This spurred conscious and serious attempts at orthographic reform (Schaechter 1999: 4). The major breakthrough came in the lexicographic work of Lifshits (1867, 1869, 1876). The impact of Lifshits was significant in setting the direction of future orthographic reform. Among Lifshits' specific innovations, Schaechter (1999: 4) cites: the *rofe* diacritic on /f/ פֿ to distinguish it from /p/ פּ; syllabic ל *l* (vs. daytshmerish על- *-el*), e.g., הימל *himl* 'sky'; svarabhakti vowel, e.g., באדערפֿעניש *baderf-ə-niš* 'need' (cf. StG *Bedürf-Ø-nis*); suffixes לעך, עך (vs. daytshmerish spelling ליך, ־יך; cf. StG *-ich, -lich*); dropping of silent ע in, e.g., *lib*, *fil* (vs. daytshmerish ליעב, ליעל, פֿ; cf. StG *Lieb, viel*); use of ' to indicate palatalized consonants ליאדע /l'adə/ 'any,' ליארעם /l'arəm/ 'noise'; word-final ס (*tes*) replacing daytshmerish ד, thus: האַנט 'hand; arm,' ווינט 'wind,' געלט 'money' (cf. StG *Hand, Wind, Geld*).

In general, the history of StY orthography involves an ongoing process to free itself from daytshmerish orthography, and to base Yiddish orthography on Yiddish-internal considerations (phonetic/phonological, and morphological). This process is seen in those orthographic reformers who came after Lifshits. Sholem Aleykhem (1888) had an orthographic system which was innovative yet contained daytshmerish elements (Schaechter, 1999: 5),[39] e.g., in his proposal to differentiate שטיין 'stone' from שטעהן 'stand' (based on StG *Stein, stehen*). Later sources in which daytshmerish spelling is found include (p. 5): (early on) Yiddish grammar books, the first modern Yiddish journal *Der Yud* (1899–1902), and, later, *Der Fraynd* (1903–1914).

The major twentieth-century figures associated with orthographic reform – Borokhov, Yofe, Prilutski, Birnbaum, and Soviet Yiddish linguists – to varying degrees all adopted Lifshits' approach (Schaechter, 1999: 9). The emerging yiddophone intelligentsia increasingly saw orthographic normalcy as important and necessary for the Yiddish-based national agenda (pp. 9–10); thus, see Borokhov (1913). Even in orthodox traditionalist circles, orthographic reform became an issue (Schaechter 1999: 32–33). The interwar period saw the formalization of two major secularist orthographic schools – the Soviet version, and the YIVO/Tsisho version. Both versions developed from a common source (pp. 11–26), especially the Kiev-based (in independent Ukraine, 1917–1919) commission for the "new orthography." The Kiev commission not only developed a system (with sixty orthographic rules), but also succeeded in having it adopted by a major Yiddish daily newspaper (p. 10).

StY orthographic debates in recent decades have largely involved fine-tuning, for example, on use of diacritics vs. silent *alef* in וואו vs. ·וו /vu/ 'where.' With some exceptions, the YIVO StY orthography has gained ground in recent decades, and even publications with longstanding orthographic traditions of

---

[39] Schaechter notes that in matters of lexicon, Sholem Aleykhem was strongly anti-daytshmerish.

their own (such as the newspaper *Der Forverts*, founded 1897) have recently switched to StY orthography.

7.7.5   Romanization systems

The orthography debates also included calls for romanization – the writing of Yiddish in Latin letters (for internal use within the Yiddish speech community). Serious early calls for romanization came from prominent figures: Nathan Birnbaum (in his early years), the convener of the 1908 Tshernovits conference; Ludwig Zamenhof; Zaretski; Zhitlovski; Yofe; and others (Schaechter 1999: 16). The earliest such voice was likely Dr. Philip Mansch (1888–1890). Overwhelmingly, however, there was a strong negative reaction to romanization, though some short-lived romanized publications did appear (Schaechter 1999: 16): *Unzer Shrift* (1912; New York), *Der Unhojb* (1923; Vienna), as well as some Holocaust-survivor publications (1945–1947; Germany and Austria). Language ideology carries over into romanization as well. Orthographic distance from German – a notion which had gained support in modern Yiddishist circles – carries over into Max Weinreich's principled system of romanization for transliteration purposes – e.g., *sh* for ש, thus, graphically distinct from German-based *sch*; or *kh* vs. German *ch* for [x] (Frakes 1993: xviii–xix).

7.8   Post-Yiddish Ashkenazic speech

Under the impact of modernization, segments of the yiddophone Ashkenazic population (in differing times and places under somewhat differing circumstances) ceased using Yiddish as their dominant vernacular, giving rise to Jewish ethnolects of German, Dutch, English, revived Hebrew, etc. The newly created post-Yiddish ethnolects shared many common features. One may thus speak of Ashkenazic speech in its broadest sense; the post-Yiddish ethnolects are successor lects to Yiddish, arising via language shift.[40]

WY largely died out among western Ashkenazim, who shifted to the new vernaculars (German, Dutch, French, etc.) asssociated with modernity, emancipation, and acculturation. However, Yiddish in the west survived into the modern period in two main ways. First, it survived at the geographic margins (Alsace, Switzerland, etc.) well into the twentieth century. Second, it survived in socially circumscribed contexts, serving a more limited range of functions than it did some few generations earlier. Speakers in a given generation might use WY in conversations with their grandparents, but German with their parents. Additionally, vestiges of Yiddish could be used in intragroup Jewish German or Jewish Dutch; these are mainly vocabulary words (Weinberg 1969; Beem

---

[40] Comparative Jewish German and Jewish Dutch is addressed in Jacobs (1999).

