**BACKGROUND & AIM**

Yiddish has always stood in the position of a minority language spoken outside of any regulation by multilingual speakers, as it would seem, without a strong attitude favoring linguistic purism, and as such has been in an intense interlinguistic contact not limited to intergroup interactions but also on the individual plane, not to mention the religio-cultural and sociological reasons for further intergroup linguistic attitudes. It is then no surprise that the Yiddish lexicon in terms of etymology consists of several major elements.

So far there has not yet, at least to the author’s knowledge, been conducted any all-round more or less comprehensive research to reach specific figures for how big of a part these elements take up, leaving the topic with only the educated estimates of 70-20-10 or 85-12-3 % (Jacobs 1994) for the Germanic, Semitic, and Slavic element respectively.

The aim of this descriptive work-in-progress research conducted as part of the author’s dissertation is to establish more precise and concrete dictionary & text-data-based figures in terms of lexemes provided with further arrangement in word classes, as well as isolated roots. A short note on the level of integration of each element is also provided.

**RESULTS**
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The results stemming from the analysis of the gathered dictionary data are presented in tables 1 to 4, both in total numbers and in percentages.

*Tables 1 and 2 present the results for lexemes divided into word classes, the category of “Function Words” consists of prepositions, conjunctions and particles. Pronouns class is omitted here, although the author finds it appropriate to mention there was no non-Germanic leemem found there. Table 2 shows the three elements in question, without the Romance and classical elements that in majority of cases consist of European internationalisms.

**CONCLUSIONS**

As for the adaptation and incorporation, it can be said that the Slavic element is phonologically quite adapted (except for [I]) and fully incorporated into the morphological system. Neuter nouns are sometimes redesignated as feminine, adjectives are usually loaned in their nominative singular neuter form but regularly inflected, and verbs are also regular but curious in their stem-final -e. The Semitic element on the other hand begins to stand out already on the level of orthography as almost all it kept its original spelling. It is well adapted to match the Yiddish phonological inventory but the morphological incorporation is incomplete, nouns mostly retain their original plural suffix which Weisrech (1979) explains rather by less lexical transfer and a posteriori reanalysis than grammatical interference, adjectives are either used only predicatively or they are equipped with Germanic adjective-forming suffix, verbs are either fully incorporated or they are frozen in the present participle form and restructured as, as Katz (1987) calls them, “inherently analytic verbs” with auxiliary to be.

**DISCUSSION & RESEARCH FOLLOW-UP**

Given the debated location of the birthplace of Yiddish, it might also be of value to further divide lexemes of Romance origin into internationalisms, Romance element already present in Old High German, and specifically Yiddish Romance element. Furthermore, where possible, the research would surely benefit from dividing the (neo-)classical element based on which branch it entered Yiddish. The author is going to continue this research by expanding both databases, the full dictionary database consisting of Weisrech’s dictionary should then be compared to data from Beinfeld Ial. (2013); the text database should also be expanded by original and translated literary works of various nature.

It is also planned to analyze the full data in terms of semantic fields.
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