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Preface

The idea of this theses emerged out of my general interest in appearance and development of slurs and pejorative language. Why do 'neutral' words acquire pejorative meaning through time? Why do we get offended when called certain names? What is behind a slur?

One of the key notions that may help us to answer these and related questions is the fact that language is never a mysterious independent medium that has some secret power over human beings. Rather, human beings create language and use it as a potential weapon against other human beings. Depending on the context and intonation of a speaker almost any word can be either positive or negative. Yet there are some words that people use more often than others as offensive terms. D. Cameron in her book Verbal Hygiene discusses the social roles of sexist, racist, ableist and other '-ist' language used against various marginalized groups. One of the strategies that members of these groups (ethnic minorities, homosexuals, disabled people) use to counteract verbal discrimination is re-claiming the offensive terms as the in-group names. For example 'queer' used by gay/lesbian/bisexual/transsexual/etc people, 'nigger' used by black people among themselves. Cameron, along with many other authors notes the ambiguity and complexity of reclaiming slurs. Reclaiming does not erase the negative connotation previously associated with it, yet confuses the offenders by defiantly turning their weapon back at them or ironically downplays the negative connotation.

However, all the authors who make a broad comparisons between various -ist slurs can only go that far with their generalizations, as there are important differences among the terms. The way each slur functions, the success and peculiarities of its re-claiming are closely connected with the history of the particular marginalized group. Thus I believe that to gain a deeper understanding of the working of slurs in society one needs to move beyond broad comparisons and narrow the focus of study on each particular group and examine it
cross-culturally or focus on one slur and examine it from sociolinguistic and historical perspectives. In this light I will attempt to examine the word *zhid* -- an ethnic slur commonly used against Jews by Russian-speaking bigots. The interesting fact about this word is that it comes, most likely, from the Hebrew root *Yehudi*, meaning 'Jew', which is a self-name for Jews. How did a word that originates from a self-name of a group came to be used against them? In my research I draw upon primary sources to demonstrate that the word did not always have a pejorative meaning, but acquired it gradually as the social conditions of the Jews in Russia changed over time. I also try to trace some of the history of in-group use of the term either as an ironic self-name or an expression of self-hatred.

My special thanks are due to my mother, Yelena Polyak, for her invaluable help with the primary sources research, to my father, Leonid Steingart, for his structural suggestions, and to my friend, Alla Marants, for her helpful criticisms. I would like to thank Suzanne Romaine and Gennady Estraikh of Oxford who gave me advice at the incipient stages of this paper. I also would like to thank my mentors at Swarthmore: John Baugh, Ted Fernald and Donna Jo Napoli, for their criticism and advice. I am particularly grateful to all of the aforementioned individuals for their support and understanding. Undoubtedly, I remain the only one responsible for all the imperfections of this paper.

**Theoretical Foundations**

The theoretical foundation of my work is based on the critical linguistics approach elaborated by Menz in the tradition of Adorno, Horkheimer and Habermas. Menz states that social scientists can not limit themselves to the so called descriptive and objective representations of facts, as if given by nature because scientists themselves have ideologies (Menz 228). What we learn from Menz is that in order for the open progressive analyses to take place, science must be self-reflective and historically grounded. By self-reflection Menz means consideration of the social impact of one's actions in light of the fact that scientists are part of the system that they analyze. In case of critical linguistics in particular one must be aware that language is both the object and the metasphere of inquiry. A scholar should declare and substantiate his or her interests in order for progressive analyses to take place. Critical social science must be conscious of the historical context of social rules that it
analyses because the science that loses its self-reflective nature becomes ideological, professing something that has to be believed rather than providing open access for questioning. According to the critical inquiry model constructed by Menz critical linguistics, as any other social science critical of ideology reveals ruling structures, interests of powerful groups and historical concealments (Menz 229, also see chart 1 attached).

In his model of linguistic inquiry Menz notes that in addition to sociological perspective, as based on Habermas et al., we must consider psychological and unconscious motivations that manifest themselves linguistically. He draws upon Steiner’s model on the psychological prospective and Wodak’s model for the unconscious. Although the main thrust of my argument is based on socio-historical evidence I discuss certain psychological aspects of zhid in light of some theoretical notions summarized by Greenberg, Kirkland and Pyszczynski, particularly in relation to in-group versus outgroup usage of an ethnic slur or DEL (derogatory ethnic label -- the term proposed by Greenberg et. al.). Greenberg et al. ask among other things, whether the in-group usage of a DEL by the members of a marginalized group is reflective of the group’s acceptance of the dominant negative stereotype, and is it thus, in some sense a form of self-hate. I demonstrate the examples of in-group usage in Russian-Jewish press and discuss the sociological implications of such usage. I believe that when the employment of antisemitic rhetoric by Jews lead to creating a negative self-image in the eyes of the majority these cases could be interpreted as self-hate.

In light of Menz’s model of critical linguistics I explain why I think my research is relevant to our understanding of human interaction and particularly group relations. I believe that by studying one example of an ethnic slur I can suggest that similar dependance of meaning upon socio-historical conditions may apply to slurs used in contemporary US (in English) and in other places. This paper is about working out some methodologies that could also be usefully applied to understanding of other related cases.