1967). Even where knowledge of Yiddish continued, it was increasingly not as the dominant language. Hoge (1991) links the death of WY to the disruption of a traditional triglossic situation.

For some speakers of EY in America, one may describe a situation of incomplete L-1 learning (Levine 1997). Among the features discussed by Levine is the loss of a distinction in the past-tense AUX *zajn* vs. *hobn*; incomplete L-1 speakers in America have only *hobn*. Still, caution must be exercised in discussions of language death. Many features which some might be tempted to view as indicative of language loss are found within vibrant spoken EY (e.g., collapse of case and gender distinctions in much of spoken EY; the loss of AUX *zajn* is characteristic for much of NEY).

The widespread rise of identifiably Jewish ethnolects represents an important peripheral area for Yiddish linguistics. M. Weinreich (1923: 50) recognized the importance of the systematic investigation of Jewish German as a post-Yiddish phenomenon. Van Ginneken (1914) devoted much space within his discussion of Jewish speech (including Yiddish in the Netherlands) to Jewish Dutch.[41] In a similar vein, see Gold (1986) on Jewish English; on Jewish German, see Matras (1991) and Jacobs (1996c); Jacobs and Hinskens (1997) for Jewish Dutch; Brzezina (1986) for Jewish Polish. The appearance of Yeshivish represents a new manifestation of Jewish English (Weiser 1995), involving a complex mixing of "traditional" Jewish English in the context of internal Jewish bilingualism, with an admixture from newly observant Jews who were formerly English monolinguals.

Post-Yiddish Jewish ethnolects exhibit many features typical of language shift – in word order, intonation, pronunciation, etc. Thus, typical of Jewish German (Matras 1991: 277; Jacobs 1996c: 192) is the proximity of AUX and main verb, as is the use of finite verb in initial position to mark a discourse boundary. Ashkenazic Jewish Dutch also exhibits shift features, e.g., in intonation, and syntax (Jacobs and Hinskens 1997). For example, Ashkenazic Jewish Dutch permits Yiddish-style topicalization, as well as the postposing of direct object after the verb complex: *ik heb daar gezien een kalle* 'I have there seen a bride.' A further characteristic of Ashkenazic Jewish Dutch is obligatory preposition *aan* with dative objects: *ik heb het aan hem gegeven* 'I gave it (on) him'; non-Jewish Dutch does not require this (van Praag 1948; Jacobs and Hinskens 1997). Also characteristic of post-Yiddish Jewish ethnolects are calques from Yiddish; thus, Jewish Dutch *een goed uur*, lit. 'a good hour,' used, however, in Jewish Dutch in the sense of wishing good luck; cf. Yiddish *in a mazldikǝr šo* 'in a lucky hour,' modern Israeli Hebrew *bešaʕa tova* 'in hour good';

Jewish English *make a blessing* (< Yiddish *maxn a broxǝ*) vs. non-Jewish *say a blessing*.

The identifiably Jewish ethnolects are typically stigmatized in the general (non-Jewish) speech community. The internalization by some Jews of this stigmatization has also led to a type of hyperlectal speech which seeks to rid itself systematically of the stigmatized features. Herzog (1978: 53–54) notes a type of monotone speech employed by some Jews in their English as a way of avoiding the stigmatized Jewish (= Yiddish) intonation. Acculturating German Jews of the late eighteenth century innovated hypercorrect front-round vowels, e.g., *eigenhöndig* 'with one's own hand,' *anzeugen* 'indicate,' *fünden sich* 'find oneself' (M. Weinreich 1973, III, 293); the hypercorrection is based on the perception that Yiddish has "incorrect" unrounded vowels corresponding to front-rounded vowels (*ü, ö, eu*) in "correct" German; however, cf. StG *eigenhändig, anzeigen, finden sich*. On hyperlectal Jewish German in the twentieth century, see Jacobs (1996c: 199–201).

The large number of words of Yiddish (and/or HA) origin in post-Yiddish ethnolects presents a special challenge to the Thomason and Kaufman model, where characteristic of shift are inherited features in syntax and phonology, much less so in morphology and lexicon. The lexicon of the prior language typically is jettisoned in the shift process. However, typical of the post-Yiddish ethnolects are many words of Yiddish origin; see, e.g., Weinberg (1969) for Jewish German; Voorzanger and Polak (1915), Beem (1967) for Jewish Dutch. Jewish speakers typically possessed competence in both Jewish and non-Jewish varieties of the new vernaculars, and could modify their style according to interlocutor. In the presence of non-Jews, HAisms (as well as other "Jewish" markers) could be avoided (Beem 1974: 34; Beckermann 1989: 118). Conversely, such words could be consciously inserted as markers of intragroup solidarity in other sociolinguistic situations.[42] The point is that many Ashkenazic Jews had competence in multiple varieties of the new vernacular, and these varieties existed within a specialized type of diglossia. Finally, new borrowing directly from HA may occur in a post-Yiddish Jewish ethnolect; this is quite evident in Yeshivish.

