



BRILL



brill.com/jjl

The *Loshn Koydesh* Component in Contemporary Hasidic Yiddish

Zoë Belk, Lily Kahn, and Kriszta Eszter Szendrői

University College London, London, UK

zoe.belk@ucl.ac.uk; l.kahn@ucl.ac.uk; k.szendroi@ucl.ac.uk

Abstract

The *loshn koydesh* (Hebrew and Aramaic) component has historically influenced the development of Yiddish lexis and grammar. We examine its contemporary use among 26 native speakers of contemporary Hasidic Yiddish from Israel, New York, and London using a written questionnaire examining the gender of *loshn koydesh* nouns, periphrastic verbs with a Hebrew/Aramaic element, and adjectives derived from the *loshn koydesh* element of periphrastics. Our findings show that there are differences on both the geographical and gender axes, many of which are consistent with the speakers' varied exposure to Modern Hebrew, English, and *loshn koydesh*. We also found that the *loshn koydesh* component has developed since the pre-War stage of the language in ways that seem to affect contemporary Hasidic Yiddish usage in all locations and for both genders. We take these developments to provide evidence for the existence of this newly emergent variety of Yiddish – Contemporary Hasidic Yiddish.

Keywords

Hasidic Yiddish – *loshn koydesh* – Hebrew/Aramaic component – periphrastics – noun gender – adjectives

Introduction¹

In this article we seek to examine the role that the traditional *loshn koydesh*, i.e., Hebrew and Aramaic, component of Eastern Yiddish (henceforth referred to simply as Yiddish) plays in the speech and writing of contemporary male and female Hasidic Yiddish speakers living in Israel, where the majority language is Hebrew, in comparison with that of male and female Hasidic Yiddish speakers living in the United States and the United Kingdom, where the majority language is English. An additional aim of the article is to ascertain whether there are differences between male and female speakers in each language environment due to differing levels of familiarity with and exposure to the traditional pre-Modern Hebrew of classical Jewish texts on the one hand, and with spoken Modern (Israeli) Hebrew on the other hand.² To this end, we investigate three different areas where the *loshn koydesh* component has formed an integral part of Yiddish grammar, namely 1) the gender of *loshn koydesh* nouns, 2) periphrastic verbs with a *loshn koydesh* element, and 3) adjectives based on *loshn koydesh* passive participles. In each case, we seek to investigate the effect of the contact languages on the forms and constructions in question, in addition to possible interlinked gender differences. This study is necessary because there has thus far been little scholarly attention paid to the role which the traditional Semitic component of Yiddish plays in the present-day varieties employed by Hasidic speakers and the ways in which the dominant co-territorial contact languages Modern Hebrew and English have influenced it, as well as the extent to which speakers' gender is relevant to this process. The only works we are aware of are Assouline (2010), where she discusses periphrastic verbs with a Hebrew-origin component in contemporary Israeli Haredi Yiddish, Assouline (2017:125-154), discussing lexical borrowing from Modern Hebrew in Israeli Haredi Yiddish, and Assouline (2019), providing a comparative overview of the Hebrew component in Israeli and American Haredi Yiddish. Assouline's main findings are that Modern Hebrew has exerted a significant influence on the

1 We gratefully acknowledge Eli Benedict for his help in preparing and administering the questionnaire, as well as for his insightful discussions. We are also grateful for the contributions of Shifra Hiley and Sonya Yampolskaya. This research is generously funded by the UK Arts and Humanities Research Council.

2 We also considered the question of whether association with different Hasidic dynasties might play a role in grammatical differences between speakers with respect to the *loshn koydesh* component, given the different attitudes towards Yiddish, Modern Hebrew, and *loshn koydesh* in the various dynasties (e.g., the anti-Modern Hebrew stance of anti-Zionist groups such as Satmar, compared to the much more pro-Zionist stance of e.g., Belz). However, our analysis of the data revealed a lack of difference in speakers' responses associated with this variable, and therefore we do not discuss it in this article.

Yiddish of Israeli speakers, resulting in an increased overlap in form and meaning between *loshn koydesh*-component forms in Yiddish and their Modern Hebrew counterparts, while simultaneously leading to a decrease in the use of traditional *loshn koydesh*-component forms that are not common in Modern Hebrew. Our findings show that there are marked differences on both the geographical and gender axes, many of which are consistent with the speaker's varied exposure to Modern Hebrew, English, and *loshn koydesh*. We also found that the *loshn koydesh* component has developed since the pre-War stage of the language and that some of these grammatical changes seem to affect contemporary Hasidic Yiddish usage in all locations and for both genders. In this respect, our findings echo those of Assouline (2019) in that the influence of Modern Hebrew can be seen in the Yiddish of Israeli vs. non-Israeli communities. However, we demonstrate that gender and, to a certain extent, geographical community outside of Israel have a greater effect. Furthermore, whereas Assouline focuses on an oral corpus of radio interviews, sermons, and lessons and thus provides primarily positive data, our study provides both positive and negative data – not only which forms speakers use but also which forms they reject, do not recognize, or are uncomfortable with. In addition, our study provides metalinguistic information on speaker preferences.

Contemporary Hasidic Yiddish

The majority of Yiddish speakers in the 21st century belong to Hasidic communities in various countries worldwide. The global Hasidic population has been estimated at 700-750,000 (Biale et al. 2018; Wodziński 2018:191), many of whom are Yiddish-speaking. There are major concentrations of Hasidim in Israel, particularly in Bnei Brak and in and around Jerusalem, with an estimated total Israeli Hasidic population of roughly 350,000 (Wodziński 2018:191). There are also particularly large Hasidic communities in the United States, chiefly in and around New York City, and in the United Kingdom, chiefly concentrated in London's Stamford Hill.³ Together, the Israeli, US, and UK Hasidic communities comprise the vast bulk (93%) of the total global Hasidic population (Wodziński 2018:191-192). The New York Hasidic community has an estimated population of 130-145,000 as of the year 2000 (a figure which has most likely grown considerably in the past 20 years), many of whom are Yiddish speakers (Comenetz 2006:58). The Stamford Hill Hasidic community is much smaller than New York, although it is the largest in Europe, with a population of approximately 40,000, and with approximately 75% of community members fluent in Yiddish

3 There are also major Yiddish-speaking Hasidic communities in and around Antwerp, Belgium; Montreal, Quebec, Canada; and Manchester, United Kingdom.

(Holman and Holman 2002). See Biale et al. (2018) and Wodziński (2018) for more detailed discussion of contemporary Hasidic groups in these areas. The Yiddish spoken by present-day Hasidic groups is based largely on Mideastern (Polish and Hungarian) and Southeastern (Ukrainian and Romanian) pre-War dialects of Yiddish, but has undergone significant grammatical changes in comparison to those dialects. An especially prominent feature of contemporary Stamford Hill Hasidic Yiddish is its complete lack of morphological gender and case (Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői 2020). This development in the morphological system is also true of Hasidic Yiddish spoken in other locations as well (see Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői under review for details; Assouline 2017; Krogh 2012, 2018; Sadock & Masor 2018 for related discussion). Given the rapid and widespread linguistic development that has been documented in various aspects of the Yiddish of Hasidic speakers, it is instructive to investigate the issue of the *loshn koydesh* component of contemporary Hasidic Yiddish in order to ascertain whether it too has undergone changes.

Motivation for Our Current Investigation and Research Questions

Historically, the *loshn koydesh* component of Yiddish was substantial and pervasive, affecting various areas of the grammar, and has been fully integrated into the grammar of Yiddish. At the same time, various factors affecting Yiddish-speaking communities immediately after and continually since World War II are likely to have led to developments in the Semitic component of contemporary Hasidic Yiddish. First, the devastating effect of the Holocaust on the speech communities and the ensuing geographical dispersal of the speakers has led to the establishment of new speech communities, which live co-territorial with different languages. In the present-day Hasidic communities in Israel, for the first time in the history of Yiddish, Yiddish has been co-existing with the gradually ascending and increasingly dominant Modern Hebrew (see Assouline 2017, 2019). In the communities in the US and the UK, Yiddish now co-exists with English.

For these reasons, our first main research question is whether the *loshn koydesh* component of Yiddish, specifically the three areas of the grammar mentioned above (i.e., the morphological gender of *loshn koydesh* nouns; periphrastic verbs with a *loshn koydesh* component; and predicative and attributive adjectives based on a *loshn koydesh* passive participle) continue to function in the same way in contemporary Israeli and New York or London Hasidic Yiddish, or whether there is a difference between the use or frequency of these forms in New York (and London) on the one hand, where the major contact language is English, and Israel on the other hand, where the major contact language is Modern Hebrew. Similarly, we wanted to ascertain whether the contact with

Modern Hebrew contributed to a higher rate of use, or greater productivity, of the periphrastic forms and passive adjectives, and to a higher rate of recognition of the traditional morphological gender of *loshn koydesh* nouns (where that corresponds to the Modern Hebrew gender), among Israeli Hasidic Yiddish speakers than among their New York and London counterparts, who have less exposure to Modern Hebrew and greater exposure to English.

In addition to the geographical relocation of the speech communities and ensuing exposure to different contact languages, various other socio-linguistic factors have also potentially affected the communities to different degrees. One such factor is speaker gender. This is an issue worthy of investigation for two reasons. First, among Israeli Hasidic Yiddish speakers, there is a pronounced gender distinction whereby women are more likely than men to work outside of the Yiddish-speaking community and as such often have a higher rate of exposure to Modern Hebrew (in contrast to *loshn koydesh*, to which men typically have greater exposure), as well as an increased tendency to employ the language actively on a regular basis (see Bogoch 1999; Isaacs 1999a:119, 199b:15; Assouline 2017:93-123).⁴ As such, it is possible that female Israeli Hasidic Yiddish speakers will exhibit a higher degree of influence from Modern Hebrew than their male counterparts in the grammatical categories under examination. Second, in New York and London, where Modern Hebrew is not a dominant everyday language, male and female Hasidic Yiddish speakers may display divergences from each other in these respects due to their different levels of familiarity and use of *loshn koydesh* and English: men have a greater rate of exposure to traditional Hebrew and Aramaic texts as a result of their studies in *yeshiva* (religious college) and *kolel* (a house of study for married men), whereas women tend to speak more English and have less intensive engagement with *loshn koydesh* (Glinert 1999:32; Fader 2009, especially 135; see also Assouline 2018:47). Thus, it is possible that women will exhibit greater influence from English whereas men will exhibit a higher level of familiarity with *loshn koydesh* grammatical elements and will be able to use them more productively. Moreover, because men tend to travel internationally more than women and to relocate for marriage between Hasidic communities, they have more occasion to use Yiddish as a lingua franca; in addition, as they spend more time mixing with Hasidic Yiddish speakers in different countries, their Yiddish is more likely to converge regardless of their country of residence. For these reasons, the second major question to be examined in this article is

4 This and the other claims in this section are also supported by our unpublished interview data with over 40 native Hasidic Yiddish speakers in Israel, the UK, the USA, Canada, and Belgium.

whether there are differences in usage between male and female speakers in both geographical settings.

Roadmap

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. The next section provides an overview of the *loshn koydesh* component of Yiddish from a historical perspective, addressing nouns, verbs, and adjectives respectively. The section following that, Methods and Data, gives details of our participants and describes the design, implementation, and results of our questionnaire (again, focusing on nouns, verbs, and adjectives in turn). The final major section, Discussion, consolidates our findings and explores them along the axes of speaker origin and gender. The concluding section provides some closing remarks and suggestions for further research.

Historical Overview of the *Loshn Koydesh* Component in Yiddish

Loshn koydesh has always been a part of Yiddish lexis and, to a certain extent, grammar. This section outlines the historical use of *loshn koydesh* in Yiddish, which we contrast with developments in contemporary Hasidic Yiddish in the Methods and Data section.

Nouns

Loshn koydesh forms a substantial element of the Yiddish language, comprising an estimated 12–20% of its total vocabulary (Jacobs, Prince, & van der Auwera 1994:417). The *loshn koydesh* component of Yiddish derives largely from rabbinic and medieval Hebrew, and to a lesser extent from the language's biblical stratum. *Loshn koydesh* nouns in Yiddish span a wide array of semantic domains, ranging from home and family life (e.g., משפחה *mishpokhe* 'family,' דירה *dire* 'apartment') to work (e.g., פרנסה *parnose* 'earnings, a living'), the body (e.g., גוף *guf* 'body,' מוח *moyekh* 'brain'), and abstract concepts (e.g., רחמנות *rakhmones* 'mercy,' כבוד *koved* 'honor'), in addition to the expected domains relating to Jewish religious culture (e.g., שבת *shabes* 'Sabbath,' סידור *sider* 'prayer book').