In terms of group interaction I use Goffman’s theory of ‘teams’ (in my case as applied to Jews and Gentiles) that he describes in The presentation of self in everyday life. As an example of relevance of my work to other situations I would like to compare the case of zhid with ethnic slurs referred to other groups with similar history: such as “nigger” as reffered to African-Americans, and “queer” to sexual minorities. Ultimately, the goal of the
theses is to contribute to demystification of an ethnic slur and demonstrate that through history people shape the meaning of a word by using it as a tool of discrimination. The meaning and function of a term now considered derogatory changed along with the change in socio-historical situation of the given discriminated group. Beyond its verbal function the word remains but a combination of utterances.

To tackle this demystification process I will use different types of sources: primary, comparing terms referring to Jews in the Jewish Russian press, Progressive press and Anti-Semitic press, as well as in fiction and poetry. These oppositions would hopefully highlight how the meaning of the word is inseparable from the intention, tone and overall ideological context of the writer/speaker. Secondary sources include dictionaries, history books and papers, literary criticism and linguistic theory. I will try to examine what implications the knowledge about the history of derogation has for our contemporary societies. Yet another goal of this paper is to achieve a better understanding of how marginalized groups may deal with linguistic discrimination.

In this work I try to make close connection between the socio-historical and political context and linguistic phenomena. According to Valentine, the effectiveness of calling becalling euphemising and muting in relation to marginalized groups depends upon the power relations. The power of groups to resist, subvert or escape naming must be recognized but in a society with an imbalance of resources and a powerful center the free fragmentary visions of postmodernism appear somewhat wishful and wistful.

When discussing the primary sources I try to situate their rhetoric in the context of changing conditions of Russian Jewish communities from the annexation of the parts of Poland with significant Jewish populations and the creation of the Pale to the rise of Russian Nationalism, Zionism and revolutionary movements.

Methodology

Variation as key to change

Labov has contributed largely to our understanding of the relationship between language change and language variability according to he boundaries of social class,
geographic space, and time (Lass 223, Romaine 19). The idea that variation in a particular speech community may trigger change is crucial. If there is no variation between speakers, there may not be any change. In this regard Romaine mentions, for example, Labov's and Bailey's theories on synchronic variation (Romaine 252). It is also important to realize that variation does not necessarily have to result in change: Romaine cautions against the line of argumentation that the relationship between change and variation holds equally well in both directions (Romaine 200). Thus although change implies variation, variation does not necessarily imply change.

One of the reasons why I find Romaine's methodology particularly useful for my paper is that she discusses the application of sociolinguistic methods to diachronic data, that is data representing change over time, as opposed to synchronic data, that represents variation in a given moment of time. (The primary example of a study of synchronic data is Labov's work on New York city dialects). My work is also concerned with the change over time, namely the process of derogation of a word zhid. Romaine calls to move beyond treatment of synchronic phonetic and phonological data to a more general body of linguistics. Her own study of Middle Scots relative marker is an example of a response to this call in the form of a research in historical syntax. My study of zhid is an example of historical semantics.

Here I would like to stress that my work is not a direct response to Romaine. I became interested in the word zhid quite independently and supposed the effects of social and historical conditions as the reason for the change in its meaning over time before familiarizing myself with her work. Yet her book proved invaluable in placing my work within the field of sociolinguistics, and consequently providing me with models of description and analyses. She states that the role of models in linguistics is not to create some existential hypotheses but rather 'to illuminate facts, throw them into a new light, or make them more readily memorable'(Romaine 283). This is what her work did for me: it raised questions that gave me a new and clearer perspective on my data, as well as helped me sort it out.

**Oral versus Written language**

To what extent is sociolinguistic theory applicable and relevant to historical studies,
which are, as we infer from Romaine, based on written data? (Romaine 3)

Romaine observes that for centuries linguistics has focused primarily on the study of written texts, but with advance of phonetics the field shifted from philology to the study of spoken language (Romaine 15). The idea of the primacy of spoken language over the written language, that subsequently developed, is exemplified by Labov's view that texts can be understood only in terms of their relation to the spoken language and that the only worthwhile linguistic theories are about the language that ordinary people speak on the street (Labov, 1972: 109 in Romaine 122). Romaine points out that sociolinguistics has also emphasized the primacy of spoken language until some recent (the book is published in 1982) application to syntactic variation. Also, the fact that sociolinguistics has been considered a hybrid discipline had a limiting effect upon its applicability to written language, which has been seen as a domain of another subdiscipline, historical linguistics (Romaine 15).

Romaine disagrees with Labov about the primacy of speech over writing and points out that something does not have to be spoken in order to be written, for example legal language. Based on this view she suggests that spoken and written language are instances of the same language embodied in different media, by assumption that a medium can have a potential for full autonomy as a vehicle of language. According to the author this view is very useful as it highlights the difference between the language pattern and its material embodiment. This allows us to speak about the difference between form and substance, the first being language and the second -- medium.

The author argues for the applicability of the techniques used to analyze speech to the study of texts on the premise that as writing is an instance (or medium) of language the linguistic methods of analyses that are already valid should apply to all instances of language (Romaine 17). Yet, she notes that the study of written language 'will reveal not only patterning which is characteristic of the language itself, regardless of medium, but also that which may be peculiar to the medium itself; the findings may require us to revise certain views we have of present descriptive categories' (Romaine 18).

In my approach to written-oral language relationship I take a median position between those of Labov and Romaine. While I agree with Romaine's criticism of Labov that something does not have to be spoken in order to be written, thinking in addition to her
example of legal prose, of fiction and epistolary writing, I can not, nevertheless agree with her belief in the complete autonomy of each medium. While written language may not necessarily reflect the spoken language it is certainly informed by it. While each medium may have a potential for full autonomy, I do not see the helpfulness of the complete autonomy approach when we know that in any context where both mediums coexist one necessarily interacts with the other.

