



AARHUS UNIVERSITY



Cover sheet

This is the publisher's PDF (Version of Record) of the article.

This is the final published version of the article.

How to cite this publication:

Krogh, S. (2019). *Er hod gegeybm ales far de yi:dn* 'He gave the Jews everything': On the emergence of prepositional dative marking with *far* in Transcarpathian Yiddish. *Linguistics*, 57(5), 893-913.

<https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2019-0026>

Publication metadata

Title: *Er hod gegeybm ales far de yi:dn* 'He gave the Jews everything':
On the emergence of prepositional dative marking with *far* in
Transcarpathian Yiddish

Author(s): Steffen Krogh

Journal: Linguistics

DOI/Link: [10.1515/ling-2019-0026](https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2019-0026)

Document version: Publisher's PDF (Version of Record)

The final publication is available at www.degruyter.com

General Rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

If the document is published under a Creative Commons license, this applies instead of the general rights.

Steffen Krogh*

***Er hod gegeybm ales far de yi:dn* ‘He gave the Jews everything’: On the emergence of prepositional dative marking with *far* in Transcarpathian Yiddish**

<https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2019-0026>

Abstract: Uriel Weinreich’s seminal study “Western Traits in Transcarpathian Yiddish” (in *For Max Weinreich on his Seventieth Birthday: Studies in Jewish languages, literature, and society*, 245–264. The Hague: Mouton) brought a feature into focus that is characteristic not only of Transcarpathian Yiddish, but also of the Haredi idioms descending from it. In the eyes of many representatives of secular Yiddish, it has become a hallmark of so-called Hungarian Yiddish, i.e. Haredi Yiddish derived from Central Yiddish subdialects spoken in Hungary with its 1914 borders. The feature in question is the consistent replacement of nominal dative objects by a prepositional phrase introduced by *far* ‘for, to’. It is tempting to ascribe the rise of the construction to contact-induced influence from Hungarian, which, for historical reasons, occupies an extraordinarily firm position among Jews living in the Transcarpathian area. A major obstacle to such an assumption is, however, that Hungarian itself does not employ prepositions at all. Being an agglutinative language, it expresses grammatical categories of the noun phrase by means of suffixation.

In my paper, I will argue that a constructional borrowing from Hungarian can nevertheless be the source of the feature under scrutiny. To substantiate this assumption, another (more straightforward) example of the Hungarian impact on the prepositional system of Transcarpathian Yiddish – the employment of the preposition *of* (St Yid. *oyf* ‘on/onto’) to indicate movement in the direction of geographical locations – will be discussed as well.

Keywords: nominal dative object, prepositional phrase, Yiddish-Hungarian language contact, Haredi Satmar Yiddish, structural interference

*Corresponding author: Steffen Krogh, School of Communication and Culture: German and Romance Languages, Aarhus University, Jens Chr. Skous Vej 4, DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark, E-mail: gersk@cc.au.dk

1 Dative constructions occurring with verbs and adjectives in Eastern European Yiddish

In Standard Yiddish, a number of verbs govern an obligatory argument object in the dative (cf. Zaretski 1926: 107; Mark 1978: 174–176). Some of these verbs are divalent and some are trivalent, depending on whether (apart from the grammatical subject) they govern only the dative object or, in addition, an object in the accusative. For example, take *dinen* ‘to serve’, *gefeln* ‘to please’, *helpn* ‘to help’ on the one hand and *(iber)gebn* ‘to give’, *layen* ‘to lend’ on the other. Compare the following patterns:

- (1) *der* *poyer* *din-t* *der* *malke*
 DEF.NOM.SG.M peasant serve-PRS.3SG DEF.DAT.SG.F queen
 ‘The peasant serves the queen’
- (2) *der* *poyer* *gefel-t* *der* *malke*
 DEF.NOM.SG.M peasant please-PRS.3SG DEF.DAT.SG.F queen
 ‘The peasant pleases the queen’
- (3) *der* *poyer* *help-t* *der* *malke*
 DEF.NOM.SG.M peasant help-PRS.3SG DEF.DAT.SG.F queen
 ‘The peasant helps the queen’
- (4) *der* *poyer* *gi-t* *iber der* *malke a*
 DEF.NOM.SG.M peasant give-PRS.3SG over DEF.DAT.SG.F queen INDF
matone
 present
 ‘The peasant gives a present to the queen’
- (5) *der* *poyer* *lay-t* *der* *malke a*
 DEF.NOM.SG.M peasant lend-PRS.3SG DEF.DAT.SG.F queen INDF
matone
 present
 ‘The peasant lends a present to the queen’.

Verbs that can govern an optional argument object in the dative (in addition to an obligatory argument object in the accusative), such as *brenge* ‘to bring’, *koyfn* ‘to buy’, *shikn* ‘to send’, *shraybn* ‘to write’, *zogn* ‘to say’, are semantically and syntactically related to the latter subgroup. In Standard Yiddish, this optional

argument object is occasionally replaced by a prepositional phrase, whereas obligatory argument objects in the dative usually maintain their form. When replacement occurs, the preposition used is either *tsu* ‘to’ to indicate direction towards the recipient of the accusative object, or *far* ‘for’ to express notions of benefactivity. Compare the following patterns:

- (6) *zi koyf-t dem khosn a matone*
 she buy-PRS.3SG DEF.DAT.SG.M fiancé INDF present
 ‘She buys her fiancé a present’
 →
zi koyf-t a matone far=n khosn
 she buy-PRS.3SG INDF present for=DEF fiancé
 ‘She buys a present for her fiancé’

- (7) *er shik-t der kale a brivl*
 he send-PRS.3SG DEF.DAT.SG.F fiancée INDF letter
 ‘He sends his fiancée a letter’
 →
er shik-t a brivl tsu der kale
 he send-PRS.3SG INDF letter to DEF fiancée
 ‘He sends a letter to his fiancée’.

