

---

On the Uses of Yiddish Language Geography

Author(s): Robert D. King

Source: *Shofar*, FALL 1998, Vol. 17, No. 1, Special Issue: Studies in Jewish Geography (FALL 1998), pp. 81-89

Published by: Purdue University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42942831>

---

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to  
*Shofar*

JSTOR

## On the Uses of Yiddish Language Geography

Robert D. King  
The University of Texas

There are a number of Yiddish linguistic atlases in existence, the most comprehensive of which is the *Language and Culture Atlas of Ashkenazic Jewry (LCAAJ)* now being published in its entirety. Often thought to be useful to linguists alone, these language-atlas materials on the contrary are a rich source of invaluable information useful to historians, sociologists, folklorists, and other scholars of Jewish history and culture. Examples discussed come from *LCAAJ* data on the eating habits and food taboos among the Jews of pre-World War II Eastern Europe—the preparation of *gefilte fish* and *farfl*—and Yiddish dialect variation in Eastern Europe. Yiddish dialect geography is a valuable resource for all scholars of Jewish history and culture and not linguists alone.

My intention in this paper is to make scholars in disciplines other than linguistics aware of the wealth of information that is found in Yiddish linguistic geography and to suggest ways that these materials can be put to use by non-linguists. I am thinking here primarily of historians of the settlement and cultural history of Ashkenazic Jewry, though sociologists and folklorists too can profit from Yiddish language geography.

Most of what linguists do goes unnoticed by scholars outside of linguistics, even when it might have relevance to their work. The statement is not altogether true, of course. Linguistics enjoys periodic vogues in literary theory, and some branches of philosophy are virtually indistinguishable from linguistics. Psychology and anthropology have traditionally close associations with linguistics, and cognitive science as it emerged during the 1980's has shown how fruitful collaboration among these disciplines (and computer science and neuroscience) can be if the circumstances and the personalities are right. The academic discipline of history, on the other hand, does not often cross paths with linguistics. Historians understandably lack familiarity with linguistics, and this is often a pity, for the study of language—especially linguistic geography and historical linguistics—can contribute to the history of culture and especially to early settlement history, where knowledge is almost always the flimsiest kind of thing and conventional written records scarce when they exist at all.

Dialect geography became fashionable shortly before the turn of the century. Its motivation originally was to provide empirical confirmation of the austere Neogrammarian hypothesis that sound changes admitted of no exceptions, but linguistic geographers soon came to love the thing itself. Linguistic geography grew beyond its role as handmaiden to theoretical linguistics and became a specialty of its own. The

speech areas first dealt with by the method of mapping regional linguistic variations were Germany and France, but subsequently Italy, Denmark, Romania, Catalonia, Brittany, and most of the countries and regions of western Europe were covered to a more or less satisfactory degree. North America has been mapped linguistically in a project that was conceived in 1928, begun in the 1930s, and is now approaching completion. This was the *Linguistic Atlas of New England*;<sup>1</sup> it has been extended to all of the United States and finished at the University of Wisconsin by Frederic Cassidy as *DARE: Dictionary of American Regional English*.<sup>2</sup>

The basic scheme of a linguistic atlas is simple. It is to gather salient linguistic information over a language area and to plot it on a map. As Uriel Weinreich writes: “The primary interest of linguistic geography is the impact of communication barriers on the differentiation of dialects.”<sup>3</sup> The kinds of linguistic information most commonly gathered are dialectal variations in pronunciation and among lexical items—what words are used for the same things in different regional variants of a language (what linguists call “dialects” without pejorative connotation)—though more ambitious atlases have elicited responses that might reveal dialectal differences in morphology and syntax.

Methodologies vary widely. The *Atlas linguistique de la France* sent a single trained phonetician to all locations, Edmond Edmont, who bicycled from one village to another asking questions. The *Deutscher Sprachatlas* based its maps on written responses to a questionnaire from around 40,000 lay informants (schoolteachers), and the *Linguistic Atlas of New England* put nine trained linguists in the field. As methodologies differ, so too differs the usefulness of atlases for the linguist, whose questions are not necessarily answered by an atlas organized according to the interests of other, earlier linguists. It is not humanly possible to anticipate the questions that the next generation of linguistic theoreticians will want answered: every theory creates its own questions.