We look at dictionaries as normative guides for both spoken and written language, while the dictionaries give us examples from literature: fiction and occasionally non-fiction. the prescriptive standing of literature is particularly significant in Russian culture (including Soviet and post-Soviet periods) with its tradition of a writer representing a moral and cultural voice of the people¹. The normative nature of literature in Russian culture is reflected in the fact that scatological language, terms for sexual organs and activities equivalent to English four-letter words and some other taboo expressions are commonly referred to in writing by the adjective nepechatnyi 'unprintable'. In Russian this word is actually a euphemistic synonym for 'vulgar'. In fact only recently the taboo language has actually entered the print. Of course, like in Russian, we observe the parallel phenomenon of taboo and vulgar language being 'unprintable' in English and in other languages. This may signify on the one hand the normative nature of the written language in many cultures. On the other hand, stressing unprintability as synonymous to vulgarity in Russian may suggest a particular normative significance of written language in this culture.

In this light the impact of literature upon the spoken word is significant. In case of the word zhid, antisemites legitimize it thorough using it in their literature. Making a slur 'printable' implies that it is also acceptable in spoken language, although does not reduce its offensive force. What does subvert the power of a slur is the use of it by progressive writers who mock antisemitic rhetoric.

¹The special role of writers in Russia may be exemplified by the fact that the collective English word intelligentsia -- for intellectuals, the broadly educated middle class, or cultural elite -- comes from Russian, where writers were the spokespeople for this social group.
Social Class and Style

The working principle in sociolinguistic historical analysis is 'uniformitarian principle', according to which linguistic forces that operate today are not unlike those that have operated in the past (Romaine 122). Romaine gives credit to Labov for his research that provided a deal of information on sociolinguistic patterning of language. Labov's work has been significant, among other things, in explaining relationships between social class and style. In relation to this issue of style and social class Romaine makes a crucial statement that when reconstructing language in its social context we need information on who had access to which channels, genres and styles which are reconstructible (Romaine 125). She explains by citing various examples that in societies with rigid social hierarchies certain styles were considered appropriate for certain classes, for example nobility were expected to communicate differently from lower classes (Romaine 125). This implies that in such hierarchical societies one could decide to which social class a person belongs judging by his or her speech. Romaine points out that such rigid distinctions cannot apply to texts. Even if we analyze quoted speech in prose or verse, which may serve as an approximation of oral speech, importantly, it is still not speech itself. Furthermore, since text is a historical record we do not have real speech to which we could compare it. In addition, the norms of quoting speech could have been different in the past.

Another significant observation that Romaine makes is that if a particular feature in the text is associated with a lowly character, we cannot conclude that such feature was a common property of the speech of that particular social class in that society. In fact it might still have been characteristic of the usage of highly literate authors (Romaine 125-126). This last point is particularly relevant to my work as my sources include fiction texts where the actual position of the author with respect to using the word zhid may be obscured by putting it in the mouth of lowly characters.

Early Usage of Zhid

We find the early usage of zhid as a descriptive term for a Jew in Old Russian documents. Most scholars agree that zhid was a term for a Jew common to all Slavic languages. As follows from Fasmer the variations of the word zhid are part of all modern
Slavic languages: for example Czech and Slovak -- zid, Polish -- zyd, Serbo-Croatian -- zhid. According to Fasmer the word was borrowed through Balkan-Romance languages from Italian giudeo, and ultimately from Latin judaeus -- 'Jew'; ju- gave zhy-, then zhi- the Old Russian form zhidovin is explained from -eo (Fasmer 53). Latin judaeus, or Ioudaeus is generally and indisputably acknowledged to have come from Hebrew Yehudi -- 'Jew' (see, for example, Cassels Latin Dictionary 167). Fasmer also rejects the etymology from German Jud, based on the commonly acknowledged fact that this word was already known to Slavic peoples in 9th century (Fasmer 53).

Birnbaum in his overview of the early evidence of Jewish life and anti-Jewish sentiments in medieval Russia cites sources that demonstrated the early usage of the word zhid. He explains that zhidove (plural) and derivatives was quite current in Old Russian with reference to contemporary Jews and things Jewish, without carrying the pejorative connotations of modern Russian zhid (as opposed to yevrey) (Birnbaum 229). For example in the Nestor's Chronicle -- the oldest Russian chronicle -- there is a passage about Khazar Jews (zhidove kozarstii) who travelled to prince Vladimir. Birnbaum believes that this passage is a secondary text insertion dating past 1099 (Birnbaum 227). Although for historical purposes the account may not be accurate due to chronological and other inconsistencies, for linguistic purposes it serves as a good example of early usage of the word. Another example is the 12th century manuscript of Life of St Theodosius who went to the Jews (k zhidom) to preach Christianity (Birnbaum 229-230). Another interesting evidence which mentions Jews of both sexes is Charter (or Statute) of Yaroslav the Wise dating to 12th or possibly 13th century. Parts of the manuscript deal with sexual or marital relations between Orthodox Russians and Jews, where a male Jew is referred to as zhidovin and female -- zhidovka (Birnbaum 235-237). Interestingly, the female term survives in this form to this day, while the male one was eventually shortened to zhid. A derivative of the word zhid -- the adjective zhidovski we see in 12-13th centuries references to Jewish Gates in Kiev (zhidovski voroty) (Birnbaum 233).