In other expressions of benefactivity and in expressions of malefactivity – such as those that include the adjectives *gut* ‘good’, *shlekht* ‘bad’, *gring* ‘easy’, *shver* ‘difficult’, and *(um)meglekh* ‘(im)possible’ and the nouns *bushe* ‘embarrassment’ and *hartsveytik* ‘heartache’ – both the bare dative and the *far*-construction are common; cf. Zaretski (1926: 108), Mark (1957: 33–34), and Mark (1978: 177). Compare the following patterns:

- (8) *dem poyer (far=n poyer) iz dos*
 DEF.OBL.SG.M peasant (for=DEF peasant) be.PRS.3SG DEF.NOM.SG.N
lebn ge-ve-n shver
 life PTCP-be-PTCP difficult
 ‘Life was difficult for the peasant’
- (9) *der malke (far der malke) iz dos lebn*
 DEF.OBL.SG.F queen (for DEF queen) be.PRS.3SG DEF.NOM.SG.N life
ge-ve-n gring
 PTCP-be-PTCP easy
 ‘Life was easy for the queen’.

In Standard Yiddish, the dative case is only morphologically discernible in three form groups:

1. In the 1st and 2nd persons singular and the 3rd person singular feminine and neuter of the personal pronoun: *mir* I.DAT, *dir* you.DAT.SG, *ir* she.DAT, *im* it.DAT;
2. In the singular feminine and neuter of
 - attributive adjectives,
 - the determiners *der* ‘the, this’ (the definite article, demonstrative), *velkher* ‘which, whichever, what, whatever’ (interrogative, indefinite), *yener* ‘that’ (demonstrative), and *yeder* ‘each, every’ (distributive),
 - postnominal possessive pronouns, for example,

in dem hoyz mayn-em
in DEF house my-DAT.SG.N
‘in my house’,
 - the freestanding numeral *eyner* ‘one’,
 - the relativizer *velkher* ‘who, which’;
3. The feminine noun *mame* ‘mother’ and the neuter noun *harts* ‘hear’, to which a dative ending *-n* is occasionally attached.

In all other relevant paradigms, the dative has either merged with other case forms, or no case-marking is employed. The latter is particularly noticeable in the inflection of prenominal possessive pronouns as well as in any instance of plural inflection.

Within prewar Eastern European Yiddish, this pattern applies to Standard Yiddish as well as Southeastern Yiddish. By contrast, Northeastern Yiddish and the Polish branch of Central Yiddish are characterized by various degrees of case syncretism: in Northeastern Yiddish, the dative has merged with the accusative, and in Poland-based Central Yiddish, due to the loss of final *-r* in this subdialect, all feminine singular forms of attributive adjectives and inflectable determiners have merged into one form.

2 The state of affairs in Transcarpathian Yiddish

The situation is somewhat different in Transcarpathian Yiddish. In Transcarpathian Yiddish, noun phrases in the dative have, to a large extent, been supplanted by prepositional phrases introduced by the preposition *far*. Transcarpathian Yiddish is divided into so-called *Unterlendish* and so-called *Oyberlendish*. Unterland and Oyberland (Hungarian *Alföld* and *Felföld* or local Yiddish *Interland* and *Oyberland*) are popular designations of two regions in the kingdom of Hungary with its 1914 borders. The Unterland consists mainly of the lowland in the easternmost part of

(present-day) Hungary (east of Miskolc), the northwestern corner of Romania, East Slovakia, and Carpathian Ruthenia (the westernmost tip of Ukraine). In a wider sense, it also comprises the rest of Transylvania and the mountainous parts of East Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia. This is contrasted with the Oyberland, which incorporates the remaining part of (present-day) Hungary, West Slovakia, and the Burgenland in present-day Austria. Unterland Yiddish is the southernmost subdialect of Central Yiddish, whereas the question of the dialect-geographical status of Oyberland Yiddish remains open (cf. Weinreich 1964 *passim*).

Among Unterland Jews, the Hungarian language occupies a remarkably strong position which has outlasted the partition of pre-world-war-I Hungary confirmed in the Treaty of Trianon in 1920. To this day, Unterland Yiddish-speakers who were born in the interwar years or earlier and who chose not to emigrate are often highly proficient in Hungarian. Likewise, Unterland Jews who emigrated after World War II appear to have maintained an excellent command of Hungarian. The majority of my Romania-based Yiddish-speaking informants remarked that, in their childhood, Yiddish and Hungarian were spoken in equal measure as home languages. However, in the case of my informants, the internalization of the Hungarian language is not matched by affection for and identification with the Gentile Hungarian nation. After the Holocaust, judging from what my informants told me, the Unterland Jewry turned its back on the state of Hungary and its people, and, by contrast, those Unterland Jews who chose to stay in Romania tend to display great loyalty to the Romanian state, including its communist past. It is in this light that the title of this paper, *er hod gegeybm ales far de yi:dn* ‘He gave the Jews everything’, should be seen. These words were spoken by one of my informants, Gerson (Gersh) Schvarcz, and refer to the Romanian dictator Nicolae Ceaușescu, who was sentenced to death at a show trial in 1989 and subsequently executed.

A different picture emerges when we compare the Unterland and the Polish Jewries of the interwar years: Although the Jewish settlement in Poland antedates the Jewish settlement in the former Hungarian territories in Romania by more than half a millennium, the Polish language, on the eve of World War II, did not occupy as firm a position among Polish Jews as the Hungarian language did among Unterland Jews. It is well known that, in the interwar years, a considerable number of Jews in Poland were monolingual in Yiddish; yet in the Unterland of the same period, it would have been rare to encounter a Yiddish-speaker who was not also proficient in Hungarian.

