

GRAMMATICALIZATION OF *ALEYN* IN YIDDISH

DEBRA HALPERIN BIASCA

By drawing upon sentences elicited from native Yiddish speakers and excerpts from Yiddish texts, I examine functions performed by *aleyn* ('alone') and relate them directly to semantic properties of its pre-grammaticalized components, 'all' + 'one'. Relying upon the cognitive processes of metaphor and metonymy, in accordance with Hopper & Traugott 1993 and others I explain how *aleyn* has come to perform a contrastive function, in conjunction with Grice's (1975) quantity-based inference. Comparing the Yiddish facts to how such contrasts are drawn in Russian, Hebrew and German, I conclude that these languages did not contribute grammaticalization of *aleyn* in Yiddish.

INTRODUCTION

1. This paper explores the development of one type of grammatical marking on contrastive Noun Phrases in Modern Yiddish. In examining this construction, it will be instructive to compare it to German, Russian and Hebrew, languages which have had significant influence on Yiddish. It is particularly informative to note similarities or differences between Yiddish and her linguistic 'associates' in a grammatical study involving the Yiddish language. This paper will assume that we can inform ourselves about the origins of linguistic forms and the relationship of form to both function and meaning by reconstructing parts of semantic extensions from synchronic polysemy. It will also assume that this goal can be aided by comparison across related languages, in this instance, languages which have been in contact and which may also be related genetically.

Yiddish *aleyn* is the subject of this study.¹ It is cognate with English "alone". U. Weinreich 1977 defines *aleyn* as 'alone' and includes brief references to the more grammaticalized usages of *aleyn* translated in English by '(one)self' and 'for/by oneself':²

- (1) *Ikh aleyn bin nit mask'm, ober ...*
 I CONTR am NEG in-agreement but
 'I myself don't agree, but ... [you may have your own opinion about it]'
- (2) *Ikh hob es aleyn geton.*
 I AUX it CONTR done
 'I did it myself.'

It also means 'sheer, absolute':

- (3) *di rikhtikayt aleyn 'the absolute truth'*
 DET correctness CONTR

But 3 presupposes a contrasting proposition, challenging the truth of the stated proposition, to which Weinreich does not allude:

- (4) *Dos vos ikh zog oykh iz der ernster ernst aleyn,*
 DEM REL I say also be DET honest truth CONTR
palabrah de honor!
 word of honor

'That which I am saying is nothing but the honest truth, word of honor!' (MA 14)

Here the speaker's veracity was challenged in the preceding discourse, whether verbally or non-verbally, by the other actors in the drama from which this data was drawn.

¹ Standard Yiddish Institute for Jewish Research (YIVO) transcription is used for all Yiddish text. The correspondences to IPA are:

	YIVO	IPA
Consonants	zh	ʒ
	dzh	dʒ
	ch	č
	sh	š
	kh	x
Vowels	a	a
	ay	ai
	e	e
	ey	ei
	i	i

² In ex. 1, CONTR represents the contrastive function.

I will propose a historical explanation for the semantic bundle which encompasses the notion conveyed by *aleyn* in isolation, and I will offer a semantic explanation of why it has become grammaticalized as a contrastive marker in Yiddish and German. I will examine the contexts in which *aleyn* has become grammaticalized in Yiddish, and I will compare and contrast these with Russian and German. I will briefly note the way that contrastive function is marked in Hebrew, and will compare this to Yiddish as well. From this information, I will attempt to determine what influences on Yiddish have led to grammaticalization of *aleyn* in all of its contrastive contexts.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. YIDDISH was the language spoken by Ashkenazic Jews in Europe. It is basically Germanic, influenced considerably (perhaps 10–15%) in lexicon and somewhat less in syntax by Biblical Hebrew, beyond its use of the Hebrew alphabet. The oldest Yiddish written record dates back to 1272. It consisted of early Germanic language written on a prayer book in Hebrew characters. As evidence of Yiddish prior to that time, single Yiddish words including Yiddish personal names, have been found scattered over Hebrew manuscripts of Rashi (ca. 1100; M. Weinreich 1973).

Just prior to the Holocaust, there were over ten million Yiddish speakers in Eastern Europe. For some women, this was their only language, although many women and most men were bilingual in the language spoken where these people lived. Today, estimates are that there are some 300,000 native Yiddish speakers in the world, although the number of new speakers is dwindling (Fishman 1985).

Yiddish literature is evidenced from the 16th and 17th Centuries, with much of it being written from around 1850–1940. Today, Yiddish literature is still being produced in the US, Israel, Canada, South America and the former Soviet Union, and perhaps elsewhere. Table 1 places the development of Yiddish into the context of the development of German and English, two other Germanic languages.

750–1100→ OHG	1100–1500→ MHG	1500–1650→ Early NHG	1650–pres→ NHG
?–1100→ OE	1100–1500→ ME	1500–pres→ PDE	→ PDE
?–1250→ OY	1250–1750→ MY	1750–pres→ Modern Y	→ Modern Y
Early Period	Middle Period	Early Modern/Modern	Modern

TABLE 1. Chronology of development of relevant Germanic languages.

2.2. HISTORY OF THE CONTRASTIVE MARKER: ALL + ONE = ALONE. Yiddish *aleyn* derives from Middle High German (MHG) *all + ein*. This form comes from the uninflected adjective meaning 'all' and the uninflected (adjectival) cardinal number one. The meaning for this compound was 'alone, solitary, individual' (Voyles 1992, Cook 1903, Wuge 1884). This parallels the development of 'alone' in Middle English (ME) from Old English (OE) 'all' plus 'one' Whitney 1877. Diphthong correspondences between Yiddish and German (*aleyn* vs *alleine*) help fix the timing of these changes historically. Because of this timing and the independent development in two branches of the Germanic language family of the same compound, it is not possible to track the ultimate roots of *aleyn*. Either it came into Middle Yiddish from MHG as a compound, or it was compounded in Middle Yiddish just as it was in MHG and ME. Since the same compounding occurred in totally unrelated Arabic, neither possibility can be ruled out.³

It is interesting to note that *aleyn* underwent further grammaticalization in Yiddish, being used in the following compounds (U. Weinreich 1977), among perhaps others:

- self-service: *aleyn-badinung*
- self-government: *aleyn-farvaltung*
- self-sufficiency: *aleyn-oyskum*
- suicide: *aleyn-mord* (self-murder)
- privacy: *aleynkayt* (alone-ness)

³ Personal communication, Jassem Al-Fahid.

