



**UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS PRESS**

Review

Reviewed Work(s): *Die Reste des Jüdischdeutschen* by Werner Weinberg

Review by: Robert D. King

Source: *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. 69, No. 3 (Jul., 1970), pp. 510-513

Published by: University of Illinois Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27705906>

Accessed: 23-02-2022 02:43 UTC

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.

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



JSTOR

University of Illinois Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*

brunn, Winnetou; p. 33: Brehmer, . . . *der Deutschland*; pp. 34, 89, 164: Kern, *Selbst ist der Mann*; p. 37: Barth, *Was Peterli . . . erlebte*; pp. 58, 106: Bloem, *Komödiantinnen*; pp. 61, 138: Grabein, *Die vom Rauhen Grund*; pp. 69, 102: Baum, *Stud. chem.*; pp. 69, 248: Zabel, *Katharina*; p. 69: Heyking, Elisabeth; pp. 70, 120: Dwinger, *Zug durch Sibirien*; p. 70: Ettighofer, *deutsches Schicksal*; p. 77: Lobsien, *Störtebeker*; pp. 82, 242: Werfel, *die Frömmigkeit*; pp. 85, 174: Land, *Staatsanwalt*; pp. 88, 248: Wriede, *Hamburger Volkshumor* . . . [fiction? cf. also pp. 67, 189: Moszkowski; p. 194: Ostwald, *Der Urberliner* which is not listed in Table A at the pertinent place!]; p. 89: May, *Aus dunklem Tann*; pp. 91, 107: Discrepancies in two titles by Bloem (*Schmiede* and *Vaterland*) concerning number of copies printed; pp. 91, 112: Bürkle, *das Frühjahr*; pp. 91, 117: Döblin, 1929 [despite *DBV*]; p. 112: Bürkle, *Bis zur Heimkehr*; p. 113: Busch, *Alarrrrrm!*; p. 148: Herzog, *Schwan*; p. 167: Koebner, *Harlekin*; p. 175: Lauff, *Anne-Susanne*; p. 195: Papke, *Forsthaus* in "Christliches Verlagshaus"; p. 207: Sander, *Das feldgraue Herz*; p. 210: Schieber, *Der Lebensgarten*; p. 211: Schlicht, Friedrich von, *Exzellenz*; p. 230: Stutzer, *Brasilien*; p. 231: Svensson, *Erle* is a rather strange abbreviation as it also happens to be an independent word ["alder"]; p. 239: Wassermann, *Die Lebensalter . . . Reiners*; p. 243: Wiechert, *Magd des Jürgen*; p. 262: Löscher, *Alles . . . findet sich wieder*; p. 264: Rosen, *Allen Gewalten zum Trotz*; p. 264: Rüdiger: *Um des Glaubens willen*; p. 270: *Der grosse Brockhaus*.

Although on the whole *The German Bestseller* may serve a useful function for those interested in the more extrinsic aspects of literary phenomena, and although the book in question may even provide a potential starting point for further research in the field of the sociology of literature, the obvious shortcomings of the volume (including the photomechanical reproduction of the typescript which is hardly an ideal solution) make it ultimately impossible to call Mr. Richards' study a very representative example of "German Studies in America."

SIEGFRIED MEWS

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

DIE RESTE DES JÜDISCHDEUTSCHEN. Von Werner Weinberg. (Studia Delitzschiana, Band 12.) Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1969. Pp. 116. DM 28.

The subject of this book is "Jüdischdeutsch," which the author defines as a "Mischdeutsch, nämlich Deutsch mit reinen oder eingedeutschten hebräischen Zusätzen" (p. 14). Since Moses Mendelssohn and the Enlightenment German-Jewish intellectual opinion proscribed any sort of Yiddish characteristics in German, and *Jüdischdeutsch* in Weinberg's sense had by the 1930's come to be confined primarily to native-born German Jews from the lower-middle and lower classes. Unlike Jews in many of the smaller villages of Switzerland, Alsace, and southern Germany, who maintained into recent times a Yiddish structurally distinct in important ways from the surrounding German dialects, the informants interviewed by Weinberg (who come or came originally from Westphalia for the most part) seem at most to have interspersed their German with words of Hebrew origin for jocular or stylistic reasons, also for professional purposes, notably in buying or selling cattle or horses.