As Hebrew and Yiddish both traditionally exhibit morphological noun gender, there is a high degree of overlap between the gender assignment of a given Hebrew noun and its Hebrew-derived counterpart in the pre-War and Standard varieties of Yiddish. For example, in Hebrew grammatically feminine nouns frequently end in הַ -a (Schwarzwald 2013), and such nouns are typically feminine in pre-War and Standard Yiddish as well (e.g., משפחה *mishpokhe* 'family,' דירה *dire* 'apartment'). However, the gender of some nouns will vary

between most historical varieties of Hebrew and Modern Hebrew on the one hand and pre-War and Standard Yiddish on the other hand, usually due to phonological reasons.⁵ For example, the Hebrew feminine suffix ת- *-t* is not commonly associated with feminine gender in pre-War or Standard Yiddish; thus, words such as גשמייות *gashmies* ‘corporeality, materialism’ and שבת *shabes* ‘Sabbath,’ which are typically feminine in Hebrew (Even-Shoshan 2003:285 and 1838 respectively), are neuter in Standard Yiddish as well as in the pre-War Mideastern and Southeastern dialects.⁶ Conversely, some words ending in the Hebrew letters ה- and ע- which are typically masculine in Hebrew, such as רגע *rege* ‘moment’ and מעשה *mayse* ‘story,’ are treated as feminine in pre-War and Standard Yiddish because these endings are consistently pronounced as /ɛ/ or /ə/ in Yiddish, which are associated with feminine gender (Katz 1987:50; Jacobs 2005:167).

Periphrastic Verbs

In addition to the prominent lexical component of nouns, Hebrew and, to a lesser extent, Aramaic play a role in various Yiddish grammatical constructions. One area of Yiddish morphosyntax in which Hebrew and Aramaic occupy a central position is in the formation of periphrastic verbal forms. Periphrastic verbs are constructed by means of one of several different light verbs combined with an invariable element. The invariable element does not necessarily derive from the *loshn koydesh* component of Yiddish, but very frequently does. The two most common light verbs used in the formation of periphrastic verbs are זיין *zayn*⁷ ‘to be’ and האבן *hobn* ‘to have.’ Both of these are typically used in the formation of periphrastics with an active sense, e.g., זיין *mamshekh zayn* ‘to continue,’ זיין *maskem zayn* ‘to agree,’ and חתונה האבן *hasene hobn* ‘to marry, to get married.’ They may also have a stative sense, e.g., מורא *moyre hobn* ‘to be afraid.’ The light verb ווערן *vern* ‘to become’ is used in

5 In some historical varieties of Hebrew (e.g., certain forms of Medieval Hebrew as well as Eastern European Hebrew composed by Hasidic and Maskilic writers), nouns that are masculine in the canonical texts are treated as feminine and vice versa; see, e.g., Rabin (2000); Goldenberg (2007); Sáenz Badillos (2013); Kahn (2015, 2018), for details.

6 Note that in Northeastern/Lithuanian Yiddish, there are only two morphological genders, with all nouns being assigned to either masculine or feminine; see Jacobs 1990 for discussion of this issue.

7 We have employed Hasidic orthography for the Yiddish examples included in this study because this is the orthography used in the questionnaires supplied to our participants. We have employed YIVO Romanization for the transliteration of Yiddish examples. We have transliterated Modern Hebrew terms appearing in the article according to the system for pre-Modern Hebrew in Khan et al. 2013; this is particularly relevant for the transliteration of the letter ת /x/ as *h* (= *kh* for Yiddish) and of the letter צ /ts/ as *s* (= *ts* for Yiddish).

the construction of passive and inchoative periphrastics, e.g., נעלם ווערן *nelem vern* 'to disappear' and מגולגל ווערן *megulgl vern* 'to be reincarnated.' Less frequently, the light verb מאכן *makhn* 'to do, make' can be employed, e.g., חוזק מאכן *khoyzek makhn* 'to mock.'⁸ The invariable *loshn koydesh* element may be a noun (some of which are also used independently as nouns in Yiddish, while others exist in Yiddish only as part of the periphrastic verbal construction); examples of such nouns are מורא *moyre* 'fear' and חתונה *khaseene* 'wedding.' More frequently, the invariable *loshn koydesh* element is a masculine singular active or passive participle which typically exists in Yiddish only within the periphrastic verbal construction; examples include מסכים *maskem*, from the Hebrew masculine singular participle meaning 'agree' and ממשיך *mamshekh*, from the Hebrew masculine singular participle meaning 'continue.' The *loshn koydesh* component of the verbs in question can be drawn from the biblical stratum or from postbiblical Hebrew texts such as the Mishnah and medieval literature such as the *siddur* and *mahzor*. Periphrastic verbs are a commonly attested and well-established feature of Yiddish (see Mark 1978:311-315; Katz 1987:172-177; and Jacobs 2005:210-212 for further discussion). They have often been used productively over the centuries, particularly in the creation of verbs referring to concepts known from the Bible or Jewish tradition (e.g., עולה רגל זיין *oyle regl zayn* 'to go on pilgrimage,' זיין בעגל חוטא *khoyte b'eygl zayn* 'to commit the sin of the Golden Calf,' etc). Yiddish periphrastics have parallels in some other Germanic languages, including so-called noun-incorporation verbs (also known as nominal separable complex verbs) in Dutch (Weggelaar 1986, Booij 1990), but such verbs tend to incorporate nouns rather than adjectives or participles, and are not used as a means to borrow lexical material from other languages. A closer parallel to Yiddish periphrastics with a *loshn koydesh* component is found in Judezmo (Ladino/Judeo-Spanish), which has a similar type of construction with an auxiliary verb plus a Hebrew-origin participle (see Bunis 2009).

From a descriptive point of view, the *loshn koydesh* elements of the periphrastic verbs are often based on the masculine singular participle form of a Hebrew verb in the *qal* (basic) stem, while others are based on the masculine singular participle form of a verb in the *piel* (so-called 'intensive') stem or, somewhat less commonly, the masculine singular participle of a verb in the *hifil* (causative) stem or *hitpael* (reflexive) stem, although these derivational relations do not necessarily hold in Yiddish speakers' mental grammars. In

8 See Jacobs (2005:212) for the argument that constructions with מאכן *makhn* are not true periphrastics but rather idiomatic expressions. By contrast, Mark (1978:314) groups them together with the other periphrastics. We have included one such verb, חוזק מאכן *khoyzek makhn* 'to mock' in our examination because it behaves syntactically as other periphrastics do.

many cases, the periphrastic verb in question has a synonym or near-synonym from the Germanic lexical component of Yiddish. For example, the everyday Yiddish verb זיין מוחל *moykhl zayn* 'to forgive' has a near-synonym פאַרגעבן *fargebn* 'to forgive,' which derives from the Germanic component of the language and can typically be used in the same contexts as the periphrastic verb.

Adjectives Derived from Hebrew Passive Participles

An area of Yiddish morphosyntax related to the periphrastic verbs with a *loshn koydesh* element is the use of Hebrew-derived passive participles as attributive and predicative adjectives. The *loshn koydesh* element of a Yiddish periphrastic has an invariable form, which is often a Hebrew masculine singular active participle. In Hebrew, such participles are derivationally related to an associated participial form with a passive or resultative sense. This occurs in a variety of verbal stems, namely the *qaṭul* (the passive participle of the *qal* or G-stem, i.e., the basic Hebrew active and stative verbal pattern), the *nifal* (also known as the N-stem, i.e., the basic passive Hebrew verbal pattern), the *pual* (the passive equivalent of the *piel* or D-stem, i.e., the Hebrew stem with a doubled middle radical which sometimes has a factitive or distributive sense), and the *hufal* (the passive equivalent of the *hifil* or C-stem, i.e., the causative stem in Hebrew).

Historically, some of these adjectival forms existed in Yiddish. For example, the Yiddish periphrastic verb זיין מכבד *mekhabed zayn* 'to honor, to respect' is derivationally associated with the Yiddish adjective מכובד *mekhubed* 'respected, esteemed' (Niborski 2012:283). However, the derivation of adjectives from *loshn koydesh* participial forms does not appear to have been a productive part of Yiddish grammar: only a handful of examples exist.

Methods and Data

In the following sections we discuss the questionnaire used for this study, the participants and their selection process, and the individual tasks and findings.

Questionnaire

In order to investigate the domains of nominal gender, use of periphrastics, and derivational patterns in adjectives, as they relate to the *loshn koydesh* component of Yiddish, we developed a questionnaire to elicit written data and judgments from native Hasidic Yiddish speakers in a) Israel (primarily, Bnei Brak and Jerusalem), b) the New York area, and to a smaller extent c) London's Stamford Hill. The questionnaire was administered in Hasidic Yiddish. The questionnaires were administered in person on location (with a small number

administered by Zoom call during lockdown) by either a native or non-native fluent speaker of Hasidic Yiddish. The questionnaire was primarily a written task, although the experimenter was present for the duration of its completion. Sessions were usually audio recorded, and where they were not, the experimenter made notes about aspects of the discussion with the participant. Our findings are primarily based on the written tasks, but where the audio data are informative, they are mentioned in our discussion below. The questionnaire was composed of three separate tasks, each of which focused on a different linguistic domain. These are described in detail below, together with the results we obtained for each. The full questionnaire is provided in Appendix 1.

Participants

The participants consisted of 26 native speakers of Hasidic Yiddish from Israel, the New York area, and London. This total can be broken down into 10 speakers who were born and raised in Israel (specifically Jerusalem, Bnei Brak, and Ashdod), of whom 6 were male and 4 female; 12 who were born and raised in the New York area⁹ (specifically the Brooklyn neighborhoods of Williamsburg, Flatbush, and Borough Park, as well as Hasidic communities in New York State and New Jersey, i.e., Lakewood, Monsey, Monroe, and New Square), of whom 7 were male and 5 female); and 4 who were born and raised in London (specifically Stamford Hill), of whom 2 were male and 2 female. The age range of the speakers was 18 to 59, and they were members of 9 different Hasidic groups (Belz, Biale, Karlin, Nadvornier, Pinsk, Pupa, Satmar, Skver, and Vizhnitz) in addition to some who reported their affiliation as “general Hasidic.” Table 1 provides information about the Hasidic affiliation, age range, hometown and current place of residence, and gender of each participant.¹⁰

Participants were selected on the basis of being native Hasidic Yiddish speakers who were raised and/or educated in Yiddish, and for whom Yiddish was the main language into adulthood. We sought to recruit speakers from a variety of Hasidic affiliations and age ranges, and to have a balance of genders.¹¹

9 One of these participants was born in Israel but moved to the New York area before the age of 5. We included this participant with the New York speakers as she has lived in the New York area since a very young age.

10 Note that age ranges instead of precise ages have been given for each speaker due to confidentiality concerns. For the same reason, precise geographical details for individual speakers (e.g., Williamsburg, Monsey, Borough Park, Bnei Brak, etc.) have been avoided in favour of more general information (i.e., UK, Israel, the New York area). The specific geographical details do not have a bearing on our results, so this precise and potentially compromising information is not germane for the study.

11 Our interview data reveal that boys in all Hasidic communities tend to be educated in Yiddish and *loshn koydesh* in parallel from the age of three. In higher grades (from age

With respect to dialect, all participants described their variety of Yiddish as “Hasidic Yiddish” or *hey mish yidish* ‘observant Yiddish.’¹² All Israeli participants were fluent in Modern Hebrew, and all New York and Stamford Hill participants were fluent in English (although for many male speakers in New York, Yiddish and *loshn koydesh* are the preferred written medium). Most Israeli participants, especially women, had some familiarity with English, but all are more comfortable in Yiddish or Modern Hebrew. Very few female participants in New York or Stamford Hill were fluent or even comfortable in Modern Hebrew or *loshn koydesh*, but many male participants had spent extended periods of months or even years (e.g., during *yeshiva* studies) in Israel, and were consequently more confident in Modern Hebrew. However, no male participants from outside of Israel spoke a native-like Modern Hebrew, as judged by a native Modern Hebrew speaker. The male participants’ education, being largely conducted in *loshn koydesh*, made them more familiar with the language than the female participants.

TABLE 1 Biographical data for participants in our *loshn koydesh* grammatical survey

Code	Hasidic affiliation	Age range	Geographical information	Gender
IL01	Nadvorner	25-29	born, raised, and currently resides in Israel	M
IL02	Pinsk	25-29	born, raised, and currently resides in Israel	M
IL03	Karlin	25-29	born, raised, and currently resides in Israel	M

13 and up) *loshn koydesh* is increasingly used as a medium of education alongside and even in preference to Yiddish. In Israel, girls are often educated exclusively in Yiddish in the early years, but in higher grades Modern Hebrew is increasingly intermingled. In Stamford Hill and in the New York area, girls tend to study religious subjects for half the day, when Yiddish is used as the primary medium, and secular subjects for the other half, when English is used as the primary medium. These findings are largely supported by those of Abraham (1999) and Glinert (1999) for Stamford Hill, Fader (2009, especially 126-138) and Nove (2018b:88) for New York, and Bogoch (1999) for Israel.