GRAMMATICALIZATION

3. I will take grammaticalization to mean the process by which a lexical unit assumes a grammatical function, or by which a grammatical unit assumes a more grammatical function (Heine, Claudi & Hünnemeyer 1991) and will be concerned mainly with the former in this paper. I will not limit the term 'grammaticalization' to those instances in which the item has lost all lexical meaning but will, rather, examine an item which retains its lexical meaning in some contexts and which serves a more grammatical/less lexical function in others.

This loss of meaning, or bleaching, has been described as a process by which signs lose their (semantic) integrity (Lehmann 1985) such as occurs when the verb *do* becomes a dummy auxiliary in English and loses its lexical meaning related to activity (Traugott 1988). Other common examples of grammaticalization processes which transform purely lexical items into grammatical markers include the cross-linguistically rather common transformation of body parts into locatives, such as in *head of the bed* or *head of the class*. In the latter examples, the body part reference is to the place where the body part would physically lie and to the uppermost qualitative place in terms of overall class performance, respectively. In both cases, the body part is used metaphorically to refer to a location. Location in the first example is a physical space; in the second, it is a more abstract relationship.

As Traugott notes, grammaticalization usually involves specification achieved through infencing characterized by metaphor and metonymy. Metaphor is taken to be the use of a symbol from a more concrete source domain to represent one in a more abstract target domain. Metonymic processes, while related to metaphor, it is more aptly described as semantic transfer through contiguity, such as referencing the whole by the name for a part, as in use of *the Crown* to refer to the person who officially wears it. When metonymy is involved, Traugott claims that the grammaticalization often represents a shift from concrete or conventional meaning to 'meanings situated in the [speaker's] subjective belief-state or attitude toward the situation, including the linguistic one (1988:87). As we will see, Yiddish *aleyn* offers support for this proposition.

CONTRASTIVE FUNCTION

4.1. IN GENERAL. Frajzyngier & Katriel 1991 provide the term 'propositional relator' for words which serve to relate two propositions, one of which is presupposed while the other is overtly expressed in an utterance. Kay 1990 refers to this as a 'scopal operator', and states that it codes a relationship between two propositions, only one of which is expressed by the clause or sentence, which is thus within the operator's 'scope' (Michaelis 1994). This clause may be referred to as the 'text proposition', while the unexpressed material is referred to as the 'context proposition' since it is within the mutual knowledge of speaker and hearer and thus within the context. The context proposition may be found either within the discourse or outside it.

In the case of *aleyn*, the propositional relator focuses on the grammatical argument which is contrary to an expectation set up in a stated (within the discourse) or unstated (otherwise within the mutual knowledge base of speaker and hearer) proposition. Thus, in 5a, *even* is a propositional relator:

(5a) Even I didn't care for the food at Goldini's.

The proposition 'I didn't care for the food at Goldini's' is within its scope. The scoped proposition contrasts with the unstated context proposition 'I am easy to please with respect to food.' Because of the semantic material provided by *even*, the two propositions are related in a contrastive or contrary-to-expectation fashion. A bit more will be said about the semantic content of *even* in 4.2, below, in order to describe Yiddish *aleyn* more precisely.

The notion of contrastive function has also been discussed in Halliday (1967:206), and Lambrecht (1994:286-91). Halliday defines 'contrastive' as "contrary to some predicted or stated alternative". Givón also notes that presuppositional complexity is a dimension in the overall phenomenon of discourse markedness and suggests (1979:87-8): 'Ultimately, ... one may define discourse markedness as the degree to which a discourse phenomenon constitutes a *surprise*, a break from the communicative norm'.

Lambrecht (1994:286) notes how intonational marking, specifically sentence accent, may be used to perform the contrastive function in English:

(5b) Pat said she was called.

Here the intonational pattern is used to contrast she (coreferential with the subject Pat here) with another person who must have been previously suggested in the discourse as the receiver of the call. The contrasted argument is contrary to that expectation, as marked by the stressed intonation for that item, represented here by all capital letters.

Included in this definition of contrast would be the fact that it is based upon presupposition or inference from a particular semantic frame, a given set of knowledge about the world, or the discourse context (Lambrecht 1994:287). It is thus the suggestion of contrariness to a prediction emanating from one of these sources. So, in 6, the reflexive pronoun is used to encode the contrast: normally, one would not be expected to lift a car without assistance. But in 7, *all* marks 'by myself' as further up the scale of contrariness-to-prediction than the bare reflexive pronoun. In this sense, the notion of contrast is not discrete but rather relates to a continuum.

- (6) I lifted the car myself.
 (7) I lifted the car all by myself.

Placement of the contrast functor within the clause affects an element within that clause which is contrasted, or it may affect the entire clause. The affected structure may be called the *focus* of the contrast (Kay 1990). The focus may be clausal or some smaller element within the clause. In 8, we understand, by use of the contrastive marker *only* that there was, perhaps, reason expressed within the discourse context to expect the speaker to have eaten more than half. The focus of the contrast would be *half of it* in this instance.

- (8) I only ate half of it.

In 9, the focus is 'I':

- (9) I ate it all myself.

Here, the proposition to which 9 is contrasted is *many people ate it*. In 10, the focus is the clausal *you may wish to pay that much*, and the contrast marker is the adversative conjunction *but*:

- (10) You may wish to pay that much, but I don't.

4.2. TYPES OF CONTRAST: SCALARITY VS. NON-SCALARITY. The two propositions involved in a contrastive pair may be related in a scalar or non-scalar fashion (Kay 1990). In the scalar model, the clause containing the operator (in this case) *aleyn* codes a proposition which is located at a more extreme point on a pragmatic scale than the presupposed proposition, so that the surface clause necessarily entails the presupposed clause (Kay 1990, Michaelis 1994). Consider 5a, restated here for ease of reference:

- (5a) Even I didn't care for the food at Goldini's.