A desideratum for the field remains a comprehensive ethnography of Ashkenazic speech. This will encompass both internal Jewish bilingualism in traditional Ashkenaz and the linguistic milieu of modernity, where new linguistic "soups" have emerged. According to Birnbaum (1979a: 14) the social split into traditionalist/orthodox and modernist sectors was creating the

---

[41] While there is much useful material in van Ginneken's study, it is rife with bigoted statements and formulations concerning the Jewish people.

[42] Many "Jewish" words crossed over to become part of the language (frequently, slang) of the broader general population. Thus, many Germans use *meschugge* 'crazy,' *mies* 'ugly,' *pleite* 'bankrupt,' etc. Some general varieties (e.g., Viennese German, Dutch) show especially high numbers of such words.

basis for two different styles of Yiddish, and the conditions for an eventual split into two Yiddishes.[43] This is only partly true. Traditional internal Jewish bilingualism, with its regular code-switching, continued to serve as a template for Talmud study among English-dominant modern orthodox Jewry (Heilman 1981). A generalized form of this template carried over as a model for a Jewish discourse style in post-Yiddish Jewish ethnolects. This style involves regular code-switching in, e.g., storytelling narrative (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1972: lar code-switching in, e.g., storytelling narrative (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1972: 330–384), macaronic Yiddish folksongs (U. Weinreich 1950; Rothstein 1993), and Jewish cabaret (Jacobs 2003). The term *Ashkenazic verbal code* (Jacobs 2000) may be employed to refer to this code-switching template in the broadest sense. The Ashkenazic verbal code goes beyond grammatical features to include pragmatic and discourse features, conversational style, etc. (Tannen 1981). In ways as variegated, nuanced, and linguistically interesting as it has been from the start, Ashkenazic speech continues.

---

[43] Harshav (1993: 33–34) writes of a "Jewish polysystem" and "a whole new Jewish secular polysystem."

References

Aronson, Howard. 1985. On aspect in Yiddish. *General Linguistics* 25: 171–188.

Avé-Lallemant, Friedrich Christian Benedict. 1858–1862. *Das deutsche Gaunertum in seiner social-politischen, literarischen und linguistischen Ausbildung zu seinem heutigen Bestande*. 4 vols. Leipzig: Brockhaus.

Baker, Zachary. 1992. History of the Jewish collections at the Vernadsky Library in Kiev. *Shofar* 10(4): 31–48.

Beckermann, Ruth. 1989. *Unzugehörig: Österreicher und Juden nach 1945*. Vienna: Loecker Verlag.

Beem, H. 1967. *Sjeëriet. Resten van een taal. Woordenboekje van het Nederlandse Jiddisch*. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. BV.

1974. *Uit mokum en de mediene: Joodse woorden in Nederlandse omgeving*. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. BV.

Beranek, Franz Josef. 1965. *Westjiddischer Sprachatlas*. Marburg: Elwert.

Berliner, Note. 1981. [= 1938]. Vegn litvishn dialekt in kongres-poyln. In Joshua Fishman (ed.), *Never say die! A thousand years of Yiddish in Jewish life and letters*, 667–668. The Hague, Paris, and New York: Mouton.

Bernshteyn, Mordkhe. 1959. A bintl verter fun klezmer-loshn. *Yidishe shprakh* 19: 22–25.

Bin-Nun, Jechiel. 1973. *Jiddisch und die deutschen Mundarten*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. (See also: Fischer 1936.)

Birnbaum, Salomo (Solomon, Shloyme). 1915. *Praktische Grammatik der jiddischen Sprache*. Vienna and Leipzig.

1930. *Yidishkayt un loshn*. Warsaw: Yeshurun.

1933. Ungern oder lite? *Yivo-bleter* 5: 329–332.

1934. Di historye fun di alte *u*-klangen in yidish. *Yivo-bleter* 6: 25–60.

1971. *The Hebrew scripts*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

1979a. *Yiddish: A survey and a grammar*. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

1979b. Soviet Yiddish. *Soviet Jewish Affairs* 9(1): 29–41.

1981. (= 1938). Zeyer gerekht. [Editor's comment to Berliner 1981 (= 1938).]. In Joshua Fishman (ed.), *Never say die! A thousand years of Yiddish in Jewish life and letters*, 668–669. The Hague, Paris, New York: Mouton.

1988. *Grammatik der jiddischen Sprache: Mit einem Wörterbuch und Lesestücken*. Hamburg: H. Buske. (Reprint of Birnbaum 1915.)

Boeschenstein, Johannes. 1514. *Elementale introductorium in hebreas litteras teutonice et hebraice legendas*. Augsburg: Erhard Oeglin.