The logical question me might want to ask at this point is: what about yevrey and iudey? When were they first used and how does their usage compare to the usage of zhid?

A good discussion of the emergence of zhid-yevrey dichotomy we find in a mid-19th century Jewish newspaper Sion. Sion -- the central publication of Russian Jewry subtitled
"The Organ of Russian Jews" published a series of articles by Al. Gatsuk centered around the etymology and meaning of the word zhid. Gatsuk considered the word against the background of Russian Jewish history and historical linguistics by drawing upon wide variety of primary documents. His quite authoritative command of sources somewhat unusually coupled with a tendency for speculation Gatsuk's analyses is a hybrid of academic exercise and popular journalism. There seems to be little reason to doubt Gatsuk's handling of primary sources, as he cites mostly very well known extant manuscripts, many of which are also mentioned, for example by Birnbaum. Also, our goal is not the evidence of historicity of some events but linguistic evidence, for which Gatsuk's analyses is a good source. Another reason why I chose this particular source is its surprisingly early date -- it appeared in the context of open debate on the appropriateness of contemporary (1860's) usage of the word zhid, which I discuss further in greater detail.

Similarly to contemporary linguists, Gatsuk denies the theories of the word zhid being borrowed directly from German Jude and points to early Slavic sources (Sion, no 38, 1862: 594). Gatsuk notes that in ancient Russian writing, which represented for the most part copies of Bulgarian literature and imitations of Greek works, two words are used to designate Jews: zhid or its Church- Slavic form zhidovin (plural zhidove) and iudey or iudein (plural iudei)(ibid. 594). Gatsuk points out that the usage of ioudey and its variants (iudey being chronologically a later variant) in a particular document indicates a close dependance upon Greek sources, while the usage of zhidovin -- the impact of 'living popular element, living popular speech' (ibid. 595) because this form is much more Slavic in its phonetic form (zhi- zhu-, rather than more foreign io- iu- vowel cluster); the latter we also infer from phonological analysis Gatsuk presents earlier in the article (ibid. 593-94). The first type of documents, where according to Gatsuk the dominance of the form iudey is a sure sign of greater artificiality and imitation of of foreign thought and foreign tongue, is represented mostly by the translations of Holy Scriptures. The desire of a religious copyist to convey the word of God in the most accurate manner led them to slavish copying of the foreign forms,

\footnote{Writing came to Russia from Bulgaria. The earliest version of Cyrillic alphabet was composed by two Bulgarian monks, Cyril (Russ. Kirill) and Methodius (Chronicle of the World 314).}
often even to the detriment of the rules of their native language (Gatsuk 595). One example of such documents is Ostro"mirovo Evangelie (Ostromirov gospels) of 11th century which is a Russian copy of the 9th century Bulgarian translation of Gospels which demonstrates the usage of iudey-variants (ibid. 594) The language and style of Scripture translations both in Bulgaria and in Ancient Russia formed high, sacred style. The scripture translations and all other documents where this sacred high style dominates are more consistent in their preference of the form iudei as a designation of both ancient and contemporary Jews (ibid 595). On the other hand, in the translations of secondary sacred writings, of the works of the church fathers, as well as in the translations of the independent works of Bulgarian literature of the beginning of the 10th century-- the time when the sacred literary style had not been formed, the Greek term is used very seldom and Greek ioudaios is conveyed as Slavic zhidovin. For example in the writings of a church father Ioann the Bulgarian, we constantly see the usage of zhidovin-zhidove. For instance, Ili ne verueshi, zhidovine! (Don't you believe, Jew?) or "Sramlyaitesya zhidove..." (Be ashamed, Jews... -- what follows is a reference to Jews despising Christ) In a chapter about 'writings' this author also refers to the Jesus son of Sirakh, who had written in zhidovksy (Hebrew language). Yet interestingly, in one of the versions of this same chapter there is a phrase that uses the term yevrey: "... and [these books] are venerated v yevreikh (among the Jews) (ibid. 595)

Although much of the religious writing using the term zhidovin represents theological attacks of the Jews the usage of the word itself is not derogatory in any way. the difference is merely stylistic: high style uses iudey and popular, or shall we say low style: zhidovin. Gatsuk cites the writings of the 10th century monk Khrabr, who argued against those who thought that Slavic language could not be a true Christian tongue, because it was not a pre-existent one(iskonnyi) while the pre-existent tongues were zhidovsky (Jewish, i.e. Hebrew), rimski (Roman, i. e. Latin) and ellinski (Ellin, i.e. Greek). And further Khrabr writes: "And to the Jews (zhidovom) God gave sacred books"(ibid. 595). On the other hand, Kievan mitropolitan Ilarion, who Gatsuk calls a fanatical purist of high style uses only the form iudey in his extremely anti-Jewish theological writings (ibid. 596). Interestingly, Birnbaum also mentions Ilarion's work noting that the Jews of his writings are clearly the
Jews of the Bible, and not contemporary Jews\(^3\), and that he consistently uses the term *iudei*, rather than *zhidove* (Birnbaum 229). Gatsuk notes that in the works that are marked by greater presence of native Russian element the writers prefer the *zhid-* form, rather than *iudey* and *yevrei*. For example the famous 12th century chronicle writer Nestor always uses the Slavic form. He uses the term *iudey* only twice, and, stresses Gatsuk, "in quotations from the Holy Scriptures" (Gatsuk 596, the last emphasis is original).