The operator *even* follows a scalar model, along which scale people are rated according to how finicky they are about food, with the speaker in 5a being low on the scale. As required by Kay, the text proposition entails the context proposition. That is, if 'I' didn't care for the food, other people (further up the scale) didn't like it either. The text proposition is thus stronger or more informative than the context proposition, following Grice 1975. An example from Yiddish is:

- (11) *ikh aleyn veys nit vos mir iz.*
 I CONTR know NEG what 1SG.DAT BE
 'Even I don't know what's going on with me.' (MA 21)

Here the presupposed proposition is *one knows oneself better than anyone else knows oneself*. *Aleyn* focuses on the subject in this example, and the model is scalar because the subject in the stated clause represents the extreme point on the scale of 'who should know what is wrong with a particular person', i.e. the person him/herself. In 12, however, the model is non-scalar:

- (12) *ikh aleyn vil nit geyn.*
 I CONTR want NEG go
 'I myself don't want to go.' [though others do or I might be expected to]

Here the unstated proposition to which the operator relates the surface sentence is 'Other people want to go.' There is no presupposition involved which places 'I' or 'other people' at any particular point on the scale of those who would be expected to 'want to go.' This example parallels its English translation in this regard.

Ex. 12 contrasts with the following non-grammaticalized form:

- (13) *ikh vil nit geyn aleyn.*
 I want NEG go alone
 'I don't want to go alone.'

Here 12-13 are distinguished by word order. *Aleyn* does not appear to perform its contrastive function in post-verbal position.

Thus *aleyn* is a propositional relator which marks the unexpected singleton nature of a participant in the proposition, in accordance with a presupposition, whether pragmatically scalar or nonscalar, provided by another proposition. That is, *aleyn* occurs in a variety of contexts in which we are surprised that the participant is the moving force behind the event referred to without the aid of others/another or serves in some other grammatical role unexpectedly or without other participants, i.e., is the sole experiencer--or any other thematic role--expressed in the utterance.

4.3. ALEYN AS METONYMICALLY RELATED TO CONTRASTIVE FUNCTION. Hopper & Traugott (1993:87) point out how grammaticalization is based in large part upon metaphoric or metonymic connections between form and function:

'Being a widespread process, broad cross-domain metaphorical analogizing is one of the contexts within which grammaticalization operates, but many actual instances of grammaticalization show that the more local, syntagmatic and structure changing process of metonymy predominates in the early stages.'

For *aleyn*, this means that the meaning of its pieces may be separated out and analyzed. When this is done, it points to a logical connection between the literal meaning of the word and its grammaticalized use as marking 'unexpected participant or singleness.' The semantic connection between *one* quantified by *all* in English, and unexpected singleness, though perhaps not obvious to speakers, is undeniable.⁴

In the world within which communication functions, people ultimately cannot function without others. Normally, they do not function without others. *Alone* thus carries along with its meaning of 'singleness' that this singleness is in contrast to an expected and predicted non-singleness. In both Yiddish and English, the word is logically and directly related to the sum of its parts: 'all' and 'one.' For *aleyn*, these are *alle*, the same quantifier as noted for English, and *eyn*, the numeral one. Even in segregating its parts, we see the notion of contrast, similar to the notion that 'all there is—is one.' Thus, the mapping of form to function is hardly arbitrary. We simply do not expect singleness as the norm. It is the marked situation. Thus, the metonymic connection between the ordinary lexical meaning of 'alone' and the grammatical function of contrast with presupposed information.

In fact, the notion of being alone has itself been expressed using the number 'one' or its derivations, focusing upon one of the members of the *aleyn* compound—the singleness aspect; and in Yiddish, expression of a lonely person can also be achieved by the combination of 'one' and 'alone':

- (14) *Geyt er a bisl arum eyner*
go-3SG he INDEF little around/in one.MASC.SG
aleyn un af opgelegene un farvaksene vegn.
CONTR PARTICLE PREP remote CONJ overgrown paths
'He walked alone along remote and overgrown trails.'

or by the derivative of the numeral itself:

- (15) *eyn-zam* 'lonely'
one-ADJ⁵

This may provide support for the grammaticalization principle which provides that, once a lexical item has been grammaticalized (whether fully or partially may be controversial), its literal meaning becomes lost or 'bleached' (Heine et al. 1991:40). If this is so, it makes sense that other lexemes may be called in to fulfill or bolster the 'lost' lexical role. Another possibility is that, in the reinforced *eyner aleyn*, 'one' is itself marking contrast in addition to the contrastive role played by *aleyn* and for the same reasons.

Similarly in Russian, the numeral 'one' can be used to define the notion 'alone':

- (16) *Mne ne nravitsja byt' odin noč'ju.*
to-me NEG please be one at.night
'I don't like to be alone at night'
- (17) *Požiloy mužčina sidel v polnom odinočestve v*
old man sat PREP complete solitude PREP
parke, gluboko pogržennyj v svoi musli.
park deeply immersed in his thoughts
'An old man sat all alone in the park, deeply immersed in thought.'

In English, *only* another contrastive functor, derives from *one*. Thus, it is obvious that the numeral one may take on more than one grammatical function through grammaticalization (Frajzyngier & Katriel 1991). While the nature of all of these functions is not the focus of this study, it would be interesting, however, in the future, to examine the grammaticalization of derivatives from the numeral 'one' cross-linguistically, aside from the contrastive function examined here. The point here is that it is understandable how a language would utilize the lexeme expressing 'alone' in order to grammaticalize a contrastive function because the meaning of 'alone' itself expresses a

⁴ Because of the phonological changes which occurred to the number one—i.e. glide insertion, which occurred after the formation of 'all' + 'one' in English into *alone*, speakers do not identify *alone* with its former constituents. Likewise, although perhaps because of the phonological weakening which has occurred in *aleine*, the German speaker did not immediately connect with the notion that this was previously a compound of two common German words. Curiously, an Arabic speaker argued strenuously that *kol-wakhi'd* which means 'alone' and is formed from *kol* 'all' and *wakhi'd* 'one' had nothing to do with 'all' + 'one' in that language. Even when he wrote the words down, and they clearly had very similar orthographic images, he was reluctant to connect the compound with its constituents. This seems to be testimony to the concept of semantic bleaching which occurs as a result of the grammaticalization process.