- 12 No participants identified their variety of Yiddish with any of the historical Eastern European dialect areas, and our data show that contemporary Hasidic Yiddish has evolved to such an extent that comparisons with the historical dialects is difficult. Participants’ vowel profiles vary between a Mideastern (Polish or Hungarian) pattern, a Southeastern (Ukrainian) pattern, and a Northeastern (Lithuanian) pattern. Our data do not demonstrate any effects of dialect on the results.

TABLE 1 Biographical data for participants in our *loshn koydesh* grammatical survey (*cont.*)

Code	Hasidic affiliation	Age range	Geographical information	Gender
ILo4	Biale	30-34	born, raised, and currently resides in Israel	M
ILo5	general Hasidic	25-29	born, raised, and currently resides in Israel	F
ILo6	Vizhnitz	55-59	born, raised, and currently resides in Israel	F
ILo7	Vizhnitz	25-29	born and raised in Israel; currently resides in the UK	F
ILo8	Belz	40-44	born, raised, and currently resides in Israel	F
ILo9	Satmar	20-24	born, raised and currently resides in Israel	M
IL10	Vizhnitz	30-34	born, raised, and currently resides in Israel	M
NYo1	Satmar	35-39	born, raised, and currently resides in the New York area	F
NYo2	Pupa	20-24	born, raised, and currently resides in the New York area	M
NYo3	Satmar	25-29	born, raised, and currently resides in the New York area	F
NYo4	Satmar	25-29	born, raised, and currently resides in the New York area	M
NYo5	Satmar	45-49	born in Israel; raised and currently resides in the New York area	F
NYo6	general Hasidic	20-24	born, raised, and currently resides in the New York area	M
NYo7	Skver	25-29	born, raised, and currently resides in the New York area	F
NYo8	general Hasidic	20-24	born and raised in the New York area; currently resides in Israel	M
NYo9	general Hasidic	30-34	born, raised, and currently resides in the New York area	F
NY10	Karlin	30-34	born, raised, and currently resides in the New York area	M

TABLE 1 Biographical data for participants in our *loshn koydesh* grammatical survey (*cont.*)

Code	Hasidic affiliation	Age range	Geographical information	Gender
NY11	Satmar	20-24	born, raised, and currently resides in the New York area	M
NY12	Satmar	15-19	born, raised, and currently resides in the New York area	M
SH01	general Hasidic	20-24	born, raised, and currently resides in the UK	F
SH02	Satmar	25-29	born, raised, and currently resides in the UK	M
SH03	general Hasidic	25-29	born, raised, and currently resides in the UK	F
SH04	Vizhnitz	25-29	born, raised, and currently resides in the UK	M

Task 1: Nouns

We chose to investigate the question of morphological gender of *loshn koydesh* nouns in order to ascertain the extent to which contemporary Hasidic Yiddish speakers' usage in this regard is connected to their understanding of traditional textual Hebrew and of Modern Hebrew. Following on from earlier examinations of Israeli Hasidic Yiddish (Assouline 2017) and New York Hasidic Yiddish (Krogh 2012, 2018; see also Nove 2018a), we have demonstrated in previous work that morphological gender is not a feature of the Yiddish of Hasidic Jews in London, New York, or Israel (Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői 2020; and Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői under review). In spoken use, speakers pronounce the definite article as an invariable form *de* with a realization varying between /ε/ and schwa, while in written usage the traditional gendered forms דער *der*, די *di*, and to a much lesser extent דעם *dem* and דאס *dos* are used interchangeably and inconsistently even by a single speaker. Speakers often resort to a default, the choice of which appears to be influenced by phonological factors (Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői under review). Israeli and New York speakers tend to prefer writing די *di* to represent the definite article in writing, while London speakers sometimes use דער *der*. This is because the non-rhotic nature of London English and consequently Yiddish pronunciation of these speakers brings this form phonetically close to the spoken *de* form. Some, especially young speakers, even

use the innovative form ײַד *de* in writing. In previous work, we have not tested *loshn koydesh* nouns systematically for gender assignment, but to the extent that they form an integral part of Yiddish vocabulary, we would expect that they too have lost their gender assignment in contemporary Hasidic usage.

At the same time, Yiddish-speaking Hasidim in New York and London are often familiar with traditional *loshn koydesh* through study, recitation, and regular hearing of texts such as the Torah, *haftaroth*, and *siddur*, as well as, to a lesser extent, with Modern (Israeli) Hebrew. Speakers are often aware of the fact that Hebrew (whether *loshn koydesh* or Modern Hebrew), in contrast to their own variety of Yiddish, does have morphological gender. For example, one participant in our research commented that “Yiddish is not like Hebrew or French” in this respect. Yiddish-speaking Hasidim in Israel are frequently bilingual in Modern Hebrew and are typically exposed to this language on a daily basis, which likely further entrenches familiarity with the Hebrew morphological gender system and may in turn influence speakers’ understanding of morphological gender vis-à-vis the Hebrew-origin nouns in their Yiddish. This Hebrew-Yiddish language contact and diglossia, both in Israel and in the US and UK, raises the question of whether Hebrew-origin nouns are treated differently with respect to morphological gender than Yiddish nouns not derived from Hebrew, which our previous research has demonstrated lack morphological gender completely. Thus, through this research we seek to ascertain whether Hebrew-derived nouns in contemporary Hasidic Yiddish are more likely to be associated with morphological gender than those not derived from Hebrew. Likewise, our study investigates whether there is a difference in this respect between Israel on the one hand, where Modern Hebrew is the main language of the public domain, and New York and London on the other, where Hasidic Yiddish speakers are not typically exposed to Modern Hebrew on a daily basis. Furthermore, we will examine the question of whether there is a difference between male and female speakers in each case, as male speakers in all communities have greater exposure to *loshn koydesh* than their female counterparts.

On the face of it, it would perhaps seem natural to expect that greater exposure to Modern Hebrew would facilitate the retention of Hebrew gender assignment for Hebrew-origin nouns in Yiddish. But this is in fact an illusion. If our previous work on the loss of morphological gender in contemporary Hasidic Yiddish is on the right track, then in fact our expectation should be that morphological gender in Modern Hebrew and *loshn koydesh* should not influence speakers’ choice of gender morphology in Yiddish. This is because the Yiddish of Hasidic speakers does not mark gender morphologically, so the original gender of the *loshn koydesh* elements does not manifest itself in

uniformly, and one participant assigning the article *der* in the vast majority of cases. Thus, all the participants, irrespective of geographical location, assigned a default form of the article, but there was some variation, at least in Stamford Hill, regarding which form is taken to be the default. Almost all participants therefore apply a default form of the article irrespective of the noun's gender. Note also that the default form is not uniformly applied 100% of the time by the speakers. There is some variation with speakers occasionally employing even *dos*, *dem*, and the innovative form *de*. In sum, our findings indicate a lack of awareness of morphological gender in contemporary Hasidic Yiddish by its speakers.¹³ This pattern meshes with our previous findings on article assignment to Germanic origin nouns by Hasidic Yiddish speakers as described (Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői 2020; Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői under review).

TABLE 2 Proportion of definite article assignment in the Noun Task matching pre-War and Standard Yiddish gender assignment by participants from Israel, New York, and individual data from Stamford Hill¹⁴

	FEMININE	NEUTER	MASCULINE
Israel (n=10)	89%	0%	27.5%
New York (n=11) ¹⁵	94.5%	1.8%	17.6%
SH01	0%	0%	0%
SH02	70%	20%	68.8%
SH03	90%	0%	0%
SH04	0%	0%	87.5%
TOTAL (n=25)	83.6%	1.6%	25%

13 The same pattern was observed with our Germanic control words. Here, for nouns that are feminine in Standard Yiddish, Israeli and New York speakers used an article that corresponded to the article used in Standard Yiddish 95% and 100% of the time, respectively. For neuter nouns, Standard-like usage was 0% by Israeli speakers and 2.7% for New York speakers. Masculine nouns received a Standard-like gender assignment 5% of the time by Israeli speakers and 0% of the time by New York speakers. As far as Stamford Hill speakers are concerned, the same individual default patterns carried over to Germanic nouns as observed for *loshn koydesh* nouns.

14 Stamford Hill speakers are presented individually due to their smaller number, which makes aggregate data unreliable.

15 Note that one participant from New York did not complete this task.

TABLE 3 Proportion of definite article assignment in the Noun Task matching the original Hebrew gender assignment by participants from Israel, New York, and individual data from Stamford Hill

	FEMININE	MASCULINE
Israel (n=10)	86%	25.7%
New York (n=11)	92.1%	19.5%
SH01	0%	0%
SH02	73.3%	71.4%
SH03	93.3%	0%
SH04	0%	100%
TOTAL (n=25)	81.6%	25.7%

As Table 3 shows, participants did not show a particular sensitivity to the original Hebrew gender assignment of the nouns either, whether they are from Israel, New York, or London. Importantly, as we predicted, participants from Israel were not more likely to assign articles matching the original Hebrew gender of the nouns. For example, the noun לשון *loshn* 'language,' which is feminine in Hebrew and neuter in pre-War/Standard Yiddish, was nonetheless assigned the definite article דער *der* (which is traditionally masculine nominative) by five participants and די *di* by all the other participants. Conversely, the noun כוּחַ *koyekh*, which is masculine in both Hebrew and Standard/pre-War Yiddish, is assigned the definite article די *di* by almost all participants. This is consistent with our hypothesis that they do not have the concept of grammatical gender in Yiddish.

We were also interested in whether speakers' gender or a combination of gender and geographical origin was an important factor in noun gender assignment for *loshn koydesh* nouns. The breakdown of the findings is given in Tables 4 and 5 for Standard Yiddish and original Hebrew grammatical gender assignment, respectively. We do not report gender breakdowns for the London speakers, because there were not enough participants in this location to make such comparison informative.

TABLE 4 Breakdown of the proportion of definite article assignment in the Noun Task matching Standard Yiddish gender assignment by speaker gender and location

		FEMININE	NEUTER	MASCULINE
FEMALE SPEAKERS	Israel (n=4)	92.5%	0%	7.8%
	New York (n=5)	94%	4%	22.5%
	Total (including London, n=11)	76.4%	2%	21%
MALE SPEAKERS	Israel (n=6)	86.7%	0%	40.6%
	New York (n=6)	95%	0%	13.5%
	Total (including London, n=14)	89.3%	1.4%	28.1%

TABLE 5 Breakdown of the proportion of definite article assignment in the Noun Task matching the original Hebrew gender assignment by speaker gender and location

		FEMININE	MASCULINE
FEMALE SPEAKERS	Israel (n=4)	91.7%	5.4%
	New York (n=5)	86.7%	20%
	Total (including London, n=11)	72%	20.1%
MALE SPEAKERS	Israel (n=6)	82.2%	39.3%
	New York (n=6)	96.7%	19%
	Total (including London, n=14)	81.6%	25.7%

The breakdown of results shows that Israeli men showed a slightly higher association between the article *der* and *loshn koydesh* nouns that have masculine gender in Standard Yiddish (40.6%) and in the original Hebrew (39.3%) compared to the other participants (25% and 25.7%, respectively), while Israeli women showed a slightly lower association. Note, however, that this performance is nowhere near what would be expected if they actually treated *loshn koydesh* nouns as having grammatical gender. Gender assignment errors for frequent nouns in languages with grammatical gender are vanishingly small among native speakers (Schmid 2002).

Rather, our data reveal two general patterns or tendencies for occasional *der* assignment despite an overall general default tendency to assign *di* to most *loshn koydesh* nouns. Some Israeli men employ both of these tendencies,

and most Israeli women employ neither, while New York speakers seem to employ one or the other, mostly not both, and with no discernible speaker gender pattern. This gives rise to the differential result of Israeli men and women. We examine these two patterns of increased דער *der* assignment in turn.

One pattern can be observed whereby some speakers tend to select the form דער *der* (traditionally the masculine nominative definite article) for human male referents. Thus, in about 42% of cases speakers selected דער *der* for the nouns חבר *khaver* 'friend,' שכן *shokhn* 'neighbor,' מלך *meylekh* 'king,' חתן *khosn* 'bridegroom,' and גנב *ganev* 'thief.' However, this result does not suggest that speakers associate דער *der* with masculine gender. Rather, as almost 60% of the time speakers selected די *di* for male human nouns, it indicates that there is no grammatical rule associating words denoting human or animate male entities with דער *der*. The results suggest that די *di* is not thought of as a feminine article for speakers of contemporary Hasidic Yiddish, as that would render it incompatible with masculine, and especially animate masculine, nouns. די *di* can instead be understood as the default article, and its use may be disfavored due to other patterns or tendencies. The assignment of דער *der* to words denoting male humans is one such tendency. It is likely that this tendency has its origin in earlier stages of the language, where דער *der* was associated with masculine grammatical gender, which in turn was associated with semantic maleness. However, this pattern appears to be a fossilized relic from a historical variety rather than a productive part of the grammar of contemporary Hasidic Yiddish. Furthermore, it is almost never reflected in the speech of contemporary Hasidic Yiddish speakers, but only in the written language which medium is generally considered more conservative (Fromkin, Rodman, & Hyams 2010).