This difference, however, should not distract our attention from the fact that Yiddish in Poland was exposed to language contact with Polish for centuries (as evidenced by the considerable number of Polish loanwords in Yiddish). There has been no comparable long-term contact between Hungarian and Yiddish, and, as a result of this, there are very few Hungarian loanwords in Unterland Yiddish. One

can hold a considerably long conversation with an Unterland Yiddish-speaker without encountering a single lexical item borrowed from Hungarian.

Let us now return to the central theme of this paper, dative marking by means of the preposition *far* in Yiddish. As previously mentioned, noun phrases in the dative in Transcarpathian Yiddish are, to a large extent, supplanted by prepositional phrases introduced by the preposition *far*. Expressions of benefactivity and malefactivity as well as dative objects consisting of nouns or noun phrases are always formed in this manner. Obligatory argument objects in the dative in the form of personal pronouns usually retain their form, although a few counterexamples can be found. Compare the following examples from Unterland Yiddish, which I collected during fieldwork in Romania in 2009, 2011, and 2012¹:

- (10) [In reply to the question *tshaushesku?* ‘Ceaușescu?’]

er iz ge-vey-n a git-er mentsh yo er
 he be.PRS.3SG PTCP-be-PTCP INDF good-NOM.SG.M man yes he
ho-d ge-geyb-m ales far de yi:d-n
 have-PRS.3SG PTCP-give-PTCP everything for DEF Jew-PL
 ‘He was a good man – yes – he gave the Jews everything’
 (Gerson (Gersh) Schvarcz, b. 1913 in Érmihályfalva, then in Hungary,
 since 1920 Romanian as Valea lui Mihai; (1.06))

- (11) *in der za:t transilvanye vos i iber-ge-geyb-m*

in DEF side Transylvania REL be.PRS.3SG cede-PTCP-cede-PTCP
ge-vor-n far [...] ungarn
 PTCP-become-PTCP for Hungary
 ‘In the part of Transylvania that was ceded to Hungary’
 (Eugen (Menakhem-Yehude) Grünfeld, b. 1920 in Zau de Câmpie, c75 km
 southeast of Cluj-Napoca; (1.07))

- (12) *vuz zol-Ø igh zog-n far da:n khushn?*

what shall-PRS.1SG I say-INF for your fiancé
 ‘What shall I say to your fiancé?’
 (Margareta (Malke) Mezei, b. 1920 in Sighetu Marmăției; (0.55))

¹ In this study, Unterland Yiddish was chosen to instantiate Transcarpathian Yiddish. Today, it is almost impossible to find living *in situ* informants of Oyberland Yiddish. An Antwerp-based male interviewee, born in 1927 in Soltvadkert, c130 km south of Budapest, and a native – and still highly proficient – speaker of Oyberland Yiddish, kindly confirmed my findings from Unterland Yiddish.

- (13) *va:l dus ho-d gefel-n far yeyd-n*
 because that have-PRS.3SG please-PTCP for everybody-OBL.SG.M
 ‘Because this [story] used to please everybody’
 (Margareta (Malke) Mezei; (1.18))
- (14) *gh dertsayl-Ø es far al-e yi:d-n*
 I say-PRS.1SG it for all-PL Jew-PL
 ‘I say it to all Jews’
 (Mihai (Avrom-Khayim) Freundlich (b. 1921 in Baia Mare; (0.11))
- (15) *dus ken-Ø ikh nisht moykhl za:-n*
 DEM.ACC.SG.N can-PRS.1SG I not forgive be-INF
nisht far got
 not for God
 ‘For that I cannot forgive God’
 (Mihai (Avrom-Khayim) Freundlich; (0.18))
- (16) *de houz indzer-e ho-t men ge-geyb-m far de*
 DEF house our-INFL have-PRS.3SG IMPERS PTCP-give-PTCP for DEF
doytsh-e
 German-PL
 ‘Our house was given to the Germans’ (the informant’s Yiddish rendition of
 Hungarian
Odaad-t-ák a ház-at a német-ek-nek
 give-PST-DEF.3PL DEF house-ACC DEF German-PL-DAT
 ‘They gave the house to the Germans’
 (Lazar (Moyshe-Leyzer) Freund (b. 1922 in Baia Mare; (0.21))
- (17) *des houez ho-t men yedzd ge-geyb-m far*
 DEF. ACC.SG.N house have-PRS.3SG IMPERS now PTCP-give-PTCP for
de doytsh-n
 DEF German-PL
 ‘The house has now been given to the Germans’ (the informant’s Yiddish
 rendition of the above Hungarian sentence *Odaadták a házat a németeknek*)
 (Eugen (Yankev) Krausz (b. 1923 in the village of Zoreni, near Sânmihaiu
 de Câmpie, c80 km northeast of Cluj-Napoca; (0.26))

- (18) *takhrikh-im ho ge-hays-n de klayd-er vos*
 shroud-PL have.PRS.3SG PTCP-be_called-PTCP DEF garment-PL REL
me ti-t un far a mes
 IMPERS put-PRS.3SG on for INDF corpse
 ‘The garments in which a corpse is dressed are called shrouds’
 (Golda (Goldi) Salamon (b. 1926 in Sighetu Marmatției; (III.1.11))
- (19) *vus feyl-t far deym maydl?*
 what lack-PRS.3SG for DEM girl
 ‘What is the matter with this girl?’
 (Golda (Goldi) Salamon; (II.1.07)).