⁵ German *-sam*, Yiddish *-zam*, English *-some* reflect a very old Germanic suffix for forming adjectives; the similarity to Russian *sam* is accidental.

pragmatically contrastive notion. Indeed, the two morphemes which have combined to produce *aleyn* are contradictory to each other. It is no accident that they have come to mark contradiction with presupposed or previously stated information.

4.4. REFLEXIVES. Kemmer (1992:147) postulates a prototype analysis of grammatical marking patterns as a means of facilitating the explanation of diachronic changes in language:

'It is clear that certain grammatical categories appear again and again across languages with distinctive marking: dative case, for example, or imperfective aspect. Grammatical categories are the linguistic categories most likely to display universal aspects of language ... For this reason, the cross-linguistic marking patterns associated with grammatical categories can be taken as empirical evidence for the discovery of categories which have universal cognitive salience.'

Kemmer thus notes that those grammatical concepts which are, cross-linguistically most likely to be marked in a particular manner, be it by a grammatical marker or a particular construction, are universal to the extent that languages show a widespread tendency to code them.

The prototypical two-participant situation type (Talmy 1972) describes contexts in which two participants are involved in an asymmetrical relation in which one participant volitionally acts upon the other and where the latter is completely affected by the former. Kemmer refers to these participants as the 'Initiator' and 'Endpoint,' to highlight the prototypical situation in which the event described by the proposition involves transfer of energy from the Initiator to the Endpoint. The prototypically intransitive situation involves one participant who undergoes some action. Reflexives express a point somewhere between these two notions, in which the Initiator and Endpoint are the same but there is still a transfer of energy expressed by the proposition.

Reflexives might thus be described as a marked category; and cross-linguistically, propositions in which Initiator and Endpoint are coreferential contain an additional marker, as in English:

(18) I nicked myself with the razor this morning.

Cross-linguistically, languages differ in the types of constructions they mark in this fashion, although there is a fairly small set of proposition types which are marked for this quality, including, in addition to actions normally not performed with coreferential Initiator and Endpoint, such as causing harm to oneself in various ways in addition to that exemplified in 18, those which prototypically involve coreferential arguments, as shown in the examples from French, below. These are often referred to as 'middle' constructions and include verbs which describe grooming (19), change in body position (20), cognition (21) and reciprocal events (22):

(19) Je me suis brossé les dents.
I REFL AUX brushed DET teeth
'I brushed my teeth'

(20) Je me suis levé tôt ce matin.
I REFL AUX got.up early DEM morning
'I got up early this morning'

(21) Je me demande si ...
I 1SG.REFL ask if
'I wonder if ...'

(22) Nous nous sommes rencontrés par hasard.
we 1PL.RECIP AUX met PREP chance
'We met each other by chance.'

Since middle constructions are not canonical reflexives, it is not surprising that some languages (including English) do not mark them with a reflexive marker.

The point of this departure concerning reflexives is that this category can be considered a marked one. Although the exact situation types which are marked in a particular language can vary, it is not surprising that a reflexive marker may become grammaticalized to mark contrast with presupposition. When, however, the fact that the Initiator and Endpoint are contrary to the normal expectation, given the world we live in or the discourse context, these already marked constructions may utilize an additional marker to note the second type of contrast or markedness, which is contravention of expectation. For this reason, contrastive-reflexive utterances are addressed in the data.

YIDDISH DATA

5. The data for this study were obtained from native Yiddish, German, Hebrew and Russian speakers and from Modern Yiddish and Russian texts. There were 11 subjects. Seven were native Yiddish speakers, all of whom are also fluent English speakers. There were two speakers of German and one speaker each of Hebrew and Russian were consulted. All subjects also spoke English although the Russian speaker was less fluent in English than any of the

others. Yiddish speakers were interviewed and also filled out or responded orally to a questionnaire designed to elicit data related to usage of *aleyn* and also unrelated to the concepts it encodes. Yiddish speaker data from the questionnaire was not used unless it was consistent across at least 3 of the speakers. Exx. 23–24 show the ungrammaticalized form of *aleyn*.

- (23) *Nemen ale zikh tsegeyn*
 take all REFLEXV disperse
un zey lozn im aleyn.
 CONJ 3PL.SUBJ leave 3SG.OBJ CONTR
 'Everyone up and walks away; and he is left alone.' (MLH 10)
- (24) *Hak dem shiteyn un blayb aleyn.*
 beat DET stone CONJ remain CONTR
 'Beat the stone and remain alone.' (MLH 24)

6.1.2. UNEXPECTED SOLITARINESS OF ARGUMENT. Here the text proposition contrasts with the context proposition that the action is not prototypically accomplished solely by the focussed participant. While this category is similar to other non-reflexive contrastive constructions (cf. §6.1.3) it merits separate mention because it is perhaps at the lower end of the grammaticalization continuum for *aleyn*. In some of the examples, it is not totally clear whether the usage is grammaticalized or literal. In the cases in which it is not totally clear, these may be said to be at the lower end of the continuum from lexical item to grammaticalized functor:

- (25) *Du host es aleyn geton?*
 you AUX this CONTR done
 'You did it all by yourself.' (6-1)⁶
- (26) *S'iz nit ken filosofye. Ikh hob es in mir*
 it is NEG QUAN philosophy 1SG AUX it PREP 1SG.DAT
aleyn oysgefinen.
 CONTR figure out
 'This is no philosophy. I figured it out all by myself.' (MA 29)
- (27) *Zet men im nisht aroys; es dakht zikh,*
 see PASSV 3SG.OBJ NEG PARTICLE it seem REFLX
az der kastn geyt aleyn af tsvey fis.
 COMP DET box go CONTR PREP two feet
 'When he walked through the streets, bent double under a case of goods, he was not visible. It seemed as if the case were walking all by itself on two legs.' (SL, 'An idyllic home', 147)
- (28) *Hot er dermit epes guts geton,*
 AUX he with-that something good do.PAST
vet er aleyn gedenken.
 FUT he CONTR remember
 '[He wouldn't even remind God of the incident.] If he, [Shmeril], had done the proper thing, God would remember it on his own.' (SL, 'The treasure', 143)