A further, perhaps more interesting and innovative, pattern can also be observed whereby a significant minority of speakers assign דער *der* to the nouns שבת *shabes* 'Sabbath,' ים *yam* 'sea, ocean,' שלום *sholem* 'peace,' ספר *seyfer* 'Jewish religious book,' סידור *sider* 'prayer book,' and לשון *loshn* 'language.' Metalinguistic discussion with participants suggests that they associate the form דער *der* with objects or people that are considered important.¹⁶ The concept of importance is clearly subjective but is associated with items or concepts of religious or cultural significance such as the Sabbath, prayer books

16 Another illustration of the pervasive extent of this phenomenon can be seen by the use of the traditionally masculine accusative article דעם *dem* for the Germanic-origin noun שפראך 'language' (which is feminine in Standard Yiddish) in the context of a song praising the significance and importance of the Yiddish language, by Levy Falkowitz and the Shira Choir: ביי אונזערע אידן רעדט מען נאר דעם שפראך אידיש *bay undzere yidn redt men nor dem shprakh yidish* 'our Jews only speak the Yiddish language.' See the recording online at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3puJAZg2TEU>.

and other holy books, and peace, but not for example מעשה *mayse* 'story' or פנים *ponem* 'face.' It is not clear from our data whether this pattern has its roots in a stronger tendency for words denoting important or significant objects to retain their original gender assignment in a fossilized form simply because they are words that are perceived to be more important. In fact, some of our data suggest that this pattern is more far-reaching and more innovative: we find nouns denoting important or significant objects that were assigned feminine or neuter gender in pre-War/Standard Yiddish, as well as in Hebrew, which now fall into this pattern, such as לשון *loshn* 'language,' or חלה *khale* 'challah.' This tendency, like the previous one, is nearly absent from spoken contemporary Hasidic Yiddish.

Interim Summary

Returning to our original predictions and research questions, we find that, in accordance with previous work, *loshn koydesh* nouns are not associated with morphological gender in Yiddish and do not preserve their pre-War or Standard Yiddish grammatical gender or the original Hebrew gender assignment. There is no difference between male or female speakers, despite the former group's higher exposure to *loshn koydesh*. There is also no advantage for Israeli speakers, who have greater exposure to Modern Hebrew (especially Israeli women), in retaining the original *loshn koydesh* gender assignment. We observe two further trends in the data that we did not anticipate: some (often male Israeli) speakers sometimes assign the article דער *der* to words denoting male human entities as well as to words whose meaning is perceived as important or significant.

The task demonstrates that there is no particular distinction made by Hasidic Yiddish speakers in either majority Hebrew- or English-speaking countries in terms of morphological gender between nouns from the *loshn koydesh* component and nouns from the Germanic component. Overall, our findings in the nominal domain are consistent with the findings of Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői (2020) in demonstrating a complete lack of morphological gender in contemporary Hasidic Yiddish. That this is true even where speakers know the gender of a given noun in the language from which it is borrowed underlines the fact that the concept of morphological gender is entirely absent from the mental grammars of contemporary Hasidic Yiddish speakers. There is a tendency (in writing, and typically not in speech), for words denoting male human entities to optionally make use of the article דער *der*, which was historically associated with masculine grammatical gender. There is also some indication that traditional masculine gender morphology may be associated (again, in writing)

with the importance or significance of the concept denoted by certain nouns. These tendencies are strongest among Israeli males and weakest among Israeli female speakers.

Task 2: Periphrastic Verbs

Periphrastic verbs with a *loshn koydesh* element are a characteristic aspect of Standard Yiddish and traditional pre-War Yiddish dialects. By investigating the use of these periphrastics among contemporary Israeli, New York, and London Hasidic Yiddish speakers we can ascertain whether periphrastics are still a productive element of the grammar of contemporary Hasidic Yiddish, and whether any differences in their use can be detected between subgroups of speakers. Furthermore, we aim to explore speakers' attitudes to synonyms to periphrastics derived from the Germanic component of Yiddish as well as direct (i.e., phonologically and morphologically unintegrated) and integrated borrowings from English and Modern Hebrew.

This task was designed to test not just the acceptability of each lexical item, but the relative acceptability of a number of potential synonyms: traditional Yiddish periphrastics, synonymous verbs from the Germanic component of Yiddish, direct borrowings from English and Modern Hebrew, and grammatically integrated borrowings from English and Modern Hebrew. As English is a Germanic language, it is relatively straightforward to add Yiddish verbal morphology onto an English verbal root. However, the issue of integrating Modern Hebrew roots into Yiddish grammar deserves further comment.

Despite the fact that periphrastic verbs typically have a *loshn koydesh* element, in many cases this element is not actually commonly used in Modern Hebrew, which instead employs a different form for the same meaning. For example, the Yiddish periphrastic verb מוחל זיין *moykhl zayn* 'to forgive' does not have a frequently used equivalent of the same root in Modern Hebrew, in which the cognate form למחול *limḥol* 'to forgive' is reserved for high-register and religious contexts. Instead, the everyday verb meaning 'to forgive' is לסלוח *lisloah*. Traditionally, one way to integrate *loshn koydesh* verbs into Yiddish grammar was by use of periphrastics, so we wanted to investigate whether speakers accepted novel periphrastics based on Modern Hebrew roots and how such novel periphrastics compared to other synonyms. In short, we are interested in investigating i) speakers' familiarity with a variety of *loshn koydesh* periphrastics, ii) speakers' familiarity with synonyms to these periphrastics, derived from the Germanic component of Yiddish, iii) patterns of borrowing from English and Modern Hebrew, and particularly iv) grammatical integration of borrowed items into Yiddish.

We predict that participants from Israel, New York, and London should all be familiar with the standard periphrastic *and*, where available, the Germanic equivalent. Furthermore, we predict that participants in Israel will more readily accept forms with Modern Hebrew cognates and direct borrowings from Modern Hebrew, while those in New York and London will more readily employ forms derived from English, either with or without the Yiddish infinitival marker. Finally, we predict that the Israeli Hasidic Yiddish speakers will be more comfortable with the novel Yiddish periphrastics in everyday contexts than their peers from English-speaking countries, where their exposure to Modern Hebrew verbs is much lower. Conversely, we predict that the Hasidic Yiddish speakers from New York and London may exhibit a greater preference for Germanic roots than the Israeli speakers, since they are often cognate with the English verbs to which they have regular exposure. For Germanic verbs without a transparent English cognate, we aim to ascertain whether our participants in majority English-speaking countries will nevertheless prefer them to the *loshn koydesh* forms and/or the forms specifically based on Modern Hebrew verbs.

We may also predict differences between men and women. In particular, men in Hasidic communities tend to use Yiddish more regularly than women, while women tend to use the language of the surrounding community more often than men. Thus, we predict that women in Israel should be more likely to borrow from Modern Hebrew than their male counterparts, while women in New York and London should be more likely to borrow from English than their male counterparts. Men in New York and London may prefer English borrowings with the Yiddish infinitival marker (a preference that may be less marked or entirely absent in women). Men in both groups may be more likely to use Germanic roots than their female counterparts, as their Yiddish vocabulary may be richer.

Description of Task 2 (Periphrastic Verbs)

This task aims to investigate the acceptability of *loshn koydesh* periphrastics and their synonyms. Participants were presented with 21 Yiddish sentences, each of which included a missing infinitival verb. For the infinitive, between four and seven different options were provided in a randomized order. In each case, the options were minimally composed of a) a *loshn koydesh* periphrastic (selected on the basis of their common use in pre-War and Standard Yiddish, and to represent a range of auxiliaries and *loshn koydesh* components), b) the equivalent verb in Modern Hebrew, c) the equivalent verb in English (presented in the Yiddish alphabet) with the Yiddish infinitival marker γ - (*-n*), and

d) the equivalent verb in English (presented in the Yiddish alphabet) without the infinitival marker.¹⁷ Additional options were provided where there is e) a synonymous word in Yiddish from the Germanic component, f) a synonymous *loshn koydesh* or Modern Hebrew periphrastic, or g) more than one English or Hebrew equivalent. An example is given in (2). Note that participants only saw the example in Hebrew letters and not the transliteration, which is provided here for the reader’s convenience.

(2)	לסלוח	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	מוחל זיין	<input type="checkbox"/>	
איר חברטע	פארגיזן	<input type="checkbox"/>	חנה וועט
	פארגעבן	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	סולח זיין	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	פארגיזן	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<i>khane vet</i>	<i>lisloah</i>		
	<i>moykhl zayn</i>		
	<i>forgivn</i>		<i>ir khaverte</i>
	<i>fargebn</i>		
	<i>soyleyekh zayn</i>		
	<i>forgiv</i>		
‘Khane will	forgive		her friend’

The participant’s task was to rank the naturalness of each option in descending order. In other words, the word that they would use most often, or that sounds most natural to them, would be ranked ‘1,’ while a word they would use less often, or that sounds less natural to them, would be ranked lower. Where they would never use a particular option, they were asked to indicate this with an ‘X’ or leave the box blank.

Results

The results of this task are summarized in Table 6. Here we can see that all speakers everywhere accept *loshn koydesh* periphrastics. This feature continues to be an integral part of Yiddish in the contemporary Hasidic setting. Most speakers also find Germanic equivalents grammatical, again without any geographical differences. Speakers also uniformly reject direct loans from English.

17 The use of English lexical items in Yiddish script is an extremely commonly observed practice in Hasidic Yiddish-speaking communities; see Fader (2009:108).

TABLE 6 Proportion of accepting judgment for *loshn koydesh* periphrastics and their alternatives by Israeli, New York, and London participants

	Israel (n=10)	New York (n=12)	London (n=4)	TOTAL (n=26)
Modern Hebrew infinitive, e.g., לסלוח <i>lisloah</i>	14.8%	0.8%	0%	6.1%
Modern Hebrew periphrastic, e.g., סולח זיין <i>soyleyekh zayn</i>	38.8%	11.4%	21.9%	23.6%
<i>Loshn koydesh</i> periphrastic, e.g., מוחל זיין <i>moykhl zayn</i>	91.6%	86.4%	86.4%	88.4%
Germanic equivalent, e.g., פארגעבן <i>fargebn</i>	56.3%	56%	63.8%	52.1%
English-origin verb with Yiddish inflection, e.g., פארגייוון <i>forgivn</i>	0.9%	23.7%	9.2%	13.3%
English loan e.g., פארגייוו <i>forgive</i>	0.5%	1.3%	1.1%	1%

Furthermore, although Table 6 indicates only the acceptability of each item type, our results show that, perhaps unsurprisingly, items that are accepted by a greater number of participants also tend to be ranked higher than items that are less widely accepted.

Differences between the locations emerge. On the one hand, Israeli speakers are more accepting of Modern Hebrew-based innovative periphrastics and, to a lesser extent, of direct borrowings from Modern Hebrew than speakers from English-speaking countries (see also Assouline 2019). On the other hand, New York speakers and, to a lesser extent, London speakers are more accepting of English-origin verbs with Yiddish inflection compared to Israeli speakers. This result is as expected and is a straightforward effect of contact with Hebrew and English respectively. Somewhat more surprising is the fact that very few speakers indicated that they would use an English infinitive without the Yiddish infinitival marker γ -*n*, and relatively few speakers would use a Hebrew infinitive (for Israeli speakers) or Yiddishized English infinitive (for New York and London speakers). Nevertheless, this pattern of borrowing is more informative than it might at first seem. The fact that New York and London speakers reject pure English borrowings in favor of borrowings that have been grammatically

integrated into Yiddish (through addition of the Yiddish infinitival ending), may indicate that even when borrowing, these participants make use of their Yiddish grammar.

By contrast, Israeli speakers borrow from Modern Hebrew without changing the form of the infinitive: they use the Hebrew infinitival marker *לֵ* *l-* rather than the Yiddish infinitival marker. Additionally, they pronounce the infinitive with a Modern Hebrew accent, rather than the Ashkenazi accent that would be used for the *loshn koydesh* component of periphrastics. These instances of borrowing from Modern Hebrew are thus less grammatically integrated than borrowings from English. At the same time, speakers from Israel appear to be more creative in their use of periphrastics derived from *loshn koydesh*, especially compared to New York speakers. While almost all speakers in all communities prefer the standard periphrastic to the alternatives in all carrier sentences, Hebrew speakers accept non-standard periphrastics, or periphrastics based on Modern Hebrew roots, more often than speakers from New York or London. This suggests a greater degree of integration of the Modern Hebrew forms into the periphrastic construction by Israeli speakers. So, Israeli speakers appear to be treating Modern Hebrew as a mere borrowing from one perspective, and as an integrated part of Yiddish from another.