What follows from Gatsuk, is that in the ancient Russian writing the variant forms of *iudey* were characteristic of the high sacred style, and those of *zhidovin* -- of the simple, or popular style. Unfortunately, Gatsuk does not offer any detailed discussion of the early usage of the word *yevrey*, yet he clearly implies that the latter was also characteristic of the high style. What is important for my purpose is the fact that the word *zhid* became associated in the minds of Russian readers with more popular or low style. As I try to demonstrate further it is the low word that eventually acquired derogatory connotations in later writings, while *yevrey* took an intermediary position between the high form *iudey* and the low form *zhid*. Through the selective survey of Russian literature from the ancient times till the present I attempt to show that the high-low dichotomy has been crucial in the process of derogation. Here I would like to note that I use the terms high and low in a relative, rather than absolute meaning, for the sake of a convenient stylistic model, high and low being the extreme points of stylistic continuum. In particular I do not use the word 'low' as derogatory, unless it is specifically concerned with derogatory context, but rather as a synonym for "simple" and "popular".

**Russia without Jews**

Following the Mongol invasion (1240) the Kievan Jewish community was dispersed. With few exceptions Jews, entirely disappear from the pages of Russian chronicles (Birnbaum 242). While Jews enjoyed considerable rights and privileges in Poland and Grand Duchy of

---

\(^3\) Consequently, Ilarion's works do not provide historical evidence on the attitude to his contemporary Jews, which is the purpose of Birnbaum's paper. Yet for my purposes this is a very helpful linguistic source.
Lithuania, they were virtually barred from settlement in the growing state of Muskovy and in independent Novgorod (Birnbaum 253). Klier notes that while the Jewish population grew to enormous size in medieval Poland, largely due to migration of Jews from Western Europe and particularly Germany, the Jewish population of the Russian state was very small (Klier, 1995:86). In 1742 Empress Elizabeth I expelled the minuscule Jewish population, calling Jews "the enemies of Christ" (Klier, 1995:86, Harris 144). On the usage of the word zhid prior to the annexation of Poland in 1772, Klier notes that it was preferred to yevrey in official pronouncements. He also states with regard to zhid-yevrey dichotomy that it was hardly a problem in light of the fact that the Jewish population of Russia was so insignificant prior to annexation (Klier, 1982: 2).

In this paper I skip the detailed analyses of medieval and pre-annexation usage, because I have not done any considerable research on the long period from the end of Mongol dominance till the annexation of Poland. Yet for the sake of scientific honesty I would like to note that any analysis aspiring to thoroughness should consider some examples of religious and secular literature from 14th to mid 18th century to see if there had been any considerable change in meaning of the words zhid, yevrey and iudey, compared to the pre-Mongol era. Based on the fact that Jews played a very insignificant role in Russian life throughout all the years in question I suppose that there was no significant change in the distribution of the original high-low dichotomy, where yevrei and iudey was preferred in religious and high style texts, while zhid was reserved for secular and popular literature. This hypothesis however would have to be tested. Yet in favor of this hypothesis I would like to note that Russian cultural life and literature were relatively stagnant before the revolutionary reforms by Peter the Great. Consequently I would not expect any significant change in usage prior to Peter, but as Peter’s epoch was characterized by increased contact with the West, we may find some interesting references to the contacts and attitudes to Western Jews, as limited as they were. My discussion will focus on the period post annexation, when significant increase in the Jewish population of Russia was paralleled, in less than a hundred years, by a significant change in meaning of the word zhid in the Russian language.
After the annexation of Poland: *zhid*—starts to become somewhat unsavory

As a result of the three partitions of Poland— in 1772, 1793 and 1795, Russian Empire annexed large territories of what is now Poland, Ukraine and Belorus, and, as a consequence, acquired the largest Jewish population in the world (Klier 1995: 56-59). One of the first important documents of the post-annexation era that mentioned Jews, was the proclamation by Count Chernyshev, the newly-appointed governor-general of Byelorussia. The proclamation assured the native population of the newly acquired lands that they will enjoy the same rights and privileges that they had under Polish kings. The document specifically assured the Jews that they would enjoy the freedom of religion as well as security of person and property. In this proclamation the Jewish communities were referred to as *yevreyskie*, rather than *zhidovskie*, although the latter had been a more common term at the time. Klier observes that this usage has attracted much scholarly attention and semantic speculation. Yet we infer from Klier that nothing definitive can be said about Chernyshev's choice as in subsequent pronouncements he used the term *zhid* as well. Consistency was also lacking in the reports of other officials, for example Gavriil Derzhavin in his Opinion on the Jews of Byelorussia uses both terms interchangeably. Yet, Klier notes, *yevrey* was gradually replacing *zhid* in official pronouncements. He states that the last use of *zhid* in the Full Collection of Laws of the Russian Empire published in 1830\(^4\), is an order to Vice-Chancellor Ostermann on 19 November, 1781 (vol. XXI, no. 15282, Klier, 1982:3).