In 29, ambiguity between ungrammaticalized *alone* unaccompanied, by himself, without his expected accompaniment' because he is a child, and 'Hananya himself' contrast, whose focus is the object Hananya, makes this an especially interesting example of the grammaticalization continuum for *aleyn*:

- (29) *Dertseyt men im, vos di muter tut,⁷ heyst er,*
 told PASSV to.him what DET mother did, commanded he
men zol aroifshikn Hananya aleyn.
 PASSIVE AUX.3SG send.along Hananya CONTR

⁶ Of the two numbers given after examples such as this, the first indicates the number of subjects who responded with a construction using *aleyn*; the second indicates the number of subjects whose constructions did not include *aleyn*.

In cases where the use of *aleyn* is not consistent across all subjects, the results are somewhat problematic. Certainly a wider sample should be examined in order to see if the 'majority' results are found to be more robust. I suggest that the inconsistency may be attributed, at least in part, to the fact that none of these speakers are using Yiddish on a daily basis, and interference from English is a contributing factor.

⁷ The notion of consequence here is conveyed by inverted word order.

'Told of what the mother had done, he asked that Hananya himself?/alone? be called (i.e. that his mother be left behind).' (SL, 'Self-sacrifice', 55)

Examples like 29 show how a metonymic process participates in grammaticalization. At the lower end of the continuum, we find a fuzzy distinction between grammaticalized and ungrammaticalized forms.

6.1.3. REFLEXIVES. Yiddish marks reflexivity by an uninflected *zikh*:

- (30) *ikh hob zikh gezen in shpigl.*
I AUX REFL seen PREP mirror
'I saw myself in the mirror.'

Here the reflexive marking is used since Initiator and Endpoint are the same, but no contrastive marker appears since seeing ourselves in a mirror is a canonically reflexive activity. On the other hand, in 31, we do not prototypically talk to ourselves, and *aleyn* is drafted to mark this non-canonical use of the reflexive as a contrast:

- (31) *Her-oyf tsu redn tsu zikh aley.*
cease to talk to REFL CONTR
'Stop talking to yourself.' (5-2)

Although the same marker in Yiddish occurs in both reflexive and non-reflexive situations which are contrary-to-expectation, the facts about reflexives are noted here because these are doubly marked. In addition, their situation is obligatorily unique in terms of the grammatical role(s) of the contrastive scope operator.

6.1.4. GRAMMATICAL ROLES WHICH CAN BE MARKED FOR CONTRAST BY *ALEYN*. In non-reflexive situations, there appears to be no limitation upon which grammatical roles can be marked with *aleyn*. While most of the examples I was able to find involve subject-focused contrast, others are possible. For example, 32 provides an object-focused contrast:

- (32) *Er zolt shoyrn bay mir 'opgenumen'*
he COND ADV PREP 1SG.DAT 'give-birth'
un farloyrn nisht nor dem boykh aley.
CONJ lose NEG only DET belly CONTR
'I would make him 'give birth' but it wouldn't be just his belly he'd be losing!' (SA 137)

But 33 provides a malefactive-dative focus:

- (33) *Du bist aley shuldikn dem.*
you be CONTR blame for-that
'You brought that [bad fortune] on yourself.' (3-2)

In 34 we see a contrastive equational proposition, where the presupposition is that the two arguments would not be equational:

- (34) *A s'iz nito keyn naves*
COMP it-be not-there QUAN news
iz dos aley a gute bsure.
be DEM CONTR INDEF good message
'No news is good news.'⁸

A subject-focused contrast occurs in 35:⁹

- (35) *... aroyf biz tsu zayn kheder is tsugekumen*
up-from until to 3PL.POSS room AUX come-to
fun di bukhrim nor der klang aley,
from DEM GEN-students only DET sounds CONTR
on a khitekh hadiber ...
without a clearly-enunciated speech
'... up from the students' rooms came only the muffled sounds of their voices ...' (SL, 'Self-sacrifice', 45)

Ex. 36 is a particularly clear example of the non-reflexive contrastive form used in Yiddish:

⁸ Professor Marvin Herzog, e-mail communication on Mendele, the Yiddish Language and Culture discussion group.

⁹ This is preceded in the text by 'Exactly what they were saying he couldn't and didn't want to hear'.

- (36) *Vayl er flegt zi paynikn un roydefn,*
 because he HABIT 3SG.DAT.F torture CONJ persecution
hot zi af zikh aleyk gebet dem toyt.
 AUX she PREP REFLX CONTR begged DET death
 'Because he caused her so much torment and suffering, she wished she were dead.' (SL, 'Self-sacrifice', 59)

The subject-focus wishes her own death. While this contrast may be marked in English with *own* in Yiddish it is, again, *aleyn*. The contrast is with the world-knowledge that, it is the unmarked case that 'most people wish to continue living.'

6.1.5. SCALAR CONTRASTIVE FOCUS. *Aleyk* is used to mark contrast in the scalar model as well as the non-scalar. In English, separate markers are used, with *even* represented in the scalar contrast. This is exemplified in 11, repeated below for ease of reference:

- (11) *Ikh aleyk veyt nit vos mir iz.*
 I CONTR know NEG what 1SG.DAT be
 'Even I don't know what's going on with me. (MA, 21)

The reflexive, accompanied by stress intonation may also mark scalar contrast in English:

- (37) I myself don't know what's going on with me these days.

Since Yiddish has no inflected reflexive marker, it is not surprising that this strategy does not work in Yiddish.

6.1.6 NON-SCALAR CONTRASTIVE FOCUS. Perhaps more commonly, *aleyn*'s focus is viewed in a non-scalar model. The focus is unexpected but the degree of unexpectedness is not an issue.¹⁰

- (38) *Ikh aleyk hob nit lib shvemlekh.*
 I CONTR AUX NEG like mushrooms
 'I myself don't like mushrooms.'

