

25 February 1980  
London

Dear Dr. Florence Guggenheim,

I am extremely thankful to you for your very kind letter of 30 Dec. All of your works arrived safely and I am greatly enjoying studying all of them. I hope you had no problems with the check, but if you did (or if it was not enough to cover the postage) please let me know and I will set it right.

Several points which I wished to bring up to you—

(1) Regarding your note that the words I quoted at  $E_2$  actually correspond to M. Weinreich's  $E_3$  — it has long been my conviction that these lexical items are  $E_2$  (i.e. originally long) rather than  $E_3$  (secondarily lengthened in an open syllable). I presented some of the evidence for this in my Oxford paper and other evidence elsewhere (including in my thesis which is now in progress). I should have brought this to your attention, however, instead of merely quoting them as  $E_2$ . For the problem that concerned us, it doesn't matter practically because  $E_2$  and  $E_3$  are generally merged throughout the historical territory of Yiddish, and in any case the questionable Semitic Component items always appear with the local phonetic realization of  $E_2$ .

(2) Thank you for confirming that  $E_{2/3}$  is not merged with  $E_5$  in Surbtal Yiddish.

(3) If I understand you correctly, the monophthongal (long vowel) realizations documented in maps 24, 25 and 26 for vowel  $E_{2/3}$  are indeed identical (collapsed with) ~~with~~ realizations for  $E_5$  in these areas. In other words, it would be jéledle, kélef, both with the exact same vowel (I am assuming for the moment that the distinction between e: and é: is allophonic, conditioned by the following consonant. Is this correct? P. ~~unlike~~ Surbtal Yiddish).

(4) I have recently written to Frauenfeld in connection with the record and hope to hear from them shortly (I don't have a record player but will manage to get it copied onto a cassette, hopefully without too much loss of sound quality).

(5) In the Wörterbuch zu Surbtaler Jiddisch, you seem to give preference to the ai forms of such words as sälə/šailə, mərəf/mairəf etc. But in your Atlas, Phonologie and other works there is evidence of a strong strain of ā forms in Surbtal Yiddish. Have you noted any sociological differences between the forms (e.g. ā or ai having more or less prestige, being used by a certain segment of the population, etc.?)

(6) Thank you for informing me of the 1385 attestations of the Zurich court records. I would of course be most grateful to you for the bibliographical reference for this material and will of course thank you for this in any use thereof, published or in my thesis.

(7) I am enclosing <sup>for</sup> your interest the handout-sheets I distributed at the YIVO Conference in November. It was an attempt at a classification of Western Yiddish dialects based on 18th century Latin letter transcriptions (e.g. J.W.1714?, Philoglottus 1733, Bibliophilus 1742, Reizenstein 1764, Friedrich 1784 etc. etc.) Incidentally, I found the dialect of Philoglottus (=J. P. Lütke?) whose book was published in Freiberg, more or less identical with the phonological oppositions of the modern Surbtal Yiddish you have documented and quite close indeed to Alsatian Yiddish.

With deep thanks and appreciation for  
all, I remain

T. J. C.