3 The emergence of the Transcarpathian Yiddish *far*-construction

The origin of the *far*-construction is obscure. Weinreich’s (1964: 257–258) characterization of it as Central Yiddish is, in all likelihood, incorrect or, at best, premature. In interviews conducted by me over the past ten to fifteen years with speakers of Central Yiddish who were born, raised, and educated in Poland before World War II, there were only a couple of – dubious – instances of the construction. Moreover, in example sentences with dative objects that were presented to some informants for them to translate from Polish into Yiddish, the construction did not occur at all. Judging from this evidence, there can be little doubt that the consistent replacement of nominal dative objects by the *far*-construction is by no means a typically Central Yiddish feature. It is confined to the Transcarpathian region.² The occurrence of this construction in both Unterland and Oyberland Yiddish confirms that it must be of considerable age. A collection of songs in Oyberland Yiddish, edited by Taglikht (1929) (cf. *Leksikon fun der nayer yidisher literatur* 1961: 9–10) and based on his recollection of yeshivah students performing them approximately 50 years earlier, contains one example of this construction:

² Against this background, it becomes apparent why Y. Mark, in whose writings Transcarpathian Yiddish is generally left aside, makes no mention of it in his (1957) article. Assouline (2014: 56) also assigns this construction to ‘Hungarian’ Yiddish, though she doesn’t discuss the specifics of its emergence.

- (20) *zug-ts niks oys far kan-em*
 say-IMP.2PL nothing out for nobody-OBL.SG.M
 ‘Don’t tell anybody anything!’
 (Taglikht 1929: 300).

Its firm position within Transcarpathian Yiddish is furthermore evidenced by the fact that it belongs to the relatively few dialect features found in the works of twentieth-century Unterland Yiddish writers. Take, for example:

- (21) *oykh iz neytig az yed-er yud zol-Ø*
 also be.PRS.3SG necessary that every-NOM.SG.M Jew shall-PRS.3SG
geb-in dos seyfer tsi lez-in far zayn-e kind-er
 give-INF DEF religious book to read-INF for his-PL child-PL
 ‘It is also necessary that everybody gives the book to their children for them to read’
 (Malik 1935 [cf. Komoróczy 2011: 250]; (1))
- (22) *ho-t der sotn gi-zog-t far=in eybersht-in*
 have-PRS.3SG DEF Satan PTCP-say-PTCP for=DEF highest-OBL.SG.M
 ‘Then Satan said to the Lord’
 (Malik 1935 [cf. Komoróczy 2011: 250]; (3))
- (23) *vos ve-t er zog-n far di yingl-ekh?*
 what will-PRS.3SG he say-INF for DEF boy-PL
 ‘What will he say to the boys?’
 (Ring 1940 [cf. Komoróczy 2011: 270]; (27))
- (24) *mayn-e kind-er hob-n far der velt a groys likht*
 my-PL child-PL have-PRS.3PL for DEF world INDF great light
ge-geb-n (59)
 PTCP-give-PTCP
 ‘My children gave great light to the world’
 (Ring 1940 [cf. Komoróczy 2011: 270]; (59))
- (25) *far keyn ge-shlog-en-em hunt zol-Ø men keyn*
 for no PTCP-beat-PTCP-OBL.SG.M dog shall-PRS.3SG IMPERS no
shtekn nisht vayz-n
 stick not show-INF
 ‘You should never show a stick to a beaten dog’
 (Tambur 1975 [cf. Kagan 1986: 276]; (40))

- (26) *halevay zayn shvester zol-Ø nor gefel-n far fayvish-n*
 if his sister shall-PRS.3SG only please-INF for Fayvish-OBL
 ‘If only his sister could please Fayvish’
 (Tambur 1975 [cf. Kagan 1986: 276]; (113)).

In view of the fact that the Unterland subdialect of Central Yiddish forms the basis of Haredi Satmar Yiddish, the most widespread variety of Haredi Yiddish worldwide today (cf. Krogh 2014: 63–70), the question of how the *far*-construction originated is of particular interest. In Haredi Satmar Yiddish, this construction is found in spoken as well as in written language. Here are a few typical examples from recent written sources:

- (27) [...] *kedey iber tsu geb-en di bsure toyve far di kind-er*
 in order over to give-INF DEF news good for DEF child-PL
 ‘[...] to give the good news to the children’
 (*Die vokh* 1998; (5,3))
- (28) *far r’sholem iz bay-ge-fal-en a plan*
 for Reb Sholem be.PRS.3SG occur-PTCP-occur-PTCP INDF plan
 ‘A plan came to Reb Sholem’s mind’
 (*Die vokh* 1998; (13,3))
- (29) *ikh hob-Ø afile nisht ge-zog-t far mayn tate-’n*
 I have-PRS.1SG even not PTCP-say-PTCP for my father-OBL.SG
az ikh kum-Ø aher
 that I come-PRS.1SG to this place
 ‘I didn’t even tell my father that I would be coming here’
 (Hirshsohn 1999, vol. 1: 14)
- (30) *dos ho-t shoyn zeyer fardros-n far r’am*
 DEM.NOM.SG.N have-PRS.3SG actually quite annoy-PTCP for Reb Arn
 ‘Reb Arn was actually quite annoyed by that’
 (Hirshsohn 1999, vol. 1: 261)
- (31) *er ho-t ge-vintsh-n far=n gants-n tsiber*
 he have-PRS.3SG PTCP-wish-PTCP for=DEF whole-OBL.SG.M community
 ‘*leshone toyve*’ *vi shtendig*
 Happy New Year as usual
 ‘As usual, he wished the whole community a Happy New Year’
 (*Der idisher gedank* 1999; (38,1))