Until recently there was always a sort of generation lag in Yiddish linguistics. Linguistic investigation of the kind we think of as “modern” began in the 1850s and 1860s for languages such as English, German, French, Greek, and Latin, but came to Yiddish about a generation later. While one can place the beginnings of serious linguistic scholarship in Yiddish at various dates and with various scholars, I do not

---

<sup>1</sup>See Hans Kurath, *Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England* (Washington, DC: American Council of Learned Societies, 1939) and Hans Kurath and Raven I. McDavid, Jr., *The Pronunciation of English in the Atlantic States* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1961).

<sup>2</sup>See Frederic G. Cassidy, *Dictionary of American Regional English*, Vol. 1 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985).

<sup>3</sup>Uriel Weinreich, “Multilingual Dialectology and the New Yiddish Atlas,” *Anthropological Linguistics* 4 (1962), pp. 6–22.

think we involve ourselves in serious controversy if we take the work on Yiddish of the Austrian Alfred Landau and the Romanian Lazar Saineanu shortly before the turn of the century as points of departure for modern scholarship on the Yiddish language.<sup>4</sup>

The “lag” in this case was about thirty years. (There was a second linguistic generation lag that came later—a result of the destruction of European Jewry under Hitler.) The reasons for the first “generation lag” from general to Yiddish linguistics are well known, but they all basically came down to one: the view prior to the Czernowitz Conference in 1908<sup>5</sup> that Yiddish was not a language to be taken seriously, actually hardly a language at all but a “half-animal” kind of “stammering,” as the German historian Heinrich Graetz, himself a Jew (though thoroughly deracinated), so repellingly put it. If a language cannot be taken seriously, it cannot be studied seriously, and so Yiddish was not.

The linguistic atlas movement thus came late to Yiddish.<sup>6</sup> Only in 1931 did the first language atlas appear, a product of the short-lived sufferance of a Jewish intellectual life by the Soviet authorities in the 1920s and early 1930s. This was Vilenkin’s Yiddish language atlas of the Soviet Union, which covered the eastern (pre-1939) portions of Belarus and Ukraine.<sup>7</sup> Beranek’s *Sprachgeographie des Jiddischen in der Slowakei*<sup>8</sup> is a small atlas-type treatment of Slovakian Yiddish. Jean Jofen in 1953 used refugee informants in the United States to write a Columbia University dissertation that was the first American attempt toward a Yiddish language atlas.<sup>9</sup> Franz Beranek published his

---

<sup>4</sup>See Chaim Gininger, “Sainéan’s Accomplishments in Yiddish Linguistics,” in Uriel Weinreich, ed., *The Field of Yiddish*, Vol. 1 (New York: Linguistic Circle of New York, 1954), pp. 147–178; and Max Weinreich, “Prehistory and Early History of Yiddish: Facts and Conceptual Framework,” in Weinreich, *The Field of Yiddish*, pp. 73–101. Leo Wiener should probably be included in this grouping even if he usually is not; see Leo Wiener, “On the Judeo-German Spoken by the Russian Jews,” *American Journal of Philology* 14 (1893), pp. 41–67, 456–83.

<sup>5</sup>See Robert D. King, “Migration and Linguistics as Illustrated by Yiddish,” in Edgar C. Polomé and Werner Winter, eds., *Reconstructing Languages and Cultures* (Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992), pp. 419–39. See also Robert D. King, “Matisyohu Miseses,” in Dov-Ber Kerler, ed., *History of Yiddish Studies* (Chur, Switzerland: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1991), pp. 25–38.

<sup>6</sup>For the history of research on Yiddish dialectology see Dovid Katz, “Origins of Yiddish Dialectology,” in Dovid Katz, ed., *Dialects of the Yiddish Language* (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1988), pp. 39–55.

<sup>7</sup>L. Vilenkin, *Yidisher sprachatlas fun sovetsfarband. Minsk: Vaysrusishe visnshaft-akademye, yidisher sektor* (1931).

<sup>8</sup>Franz J. Beranek, “Sprachgeographie des Jiddischen in der Slowakei,” *Zeitschrift für Phonetik und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft* 3 (1949), pp. 25–46.