Klier is of the opinion that the term *zhid* was already becoming slightly unsavory by the end of the 18th century— hence its disappearance from official pronouncements (Klier 1982:3). That *zhid* was transforming into a term of opprobrium at the beginning of the century he cites the fact that in 1823 Prince Kochubey, the adviser of Alexander I, suggested discrediting Sabbatarian peasant-sectarians by officially designating them as *zhids*. (Baron 349, n 10, Klier 1982: 4) When considering this situation of the 'gradual transformation of a term into one of opprobrium' (Klier 1982: 40) we have to be very cautious, as it is only in

\(^{4}\) *Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiyol Imperii, 45 vols, St Petersburg, 1830 — cited by Klier, 1982:2, no 7.*
retrospective that we can see the aforementioned instances of official avoidance and sanctioning of zhid as evidence to its incipient derogatory meaning. It is important to consider the social circumstances that affected these particular linguistic choices. If we accept the already described high-low dichotomy for the yevrey-zhid variation, we may ask why the high term became generally preferable in legislative language while the low one in a specific discrediting context. On the matter of the switch in legislative language I suggest that the usage of a high term became more in line with the late 18th century Russian 'high' culture, with its preference for elegant, Europeanized and often pretentious style in dress and verse, the popularity of foreign and bookish words, as well as the extreme dislike for anything crude and peasant-like. With the tremendously increased separation between the Westernized nobility and the folk, the use of a simple, popular, peasant term became inappropriate. Here one may recall Romaine’s mentioning of legal language as an example of language that does not have to be spoken in order to be written.

In the case of a suggestion of official designation of Judaising sectarians as zhidy one has to consider, first of all the similarity that Russian officials perceives between this sect and the 15th century heresy of the Judaisers (zhidovstvovuyushchie), which Baron actually mentions without noticing this name-connection (Baron 349, n 10). Thus I believe that the discrediting nature of designating the sect as zhidy was not as much in the derogatory nature of the word but in this reference to the old heresy much hated and persecuted by the Orthodox Church. Furthermore, it is important that the sectarians were peasants, and thus in order to prevent their harmful influence upon Orthodox peasants, one had to use a popular term, more familiar to them. Also, since yevrey became the official term in legislature, and the sectarians were 'outlaws', violators of the order, their designation as yevrei would have equated them with professing Jews and thus legitimize their persuasion. Finally, an important moment in designating someone as a Jew, by either high or low term was in itself viewed as a negative thing by many Russians at the time. with Jews living on the outskirts of the empire, which later was codified into the Pale, Russian people were hardly familiar with them. For peasants the image of a Jew was associated with the stereotypes of ritual murders of Christian babies and ultimately Christ -killers. For higher strata of society the Western images of a Jew as Shylock, spy or Wandering Jew (in Russian Vechnyj zhid) were more
common. Also of course the social position of Jews contributed to their stereotype as usurers and leeches of Christian blood. The negative connotation of a word Jew is not unique to the early the century Russia. As late as 1858 Alexander Hertzen's progressive publication Kolokol received a letter protesting against designation of a bureaucrat Posen as a Jew in belief that the author of the original article intended an insult by this designation. The protestor wrote: "Due to some strange fanaticism, that has stuck to the Christian religion almost from its cradle, and has made no small contribution to the corruption of its original purity, the term Jew has become among the Christian peoples a general slur for any scoundrel or outcast of society." The author further condemned this fanaticism and intolerance, as well as accused the Russian government of promoting such intolerance5 (Kolokol -- The Bell, no. 30-31, London, 15 December 1858, p. 254) Apparently the author of the protest was mistaken in seeing the word Jew in aforementioned context as an insult. In a footnote to this letter Herzen protested against any accusations of intolerance and explained that they had published the original article without changing its wording -- that is all (ibid).

Zhid-Yevrey dichotomy in Russian literature

The societal stereotypes of Jews are important to keep in mind when analyzing the choice between yevrey and zhid in Russian literature. At the beginning of the century either one could be positive or negative. Yet we see that the majority of writers came to prefer the high word -- yevrey -- for high themes and positive characters, while -- zhid was reserved for the low ones. Thus Pushkin in his Gavriliada -- a brilliant parody of the immaculate conception story -- uses only the term yevrey (feminine yevreyka) in line with the high Biblical theme. At the same time, in his Avaricious Knight we see a low character of a Jewish usurer -- referred to as zhid, who offers to poison the old father of the young knight so that the latter can get his inheritance. Interestingly whenever Pushkin writes about a

5Kolokol was a journal published in London by progressive Russian ex-patriots, and thus could openly critique the government.
beautiful Jewish woman, he uses the term yevretyka. this is quite in line with the Western European literary stereotypes of an old ugly and avaricious Jew and a pretty young Jewess (often and quite amazingly the daughter of this ugly Jew). As observed by Kunitz this paradoxical stereotype was very prevalent in Russian literature of the first half of the century (Kunitz 22 -23). Yet in Lermontov we see the violation of association of a high term with a woman in his Ballad (Ballada): "Whither so swiftly, thou pretty young Jewess (zhidovka)...
where a beautiful young Jewess is in love with a Christian and is killed for that by her fanatical father. Yet in his youthful romantic Spaniards, where Jews are heroes and Christians --villains, as well as in his mature poem 'Sashka' he uses the terms yevrey-yevreyka for noble and Romantic characters. Another example of the word zhid being used in a high theme is the romantic Daughter of a Jew (Doch' Zhida) where the sympathetic main character is inspired by Judith (Pavlova 147). We can observe on the one hand the still present flexibility in interchanging zhid and yevrety, and on the other hand, a growing stylistic distinction.