Here the surface proposition contrasts with the unstated proposition 'some people like mushrooms.' There is no presupposition, however, that 'I' am more likely to like or dislike mushrooms than 'some people.' Thus the model for 38 is not scalar, merely contrastive. This example and 12, repeated below for ease of reference, indicate that the scalar/non-scalar distinction is not grammatically encoded for Yiddish by *aleyn*. Further study would be required to determine the role, if any, of intonational differences.

- (12) *Ikh aleyk vil nit geyn.*
 I CONTR want NEG go
 'I myself don't want to go.'

HEBREW

7.1. In examining the languages which have had significant impact upon Yiddish, either genetically, in the case of German and Hebrew, or by contact, in the case of Russian,¹¹ we find none of the languages have grammaticalized *alone* in the same way that Yiddish has.

In Hebrew, *levad* in isolation means 'alone'. The reflexive is marked with *at-sm-* which inflects for person and number and it is this morpheme which is utilized to form compounds including many of those enumerated in §2.3 for Yiddish, such as *bitokhn-at-smi* 'self-reliance'. *Levad* has very few grammaticalized contexts. In 39, it is used with its literal meaning:

- (39) *ani lo ohev li-hiyot levad ba-layla.*
 I NEG like to-be alone PREP-night
 'I don't like to be alone at night.'

Middle constructions which would be marked in Yiddish are not marked with a reflexive pronoun in Hebrew:

- (40) *kamti mukdam ha-boker.*
 rise.1SG.PAST early DEF-morning
 'I got up early this morning.'

Expectation contravention may also be coded by *rak* 'only':

¹⁰ These data were the result of one of the interviews with Yiddish speakers. The data were not solicited from all speakers

¹¹ Polish, another Slavic language, may also have had significant impact upon Yiddish by reason of contact from the 16th century until the 18th or 19th centuries. Comparison with Polish is an important issue for further investigation.

- (41) *Masha savla kol kach shehi rak ratsia lamot .*
 Masha suffered so much that only wanted.3SG.FEM to die
 'Masha's life was so miserable that she wished she were dead.'

Unexpected reflexives are not marked with *levad* (42) and are not always marked with the reflexive *atsm-*, but contrastive solitary participants may be marked with *levad* (43) or with either the reflexive *atsm-* or *levad* 44–46:

- (42) *kibalti maka mehadelet*
 received.1SG hit.INDEF with.DEF.door
 'I hit myself with the door.'
- (43) *asita et ze levad.*
 do.PAST.2SG ACC it alone
 'You did it all by yourself.'
- (44) *atem tsrichim laasot et ze levad.*
 you need.MASC.PL do ACC DEM alone
 'You (Pl) have to do that by yourselves.'
- (45) *achalti et kol haoga beatsmillevad.*
 ate.1SG ACC all cake REFL.1SG/alone
 'I ate the entire cake myself.'
- (46) *Ani tamid medaber el atsmi*
 I always talk PREP self
kshe ani levad ba-bayit.
 when I alone PREP house
 'I always talk to myself when I am alone in the house.'

Malefactive-datives are also unmarked for the contrast by *levad*. Rather, only the reflexive morphology is utilized:

- (47) *Ata garamta leze be-atmecha.*
 2SG.MASC cause.2SG.MASC.PAST DEM PREP-yourself
 'You brought this [context: bad thing] on yourself.'

Scalar contrast in Hebrew is marked by *afilu* 'even':

- (48) *Afilu ani lo yodea ma habaya kan.*
 even I NEG know what DEF.go LOC
 'Even I don't know what's wrong with it.' [context: 'it' is a machine with which 'I' am familiar; the machine doesn't function properly]

Non-scalar contrast is marked by *lemashal* 'for example':

- (49) *Ani lemashal lo ohev pitriyot.*
 I for.example NEG like mushrooms
 'I myself don't like mushrooms.'

Thus, while Hebrew speakers have grammaticalized *levad* in somewhat the same manner as Yiddish *aleyn*, the grammaticalization is not as extensive as that of Yiddish.

RUSSIAN

8. In Russian, *odin*, which also means 'alone', is the numeral 'one'. *Sam-* is a morpheme which may carry pronominal or adjectival inflection and which functions as an intensifier and also means 'oneself'. The general reflexive morpheme is *sebjä* but *sja* is used to mark middle voice (Kemmer 1992). Ex. 50 exemplifies ungrammaticalized 'alone' utilizing the numeral 'one':

- (50) *Ja ne xoču byt' odin noč'ju.*
 1SG NEG like be one at.night
 'I don't like to be alone at night.'

Ex. 51 demonstrates use of the reflexive *sebjä*:

- (51) *Ja vižu sebjä v zerkale.*
 I see REFL PREP mirror
 'I saw myself in [the] mirror.'

In 52, we see the middle voice marker *sja* used to express change in body position:

- (52) *Ja prosnul-sja rano utrom.*
 I rise-REFL early morning
 'I got up early this morning.'

Russian marks unexpected solitary participants (53) and unexpected reflexive arguments (54) with *sam*:

- (53) *Ja vseгда razgovarivaju sam so soboj*
 I always talk CONTR PREP self
kogdu ja odin doma.
 when I alone at home
 'I always talk to myself when I am alone in the house.'

- (54) *Ty sdelal vse èto sam.*
 you do-PAST all this CONTR
 'You did it all by yourself.'

In 53, it is clear that *sam* is functioning contrastively since the reflexive pronoun *sobojj*(*sebjja* with appropriate inflection for prepositional case) co-occur.

Unexpected participants may also be marked with *odin*.

- (55) *On odin byl otvetstvennym zu ètot proekt.*
 he one be responsible PREP DEM project
 'He himself took charge of the project.'

Scalar contrastives are marked in Russian by *daže* 'even':

- (56) *Daže ja ne znaju što priključilos' s ètoj mašinoj.*
 even I NEG know what happen (adventure) PREP DEM machine
 'Even I don't know what's wrong with this machine.'
 [context: with which I am very familiar]

Non-scalar contrastives may be marked in Russian with *lično* 'personally':

- (57) *Lično ja ne lublju griby.*
 personally I NEG like.1 SG mushrooms
 'I myself don't like mushrooms.'