<sup>9</sup>Jean B. Jofen, “The First American Attempt to Produce a Yiddish Language Atlas,” in Katz, *Dialects of the Yiddish Language*, pp. 27–37.

language atlas of Western Yiddish in 1965, encompassing Germany, Alsace-Lorraine, Switzerland, and parts of central Europe.<sup>10</sup>

The surpassing accomplishment of Yiddish linguistic geography—and the linguistic tool that accommodates itself best to the uses of the non-linguist—is the *Language and Culture Atlas of Ashkenazic Jewry (LCAAJ)*. Conceived and planned by Uriel Weinreich, its fieldwork conducted largely among survivors of World War II in Israel and America, the *LCAAJ* is a stunning testimonial to the dedication, intelligence, and resourcefulness of that extraordinary linguist and human being, Uriel Weinreich. The *LCAAJ* is now being published in its entirety, thanks to the dedication and persistence of its director, Marvin I. Herzog.<sup>11</sup>

Earlier a great deal of data and many maps from the *LCAAJ* were already published, and a substantial amount of material has been available since the 1960s. The sources are primarily two: *Field of Yiddish*, Vol. 3, a collection of articles using *LCAAJ* materials that came out of a 1965 Columbia University Conference on Yiddish Dialectology;<sup>12</sup> and Marvin Herzog's monograph *The Yiddish Language in Northern Poland*.<sup>13</sup>

What distinguishes the *LCAAJ* from other linguistic atlases is the word "Culture" in its title, which is more than a formal but meaningless obeisance in the direction of greater "relevance." It was decided early in the planning stages of the *LCAAJ* that culture was to be an integral part of the information elicited. The kind of question asked of informants in a usual Yiddish-language atlas project might be: "How do you say 'hello'?", hoping to elicit a variant of (*a*) *gutn tog* which in northeastern Yiddish might be [a *gutn tog*] and in central Yiddish [a *gitt tu(:)k*], confirming thus one of the stereotypical differences between "Lithuanian" and "Polish" Yiddish, an isogloss. (Linguists use the word "isogloss" for the boundary between one pronunciation and another, or more generally between one dialect area and another.) "How do you say 'the foot'?" will elicit grammatical information as well as phonological information, e.g. *der* [fi:s] in "Polish" Yiddish and *di* [fus] in "Lithuanian" Yiddish, the *der/di* signaling different gender relationships,<sup>14</sup> while the *u/i(:)* distinction is a well-known isogloss.

<sup>10</sup>Franz J. Beranek, *Westjiddischer Sprachatlas* (Marburg: N. G. Elwert Verlag, 1965).

<sup>11</sup>Marvin I. Herzog, Uriel Weinreich, and Vera Baviskar, *The Language and Cultural Atlas of Ashkenazic Jewry*. Vol. 1: Historical and Theoretical Foundations (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1992).

<sup>12</sup>Marvin I. Herzog, Wita Ravid, and Uriel Weinreich, *The Field of Yiddish*, Vol. 3 (The Hague: Mouton, 1969).

<sup>13</sup>Marvin I. Herzog, *The Yiddish Language in Northern Poland* (The Hague: Mouton, 1965) (= *International Journal of American Linguistics*, Part III, Vol. 31, No. 2 [April 1965]; Publication 37 of the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics).

<sup>14</sup>Herzog, *Yiddish Language in Northern Poland*, p. 119.

Questions that seek to elicit regional dialect differences in lexical items are often as much ethnographic in substance as they are linguistic, e.g. “What do you call the skullcap worn indoors by males in obedience to the commandment to keep one’s head covered in the presence of the Lord?” (*yarmulke, kapl, kipe*).<sup>15</sup>

Such questions are common to almost all dialect geography. Responses to them permit the mapping of phonological, morphological, and lexical isoglosses. Where the *LCAAJ* differs from the norm is in its inclusion of purely ethnographic questions such as: “How do you season the Sabbath fish?” (with sugar or without sugar); “How do you prepare *farfl*?” (chop, cut, or grate); “Did you eat tomatoes where you grew up?”; “Were there varieties of mushrooms that were *treyf*?” (*Farfl* is noodles in the form of small pellets or granules, and *treyf* means ritually impure, unclean.) Information about the informants was noted, such as whether or not they were Hasidic. In this way almost every aspect and byway of Jewish life in eastern Europe before the Holocaust is encompassed.