In later literature this distinction gradually becomes even clearer. After mid-the century open press debates on the appropriateness of the term zhid, in fact no Russian writer could use it ambiguously. zhid disappeared form the narrative of the author and was invariably used by progressive writers to designate regional, simple or, increasingly clearly Judeophobic speech. In Chekhov's play Ivanov(final version completed in 1889) the main character is married to a Jewish woman Anna, formerly Sarra Abramson, who converted to Orthodoxy out of great love for him. When Anna offended by Ivanov's insensitivity says he never truly loved her, he responds:" Stop it, for God's sake! i can not be responsible for myself... I am suffocated by anger, and I... I may insult you..." As she continues to accuse him of deceiving her, he explodes: "Sarra, stop it, go away, otherwise the word will escape my lips! I can hardly keep myself from saying something terrible, insulting to you...
(Yelling) Stop it, zhidovka! " (Chekhov 64, my emphasis). The highly offensive nature of the word is unambiguous in this context. The well educated, decent but weak Ivanov suffers terrible remorse, having said what he said. Here one may recall Gatsuk's observation made more than a quarter of a century before the play was written, that "With the word zhid as with swearing an enlightened Russian person would want to address someone only in the outburst of anger , when passion blinds in him humanity and tact of feelings and thoughts"
Thus by the turn of the century the word has become unambiguously insulting to a Russian ear. The insulting nature of the word was further reinforced when it was appropriated for their infamous slogan: "Beat the Yids, save Russia!" -- "Bey zhidov, spasay Rossiyu!" this usage is clearly demonstrated by Kuprin in his story Gambrinus, where the main character, a Jewish violinist in a local pub is cornered by the pogrom crowd on the street. While the author consistently uses the word yevrey to refer to his highly sympathetically drawn character, he puts the word zhid into the mouth of pogrom-makers:

"...some stone-mason, in a red shirt and white apron, raised a chisel above his head and roared:
-- Zhi-id! Beat the zhid! To the blood!
But someone grabbed him by the hand from behind."

Importantly for most today's Russian Jews it is this pogromish rhetoric that first comes to mind with the word zhid, displacing other associations.

Press

While in literature we often need to infer the meaning based on the writer's treatment of a character, press may offer a more direct evidence on usage. Even more so, Russian newspapers of the mid-19th century offered its pages for the open discussion of the appropriateness of the word zhid in press. these discussions became possible after the death of the tzar Nicolas I ("Bloody Nicolas") and the considerable relaxation of state censorship (see, for example Klier, 1995:32). The discussion of zhid was part of the broader debates on the Jewish Question, characteristic of the Era of the Great Reforms. Importantly, discussion of the Jewish question had been specifically forbidden prior to 1858 (Klier 1995: XVII). Klier notes that once the censorship was loosened, noone could prevent the public debate. Most any topic was discussed in connection with the Jewish Question, including indirect and direct calls for the full civil and political emancipation of the Jews (Klier 1995: XVII). The political atmosphere of the 1860's was characterized by glib liberalism and hopes for the possibility of
great changes in the fundamental structures of Russian society (Klier 1995: 63). It is in this light that we need to consider the discussion of the word zhid by Al. Gatsuk in Sion newspaper (which has been discussed above in connection with the historical analysis of early usage of zhid).

Gatsuk on the origins of zhid and rehabilitation:

In the first part of his historico-linguistic analysis Gatsuk expresses his resentment at the fact that the old Slavic word *zhid* has become an extremely derogatory term. Noting the same origin of the word with the term *iudey* and the relation to the non-derogatory French *juif* and German *jude*, Gatsuk plays devil's advocate by asking what could be so derogatory about the Slavic form? He acutely brings home the point that despite his linguistic erudition about the non-derogatory origins of the word he has to acknowledge its highly offensive nature:

... as any educated Russian person I would feel for some reason uncomfortable [literally bad conscience] calling your journal, for example the organ of Russian Yids (*zhidy*) as I would feel uncomfortable addressing anyone with a question: 'you are, probably, a yid?' With the word *zhid* as with swearing an enlightened Russian person would want to address someone only in the outburst of anger, when passion blinds in him humanity and tact of feelings and thoughts (Sion no. 1, 1861: 5).

Gatsuk correctly connects the derogatory meaning of the term with the historical developments of negative attitudes toward the Jews in Russia. Yet while pointing out the absurdity of using this derogatory term both in print and everyday speech by an educated Russian speaker he expresses his belief that as: enlightenment and civilization both other European peoples and Jews themselves have been speedily erasing recently the negative connotations associated with the words *juif*, *jude*, etc so will of course our word *zhid* soon stop being a derogatory slur with the success of enlightenment in Russia, and then educated Jews, when speaking Russian will stop avoiding this Russian form of their common European
name (Sion, no.1, 1861: pp. 6-10).

While Gatsuk's view unequivocally demonstrates the derogatory nature of the term, it is important that he speaks on behalf of the enlightened Russian people and addresses the enlightened Jews. Yet when he notes why the rehabilitation has not happened yet, he obviously refers to the common Russian persons attitude to the common Jew: the attitude of the Russian person towards the Jew has not changed so much that the old concept connected with the word *zhid* could be erased. Although he sees the dichotomy between the low status of *zhid* and polite, proper status of *yevrey*, the latter for him is still somewhat of a euphemism, rather than simply an alternative term. This view reflects glib hope of a Russian intelligentsia for the enlightment of the masses during the era of the Great Reforms following the 1862 liberation of the serfs. As we well know the rehabilitation of the word never took place. On the contrary the word became even more unequivocally pejorative appropriated later as an integral part of pogrom- makers rhetoric.