Let us now turn to the breakdown of the results for speaker gender. As Table 7 reveals, there are some significant gender differences, especially among Israeli speakers. First, we can see that Israeli women are the least accepting of Germanic equivalent forms. They tend to reject innovative, integrated Modern Hebrew periphrastic forms, and instead have a much higher acceptance rate of straight borrowings of Modern Hebrew infinitives than any other group. In contrast, Israeli male speakers show the highest acceptance of Germanic equivalents among all the groups. They never accept direct borrowings of Modern Hebrew infinitives, and they are the most accepting of integrated, innovative Modern Hebrew periphrastics.

Thus, we find a difference in borrowing strategies between the two genders among Israeli speakers. The use of a *loshn koydesh*-derived periphrastic, rather than a Hebrew infinitive, indicates that the borrowing is more grammatically integrated into Yiddish. The finding may therefore be indicative of more productive use of Yiddish grammatical patterns among male speakers in Israel as compared to female speakers, which would be in line with the greater degree of exposure to Yiddish in daily life among Hasidic men compared to women and a greater degree of exposure to Modern Hebrew among Hasidic women in Israel.

TABLE 7 Proportion of accepting judgments for *loshn koydesh* periphrastics and their alternatives by speaker gender for Israeli and New York participants

	Israel		New York	
	Female (n=4)	Male (n=6)	Female (n=5)	Male (n=7)
Modern Hebrew infinitive, e.g., לִסְלוֹחַ <i>lisloah</i>	36.9%	0%	0%	2.1%
Modern Hebrew periphrastic, e.g., סוּלַח זַיִן <i>soyleyekh zayn</i>	28.1%	45.8%	0%	19.6%
<i>Loshn koydesh</i> periphrastic, e.g., מוּחַל זַיִן <i>moykhl zayn</i>	86.9%	94.7%	82.7%	89%
Germanic equivalent, e.g., פֶּאַרְגֶּעבן <i>fargebn</i>	41.9%	65.8%	52%	59.3%
English-origin verb with Yiddish inflection, e.g., פֶּאַרְגִּיבִין <i>forgivn</i>	0%	1.4%	33.5%	16.7%
English loan e.g., פֶּאַרְגִּיבִי <i>forgive</i>	0%	0.8%	0.9%	1.6%

Among New York speakers, the gender differences were less pronounced. At the same time, the breakdown of the data by speaker gender clearly reveals that the trend to accept Yiddishized English words is driven by New York women more than by men. Again, this points to a greater degree of influence of English in the case of New York women compared to men, but the degree of integration of the borrowing into Yiddish grammar is higher than for Israeli women, who also accept direct borrowings without grammatical integration. New York female speakers are also the least accepting of innovative, integrated Modern Hebrew-based periphrastic forms, while New York men accept these at about the same rate as Israeli women. Again, this shows that the periphrastic construction is less flexible and less productive in the grammars of female speakers from New York compared to the grammars of men (in both New York and Israel), which is presumably explained by women's lesser exposure to *loshn koydesh* compared to men.

Interim Summary

Overall, the results of Task 2 support our predictions that a greater familiarity with Modern Hebrew and *loshn koydesh* will correlate with higher usage of and more productivity with periphrastics derived from *loshn koydesh*. Additionally, and perhaps unsurprisingly, speakers who are exposed to more Modern Hebrew will tend to borrow from Modern Hebrew, while those exposed to more English will tend to borrow from English. What is more unexpected is that borrowings from English are more grammatically integrated than those from Hebrew. All speakers accepted infinitives from the Germanic component of Yiddish. There was no advantage of an English-speaking background even where those infinitives are cognate with English. We found a strong gender split among Israeli speakers in that female speakers are driving direct borrowing and are least accepting of innovative, integrated periphrastic forms, while male speakers showed the opposite pattern. Taken together, these results suggest that knowledge of *loshn koydesh* and Modern Hebrew have a variety of effects on the selection of verbal lexis and strategies for integrating these verbs into the grammar.

Task 3: Adjectives Derived from Loshn Koydesh Passive Participles

As discussed in the historical overview, Yiddish periphrastics are often based on a *loshn koydesh* masculine singular active participle. These participles also have passive variants, a small number of which were used as adjectival forms in historical varieties of Yiddish. The derivational relations between the active forms and their passive counterparts within the grammar of *loshn koydesh* and Modern Hebrew are well known, but it is not clear the extent to which these derivational patterns are active in the mental grammar of Yiddish speakers (either pre-War or contemporary Hasidic) or whether they represent borrowings from Semitic. Because these adjectival forms have varying rates of frequency in everyday Yiddish speech, we predict that there may be a difference in responses between the speakers whose co-territorial language is Modern Hebrew and those whose co-territorial language is English. This is due to the fact that the passive participles of these roots are typically employed in Modern Hebrew as adjectival forms, e.g., מסודר *mesudar* 'organized,' מצליח *maṣliḥ* 'successful.' The high frequency of these forms in Modern Hebrew may result in Israeli Yiddish speakers' increased ability to use the corresponding Yiddish adjectives productively, whereas the Hasidic Yiddish speakers from English-speaking countries may be less comfortable producing such adjectival forms. There may also be a difference between male and female speakers in both countries due to their varying levels of familiarity with *loshn koydesh* and Modern Hebrew (see Introduction).

An additional question concerns the use of Yiddish adjectival morphology in the formation of the adjective associated with these periphrastic forms. In pre-War and Standard Yiddish, the Germanic suffix דײַג *-dig* (spelt דײַק *-dik* in the YIVO orthography) can be used to form adjectives from nouns and other non-adjectival parts of speech, including those from the *loshn koydesh* component. For example, the noun שבת *shabes* ‘Sabbath’ has the adjectival form שבתדיג *shabesdig* ‘pertaining to the Sabbath, suitable for the Sabbath,’ and the noun חן *kheyn* ‘charm’ has the corresponding adjective חנעווידיג *kheynev-dig* ‘charming.’ Similarly, the noun וואך *vokh* ‘week,’ from the Germanic component of Yiddish, has the adjectival form וואכעדיג *vokhedig* ‘pertaining to the weekdays.’ Our study required participants to derive adjectives from a selection of the periphrastic verbs tested in the same research questionnaire, allowing us to gauge the productivity of the suffix דײַג *-dig* in their language. We wanted to examine the extent to which the predictable formation of passive participles based on these verbal roots in Modern Hebrew has led to an increased use of parallel adjectival forms in the Yiddish of Israeli speakers, and whether a similar pattern is found in the Hasidic Yiddish of English-speaking countries.

Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői (2020) show that former gender agreement morphology has been reanalyzed as attributive marking in contemporary Hasidic Yiddish. Thus, we also predict that such morphology should appear on all and only attributive adjectives in contemporary Hasidic Yiddish, regardless of the component of Yiddish they are derived from. Such marking would indicate that the adjectives in question are integrated into the grammar of contemporary Hasidic Yiddish. On the other hand, direct borrowings from another language may be expected to be less well integrated.

Thus our aim was to investigate morphological patterns in the derivation of adjectives from *loshn koydesh* past participles. We predict that women in Israel, who are more familiar with Modern Hebrew, will show similar patterns of behavior to men in both New York/London and Israel in preferring Semitic morphological patterns, as men in both communities use pre-Modern Hebrew and Aramaic extensively in their daily lives. Women in New York and London are exposed to less Modern and pre-Modern Hebrew, and very little Aramaic, and so may either prefer Germanic patterns or struggle to derive adjectives from *loshn koydesh* past participles at all. Equally, we predict that speakers from New York and London preferentially use the adjectivalizing suffix דײַג *-dig*, while those in Israel prefer Hebrew morphological changes. Finally, we predict that attributive adjectives, or at least those that are integrated into Yiddish grammar, will appear with attributive adjectival morphology.

Description of Task 3 (Adjectives)

Task 3 focuses on adjectives derived from *loshn koydesh* passive participles. Participants were presented with a sentence in the past tense, which was followed by two related sentences with gaps in the position of a predicative and an attributive adjective, respectively. For example, the sentence “Zisi has cleaned her room” might be followed by “Now her room is _____” and “It is a _____ room”. Participants were asked to fill in the blanks with an appropriate word, and were provided with a model item demonstrating that the appropriate word is derived from the past participle. The entire questionnaire is provided in the appendix to this article, but an example is provided in (3) for ease of reference. Again, as before, the transliteration was not included in the original questionnaire and is provided for the reader’s benefit.

- (3) . _____ מאמע האט מסדר געווען די גאנצע ← יעצט איז די שטוב
שטוב.
ס'איז אין גאנצן א _____ שטוב.
mame hot mesader geven di gantse shtub. → yetst iz di shtub _____.
s'iz in gantsn a _____ shtub.
'Mum **organized** the whole house. → Now the house is _____.
It's a completely _____ house.'

Task 3 included 14 sets of sentences. Two sets made use of Germanic roots as controls, two sets used periphrastics involving *loshn koydesh* nouns, and the remaining 10 sets used *loshn koydesh* periphrastic verbs from Task 2. The verbs were selected in order to ensure a range of light verbs and of *loshn koydesh* participle types. Furthermore, we included two verbs that were likely to produce semantically marked adjectives (e.g., זיין מסכים *maskem zayn* ‘agree’) even for Modern Hebrew speakers, with the intention of testing the boundaries of participants’ creativity with respect to Hebrew-origin deverbal adjectives. The design of the task was open-ended enough that speakers could (and sometimes did) choose a completely different Yiddish lexical item (rather than a Modern Hebrew or English loanword) if they preferred this option.

Results

The results of this task showed a similar overall pattern across all participants, but participants from London displayed the pattern to a smaller degree. Let us look at the pattern of results for speakers from each location.

Israeli participants were highly reluctant to use the original form of the *loshn koydesh* element (i.e., a masculine singular active participle) in the

predicative and even more so in the attributive position. In about half of cases they applied a stem change using their knowledge of Hebrew grammar (e.g., מסדר *mesader* → מסודר *mesuder*) in order to derive an adjective (identical to a Hebrew passive participle) from the provided active participle. Thus they selected adjectival forms based on Hebrew passive participles as opposed to active ones (e.g., the *pual* [passive factitive stem], forms מחונך *mekhunekh* 'educated,' מבולבל *mevubl* 'confused,' מכובד *mekhubed* 'honorable/honored,' and מסודר *mesuder*, and the *hufal* [passive causative stem] form מוצלח *mutslekh* 'successful'). They produced these forms based on a prompt containing a periphrastic verb in the corresponding active stem, namely the Hebrew *piel* (factitive stem) forms מחדן זיין *mekhanekh zayn* 'to educate,' מבלבל זיין *mevalbl zayn* 'to confuse,' מכבד זיין *mekhabed zayn* 'to honor,' and מסדר זיין *mesader zayn* 'to organize,' and the *hifil* (causative stem) form מצליח זיין *matsliyekh zayn* 'to succeed.' This shows that their grammar has a strong link between these active and passive *loshn koydesh* forms. It is not clear the extent to which such a link existed in pre-War and Standard Yiddish as the adjectival forms are relatively rarely attested, but these results are consistent with the link having been introduced or reinforced through familiarity with Modern Hebrew, in which the same active and corresponding passive forms exist and are in regular usage. In about 40% of instances Israeli speakers applied an alternative strategy, such as replacing the original *loshn koydesh* participle with a Germanic-origin adjective or past participle or chose not to provide an adjective. Thus, overall, the Israeli participants demonstrated an ability to create adjectives derived from the periphrastic verbs given using *loshn koydesh* adjectivalizing morphology with a high degree of productivity (Table 8).

TABLE 8 Proportion of each response type in the adjective task among Israeli, New York, and London participants

	Predicative			Attributive		
	Stem change (e.g., מסודר <i>mesuder</i>)	No stem change (e.g., מסדר <i>mesader</i>)	Other (i.e., no response, Germanic alternative, etc.)	Stem change (e.g., מסודר <i>mesuder</i>)	No stem change (e.g., מסדר <i>mesader</i>)	Other (i.e., no response, Germanic alternative, etc.)
Israel (n=10)	51%	13%	36%	48%	8%	44%

TABLE 8 Proportion of each response type in the adjective task (*cont.*)

	Predicative			Attributive		
	Stem change (e.g., מסודר <i>mesuder</i>)	No stem change (e.g., מסדר <i>mesader</i>)	Other (i.e., no response, Germanic alternative, etc.)	Stem change (e.g., מסודר <i>mesuder</i>)	No stem change (e.g., מסדר <i>mesader</i>)	Other (i.e., no response, Germanic alternative, etc.)
New York (n=11) ¹⁸	44.5%	35.5%	20%	44.5%	23.6%	28.2%
London (n=4)	22.5%	52.5%	25%	22.5%	37.5%	40%
TOTAL	43.6%	29.2%	27.2%	40.4%	19.6%	40%

Participants from New York also applied the *loshn koydesh* stem change adjectivalizing morphology to both predicative and attributive adjectives about 44% of the time. This is an interesting finding, given that it shows the productivity of Hebrew morphology in Yiddish carrier sentences. New York speakers showed somewhat less reluctance to leave the stem unchanged both attributively and predicatively compared to Israeli speakers, although their reluctance was more pronounced in the attributive position. Nevertheless, their overall pattern of response is similar to the Israeli participants, showing an ability to create adjectives derived from the periphrastic verbs given using *loshn koydesh* adjectivalizing morphology with a high degree of productivity.