- (32) *es fel-t zikh oys far=n eroplan 5 biz 6 mayl-Ø*
 it lack-PRS.3SG REFL PFV for=DEF plane 5 to 6 mile-PL
 (8 biz 10 kilometer-Ø) *zikh tsu ken-en oysglaykh-n*
 8 to 10 kilometer-PL REFL to can-INF straighten-INF
mit=n ronvey
 with=DEF runway
 ‘The plane is five or six miles (eight or ten kilometers) short of being able to land on the runway’
 (Der idisher gedank 1999; (66,1))
- (33) *seminovitsh ho-t ge-heys-n far a baamt-n*
 Seminowicz have-PRS.3SG PTCP-order-PTCP for INDF official-OBL.SG.M
tsu fir-n stashek tsu zayn kvartir
 to take-INF Staszek to his quarters
 ‘Seminowicz ordered an official to take Staszek to his quarters’
 (Der blat 2001; (55,2))
- (34) *bush ho-t in zayn rede ge-zog-t, az der*
 Bush have-PRS.3SG in his speech PTCP-say-PTCP that DET
kiote opmakh ve-t shtark shat-n far di
 Kyoto agreement will-PRS.3SG seriously harm-INF for DET
amerikaner ekonomye
 American economy
 ‘In his speech, Bush said that the Kyoto agreement would cause serious damage to the American economy’
 (Der blat 2001; (119,2))
- (35) *di zakh ho-t bikhlal nisht ge-shmek-t far*
 DEF thing have-PRS.3SG at all not PTCP-please-PTCP for
homen-'en
 Haman-OBL
 ‘The whole thing did not please Haman at all’
 (Der id 2008; (B: 31,2))
- (36) *ven men ho-t derlang-t a tey far akhashveyresh*
 when IMPERS have-PRS.3SG serve-PTCP INDF tea for Ahasuerus
 ‘When tea was served to Ahasuerus’
 (Der id 2008; (B: 61, boxout)).

Due to the status of so-called Hungarian Yiddish in the Haredi world, the *far*-construction has spread to other Haredi Yiddish varieties that originate from the Central Yiddish of prewar Poland. In Israel, it can also be observed in the Haredi Yiddish derived from Northeastern Yiddish and has even encroached upon the domain of historical accusative objects (Assouline 2014: 43).

The fact that the *far*-construction in Eastern Europe is confined to the Unter- and the Oyberland suggests that it emerged in a contact situation with Hungarian. However, such a suggestion is potentially undermined by the fact that Hungarian, an agglutinative Non-Indo-European language, itself employs no prepositions (when Yiddish and other Indo-European languages form prepositional phrases, Hungarian adds case endings (suffixes) to the noun or pronoun in question). Therefore, if we wish to claim that the innovation in Transcarpathian Yiddish was induced by contact with Hungarian, we have to assume that it reached Transcarpathian Yiddish indirectly. To visualize its journey, it is first necessary to recollect how dativity is expressed in Yiddish and Hungarian. *Dativity* means the more or less abstract content of constructions involving the dative, that is – aside from dative marking of prepositional complements – dative objects of various kinds as well as other notions of benefactivity and notions of malefactivity. As previously mentioned, Eastern European Yiddish sometimes employs the bare dative and sometimes employs prepositional phrases (mostly with the preposition *far* as the head of the phrase). Hungarian, by contrast, universally adds the dative suffix *-nak/-nek* to the stem of the noun, as shown by the following patterns (cf. the Standard Yiddish equivalents in Section 1 above):

(37) *A paraszt szolgál-Ø a királynő-nek*
 DEF peasant serve-PRS.INDF.3SG DEF queen-DAT
 ‘The peasant serves the queen’

(38) *A paraszt tetsz-ik a királynő-nek*
 DEF peasant please-PRS.INDF.3SG DEF queen-DAT
 ‘The peasant pleases the queen’

(39) *A paraszt segít-Ø a királynő-nek*
 DEF peasant help-PRS.INDF.3SG DEF queen-DAT
 ‘The peasant helps the queen’

(40) *A paraszt ajándék-ot ad-Ø a királynő-nek*
 DEF peasant present-ACC give-PRS.INDF.3SG DEF queen-DAT
 ‘The peasant gives a present to the queen’

- (41) *A paraszt ajándék-ot kölcsönöz-Ø a királynő-nek*
 DEF peasant present-ACC lend-PRS.INDF.3SG DEF queen-DAT
 ‘The peasant lends a present to the queen’
- (42) *A paraszt-nak nehéz élet-e vol-t*
 DEF peasant-DAT difficult life-POSS.3SG be-PST.3SG
 ‘Life was difficult for the peasant’
- (43) *A királynő-nek könnyű élet-e vol-t*
 DEF queen-DAT easy life-POSS.3SG be-PST.3SG
 ‘Life was easy for the queen’.

Hungarian can have influenced Transcarpathian Yiddish along the following lines: First, the bilingual Transcarpathian Yiddish speech community developed an awareness of how the two languages differ by the way dativity is expressed: uniformity in Hungarian versus nonuniformity in Yiddish. Following this, a desire to replicate the principle of uniform dativity rendition arose in Yiddish (for an account of the fundamentals of pattern replication, see Matras and Sakel 2007: esp. 829–832). There were basically two ways to proceed: generalization of the bare dative construction or generalization of the prepositional phrase with *far*. Transcarpathian Yiddish eventually trod the second path by extending the *far*-construction to all relevant nominal constructions. The generalization of the *far*-construction was facilitated by its transparency. Expressing dativity with the *far*-construction precludes confusion with the nominative and the accusative, most notably in phrases containing a noun with a preceding possessive pronoun, such as *mayn bruder* ‘my brother’, *ir man* ‘her husband’, and *zeyere kinder* ‘their children’, which are marked for number, but not for case.³

In this way, the preposition *far* extended its operating range considerably. However, at this stage, it would be premature to appeal to grammaticalization as defined by Heine and Kuteva (2005: 13–21, 80–92), which, in the strict sense of the term, implies the following prerequisites:

³ In Hungarian, benefactivity can also be expressed by a construction involving one of the postpositions *számára*, *részére* – both meaning ‘for’ –, and *javára* ‘for the benefit of’; cf. Kenesei et al. (1998: 208–209). However, such a construction is apparently always an adjunct. It cannot replace a formal dative object, which, in the assumed transfer of a Hungarian construction into Transcarpathian Yiddish, was the point of departure. Hence, it is unlikely that it has been of any significance to this process.