It is easy to show that this kind of atlas is in fact as much of a contribution to cultural geography as to linguistic geography. One curious example will suffice, that of the avoidance of the eating of tomatoes. Folklorists will note the potential salience of the eating or avoidance of tomatoes. Tomatoes are after all somehow ambiguous, a difficult fruit as fruits go. *Are* they for that matter a fruit, or are they a vegetable? Their color is the color of blood, with all the questions of ritual and sexual purity conjured up by that. As Herzog says:

Frequently the tomato was considered poisonous; among Jews its avoidance was often defined in terms of ritual purity. Since it was said to contain blood, the tomato was considered *treyf* ‘ritually impure’. Informants recall the fear and the fainting that accompanied their first brave attempts to eat it. Though tomatoes are generally called *pomidorn* in the area (cf. Polish *pomidor*) it is interesting to note that two of the informants (from Silc and Kalesin) for whom they were *treyf* called them *kalidorn*—the usual term for ‘cauliflowers’, another term reputedly in the category of forbidden foods.<sup>16</sup>

The relevant map in Herzog<sup>17</sup> gives us the picture of a food taboo giving way under pressure both from the west (Poland) and from the east (Lithuania and possibly Belorussia). The distribution is in other words “the result of innovation—illustrating the efficacy of what might be termed pressures of modernization emanating from Poland

---

<sup>15</sup>Herzog, *Yiddish Language in Northern Poland*, p. 64.

<sup>16</sup>Herzog, *Yiddish Language in Northern Poland*, pp. 29–30.

<sup>17</sup>Herzog, *Yiddish Language in Northern Poland*, Fig. 2:11, p. 29.

Major in the west and Lithuania in the east.”<sup>18</sup> These channels of modernization can also be correlated with trade routes in northern Poland going back to 1466.<sup>19</sup>

It would not be idle to speculate on the influence of Hasidism in this matter of the eating of tomatoes. That Hasidism played a role in other cultural matters in this area of eastern Europe is clear. Northern Poland was divided between Hasidic and non-Hasidic areas.<sup>20</sup> The distribution reflects the historical spread of Hasidism, which arose in Ukraine in the eighteenth century (the Bal Shem Tov’s dates are 1700–1760), made dramatic conquests westward into Poland, and after establishing early beachheads in Lithuania and Belarus was forced to retreat under “the impact of relentless rabbinical persecution, emanating from Vilna from 1772 on.”<sup>21</sup>

Another cultural cline is the distribution of the method of preparing *farfl*—whether it is cut or whether it is shaped by hand into pellets of dough.<sup>22</sup> Still another has to do with the preparation of fish as a Sabbath dish: “The custom of preparing fish as a Sabbath delicacy dates at least to Talmudic times, and is universal in our area. However, sweetened fish, also called *poylishe fish* ‘Polish fish’, is generally unpalatable to those east of the indicated border, who prefer their fish seasoned only with pepper.”<sup>23</sup> The boundaries of the two culinary habits coincide remarkably well with the boundaries of Hasidism. Is this an accident, or is there a causality involved? Herzog’s explanation seems persuasive to me:

These items [i.e. the preparation of *farfl* and the seasoning of the Sabbath fish], being ideologically neutral, are unlikely ever to have been the objects of a counter-offensive by the Lithuanian rabbis. And yet they seem to show the spread of innovations from the southwest to the northeast coming to a halt along the same line as the ideologically loaded innovation of Hasidism.<sup>24</sup>

Notice how effortlessly the discussion has shifted from linguistics to cultural history. It is an easy march from isogloss to isopleth—from a line demarcating different linguistic areas to a line demarcating different cultural areas. It is also a short distance

---

<sup>18</sup>Herzog, *Yiddish Language in Northern Poland*, p. 259.

<sup>19</sup>Herzog, *Yiddish Language in Northern Poland*, pp. 264–8.

<sup>20</sup>See Herzog, *Yiddish Language in Northern Poland*, Fig. 2:5, p. 22.

<sup>21</sup>See Herzog, *Yiddish Language in Northern Poland*, p. 21; cf. Simon M. Dubnow, *Di veltgeshikhte fun yidishn folk*, Vol. 7 (Buenos Aires and New York: A. Laub Farlag, 1948–1956), p. 414.

<sup>22</sup>Herzog, *Yiddish Language in Northern Poland*, pp. 18–19.

<sup>23</sup>Herzog, *Yiddish Language in Northern Poland*, p. 18.