In the sense of this book, then, *Jüdischdeutsch* is not really a language as much as it is a lexicon. It has no morphological or syntactic characteristics that distinguish it from "normal" German: like standard German its verbs

have both preterites and past participles (*pattern pattered gepattered* 'to get rid of'), and its non-finite verb forms go to the end of the clause (*Er hat ihm die pore verjacket* 'he raised the price of the cow'). Its phonology is essentially that of the German dialect of its speakers, though there is an additional diphthong /ei/ in the inventory and, as one would expect, distributional differences resulting from the superimposition of a Hebrew lexicon on a German one: both velar [x] and voiceless [s] occur in word-initial position, for example. In speaking German the speakers of *Jüdischdeutsch* do not seem to have had any "Yiddish" characteristics, though Weinberg (pp. 112–14) calls attention to the occurrence of such features ([ǎ]→[ǒ], [ũ ö]→[ĩ ě], [oi]→[ei~ai]) for mock-comic effect and in relating anecdotes. Nothing is said about a Yiddish intonation.

In short, as Weinberg presents it, the only thing that distinguishes *Jüdischdeutsch* from an average German dialect is its Hebrew-Aramaic lexicon; accordingly, more than half the book consists of a glossary with semantic and etymological information for each entry along with a number of useful cross-references. The following is a typical entry abbreviated by leaving out the Hebrew etymon and some of the cross-references:

gannew, auch **ganöwe**, m.; f. **gannewte**; pl. **ganöwem**, -n. Dieb; auch gerissene Person. Vgl. **genëiwe**. "So ein **gannew!**" 'ein ganz gerissener Bursche!' "Dem **gannew** brennt der Hut" d.h. der Dieb hat keine ruhige Minute.

The items in the glossary are all Hebrew-Aramaic in origin; the few words in Weinberg's *Jüdischdeutsch* from other sources (e.g., Romance *benschen* 'to bless,' *dormen* 'to sleep') are treated separately (pp. 111–12). The rest of the book deals with the background and method of Weinberg's research, the (very interesting) sociological setting of *Jüdischdeutsch*, and the grammar of this quasi-language.

My initial reaction to this book is one of considerable gratitude that someone took it on himself to collect fragile material on a dying idiom while at least a few of its speakers are still alive. The task has rich merit, and the result is a book that should be useful to students of German-Jewish literature, of *Rotwelsch*, and in a modest way to students of German-Jewish culture. One major aspect of Jewish culture is, of course, its humor, both self-deprecatory and otherwise, and *Jüdischdeutsch* was a supple vehicle for such humor: for example, in *Jüdischdeutsch* the initials "G.m.b.H." were interpreted as "*gannew* (stiehl) mit beiden Händen" (p. 17). Students of the Jewish joke and Jewish humor will find much to appreciate in Weinberg's book.

I am greatly disappointed, however, that the book turns out to be of so little use to students of Yiddish—in particular to anyone interested in the historical development of Yiddish in Germany. The author insists that his *Jüdischdeutsch* is not Yiddish, and this is correct of course—trivially so since Weinberg's *Jüdischdeutsch* is not a language at all in any very useful sense of the word and Yiddish *is*. Diachronically, on the other hand, I do not know what *Jüdischdeutsch* could possibly be if not a continuation, atrophied though it may be, of Western Yiddish. In refusing to recognize his *Jüdischdeutsch* as the endpoint in a historical continuity from Western Yiddish, Weinberg largely ignores the considerable research hitherto done on Western Yiddish

and consequently deprives himself of the opportunity to produce a work that extends our understanding of the history of Yiddish in Germany.

It is not at all clear why the author so diligently avoids relating his *Jüdischdeutsch* to Western Yiddish. He says: "Daher ist auch die Bezeichnung 'Westjiddisch,' die man letzstens oft findet, sowohl irreführend als auch anachronistisch, weil eben 'Jiddisch' den Begriff einer vollständigen Sprache vermittelt und weil dies Wort selbst viel jünger ist als die Sprachelemente, die wir hier behandeln" (p. 14). I find this comment of the author's at least as "irreführend" as he finds the term "Western Yiddish." In his rejection of Western Yiddish Weinberg will find no support among scholars concerned with Jewish languages. The historical development of Yiddish simply does not make sense without the reconstruction of a stage equivalent to what now is generally called "Western Yiddish," and there are modern dialect representatives of it. Max Weinreich ("Rosheprokim vegn mayrevdikn yidish," *Yidishe sprachh*, XIII [1953], 35-69) established the importance and viability of Western Yiddish, the Second Collection of *The Field of Yiddish* (The Hague, 1965) has no fewer than four articles on Western Yiddish. There is now a dialect atlas of Western Yiddish (Franz J. Beranek, *Westjiddischer Sprachatlas* [Marburg, 1965]), and individual studies (H. Beem for Holland, F. Guggenheim-Grünberg for more southerly regions) have filled in some of the missing gaps.