- 1) extension to new contexts;
- 2) various reductional features: desemanticization, decategorialization (loss of morphosyntactic properties), and phonetic reduction.

Contrary to what we can observe in the Israeli Haredi Yiddish of the twenty-first century (see Assouline 2014: 50–58), *far*, at this point, still fulfilled all of its traditional prepositional functions and had not experienced any reduction regarding its phonetic shape. Accordingly, it would also be inappropriate to perceive the replacement of indirect objects in Modern English by prepositional phrases with *to* as a case of grammaticalization, since, parallel to this development, *to* continues to display its full range of prepositional functions and its phonetic substance is not diminished or altered. Similar observations can be made regarding the use of the preposition *vir* ('for') in Afrikaans; cf. Donaldson (1993: 341–344), De Stadler (1996: 266).

There is hardly any reason to assume a relation of cause and effect in Transcarpathian Yiddish between the (seminal state of) case syncretism characteristic of this subdialect (see Krogh 2012: 493–495) and the victory of the *far*-construction, since the latter verifiably antedates the former.

In part, the genesis of the Transcarpathian Yiddish *far*-construction resembles that of prepositional dative marking with *an* 'at, beside' and *in* 'in, into' in Upper German, since, in both idioms, it obviously took as a starting point the fact that the most frequent occurrence of the dative was not as a bare dative noun phrase, but as a complement in a prepositional phrase (for a comprehensive treatment of the Upper German equivalent, see Seiler (2003: esp. 214–253)).

As mentioned above, the *far*-construction prevailed only in noun phrases. Pronominal dative objects were mostly unaffected by this innovation. The reason why the *far*-construction failed to oust bare pronominal dative objects can be that, in Hungarian, personal pronoun dativity is realized differently from nominal dativity, utilizing the formant *-nak/-nek* not as a suffix, but as a stem, to which personal suffixes are attached:

- (44) *nekem* 'for/to me'
neked 'for/to you [singular]'
neki 'for/to him/her/it'
nekünk 'for/to us'
nektek 'for/to you [plural]'
nekik 'for/to them'.

It appears that Weinreich (1964) did not observe any examples of pronominal dative objects having been replaced by the *far*-construction. In my corpus,

however, there are sporadic instances of this in the speech of Golda Salamon, the youngest of my Unterland Yiddish informants (b. 1926):

- (45) *de ba:be ester ho ge-zuk-t far mir*
 DET grandmother Esther have.PRS.3SG PTCP-say-PTCP for me
 ‘Grandma Esther said to me’.
 (I.1.41)

- (46) *ikh hob-Ø mikh iber-ge-geyb-m far zay*
 I have-PRS.1SG myself entrust-PTCP-entrust-PTCP for them
 ‘I have entrusted myself to them’,
 (II.0.01)

and also in the printed texts:

- (47) *mayn meynung iz: dos men darf-Ø dos yo*
 my opinion be.PRS.3SG that IMPERS shall-PRS.3SG that indeed
vayz-en far ir
 show-INF for her
 ‘My opinion is that you should show it to her’
 (*Die vokh* 1998; (12,3–4))

- (48) *far zey ho-t er nisht ge-geb-n zayn heylig-e*
 for them have-PRS.3SG he not PTCP-give-PTCP his holy-INFL
toyre
 Torah
 ‘To them he did not give his holy Torah’
 (*Der idisher gedank* 1999; (82,2))

- (49) *afile nokhdem vos di askon-im hob-n khotsh*
 even after that DEF staff member-PL have-PRS.3PL nevertheless
ge-vol-t onbot-n far zey epes meditsinish-e hilf
 PTCP-want-PTCP offer-INF for them somehow medical-INFL aid
 [...] *hob-n zey dos oykh tsurik-ge-viz-n*
 have-PRS.3PL they that also reject-PTCP-reject-PTCP
 ‘Even after the staff members nevertheless wanted to offer them medical
 aid of some kind, they rejected that as well’
 (*Der blat* 2001; (114,4)).

This is readily explicable in terms of language change. The majority of Weinreich's informants were a generation older than the informants questioned for the present study and thus represent a language stage closer to the initial phase of the innovation. Subsequent linguistic evolution means that, today, pronominal dative objects can – in some cases – also be replaced by the *far*-construction (as illustrated by the above examples). In Israeli Haredi Yiddish, the original constraint regarding the shape of the dative object no longer applies (Assouline 2014: 43). In this second stage of the innovation, pronominal dative objects were reshaped not on the model of Hungarian but on the model of the *far*-construction that had superseded nominal dative objects in the first stage of the innovation.

As mentioned above, Transcarpathian Yiddish contains very few borrowed lexical items from Hungarian (at least according to the language of my informants). This is confirmed by Beranek's (1941: 14) observations regarding the Unterland Yiddish spoken in Carpathian Ruthenia. However, structural borrowing does not always accompany or even presuppose lexical transfer. Even in cases of intense language contact, the import of loanwords from the dominant language can be inhibited by strong social constraints in the speech community of the recipient language, while structural borrowing as a largely subconscious and prolonged process is, to a much lesser extent, subject to such limitations (cf. Matras and Sakel 2007: 842; Matras 2009: 220, 234–235). Other structural traits in Transcarpathian (Unterland) Yiddish that may have been caused by Hungarian-Yiddish language contact include: extended use of secondary stress (cf. Weinreich 1964: 261), retention of long consonants on the morpheme boundary (e.g. *deym maydl* quoted in Section 2 above vis-à-vis otherwise pan-Eastern Yiddish reduction of the long consonant – thus far, this feature has not been subject to scholarly scrutiny), and vacillation regarding nominal gender assignment (cf. Weinreich 1964: 261–262). In Haredi Satmar Yiddish, the first two features seem to have given way to the pan-Yiddish state of affairs. This is, in all likelihood, due to the loss of Hungarian-Yiddish bilingualism in the younger generations of speakers and contact with other Yiddish emigrant dialects.