Participants from London were the most tolerant towards using the stem in its unchanged form, although again this tendency is less pronounced in the attributive position. Nevertheless, they were able to use stem change morphology productively a little over 20% of the time, showing a limited degree of productivity with Hebrew morphology. This difference between London speakers and speakers from New York and Israel can perhaps be attributed to the smaller sample.

¹⁸ One participant from New York did not finish this task.

As Table 9 illustrates, *loshn koydesh* adjectivalizing stem change morphology is productively used by all groups except London female participants, with the highest level of productivity apparent in Israeli women. Nevertheless, men from all communities and female participants from New York also show an ability to perform stem change in both the attributive and predicative position. Gender and location differences are most pronounced in the attributive, where speakers are most reluctant to use the stem in its unchanged form. Israeli men and women were most reluctant to do so, followed by men from New York and London. Women from New York and especially women from London showed the highest tolerance for keeping the unchanged stem. This gender-location breakdown of the data is consistent with the original prediction in the sense that the language use correlates with the degree to which participants are exposed to Modern Hebrew (high: Israeli men and women; low: New York and London men and women) and *loshn koydesh* (high: all men; low: all women). It is nevertheless interesting that the influence of exposure to Modern Hebrew and *loshn koydesh* did not manifest itself in an increased ability to apply stem changes productively, but rather in an increased reluctance to use the unchanged stem. In such cases, participants typically either produce an equally appropriate (often Germanic) adjective or refuse to provide a response. Altogether, these findings suggest that for some items the stem variants are readily available to the speakers and form part of their productive morphology (e.g., that there is a link between the forms מסדר *mesader* and מסודר *mesuder*). For items where speakers are unable to produce the stem change variant, either because they do not know it or because the form pair simply does not exist in Hebrew, the more exposure to *loshn koydesh* or Modern Hebrew the speaker has, the more reluctant they are to use the unchanged variant. These results suggest that a high degree of exposure to Modern Hebrew or *loshn koydesh* makes people aware of the inappropriateness of the unchanged stem in an adjectival position, especially in the attributive, and this pushes them to instead use an alternative strategy or give a zero response.

If participants are relatively comfortable with *loshn koydesh* adjectivalizing morphology, one might wonder to what extent they make use of the Germanic adjectivalizing suffix דיג *-dig*. Our results demonstrate that there was a marked difference in form between the predicative and attributive forms of the adjective that participants produced, a finding that was entirely unexpected.¹⁹ In the predicative position, participants typically used the masculine singular

19 Note that this difference does not seem to have existed in pre-War Yiddish, where both the suffixed and the unsuffixed forms are attested interchangeably in attributive and

TABLE 9 Breakdown of the proportion of different response types in the adjective task for speaker gender for Israeli, New York, and London participants

		Predicative			Attributive		
		Stem change (e.g., מסודר <i>mesuder</i>)	No stem change (e.g., מסדר <i>mesader</i>)	Other (i.e., no response, Germanic alternative, etc.)	Stem change (e.g., מסודר <i>mesuder</i>)	No stem change (e.g., מסדר <i>mesader</i>)	Other (i.e., no response, Germanic alternative, etc.)
F	Israel	55%	15%	30%	47.5%	10%	42.5%
E	(n=4)						
M	NY	44%	44%	12%	40%	28%	32%
A	(n=5)						
L	London	0%	75%	25%	5%	45%	50%
E	(n=2)						
M	Israel	48.3%	11.7%	40%	48.3%	6.7%	45%
A	(n=6)						
L	NY	45%	28.3%	26.7%	40%	20%	40%
E	(n=6)						
	London	45%	30%	25%	40%	30%	30%
	(n=2)						

participle of the periphrastic verbs in question without adding the adjectival suffix דיג *-dig*, providing forms such as מסודר *mesuder* ‘organized,’ מכובד *mekhubed* ‘honorable/honored,’ מחונך *mekhunekh* ‘educated,’ מתפעל *mispoel* ‘amazed.’ By contrast, when they formed the attributive adjective from the same periphrastic form, they often added the adjectival suffix דיג *-dig*, followed by the attributive suffix ע(ר) *-e(r)* (see Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői 2020; and Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői under review) for discussion of the attributive suffix in contemporary Hasidic Yiddish). Most unexpectedly, they form the attributive adjective by adding the Germanic adjectivalizing suffix onto a form that

predicative positions; see, e.g., the entries for מסוכן *mesukn* and מסוכנדיק *mesukndik* ‘dangerous’ and others in Niborski (2012:296).

has already undergone a *loshn koydesh* adjectivalizing stem change. In other words, participants added a suffix that, in other areas of Yiddish grammar, is only used to derive adjectives from non-adjectival categories to a form that they recognize and produce as a predicative adjective. This highly productive strategy resulted in attributive forms such as מסודרדיגע *mesuderdige* ‘organized,’ מכובדיגע *mekhubedige* ‘honorable,’ מחונכדיגע *mekhunekhdige* ‘educated,’ and מתפעלדיגע *mispoldige* ‘amazed.’ The pattern is illustrated in Table 10.

TABLE 10 Proportion of application of adjectival suffix דיג *-dig* in the adjective task for Israeli, New York, and London participants

	Predicative		Attributive	
	דיג <i>-dig</i> applied	דיג <i>-dig</i> not applied	דיג <i>-dig</i> applied	דיג <i>-dig</i> not applied
Israel	3.5%	96.5%	86.2%	13.8%
New York	7.2%	92.8%	87%	13%
London	14.3%	85.7%	91.7%	8.3%
TOTAL	7.1%	92.9%	87.4%	12.6%

This difference is noteworthy because it indicates that the *loshn koydesh* participial forms that can function independently in the predicative position must nevertheless undergo further derivation with the addition of the adjectivalizing suffix דיג *-dig* for the attributive marking inflection to apply. This contrasts with other Yiddish adjectives derived from non-adjectival categories, including those derived from *loshn koydesh* nouns such as חנעוודיג *khyenevdig* ‘charming’ or שבתדיג *shabesdig* ‘pertaining to or suitable for the Sabbath,’ which take the adjectival suffix דיג *-dig* in both predicative and attributive contexts. Indeed, in the two control items we included that involved *loshn koydesh* nouns, דיג *-dig* was applied in all the derived adjectival forms.

Assouline (2017:148-150) has documented a similar morphological difference between predicative and attributive participial adjectives borrowed from Modern Hebrew (e.g., *metuskal* ‘frustrated’) in the Yiddish of Hasidic speakers in Israel. Her findings are consistent with an analysis where borrowed adjectives are marked as lexically distinct and therefore not morphologically integrated into Yiddish grammar in the predicative position. By contrast, our findings are not based on borrowed adjectives, but rather on adjectives resulting from an integrative and productive Yiddish periphrastic model. As such, we analyse our results as deriving from an incompatibility between Semitic

participial morphology and the Germanic attributive suffix, which is overcome by means of the adjectivalizing suffix גײַג -*dig*.

As expected, participants applied the attributive marker (ר)ע- *-e(r)* to the adjectives overwhelmingly in the attributive position and never in the predicative position. This confirms our earlier findings that this suffix is used as an attributive marker rather than a case or gender marker. As Table 11 shows, this pattern holds of all participants and there were no location or gender differences in this regard. This pattern also suggests that the adjectives were highly integrated into the Yiddish sentence and not used as direct borrowings. The few instances where the attributive marker is not applied in attributive contexts typically lack the גײַג -*dig* suffix and instead make use of Hebrew gender agreement morphology; e.g., one speaker provided מַסְכִּימָה *maskima* (lit: ‘agreeing;’ intended: ‘agreeable,’ fem.). This suggests that these specific forms are indeed direct borrowings from Modern Hebrew or *loshn koydesh* and are not evidence of Yiddish grammatical proficiency. In fact, this pattern appears to be restricted to a very small number of lexical items, e.g., מַקְיִים *mekayem* (lit. ‘fulfillable;’ intended: ‘fulfilled,’ masc.).²⁰

TABLE 11 Proportion of attributive marking in the adjective task for Israeli, New York, and London participants

	Predicative		Attributive	
	Attributive marking	No attributive marking	Attributive marking	No attributive marking
Israel	0%	100%	95.7%	4.3%
New York	0%	100%	92.8%	7.2%
London	0%	100%	96%	4%
TOTAL	0%	100%	94.7%	5.3%

Additionally, we propose that the fact that these attributive adjectives, but not their predicative counterparts, appear to require the adjectivalizing suffix גײַג -*dig* is not due to the fact that speakers do not recognize the predicative versions as Yiddish adjectives, but rather due to a grammatical incompatibility between the Germanic attributive marker (ר)ע- *-e(r)* and a Semitic morphological stem. The attributive position requires the presence of the attributive

²⁰ We believe that at least some instances of this pattern are due to a misanalysis of the prompt as requiring a verb rather than an adjective.

marker (ר)ע- *-e(r)*, and this itself requires the presence of גיד- *-dig* to provide a non-Semitic morphological stem. In other words, the application of גיד- *-dig* is a tactic used to derive a Germanic stem rather than performing its usual adjectivalizing function. The incompatibility between (ר)ע- *-e(r)* and a Semitic morphological stem appears to be a new development in contemporary Hasidic Yiddish: the proposed requirement that (ר)ע- *-e(r)* not attach to a Semitic morphological stem does not appear to have existed in pre-War Yiddish, in which (ר)ע- *-e(r)* could attach freely to Semitic participials and conversely גיד- *-dig* could appear in the predicative position, where it was not needed in order to provide a stem for an attributive marker (see footnote 19).

Interim Summary

All participants except for London female participants made use of Hebrew derivational patterns in deriving adjectives from periphrastic verbs and applied these productively. At the same time, the more exposure a speaker had to Modern Hebrew or *loshn koydesh*, the more reluctant they were to leave the verbal stem unchanged when deriving an adjective if they were unable to supply the stem change variant, especially in the attributive position. Thus overall, our findings confirm our prediction that being exposed to Modern Hebrew or *loshn koydesh* makes a difference in how participants form predicative and attributive adjectives from periphrastics. Speakers in all communities recognize Hebrew participial forms as adjectives, as indicated by the fact that they do not apply the adjectivalizing suffix in predicative contexts, but nonetheless add it in attributive contexts (in addition to the standard attributive marker (ר)ע- *-e(r)*). This finding is particularly surprising, as we are not aware of any other cases where the גיד- *-dig* suffix is applied to a stem that is already adjectival, nor to any cases of attributive adjectives requiring further derivational morphology compared to their predicative counterparts. We take this pattern to indicate that although Hebrew participial forms are treated as adjectives, they are not fully integrated into Yiddish grammar (cf. Assouline 2017:148-150). In order for Yiddish attributive morphology to be applicable to such adjectival stems, a Yiddish derivational morpheme, the גיד- *-dig* suffix, must also be present. This reveals an intricate pattern of language mixing, which applied to all of our speakers, irrespective of their gender and geographical origin. It also reflects an innovation in the grammar of contemporary Hasidic Yiddish which affects all geographical communities of speakers.

Discussion

The present study showed us that the *loshn koydesh* component continues to be a substantial, integrated, and productive element of 21st-century Hasidic Yiddish. We found that participants were familiar with the nouns, periphrastic verbs, and derived adjectives that we provided in the questionnaires. This was true of all the speakers regardless of their geographical origin or their gender. They overwhelmingly accepted *loshn koydesh* periphrastics as grammatical, and they were mostly able to apply Hebrew morphology when a stem change was required to create an adjectival form based on *loshn koydesh* periphrastics.

The present study suggests that the *loshn koydesh* component in the language of Yiddish-speaking Hasidim exhibits a number of developments when compared to the pre-War and Standard varieties of Yiddish. Some of these effects affected all the speakers universally, such as the loss of grammatical gender. We saw that just like with Germanic-origin words (see Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői 2020; and Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői under review), contemporary Hasidic Yiddish speakers do not assign grammatical gender to *loshn koydesh* nouns. Rather, they overwhelmingly use a default form of the article, with two additional tendencies optionally overriding the default. These tendencies are that words denoting male humans sometimes receive the article דער *der* in writing and that words denoting important or significant entities or concepts also sometimes receive דער *der*. The former seems to be a relic carried over from historical dialects, a fossilized form of an earlier grammatical rule. The latter, however, seems to be a truly innovative feature of contemporary Hasidic Yiddish language use.