<sup>24</sup>Herzog, *Yiddish Language in Northern Poland*, p. 24.

from isopleth to history. The transition is seamless. The historian can find much valuable information bearing on his concerns in material which is overtly linguistic.

Another example from some of Uriel Weinreich's early work with the *LCAAJ* files is even more striking in its dramatic distance between a "little" linguistic fact and a "big" historical generalization.<sup>25</sup> The plural of the Yiddish word for 'nose' *noz* is *nezer* in standard Yiddish. In dialects of Central Yiddish and Southeastern Yiddish are found other variants of the plural, *neyz* and *neyzer*. The isogloss for *neyz* versus *neyzer* does not follow any political boundary familiar to the twentieth century; instead it cuts right through the Poland and Romania of 1919. The roots of the matter lie much deeper in history:

To find support for our isoglosses in political geography we must go back . . . to a period before the middle of the 16th century. . . . After the Union of Lublin in 1569 the Ukraine passed to the Polish section of the joint state. The new Lithuanian-Ukrainian boundary . . . may have been only administrative, but its effect on further regionalization of Jewish society was profound. In Jewish communal autonomy, for example, it was the boundary between the Council of Lithuania on the one hand and the Council of Four Lands on the other hand. . . . As for Romania, it appears (from other considerations) that while Transylvania was settled from the west, Bukovina and Moldavia were settled by Podolian Jews, who apparently brought along the west Podolian plural *neyz*; and though Bessarabia passed to Russian hegemony after 1800, this transition of 160 years ago was too recent to permit the integration of Bessarabian Yiddish with Russian-Ukrainian Yiddish: the earlier *neyz*-type survived.<sup>26</sup>

This is history; it is nothing more or less than settlement history in a linguistic cloak. What Weinreich has done here is about the most that often can be done with Jewish settlement history in eastern Europe—to draw conclusions from a small handful of historical facts linked to inferences from linguistic reconstructions.

The uninitiated often have the perception that most of Jewish history is well known and well understood. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact very little is known about great periods of Jewish settlement history. Take for example the settlement of Jews in eastern Europe:

Was the great eastern European Jewry of the 19th century preponderantly descended (as is normally believed) from immigrants from the Germanic lands further west who arrived as refugees in the later Middle Ages, bearing with them their culture? Or did these new immigrants find already on their arrival a numerically strong Jewish life, on whom they were able to impose their superior culture, including even their tongue—as for example in the 16th century, after the arrival of the highly cultured Spanish exiles in the Turkish

---

<sup>25</sup>Weinreich devotes an entire paper to this topic: Uriel Weinreich, "The Plural of *noz*: A Chapter in Yiddish Grammatical Geography," *Yidishe shprakh* 20 (1960), pp. 81–90.

<sup>26</sup>Uriel Weinreich, "Multilingual Dialectology and the New Yiddish Atlas," *Anthropological Linguistics* 4 (1962), pp. 6–22; here pp. 9–11.



empire? Does the line of descent of Ashkenazi Jewry of today go back to a quasi-autochthonous Jewry already established in these lands, perhaps even earlier than the time of the earliest Franco-German settlement in the Dark Ages? This is one of the mysteries of Jewish history, which probably will never be solved.<sup>27</sup>

Cecil Roth is not some outsider holding eccentric views of Jewish history. He is simply more direct than many other of the major Jewish historians in forthrightly acknowledging his ignorance of the details of Jewish settlement of central and eastern Europe. As I pointed out in another article in which I tried to extract Jewish history from Yiddish linguistics:

One's initial impression, looking at Jewish history from the outside, is that there is a plethora of facts and documents from earliest times down to the present, an embarrassment of riches in comparison with what the disadvantaged Indo-Europeanist or Germanicist has available to work with. But our knowledge of Jewish history is, on closer examination, a lumpy kind of thing. What we know about given periods of Jewish history varies widely. We know much more about Jewish life in Biblical and classical times than we do about Jewish life in the Middle Ages. . . . The historical demographer of Jewish Poland from, say, 1200 to 1500 has not much to work with, and what there is, often as not, is an imperfect estimate, a whisper of a fact.<sup>28</sup>

It seems that in much of Jewish settlement history, even as late as the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the historian has little to go on except inferences from the linguistic evidence. Historical linguists have grown used to the uses of linguistic reconstruction—what linguistics can tell them about the historical development of a language. For very few historians, however, is linguistics anything but *terra incognita*—technically forbidding, occult, beyond familiar knowledge. One understands this, but one hopes it will not forever be true.