4 An additional example of Hungarian impact on the prepositional usage of Transcarpathian Yiddish

To substantiate the assumption that the extended use of the *far*-construction in Transcarpathian Yiddish is due to structural transfer from Hungarian, I will now

discuss a more straightforward example of the Hungarian impact on the prepositional system of Transcarpathian Yiddish, namely, the way in which movement towards geographical locations such as towns, cities, and countries is expressed. In Standard Yiddish, the prepositions *keyn* and *in* are used indiscriminately,⁴ take, for example:

- (50) *mir for-n keyn/in yerusholaim*
 we go-PRS.1PL to Jerusalem
 ‘We go to Jerusalem’.

In Hungarian, the majority of Hungarian town and city names as well as the country name *Magyarország* ‘Hungary’ add the sublative case suffix *-ra/-re* (Kenesei et al. 1998: 241). This also applies to names of locations that belonged to Hungary before World War I; for example:

- (51) *A vonat Hust-ra/Kassá-ra/Kolozsvár-ra/Sziget-re*
 DEF train Hust-SUB/Kassa-SUB/Kolozsvár-SUB/Sziget-SUB
megy-Ø
 go-PRS.INDF.3SG
 ‘The train goes to Xyct/Košice/Cluj-Napoca/Sighetu Marmăției’.

The primary function of the Hungarian sublative case, however, is to denote a movement onto the surface of something; compare, for example:

- (52) *A repülő rázuhan-Ø a ház-ra*
 DEF plane crash-PRS.INDF.3SG DEF house-SUB
 ‘The plane crashes onto the house’

- (53) *Emese leül-Ø a szék-re*
 Emese sit_down-PRS.INDF.3SG DEF chair-SUB
 ‘Emese sits down on the chair’.

In Transcarpathian (Unterland) Yiddish, the preposition *of*, which corresponds to Standard Yiddish *oyf* and means ‘on/onto’, is also used to express movement towards geographical locations. This usage, which, in connection with toponyms, is unparalleled in Eastern European Yiddish, is likely to originate from Hungarian. Compared to the Hungarian sublative case, the Transcarpathian

⁴ In cases where the place name governed by the preposition occurs with the definite article, e.g. *di shveys* ‘Switzerland’ and *di fareynikte shtatn* ‘the United States’, only *in* can be employed.

Yiddish preposition *of* has widened its use and can denote movement towards any geographical location, including districts and countries; compare, for example:

- (54) *der tsuk fu:r-t of aushvits/ukrayne*
 DEF train go-PRS.3SG to Auschwitz/Ukraine
 ‘The train goes to Auschwitz/Ukraine’.

In dealing with these names, Hungarian, by contrast, employs the illative case:

- (55) *A vonat Auschwitz-ba/Ukrajná-ba megy-Ø*
 DEF train Auschwitz-ILL/Ukraine-ILL go-PRS.INDF.3SG
 ‘The train goes to Auschwitz/Ukraine’.

For the sake of completeness, it should be mentioned that Unterland Yiddish also displays the above-mentioned pan-Yiddish constructions with the prepositions *kan* and *in* (St Yid. *keyn* and *in*) as well as the German-style *nukh* (cf. German *nach*).

5 Conclusions

Prepositional dative marking with *far* ‘for’ is a feature typical of both Unterland and Oyberland Yiddish spoken in Hungary with its 1914 borders. Since, in Eastern Europe, there is no unambiguous attestation of this trait outside *Hungaria Maior*, it seems reasonable to trace its origin back to the interplay between Yiddish and coterritorial Hungarian in *Hungaria Maior* in the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. Although Yiddish and Hungarian are genetically barely related and structurally very different – Yiddish is Indo-European and Hungarian is Uralic –, the considerable degree of bilingualism among Transcarpathian Jews apparently placed the two languages in a contact situation significant enough for structural transfer.

Throughout Eastern European Yiddish, prepositional phrases with *far* were frequently used as an alternative to bare dative inflection, especially in optional argument objects and instances of non-valency-bound dativity. In the present study, it is argued that Transcarpathian Yiddish went a step further by importing the Hungarian structural principle of rendering dativity uniformly – not by means of inflection as in Hungarian (or by borrowing Hungarian endings), but by extending the *far*-construction to obligatory argument objects. Pronominal dative objects, however, mostly retained their shape due to the fact that, in this case, Hungarian displayed a different pattern. The assumption that it was structural

influence from Hungarian that made the pan-Yiddish dative marking strategy by means of the preposition *far* extend its operating range in Transcarpathian Yiddish is substantiated by another instance of possible structural impact from Hungarian on the prepositional usage of Transcarpathian Yiddish: the employment of the preposition *of* (St Yid. *oyf* ‘on/onto’) to indicate movement in the direction of geographical locations. This innovation, which, within Eastern Yiddish, is not attested outside the Transcarpathian area, is explicable in terms of influence from the Hungarian sublative case.

In the decades after the Holocaust, the *far*-construction became a hallmark of the Haredi idioms that originate from Transcarpathian Yiddish and whose speech communities are found outside Eastern Europe, particularly in the USA and Israel. In Israeli Haredi Yiddish, the *far*-construction has assumed an importance which goes far beyond its function as a prepositional dative marker in prewar Transcarpathian Yiddish.

Acknowledgements: I am greatly indebted to Dalit Assouline, Katalin Deme, Paul Glasser, Yitskhok Niborski, Chaya Nove, Kathrine Thisted Petersen, Joost Robbe, and two anonymous Linguistics reviewers for valuable comments and suggestions. Lazar (Moyshe-Leyzer) Freund, Mihai (Avrom-Khayim) Freundlich, Eugen (Menakhem-Yehude) Grünfeld, Eugen (Yankev) Krausz, Margareta (Malke) Mezei, Golda (Goldi) Salamon, and Gerson (Gershon) Schvarcz deserve special thanks for generously sharing their native Unterland Yiddish with me.