Another development that seems to have affected Hasidic Yiddish speakers in all communities studied is the finding that adjectival forms derived from *loshn koydesh* participles are unacceptable in the attributive position unless a Yiddish derivational affix דיג- *-dig* and an attributive marker are applied. This is true despite the fact that the stems to which דיג- *-dig* is applied are produced as predicative adjectives – a surprising result given that in other domains דיג- *-dig* is applied only to non-adjectival categories. Furthermore, speakers in all communities have reinterpreted historical case and gender morphology as attributive marking, requiring such marking on attributive adjectives and disallowing it on predicative adjectives. This result supports earlier work on this issue (Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői 2020; Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői under review). Given that all participants pattern together in a way that is different from the pre-War and Standard varieties of Yiddish, these findings suggest that a development has taken place in the language that has been widespread enough to affect all Hasidic Yiddish speakers.

We also found developments that affected the various speech communities differently. These effects can be teased apart by examining the language of Yiddish-speaking men and women in Israel (with women being exposed to more Modern Hebrew than men), of Yiddish-speaking men and women in New York and London (with women being exposed to more English than men), and of men in Israel, New York, and London in comparison to women in those communities (with men being exposed to more *loshn koydesh* than women and mixing more with Yiddish speakers in other countries than their female counterparts, leading to a convergence effect). One aspect in which speakers from Israel and New York on the one hand differed from speakers in London was which article was selected as the default form. This appears to be phonologically conditioned: London is different from the other communities due to the non-rhotic nature of London English.²¹

Another diverging development concerned the effects of English and Modern Hebrew on acceptability of alternatives to periphrastic verb forms. New York speakers, especially women, had a much higher acceptance of Yiddishized English verbs, but not direct English borrowings. At the same time, Israeli women, but not men, had a high acceptance of direct borrowings of Modern Hebrew infinitivals. In contrast, men, especially Israeli men, had a high acceptance of innovative Modern Hebrew-based periphrastic forms, indicating a high level of grammatical productivity of these forms.

Finally, we also found that the level of exposure to Modern Hebrew or *loshn koydesh* seems to correlate with a speaker's reluctance to produce the original unchanged form of *loshn koydesh* participles as adjectives, especially in the attributive position, with Israeli men and women having the highest degree of reluctance, and London female speakers the lowest. We propose that this is attributable to familiarity with the customary Hebrew stem variations and thus ultimately can be tied to level of exposure. In sum, we found that the *loshn koydesh* component in contemporary Hasidic Yiddish language use has been affected by a number of grammatical changes. Some of these changes affected all the speakers, while some reflect the sociolinguistic landscape of the speakers.

21 This is in fact a pervasive change that affected not only the *loshn koydesh* component but all nouns.

Conclusions

We hope that this study has provided readers insight into the contemporary language practices surrounding the *loshn koydesh* component of Yiddish as spoken by Hasidim in Israel, New York, and London. Our findings are largely consistent with those of Assouline (2010, 2017, 2019), although our study covers speakers in a wider range of geographical communities and investigates the issue of speaker gender on language practices. Our use of negative and metalinguistic data provides further insight into these questions. The results of our investigation into morphological gender of *loshn koydesh*-component nouns in Yiddish represent novel findings, although they are consistent with Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői 2020 and Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői under review. We also found that speaker gender plays a significant role in the use of periphrastic verbs and their synonyms as well as patterns of adjectival derivation from *loshn koydesh*. Our interpretation of our findings, especially as they relate to adjectives derived from *loshn koydesh*, provides a different perspective than previous literature.

The methodology employed for this research (a three-part questionnaire with two open questions and one question consisting of multiple ranked options, accessible to speakers who spoke either English or Modern Hebrew as an additional language) had certain advantages and disadvantages. As the results show, the questionnaire provided us with comprehensive information on the exact issues that we wanted to investigate in a way which would be difficult to achieve via a corpus of spontaneous speech. Moreover, giving the same questionnaire to speakers from different geographical backgrounds, age ranges, Hasidic affiliations, and genders allowed us to make a clear comparison across all of these axes. It also facilitated a statistical analysis of specific sociolinguistic parameters that might have been more challenging to analyse meaningfully without such a controlled dataset. For example, we were able to investigate the possibility of grammatical differences by Hasidic affiliation and to confirm that this axis did not yield any meaningful results. Conversely, it must be acknowledged that a questionnaire composed of artificial questions is not the same as a spoken or written corpus, so the latter type of research is also desirable as a complement to the present study. The use of a questionnaire meant that some of our tasks contained items which were designed to push the boundaries of grammatical acceptability and thus may have resulted in speakers producing forms which they would not employ in spontaneous speech or writing. However, the inclusion of these items in the questionnaire was necessary in order to test the limits of what speakers judged to be permissible, and the data gleaned from this aspect of the questionnaire is therefore

useful even though it could be complemented in future research by corpus analysis along the lines of Assouline 2019. Additionally, the open-ended nature of two of the tasks meant that speakers did not always produce the intended forms, leading to a dataset that was not as complete as one produced by, for example, a forced-choice task. This methodology allows for a different, complementary perspective on the phenomena in question than studies focusing on corpus data.

While it is hoped that our study has helped to provide an overview of the role of *loshn koydesh* among contemporary Hasidic Yiddish speakers internationally, further research needs to be conducted into various aspects of this component of the language. We concentrated in this article on geographical origin, contact languages, and speaker gender, but we also examined other factors, such as a speaker's Hasidic dynasty. With respect to the latter variable, we did not find any emergent patterns. This could be because there are no such patterns, or that some aspect of our data collection method was inadequate to show it. First, given that there are dozens of Hasidic dynasties, a more extensive dataset might provide further insight into this issue. Moreover, we only included speakers who acquired Yiddish in infancy or early childhood or who went to Yiddish-medium educational institutions. This means that speakers from certain Hasidic dynasties would not be represented in our sample. Additionally, our sociolinguistic discussions with speakers suggest that there is a relatively high degree of contact between speakers from different Hasidic dynasties (with some exceptions, where particular dynasties are more closed to outsiders). For example, many Hasidic families (especially those from smaller dynasties or smaller communities) consider factors other than Hasidic dynasty when choosing schools for their children, such as language of education, educational reputation, or geographic factors. Thus, many children are educated outside of their Hasidic dynasty. Overall, the question of the effect of Hasidic dynasty on the *loshn koydesh* component of Yiddish is still very much an open one. A second topic to investigate in the future is the distribution of the use of דער *der* in writing, in light of metalinguistic data suggesting that speakers tend to select it in conjunction with *loshn koydesh* (and other) nouns which they perceive as semantically important. A third topic is the contemporary Hasidic use of *loshn koydesh*-derived verbs with an infinitive in ג- *-n*, such as פטרן *patern* 'to exempt', התמנען *khasmenen* 'to sign,' etc., and in particular how productive such a pattern is in contemporary Hasidic Yiddish in comparison with periphrastics. Finally, as mentioned above, corpus analysis would enable us to gain a different perspective on the use of Hebrew-origin elements in Hasidic Yiddish from the one presented in this article. Such future research will help

to build up a more comprehensive picture of the *loshn koydesh* component of the language.

The results presented in this article show clearly that the grammatical properties associated with the Hebrew-origin component of Yiddish (with respect to morphological gender of *loshn koydesh* nouns, replacement of *loshn koydesh* periphrastic verbs with Germanic, Modern Hebrew, and English equivalents, and morphosyntax of deverbal *loshn koydesh* adjectives) differ in contemporary Hasidic Yiddish from the pre-War and Standard varieties of the language. These differences support our previous suggestion (Belk, Kahn, & Szendrői 2020) that contemporary Hasidic Yiddish should be considered an independent variety of Yiddish distinct from any of the pre-War dialects of the language. While today's Hasidic Yiddish speakers are of course in large measure descendants of speakers of the historical Eastern European varieties of Yiddish, their language has evolved to such an extent that it cannot be classified within this traditional framework. This new variety of the language can be called Contemporary Hasidic Yiddish.

The results of the present study also support our broader argument that Contemporary Hasidic Yiddish represents not only a distinct variety from pre-War and Standard Yiddish, but also a relatively cohesive one. There are differences between speakers with respect to the *loshn koydesh* component along sociolinguistic (i.e., gender- and contact-based) dimensions. However, these appear to be quantitative rather than categorical differences, and they predominantly affect the lexis, in contrast with the grammatical differences between historical Mideastern, Southeastern, and Northeastern Yiddish as spoken by contemporary speakers' Eastern European ancestors. As such, we posit that it would be beneficial to move away from attempts to classify present-day Hasidic Yiddish within the pre-existing framework of older dialects and instead regard it as a newly evolved form of the language with its own grammatical conventions, including but not limited to its relationship with the *loshn koydesh* component.

References

- Abraham, Joan E. 1999. "Perceptions of English Learning in a Hasidic Jewish Sect." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 138: 53-80.
- Assouline, Dalit. 2010. "Verbs of Hebrew Origin in Israeli Haredi Yiddish." In *Hebrew: A Living Language* vol. 5, eds. Rina Ben-Shahar, Gideon Toury, & Nitsa Ben-Ari. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 27-45 (in Hebrew).

- Assouline, Dalit. 2017. *Contact and Ideology in a Multilingual Community: Yiddish and Hebrew among the Ultra-Orthodox*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Assouline, Dalit. 2018. "English Can Be Jewish but Hebrew Cannot: Code-Switching Patterns among Yiddish-Speaking Hasidic Women." *Journal of Jewish Languages* 6.1: 43-59.
- Assouline, Dalit. 2019. "The Hebrew Component in Israeli and American Haredi Yiddish." *Massorot* 19-20: 15-38 (in Hebrew).
- Belk, Zoë, Lily Kahn, & Kriszta Eszter Szendrői. 2020. "Complete Loss of Case and Gender within Two Generations: Evidence from Stamford Hill Hasidic Yiddish." *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* (in press).
- Belk, Zoë, Lily Kahn, & Kriszta Eszter Szendrői. Under review. "Absence of Morphological Case and Gender Marking in Contemporary Hasidic Yiddish Worldwide." *Journal of Germanic Linguistics*.
- Biale, David et al. 2018. *Hasidism: A New History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bogoch, Bryna. 1999. "Gender, Literacy, and Religiosity: Dimensions of Yiddish Education in Israeli Government Supported Schools." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 138: 123-160.
- Booij, Geert. 1990. "The Boundary between Morphology and Syntax: Separable Complex Verbs in Dutch." *Yearbook of Morphology* 3: 45-63.
- Bunis, David M. 2009. "Judezmo Analytic Verbs with a Hebrew-Origin Participle: Evidence of Ottoman Influence." In *Languages and Literatures of Sephardic and Oriental Jewry*, ed. David M. Bunis. Jerusalem: Misgav Yerushalayim and Bialik Institute, 94-166.
- Comenetz, Joshua. 2006. "Census-Based Estimation of the Hasidic Jewish Population." *Contemporary Jewry* 26: 35-74.
- Even-Shoshan, Abraham. 2003. *The Even-Shoshan Dictionary: Revised and Updated for the 21st Century*, 6 vols. Eds. Moshe Azar, Ilana Shamir, & Ya'el Yannai. Jerusalem: HaMilon HeHadash (in Hebrew).
- Fader, Ayala. 2009. *Mitzvah Girls: Bringing Up the Next Generation of Hasidic Jews in Brooklyn*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fromkin, Victoria, Robert Rodman, & Nina Hyams. 2010. *An Introduction to Language*. 9th ed. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Glinert, Lewis H. 1999. "We Never Changed Our Language: Attitudes to Yiddish Acquisition among Hasidic Educators in Britain." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 138: 31-52.
- Goldenberg, Esther. 2007. "Hebrew Language, Medieval." In *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd ed., eds. Michael Berenbaum & Fred Skolnik, vol. 8. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 650-671.

- Harkavy, Alexander. 1910. *Yiddish-English Dictionary*, 6th edn. New York: Hebrew Publishing Company.
- Holman, Christine & Naomi Holman. 2002. *Torah, Worship and Acts of Loving Kindness: Baseline Indicators for the Charedi Community in Stamford Hill*. Leicester: De Montfort University.
- Jacobs, Neil G. 1990. "Northeastern Yiddish Gender-Switch: Abstracting Dialect Features Regionally." *Diachronica* 7: 69-100.
- Jacobs, Neil G. 2005. *Yiddish: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Isaacs, Miriam. 1999a. "Contentious Partners: Yiddish and Hebrew in Haredi Israel." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 138: 101-121, <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.1999.138.101>.
- Isaacs, Miriam. 199b. "Haredi, *Haymish* and *Frim*: Yiddish Vitality and Language Choice in a Transnational, Multilingual Community." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 138: 9-30.
- Jacobs, Neil G., Ellen F. Prince, & Johan van der Auwera. 1994. "Yiddish." In *The Germanic Languages*, eds. Ekkehard König & Johan van der Auwera. London: Routledge, 388-419.
- Kahn, Lily. 2015. *A Grammar of the Eastern European Hasidic Hebrew Tale*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kahn, Lily. 2018. "The *Kitsur Shulhan 'Arukh*, Hasidic Tale, and Maskilic Literature as Exemplars of Ashkenazic Hebrew." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 108: 159-193.
- Katz, David. 1987. *Grammar of the Yiddish Language*. London: Duckworth.
- Khan, Geoffrey, et al. 2013. *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*. Brill Online.
- Krogh, Steffen. 2012. "How Satmarish Is Haredi Satmar Yiddish?" In *Leket: Yiddish Studies Today*, eds. Marion Aptroot et al. Düsseldorf: Düsseldorf University Press, 483-506.
- Krogh, Steffen. 2018. How Yiddish Is Haredi Satmar Yiddish? *Journal of Jewish Languages* 6.1: 5-42.
- Mark, Yudel. 1978. *Grammar of Standard Yiddish*. New York: Congress for Jewish Culture (in Yiddish).
- Niborski, Yitskhok. 2012. *Dictionary of Hebrew-Origin Words in Yiddish*. Paris: Bibliothèque Medem (in Yiddish).
- Nove, Chaya R. 2018a. "The Erasure of Hasidic Yiddish from Twentieth Century Yiddish Linguistics." *Journal of Jewish Languages* 6.1: 111-143.
- Nove, Chaya R. 2018b. "Social Predictors of Case Syncretism in New York Hasidic Yiddish." *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 24.2: 87-95.
- Rabin, Chaim. 2000. *The Development of the Syntax of Post-Biblical Hebrew*. Leiden: Brill.