There is thus now an abundance of material available to guide research on the development of Western Yiddish dialects in Europe, and anyone who ignores this material lays himself open to a charge of amateurishness. Weinberg is aware of a good deal of the existing work (though Beranek's dialect atlas is unaccountably omitted from the bibliography, as is all of Max Weinreich's work), but his highly delimited conception of *Jüdischdeutsch* seems to prevent him from using it except peripherally. To Weinberg *Jüdischdeutsch* is nothing more than "die Reste des alten Idioms der deutschen Juden, das zwar im Umgang gebraucht wurde und das sogar eine Literatur gezeitigt hatte, aber in seiner deutschen Umgebung nie eine selbständige Sprache geworden war und im Gefolge von Aufklärung und Emanzipation nach Umfang und Verbreitung immer mehr zusammenschumpfte" (pp. 14-15). Never a "selbständige Sprache?" That would be news to the thousands of people who once spoke Western Yiddish and to those few who still do—for example, to that speaker of Gailingen (Switzerland) Yiddish who even recently wrote plays in her home dialect (F. Guggenheim-Grünberg, *Gailinger Jiddisch* [Göttingen, 1961]).

A book that starts with assumptions like these cannot answer many of the questions that most other students of Yiddish will want to ask. What does the dual entry *māse*, *meise* 'story' (p. 78) mean? Who said *māse*, who *meise*? Is *meise* a borrowing from Eastern Yiddish? Or, since there is a major *ā/ai* isogloss cutting through the Yiddish-speaking area, is *meise* dialect-geographically important in a way not hitherto observed? Are the pronunciations such as *schläft* 'sleeps,' *ibel* 'bad,' *Leit* 'people,' *sich* 'look' merely, as Weinberg suggests (pp. 112-13), "anekdotisch" and "karikaturistisch?" Or are they relic pronunciations from a Western Yiddish dialect in Westphalia? What about the form *scho-e* (p. 100)? Beranek (p. 33) gives only the variants

schō, *schā*, *schē*, and *schī*. Weinberg (p. 103) has *suckes*, *zuckes* 'Feast of the Tabernacles.' There are isoglosses for *s/z* variants (Beranek, p. 67), but there is no way of evaluating the distribution of Weinberg's forms without additional information on his informants. Are the forms *mōl/mūl* 'rabbi who performs a circumcision' (Beranek, p. 121) and *mārew/mairew* 'evening prayer' (Beranek, p. 15 f.) completely absent from *Jüdischdeutsch*, or did Weinberg fail to elicit them?

Since, in Weinberg's opinion, *Jüdischdeutsch* is not a language and never was much of one, he did not ask questions like these; and, as he presents his material, they cannot be answered. This is a great pity, for such questions interest not only linguists and sociolinguists but historians of Jewish culture in Germany as well.

As I said earlier, Weinberg's book is useful for various audiences, and I would not like to end my review without having emphasized its worth once more. But if he had accepted his *Jüdischdeutsch* for what it surely must have been—the fossilized outcome of an earlier Western Yiddish dialect—Weinberg could have produced a work of inestimably greater value to the field of Jewish linguistic studies.

ROBERT D. KING

University of Texas

NORDISCHE BAROCKDICHTUNG. EINE DARSTELLUNG UND DEUTUNG SKANDINAVISCHER DICHTUNG ZWISCHEN REFORMATION UND AUFKLÄRUNG. Von Wilhelm Friese. München: Francke Verlag, [1968]. Pp. 320. Sw. Fr. 82.

This is an excellent book, far-ranging, clear and methodical. There is no other comprehensive account of Nordic Baroque, and Dr. Friese has produced a remarkable first treatment of seventeenth-century Scandinavian literature in its entirety. That the book leaves a good many questions unanswered is all to the good, because it draws attention to them, and the author stresses on more than one occasion that he is not attempting to be comprehensive, but to treat Baroque from one particular point of view. He is thus able to encourage other scholars to treat the problems which he does not tackle himself, and in particular he calls for an examination of the relationship between the Nordic Baroque literature in the vernacular and the Latin poetry which had been written in Scandinavia in the sixteenth century and which indeed continued to appear into the seventeenth.

In a piece of *Geistesgeschichte* at its best, Dr. Friese sees Baroque as a deliberate break with the vernacular literature preceding it, in a conscious effort to encompass literature in the desire for order which is characteristic of the seventeenth century. The abandonment of *Knittelvers* and the adoption of the Alexandrine, first based on syllable counts and then on stress, is one aspect of this. One might wonder whether this was conscious or not, but at least the thesis is tenable and well supported by the author. Order is, he maintains, "Fundament des Glaubens und der Dichtung." The close connection between the State and Lutheran orthodoxy at the time means that religious as well as secular poetry is affected. Its message is by and large an apologia for the form of government which the seventeenth century knew, and with which, the author observes, people were perfectly content.