddish – the fifteenth Slavic language. *International journal of the sociology of language* 91, 1–150, 215–225. (With critiques by B. Comrie, J. R. Dow and T. Stolz, P. Glasser, N. G. Jacobs, D. F. Marshall, G. Schaarschmidt, H. Schuster-Šewc, E. Stankiewicz.)
- (1993a). Jewish linguistics: 1981–1991–2001. *Historical linguistics 1991. Papers from the 10th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*, ed. J. van Marle, 343–361. Amsterdam-Philadelphia. Reprinted in Wexler 2006a, 53–71.
- (1993b). *The Ashkenazic Jews: A Slavo-Turkic people in search of a Jewish identity*. Columbus, Ohio.
- (1996). *The non-Jewish origins of the Sephardic Jews*. Albany, New York.
- (2001a). De la relexification en yiddish: Les Juifs, les Sorabes, les Khazars et la région de Kyjiv-Polissja. *Canadian Slavonic papers. Revue canadienne des slavistes* 43(4), 533–556. Reprinted in Wexler 2006a, 716–739.

- (2001b). Što mohuc' idyš, sučasny iwryt, esperanta a taksama serbalužyčane, palešuki i xazary skazac' pra paxodžanne habrèjaw-aškenazi? *Arche* 3, 117–126. Minsk.
 - (2002a). A German-Slavic bilingual unknowingly knows Yiddish and Modern Hebrew quite well: Why and what? *Welt der Slaven* 47(1), 57–84. Reprinted in Wexler 2006a, 740–779.
 - (2002b). *Two-tiered relexification in Yiddish. (Jews, Sorbs, Khazars and the Kiev-Polessian dialect.)* Berlin-New York.
 - (2006a). *Jewish and non-Jewish creators of “Jewish” languages. (With special attention to Judaized Arabic, Chinese, German, Greek, Persian, Portuguese, Slavic [Modern Hebrew/Yiddish], Spanish, and Karaite, and Semitic Hebrew/Ladino.)* Wiesbaden.
 - (2006b). Preface: Old views, new views, and renewed views. In Wexler 2006a, xv–xliv.
 - [ms.] *An etymological dictionary of the Yiddish language. (Motivating component choice in relexified Old Sorbian and Kiev-Polessian).*
- Wirth, P. (1933). *Beiträge zum sorbischen (wendischen) Sprachatlas* 1–2. Leipzig.
- Wolf, S. A. (1956). *Wörterbuch des Rotwelschen. Deutsche Gaunersprache.* Mannheim.
- Yasser, J. (1949). References to Hebrew in Russian medieval ballads. *Jewish social studies* 11, 21–48.
- Zdancewicz, T. (1964). Wpływy litewskie i wschodnio-słowiańskie w polskich gwarach pod Sejnam. *Acta Baltico-Slavica* 1, 227–246.

Zusammenfassung

Jiddisch ist eine slavische Sprache, die einen vorwiegend deutschen Wortschatz erworben hat. Zunächst werden knapp die beiden wichtigsten diagnostischen Tests für eine solche Hypothese (in der linguistischen Literatur bekannt als *Relexifizierung*) skizziert – unsere Fähigkeit: (a) vorauszusagen, welche deutschen Elemente im Jiddischen auftreten können (und damit auch vorauszusagen, wann im jiddischen Wortschatz Hebräismen und Slavismen zu erwarten sind), und (b) zu zeigen, dass die Grammatik und die Phonologie des Jiddischen slavisch sind, während sich der Einfluss des Deutschen auf den Wortschatz beschränkt. Im Folgenden wird begründet, dass für eine relexifizierte Sprache wie das Jiddische ein etymologisches Wörterbuch eines neuen Typs notwendig ist, mit dem der oben genannte Test zur Voraussagbarkeit des Lexikons überprüfbar wird. Der Fall des Jiddischen ist von direkter Bedeutung für sorabistische Untersuchungen, da das Sorbische sowie die südbelorussischen und nordukrainischen Mundarten (die zusammen den früheren Dialekt des Kiev-Polessischen vor etwa 1400 konstituieren) die Grundlage der Grammatik und Phonologie sowie für etwa 10 % des Wortschatzes des Jiddischen bilden.