Malefactive-dative is marked with both *sam* and *sebjja*:

- (58) *Ty sam nugovoril na sebjja.*
 you CONTR hex PREP self
 'You brought this bad luck upon yourself.'

Sam appears to function much like *aleyn* as a contrastive marker, as shown in 53–54. The same function is carried by *sam* in 58, since one would not be expected to voluntarily invite ill fortune upon oneself. Additional examples which parallel *aleyn* in function include the following:

- (59) *Ja sam ne znaju otveta.*
 I CONTR NEG know answer
 'I myself don't know the answer.'

- (60) *V samoj biblioteke byli tysjači knig.*
 in CONTR library were thousands book

'In the library itself were thousands of books.' (Dewey & Mersereau 1963:126)

Ex. 60 is somewhat problematic, or distinguishable from the Yiddish contrastive function in that, without a larger context, it is difficult to understand why the contrast is being made. One can only speculate that the particular library referred to in this example may have been expected to have fewer books for some reason stated elsewhere in the discourse. Alternatively, the library may be part of a larger complex, with books normally stored in other locations within the complex.

As shown by these examples, Russian grammaticalization of its version of 'alone' is quite similar to that of Yiddish *aleyn*, although the function seems to be shared between *sam* and *odin*.

It is interesting to note that *sam* has been borrowed into Yiddish,¹² but it does not take on its Russian contrastive function, perhaps because *aleyn* was already doing the work in Yiddish:

¹² From which Slavic language is not certain—Russian or Polish, which have the same word. The form in Yiddish is represented by *sam(e)*

- (61) *dos letste zumer-feygele, dos same letste* (Gottlieb et al. 1968:5)
 DET last butterfly DEM INTS last
 'the last butterfly, the very last'¹³ (transl. from Volavkova 1993)

GERMAN

9. In German, reflexives are marked with a reflexive pronoun which is inflected for person and number, in contrast to Yiddish, where the pronoun is uninflected and identical to German's third person singular pronoun. Many middle voice verbs which are marked by the reflexive morpheme in Yiddish are not marked by the reflexive morpheme in German. For example, to study is *lernen zikh* in Yiddish, *lernen* in German.

German marks unexpected solitary participants with *selbst*, a morpheme cognate with English 'self':

- (62) *Ho'r auf, Selbstgespräche zu führen.*
 cease self.speech to conduct
 'Stop talking to yourself.'
- (63) *Ich führe immer Selbstgespräche,*
 I conduct always self.speech
wenn ich alleine im Haus bin.
 when I alone in.the house be.1SG
 'I always talk to myself when I am alone in the house.'

Unexpected solitary participants are also marked with *alleine*:

- (64) *Ich habe den ganzen Kuchen alleine aufgegessen.*
 I AUX DET whole cake CONTR eat-up
 'I ate the entire cake myself.'

Alleine may be reinforced with *ganz* 'all':

- (65) *Du hast das ganz alleine gemacht.*
 you AUX DET all CONTR done
 'You did it all by yourself.'

Malefactive-dative is marked with *selbst* rather than *alleine*:

- (66) *Das hast du dir selbst zuzuschreiben.*
 DET PAST you you.DAT self attribute.to
 'You have to attribute (blame) this to (on) yourself.'

Scalar contrasts are marked with *selbst* (67) as well as non-scalar contrasts (68):

- (67) *Selbst ich weiss nicht, was damit los ist.*
 self I know NEG what with.it loose/broken be
 'Even I don't know what's wrong with it.' [context: 'it' is a machine with which you are familiar; the machine doesn't function properly]
- (68) *Ich selbst mag keine Pilze,*
 I self like NEG mushroom
aber ich weiss dass viele sie mögen.
 but I know that many they like
 'I myself don't like mushrooms, but I know that many people do.'

Another speaker offered the adverb cognate to 'personally' in order to translate 68 as:

- (69) *Ich persönlich mag keine Pilze.*
 I personally like NEG mushrooms
 'I myself/personally don't like mushrooms.'

The nature of the distinction between *selbst* and *alleine* will be left open here.

German *alleine* is cognate to Yiddish *aleyn*, and because of the close genetic relationship between the two languages, might have been expected to be used in a number of contexts to mark contrast. In fact, the contexts are rather limited and parallel Russian and Hebrew. However, there is one context in which *alleine* is used as a

¹³ It has been suggested (Zygmunt Frajzyngier, personal communication) that what has been borrowed into Yiddish in the text at 56, rather than just the lexical item *sam(e)* is the construction, DEM ADJ_i N, DEM ADJ_j, as in

dos letste zumer-feygele, dos same letste
 DEM ADJ.last butterfly DEM CONTR ADJ.last

contrastive marker in German which does not occur in Yiddish, Hebrew or Russian, which is as a sentential contrastive marker or adversative conjunction:

- (70) *Ich war bei ihm, allein ich traf ihn nicht an.*
 I was PREP him CONTR I find him NEG PARTICLE
 'I was at his house, but I did not find him at home.' (Curme 1922:388)

CONCLUSIONS

8. As shown by the data and illustrated in Table 2, the Yiddish word *aleyn*, 'alone', has been grammaticalized in numerous contexts as a scopal operator which marks contrast, defined by unexpectedness from discourse, context or world knowledge and encoded in the utterance by the speaker. It is clear that Yiddish did not borrow these functional markings when it borrowed the morpheme from Middle High German primarily because German forms do not exhibit the phenomenon for its cognate *alleine*. Also rather surprising, Modern German exhibits a contrastive context for *alleine* which is not found for Yiddish *aleyn* today, although this may be infrequently used by younger speakers today.¹⁴ This is as a sentential contrast or adversative conjunction. This function has not developed out of the word meaning 'alone' in Yiddish or in Russian or Hebrew, two other languages which have contributed significantly to the diachronic development of Yiddish.