An intricate linking of linguistic geography and history is provided by Uriel Weinreich's work on Belorussian Yiddish.<sup>29</sup> Weinreich studied correspondences between isoglosses in Yiddish in Belarus and isoglosses in the Belorussian language itself. Many of them agree to a remarkable degree. Weinreich attributes the coincidence of Yiddish and Belorussian isoglosses to venerable divisions within Belarus and between Belarus and "Black" Russia:

[W]e see a highly precise correspondence between Yiddish and Belorussian isogloss bundles even though the Belorussian forms whose distribution is delimited by this bundle are in their substance quite different from the Yiddish ones. The opinion has been expressed that the fundamental bundle of Belorussian isoglosses shown here goes back to

---

<sup>27</sup>Cecil Roth, "The European Age in Jewish History (to 1648)," in Louis Finkelstein, ed., *The Jews*, Vol. 1 (New York: Schocken Books, 1972), pp. 302–3.

<sup>28</sup>King, *Migration and Linguistics*, p. 420.

<sup>29</sup>"The Geographic Makeup of Belorussian Yiddish," in Herzog et al, *Field of Yiddish*, Vol. 3, pp. 82–101.

the old boundary between the Smolensk and Polock lands, on the one hand, and the Turov-Pinsk duchy and Black Russia, on the other. . . . [T]he Yiddish facts, by virtue of their recency, combined with a still pending examination of recent Belorussian innovations, may help to prove that the ancient boundary between duchies continued for a long time to function as some kind of barrier in the communicative network.<sup>30</sup>

What Weinreich is suggesting is that a dynastic difference in Belarus may have served as a dialectal barrier in both Belorussian and Yiddish. If his supposition is true, then we will require a different version of relationships between Jews and Gentiles on Belarus territory than the one given us by received history. There must have been greater closeness.

I think I may rest my case here, my “case” being that linguistics offers scholars of other disciplines something of value. This is no secret to Indo-Europeanists, for whom the 1980s were a decade of extraordinarily fruitful collaboration between linguists, archeologists, and historians.<sup>31</sup> No one can “do” Indo-European linguistics today without being part archeologist, or at least without knowing the relevant archeological material very well. Things are not that far along in Yiddish—yet; but I for one can no longer feel comfortable doing Yiddish historical linguistics without being at the same time as much historian as linguist.

I have tried elsewhere<sup>32</sup> to bring Yiddish linguistics to bear on Jewish history in eastern Europe. I was led to a conclusion at variance with the received settlement history of Jews in eastern Europe: “Regensburg and Bavaria are where the story of Yiddish really begins. It is on the banks of the Danube, not on the banks of the Rhine, that we should seek the birthplace of Yiddish and the point of departure for Jewish settlement of eastern Europe. The crucible for the creation of Ashkenazic Jewry is to be found on the Danube, not on the Rhine.”<sup>33</sup> I was led to this conclusion more by linguistics than by history, at least initially: the history followed the linguistics.

That kind of work is only a beginning. We know too little about the details of Jewish settlement in eastern Europe to ignore anything that might be of assistance. The files of the *LCAAJ* are a rich source for scholars in many fields, for the historian in particular; and the volumes now appearing will be invaluable not only for linguists. The linguistic geography of Yiddish can be almost as useful to the historian as it is to the linguist. The facts may be linguistic, but their implications are cultural and historical.

---

<sup>30</sup>U. Weinreich, *Belorussian Yiddish*, p. 100.

<sup>31</sup>See Edgar C. Polomé, *The Indo-Europeans in the Fourth and Third Millennia* (Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma Publishers, 1982). See also Susan Nacev Skomal and Edgar C. Polomé, *Proto-Indo-European: The Archeology of a Linguistic Problem: Studies in Honor of Marija Gimbutas* (Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 1987).

<sup>32</sup>King, *Migration and Linguistics*; Alice Faber and Robert D. King, “Yiddish and the Settlement History of Ashkenazic Jewry,” *The Mankind Quarterly* 24 (1984), pp. 393–425.

<sup>33</sup>King, *Migration and Linguistics*, p. 436.