- Sadock, Benjamin & Alyssa Masor. 2018. "Bobover Yiddish: 'Polish' or 'Hungarian.'" *Journal of Jewish Languages* 6.1: 89-110.
- Sáenz-Badillos, Angel. 2013. "Medieval Hebrew." In *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, ed. Geoffrey Khan et al. Brill Online.
- Schmid, Monika S. 2002. *First Language Attrition, Use and Maintenance: The Case of German Jews in Anglophone Countries*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Schwarzwald, Ora. 2013. "Gender." In *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, eds. Geoffrey Khan et al. Brill Online.
- Weggelaar, Cornelis. 1986. "Noun Incorporation in Dutch." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 52.2: 301-305.
- Wodziński, Marcin. 2018. *Historical Atlas of Hasidism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Appendix: Questionnaire as provided to participants

שפראך פראגעס

א. שרייב א נומער אין יעדן קעסטל לויט ווי עס קלינגט נאטירלעך (1 = דער נאטירלעכסטער, X = איך קען נישט די ווארט). אויב דו וואלטסט געניצט אן אנדער ווארט, קענסט עס צולייגן.

(6 אפציעס)	איר חברטע	לסלוח	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. חנה וועט
		מוחל זיין	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		פארגיוון	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		פארגעבן	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		סולח זיין	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		פארגיוו	<input type="checkbox"/>	
(6 אפציעס)	פון די קינדער	לאבן	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. מע טאר נישט
		מייקן פאן	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		חזוק מאבן	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		ללעגן	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		מייק פאן	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		לעגן זיין	<input type="checkbox"/>	
(4 אפציעס)	צו זען דער רבי	מעריט	<input type="checkbox"/>	3. שמואליק האפט אז ער וועט
		זוכה זיין	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		מעריטן	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		לזכות	<input type="checkbox"/>	

4. איך מײן אז די קינד וועט
- | | |
|--------------|--|
| מורא האבן | |
| בי אפרייד | |
| לפחד | |
| זיך דערשרעקן | |
| זיין אפרייד | |
| מפחד זיין | |
- פון די מעשה (6 אפציעס)
-
5. מע מוז
- | | |
|-------------|--|
| לרחם | |
| פיטי האבן | |
| רחמנות האבן | |
| פיל סארי | |
| מרחם זיין | |
| פילן סארי | |
- אויפן נעבעכדיקן יינגל (6 אפציעס)
-
6. מיר מוזן
- | | |
|-----------|--|
| מחנך זיין | |
| עדיוקייט | |
| לחנך | |
| עדיוקייטן | |
| בילדן | |
- די קינדער (5 אפציעס)
-
7. דו טארסט אים נישט
- | | |
|------------|--|
| לבלבל | |
| צעמישן | |
| קאנפיוז | |
| מבלבל זיין | |
| קאנפיוזן | |
| פארפירן | |
- (6 אפציעס)
-
8. מיינסטו אז בלומי וועט
- | | |
|------------|--|
| מסכים זיין | |
| להסכים | |
| אגרי | |
| אגריען | |
- צו זיין א שדכנטע? (4 אפציעס)
-
9. דער מלמד וועט
- | | |
|--------------|--|
| קאנטיניו | |
| ווייטער גיין | |
| ממשיך זיין | |
| קאנטיניוירן | |
| להמשיך | |
- מיט זיינע שיעורים (5 אפציעס)

10. דו וועסט מיט די נייע ארבעט

הצלחה האבן
סאקסידן
להצליח
סאקסיד
מצליח זיין
געלונגען

(6 אפציעס)

11. קיינער וועט חלילה נישט פון אזא שווערע ארבעט

להיפטר
שטארבן
נפטר ווערן
פאס אויך
פאסן אויך

(5 אפציעס)

12. איך האף אז דער אלטער ניגון וועט נישט פארשווינדן

דיסאפיר
להיעלם
דיסאפירן
פארשווינדן ווערן
נעלם ווערן

(6 אפציעס)

13. דער בעל תשובה וועט די מצוות

האלטן
לקיים
פולפילן
מקיים זיין
פולפיל

(5 אפציעס)

14. פנחס וויל פון די פראבלעם

געט ריד
פטור ווערן
געטן ריד
להיפטר
געטן ריד אוו
געט ריד אוו

(6 אפציעס)

15. ווען וועסטו דיין צימער?

ארגאניזירן
ארגאניז
אינסדרן
לסדר
ארגאניזן
מסדר זיין

(6 אפציעס)

16. די גאנצע שטוב וועט באלד

געט ארגאניזירט
ארגאניזירט ווערן
מסודר ווערן
ארגאניזירט ווערן
יסודר

(5 אפציעס)

17. די נבואה וועט

בי פולפילד
מקוים ווערן
פולפילד ווערן
פארקומען
תקויים

(5 אפציעס)

18. דו וועסט

שטוינען
בי אמייז
להתפעל
אמייז זיין
נתפעל ווערן

פונעם ניגון

(5 אפציעס)

19. לאמיר

געבן כבוד
מכבד זיין
האנארן
לכבד
אפגעבן כבוד
האנאר

די אורחים

(6 אפציעס)

20. דער רב וועט מיר

פריי מאכן
באפרייען
פוט זיין
עגזעמפט
עגזעמפט מאכן
לפטור
עגזעמפטן

פון די פאסטן

(7 אפציעס)

21. קענסטו מיר

להסביר
עקספליינען
דערקלערן
מסביר זיין
עקספליין

די פראבלעם?

(5 אפציעס)

ב. פיל אן די זאצן מיט פאסיגע ווערטער לויטן ביישפיל.

- ביישפיל: זיי האבן איבערגעמאכט די
בניינים.
- ← יעצט זיינען די בניינים איבערגעמאכט.
זיי זיינען איבערגעמאכטע בניינים.
1. זיסי האט גערייניגט איר צימער. ← יעצט איז איר צימער _____.
יעצט איז עס א _____ צימער.
 2. שימי האט מוצליח געווען עפענען
א נייע געשעפט אליין. ← שימי איז זייער _____.
ער איז זייער א _____ מענטש.
 3. מאמע האט מיר מחנך
געווען: זי האט מיר געגעבן א
מוסר-שמועס. ← יעצט בין איך _____.
איך בין א _____ מיידל.
 4. מיין ברודער האט מקיים געווען
וואס ער האט מיר צוגעזאגט. ← זיינע הבטחות זענען אלעמאל _____.
זיי זענען _____ הבטחות.
 5. די קינדער האבן זייער רחמנות
געהאט אויפן ארעמאן. ← די ארעמאן איז _____.
ער איז א _____ מענטש.
 6. מע האט מבבל געווען דעם
שטן ווען מע האט געבלאזן דעם
שופר. ← יעצט איז דער שטן _____.
ער איז א _____ מלאך.
 7. שיינדי האט מסכים געווען
שרייבן א בריוו צו איר באבע. ← שיינדי איז גאנץ _____.
זי איז א _____ פרוי.
 8. דער יינגל האט מכבד געווען זיין
טאטע מיט א ברכה. ← זיין טאטע איז _____.
ער איז א _____ מאן.
 9. דו האסט מורא געהאט פון דיין
חלום. ← דער חלום איז געווען _____.
סיאיז געווען זייער _____ חלום.
 10. רוחי האט חזק געמאכט פון איר
שוועסטער. ← אבער איר שוועסטער איז נישט _____.
זי איז נישט קיין _____ מיידל.
 11. אונדז האבן געהעכערט די דאך
פון אונדזער סוכה. ← יעצט איז די דאך _____.
סיאיז ממש א _____ דאך!
 12. איך בין נתפעל געווארן יעדע
מאל וואס איך האב געזען דעם
זריחה. ← איך בין א גאנצע צייט _____.
איך בין זייער א _____ מענטש.
 13. מאמע האט מסדר געווען די
גאנצע שטוב. ← יעצט איז די שטוב _____.
סיאיז אין גאנצן א _____ שטוב.
 14. מע האט פוטר געווען לייבי פון
לייענען די מגילה. ← לייבי איז גאנץ _____.
ער איז א _____ מענטש.

ג. שרייב אריין די אידישע איבערזעצונגען (עס קען זיין מער ווי איין ווארט).
 ביישפיל: די שטוב איז קליין.
 the/ה להיות/be

1. חלה _____ פריש.
 the/ה להריח/smell
2. זייער ערנסט. _____ פנים
 the/ה להיות/be
3. א מתנה. _____ חבר
 the/ה להביא/bring
4. אויפן באנק. _____ כלה
 the/ה לשבת/sit
5. גרויס. _____ משפחה
 the/ה להיות/be
6. אריין. _____ שבת
 the/ה להיכנס/come
7. פרעמד. _____ לשון
 the/ה להישמע/sound
8. פריילעך. _____ קהילה
 the/ה להיות/be
9. פיר צימערן. _____ דירה
 the/ה להיות לדירה/have
10. מין טאטעס קאפ. _____ טלית
 the/ה לכסות/cover
11. רוהיג. _____ ים
 the/ה לעשות/make
12. פון אינדעוועניג. _____ שלום
 the/ה לבוא/come
13. אויפן טיש. _____ ספר
 the/ה לשכב/lie
14. קאלט. _____ וואסער
 the/ה להיות/be
15. נאכמיטאג. _____ שכן
 the/ה לישון/sleep
16. גרויס. _____ רחמנות פון א טאטע
 the/ה להיות/be
17. יעצט. _____ מעשה
 the/ה להיגמר/finish

18. מלך _____ א שיינע לאנד.
the/ה לשלוט/rule
19. חסידות _____ גרויס.
the/ה להפוך ל-, להיות ל-/become
20. מזל _____ גוטע זאכן.
the/ה להביא/bring
21. רעגירונג _____ צופרידן.
the/ה ממשלה להיות/be
22. מנהג _____ נישט.
the/ה להשתנות/change
23. כוח _____ .
the/ה להיעלם/disappear
24. שול _____ א נייע.
the/ה להיות/be
25. רגע _____ שנעל.
the/ה לעבור/pass
26. ברויט _____ נאך ווארעם.
the/ה להיות/be
27. חתן _____ פאר די חופה.
the/ה להתפלל/pray
28. גנב _____ די בריליאנטן.
the/ה לגנוב/steal
29. הימל _____ זייער פארוואלקענט היינט.
the/ה להיות/be
30. שעה פאר די נאכטמאל _____ א סך צייט.
the/ה להימשך/last
31. חיה _____ אין די בוים.
the/ה להיסתר/hide
32. געלט _____ אין מיין קעשענע.
the/ה להיות/be
33. סידור _____ אויף די פאליצע.
the/ה לעמוד/stand
34. גשמיות אין מיר _____ מיר.
the/ה להפריע/bother
35. עדות פון דער גנב _____ נישט אמת.
the/ה להישמע/sound
36. האר פון די מיידל _____ זייער לאנג.
the/ה להיות/be

Zoë Belk

completed her PhD in the UCL Department of Linguistics, and is currently conducting research at UCL on Hasidic Yiddish globally. Her main specializations are DP syntax, particularly adjectival modifiers of nouns; linearity and adjacency constraints; and ordering restrictions.

Lily Kahn

is Professor of Hebrew and Jewish Languages at UCL. Her main research areas are Hebrew in Eastern Europe, Yiddish, and other Jewish languages. She is the co-editor (with Riitta-Liisa Valijärvi) of the UCL Press series *Grammars of World and Minority Languages*, and Co-Investigator of an AHRC project on Hasidic Yiddish worldwide.

Kriszta Eszter Szendroi

is based at the Linguistics Department at UCL. She specializes in the syntax, semantics, and prosody of focus and quantification, and their acquisition. She is currently the Principal Investigator of an AHRC project on the syntax and acquisition of Hasidic Yiddish worldwide.