English	Yiddish	German	Russian	Hebrew
alone	<i>aleyn</i> 23-24	<i>alleine</i> 63	<i>odin</i> 16-17	<i>levad</i> 39
reflexive marker	<i>zikh</i> [uninflected]	<i>zikh</i> [inflected]	<i>sebjja/sja</i> [inflected]	<i>at-sm-</i> [inflected]
reflexive contrast	<i>zikh+aleyn</i> 31	not found in data	<i>sum + sebjja</i> 53	not found in data
scalar contrast 'even I'	<i>aleyn</i> 37	<i>selbst</i> 67	<i>duže</i> 56	<i>afilu</i> 48
non-scalar contrast level I	<i>aleyn</i> 34-5	<i>alleine</i> 64-5 <i>selbst</i> 62,68	<i>sum/odin</i> 54-5	<i>at-sm-</i> <i>levad; rak</i> 42-6;41
non-scalar contrast level II 'I myself'	<i>aleyn</i> 38	<i>persönlich</i> 69	<i>lično</i> 57	<i>lemashal</i> 49
clausal contrast with 'alone'	n/a	<i>allein</i> 70	n/a	n/a

TABLE 2. Cross-linguistic summary of contrastive operators in Yiddish, German, Russian, and Hebrew. Numerals refer to examples in text.

For some reason, the manner in which data was solicited seems to have produced at least one noticeable artifact. That is, the second-level contrast category translated by 'I, myself' in English. While this is non-scalar contrast, it is notable that there are multiple ways of coding contrast, undoubtedly distinguished by degree and that in eliciting the data, perhaps the subjects interpreted the degree differently. These markers include *persönlich* in German, *lično* in Russian, and *lemashal* in Hebrew. Further research is necessary to verify this hypothesis.

Finally, the examination of grammaticalized *aleyn* in Yiddish offers support for Traugott's principle that metonymically-based grammaticalization often reflects a shift from lexical, conventional meaning to expression of the speaker's attitude toward or beliefs about the utterance in its context.

¹⁴ Personal communication, Tilo Weber, April 1994.

REFERENCES

- COOK, ALBERT S. 1903. *A first book in Old English*. New York: Ginn.
- CURME, GEORGE OLIVER. 1922. *A grammar of the German language*. New York: Macmillan.
- DEWEY, HORACE W., & JOHN MERSEREAU, JR. 1963. *Reading and translating contemporary Russian*. New York: Pitman.
- DIEKHOFF, TOBIAS. 1914. *The German language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- FISHMAN, JOSHUA A. 1985. The lively life of a 'dead' language, or everyone knows Yiddish died long ago. *Language and inequality*, ed. by Nessa Wolfson & Joan Manes, 207–22. Berlin: Mouton.
- FRAJZYNGIER, ZYGMUNT, & TAMAR KATRIEL. 1991. Functions of propositional relators. *Semantic studies*, ed. by Alan S. Kaye, 449–61. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- GIVÓN, TALMY. 1979. *On understanding grammar*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- GOTTLIEB, MALKA, et al. 1968 (eds.) *Di kinder fun Terezin*. New York: Yidish Kultur-Kongres.
- GRICE, H. PAUL. 1975. Logic and conversation. *Syntax and semantics*, ed. by John Kimball, 45–58. NY: Academic Press.
- HALLIDAY, MICHAEL A.K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English, part II. *Journal of Linguistics* 3.199–244.
- HEINE, BERND; ULRIKE CLAUDI; & FRIEDERIKE HÖNNEMEYER. 1991. *Grammaticalization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- HOPPER, PAUL, & ELIZABETH CLOSS TRAUOGOTT. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HWS = Howe, Irving; Ruth R. Wisse; and Khone Shmeruk. 1987. *The Penguin book of modern Yiddish verse*. New York: Viking Penguin.
- KAY, PAUL. 1990. *Even*. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 13.59–111.
- KEMMER, SUZANNE. 1992. Grammatical prototypes and competing motivations in a theory of linguistic change. *Explanation in historical linguistics*, ed. by Garry W. Davis & Gregory K. Iverson, 145–66. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- LAMBRECHT, KNUD. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LEHMANN, CHRISTIAN. 1985. Grammaticalization: Synchronic variation and diachronic changes. *Lingua e Stile* 20.303–18.
- MA = Alperson, Mordecai. 1986. *Di kinder fun der pampas* [Los hijos de la pampa]. Argentina: Asociación Judeo Argentina de Estudios Históricos [no city of publication available]
- MICHAELIS, LAURA A. 1994. Expectation contravention and use ambiguity: The Vietnamese connective *cu'ng*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21.1–36.
- MLH = Halpern, Moyshe-Leyb. 1982. In *New York Trans.* and ed. by Kathryn Hellerstein. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America.
- RW = Whitman, Ruth. 1966. *An anthology of modern Yiddish poetry*. New York: October House.
- SA = Sholem-Aleichem. 1918. *Marienbad*. In: *Zumer leb'n* ['Summer lives']. Marienbad. New York: Olga Rabinowitz.
- SL = Liptzin, Sol. 1947 (trans. and ed.) *Peretz*. New York: YIVO.
- TALMY, LEONARD. 1972. *Semantic structures in English and Atsugewi*. Berkeley: University of California dissertation.
- TRAUOGOTT, ELIZABETH CLOSS. 1988. Pragmatic strengthening. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 14.406–16.
- VOLAVKOVA, HANA. 1993 (ed.) *I never saw another butterfly*. 2nd ed. New York: Schocken.
- VOYLES, JOSEPH B. 1992. *Early Germanic grammar*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- WED. 1989. *Webster's encyclopedic unabridged dictionary of the English language*. New York: Gramercy Books–Random House.
- WEINREICH, MAX. 1973. *History of the Yiddish language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- WEINREICH, URIEL. 1965. *The field of Yiddish*. The Hague: Mouton.
- . 1977. *Modern English-Yiddish Yiddish-English dictionary*. New York: YIVO.
- WHITNEY, WILLIAM D. 1877. *German and English dictionary*. New Haven: Yale College.
- WRIGHT, JOSEPH. 1907. *Historical German grammar*, vol. 1. London: Oxford University Press.
- WUGE, FREDERICK. 1884. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Strassburg: Grubner.