Appendix: Yiddish Data Sources

Texts in Oyberland Yiddish

Taglikht, Yisroel-Khayim. 1929. *Lider fun Ungern un de Slovakay* [Yiddish songs in Hungary and Slovakia]. *Shriftn fun yidishn visnshaftlekhn institut. Filologishe shriftn* [Publications of the Yiddish Scientific Institute. Studies in Philology] 3. 297–312.

Texts in Unterland Yiddish

Malik, Khayim Yitskhok. 1935. *Seyfer nakhles Yankev* [The book of Jacob’s heritage]. Satumare: Meyer Lib Hirsh.

Ring, Yekhezkl. 1940. *Oyfn himl a yarid. Dertseylung* [Tumult in Heaven. Short story]. Siget: Centrala.

Tambur, Volf. 1975. *Maramoreshaner. Dertseylungen* [Maramureş Jews. Short stories]. Bukaresht: Kriteryon.

Oral interviews in Unterland Yiddish conducted by this author

1. Lazar (Moyshe-Leyzer) Freund, interview conducted on May 11, 2011 in Oradea.
2. Mihai (Avrom-Khayim) Freundlich, interview conducted on May 13, 2011 in Oradea.
3. Eugen (Menakhem-Yehude) Grünfeld, interview conducted on May 15, 2011 in Cluj-Napoca.
4. Eugen (Yankev) Krausz, interview conducted on May 15, 2011 in Cluj-Napoca.
5. Margareta (Malke) Mezei, interview conducted on May 11, 2011 in Oradea.
6. Golda (Goldi) Salamon, interviews (quoted as I-III) conducted on July 20, 2009 and on 23 and May 24, 2012 in Sighetu Marmăției.
7. Gerson (Gershn) Schvarcz, interview conducted on May 12, 2011 in Oradea.

Texts in Haredi Satmar Yiddish

Newspapers

Die vokh [The week]. July 30, 1998.

Der blat. Tsaytskrift fun alveltlikhn ortodoksishn idntum [The paper. Magazine for orthodox Jewry worldwide]. June 15, 2001.

Der id. Organ fun umophengigen ortodoksishen identum in Amerike [The Jew. Organ of independent orthodox Jewry in America]. March 21, 2008. Sections A–B. Supplement ‘Der shiker’er id’ [The drunk Jew].

Journal

Der idisher gedank [The Jewish thought] 2. October 18, 1999.

Fiction

Hirshsohn, Yankev Menakhem. 1999. *Der ring in gerangl. A shpanende dertseylung mit file shturmische momentn un dramatishe shilderungen mit lebedige filmen fun der ofene ‘siate deshmaye’ in di nisht vayte farganghayt* [sic] ... [The ring in conflict. An exciting story with many tempestuous moments and dramatic accounts with lively films of the open ‘help from Heaven’ in the recent past ...], vols 1–2. Brooklyn, NY: Or yisroel pablisning.

References

- Assouline, Dalit. 2014. Language change in a bilingual community: The preposition *far* in Israeli Haredi Yiddish. In Marion Aptrout & Björn Hansen (eds.), *Yiddish language structures*, 39–61. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Beranek, Franz J. 1941. *Die jiddische Mundart Nordostungarns*. Brünn & Leipzig: Rohrer.

- De Stadler, Leon G. 1996. The indirect object in Afrikaans. In William van Belle & Willy van Langendonck (eds.), *The dative, vol. 1: Descriptive studies*, 251–288. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Donaldson, Bruce C. 1993. *A grammar of Afrikaans*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2005. *Language contact and grammatical change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kagan, Berl. 1986. *Leksikon fun yidish-shraybers* [Lexicon of Yiddish-writers]. New York: Raye Ilman-Kagan.
- Kenesei, István, Robert M. Vago & Anna Fenyesi. 1998. *Hungarian*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Komoróczy, Szonja Ráhel. 2011. *Yiddish printing in Hungary: An annotated bibliography*. Budapest: Center for Jewish Studies at the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
- Krogh, Steffen. 2012. How Satmarish is Haredi Satmar Yiddish? In Marion Aptroot, Efrat Gal-Ed, Roland Gruschka & Simon Neuberger (eds.), *ידישע שטודיעס הײַנט. Jiddistik heute. Yiddish studies today*, 483–506. Düsseldorf: Düsseldorf University Press.
- Krogh, Steffen. 2014. The foundations of written Yiddish among Haredi Satmar Jews. In Marion Aptroot & Björn Hansen (eds.), *Yiddish language structures*, 63–103. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Leksikon fun der nayer yidisher literatur* [Bibliographical dictionary of modern Yiddish literature], vol. 4. 1961. New York: Alveltlekher yidisher kultur-kongres.
- Mark, Yudl. 1957. Di prepozitsye far [The preposition far]. *Yidishe Shprakh* [Yiddish language]. 17. 33–45.
- Mark, Yudl. 1978. *Gramatik fun der yidisher klal-shprakh* [A Grammar of Standard Yiddish]. New York: Alveltlekher yidisher kultur-kongres.
- Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel. 2007. Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in Language* 31. 829–865.
- Seiler, Guido. 2003. *Präpositionale Dativmarkierung im Oberdeutschen*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1964. Western traits in Transcarpathian Yiddish. In *For Max Weinreich on his seventieth birthday: Studies in Jewish languages, literature, and society*, 245–264. The Hague: Mouton.
- Zaretski, A[yzik]. 1926. *Praktishe yidische gramatik: Far lerers un studentn* [Practical Yiddish grammar: For teachers and students]. Moscow: Shul un bukh.