**Jewish attitude to *zhid*-yevrey dichotomy**

Yet, we might ask whether there were reasons for impossibility of rehabilitation other than the continued unenlightened state of the impoverished and oppressed Russian masses, continued disenfranchised state of the Jews and growing terror by the government of the country which was by the consensus of all progressive intellectuals the prison of peoples. The issue i would like to problematize is the attitude of the Jews themselves towards the existing *zhid*-yevrey dichotomy in light that i consider Gatsuk's rehabilitation idea as positive because in as much as it reflects changing attitudes towards a formerly marginalized group.

Commenting on the attitudes of the Sions successor as an organ of Russian Jews, Klier notes that they frequently used the term sarcastically to mock the Judeophobe railing against the evils of *zhidy*. For example in No 13, 1969 the editorialists expressed their indignation at the provision stating education requirement as a prerequisite for the free choice of residence outside the Pale as well as the choice of occupation for the Jews. Den criticized one of the central newspapers Russkie Vedomosti which saw this discriminatory provision as an improvement. They noted that the only people who could benefit from this sort of
provision were dishonest adventures and lumpen who would trick the law to get through. Meanwhile the provision did nothing to help the starving Jewish masses (who of course could not pass the education requirement due to the lack of access to states highly competitive educational institutions, as well as lack of means to afford it). The editors commented ironically on the ignorance and nearsightedness of the provisions advocates in the face of extreme suffering of the Jewish poor:

.zhidy., which were not called anything other than leeches sucking the best juices of the country, who everybody considered Croesuses, secretly hovering over their gold, suddenly played a trick: made up their minds and started dying of starvation by the thousands. (Den' No 13, 1869: 194)

In another issue Den' termed Judeophobes as zhidoedy (zhid-eaters) (Den', no 1, 1870, as cited by Klier, 1982: 11)

On the other hand while Den' implicitly or explicitly chided others for using the term zhid, and definitely associated it with Judeophobic rhetoric, they employed it themselves when condemning what they perceived as the negative traits of their co-religionists (Klier 1982: 11). For example in the article written as a letter to the editor entitled From Siberia the author, while praising the Jews of Tomsk for their Westernized manner in dress, preference for Russified, rather than Yiddish name forms, and relative lack of grammar mistakes in their speech asserts that the latter would not even appear if it were not for the tackiest zhidovski jargon, which doesn't have here even a slightest raison d'Atre (Den, no 9, 1869). By zhidovski jargon the author, a certain Blamer, means Yiddish. While further despising this polish-german-yid jargon (pol-sko-nemetzko-zhidovski zhargon) as filth the author highly praises Hebrew as a national, rich, and polished language that should be learned (Den, no 9, 1869).

This attitude of dismissing one's own language by means of Judeophobe rhetoric is more than alarming. If Jews use a slur against themselves what can one expect of gentiles? I see this attitude as a clear expression of Jewish self hatred. The phenomenon of employing Judeophobic rhetoric, and particularly the word zhid, and the adjective zhidovski to mock
Jews that conform to antisemitic stereotypes is very much alive today. I have heard it used among Soviet Jewish intelligentsia, including my family, though of course not to mock Yiddish, but to refer traits which they saw as uncultured, provincial and to use the century terminology, reflecting 'lack of enlightenment'. Thus we could see two types of the insider use of the term zhid: as an ironic self-name to mock the Judeophobes and as a self-mocking term. In the first case the Judeophobes tool of abuse is turned against them, which contributes to the group's unity in the face of the offender as well as weakens their offense. In the second case the Judeophobic weapon is turned against the Jews themselves.

By accepting the Judeophobic rhetoric Jews split themselves into two groups 'the low, unenlightened zhidy, and the 'high' enlightened yevrei and thus as a group become more vulnerable to further attacks. In light of Goffman's team theory the Jews that employ the term zhid against other Jews are 'traitors to the team' as the team is defined by the cooperation in the face of the audience (Goffman, 104-105). What happens is that the team 'Jews' splits into two imaginary teams of 'high' and 'low' where the 'high' are siding with the enemy while the 'low', of course do not cooperate between themselves as the split into high and low only exists in the minds of the 'high' who articulate it and distance themselves from the masses. The sad irony is that the 'high' or the 'enlightened' are supposedly the best and brightest representatives of the nation.

Conclusion:

The pre-existent condition for the change in meaning of the word zhid was the zhid -- yevrey -- iudey variation existing from early stages in the development of Russian language. the condition that affected the direction and nature of change was the social and political situation of Jews in Russia. To borrow a model from chemistry (in light of Romaine's suggestion on the role of models in linguistics, discussed above) the words zhid, yevrey and iudey were the substances participating in the metaphorical reaction in which the driving force was the change in social conditions. Originally, zhid was the one mostly widely used in literature of all the three terms, its scope ranging from religious to popular writing. The
usage of *yevrey* was mostly restricted to 'high' style in religious and official texts. The result of the reaction was the change in the nature of substances involved. *zhid* gradually became some sort of a precipitate, that settled down on the negative periphery of written language, its use becoming restricted to specific narrow contexts of progressive fiction and antisemitic literature. *yevrey*, on the other hand replaced *zhid* in its neutral descriptive context and thus expanded its scope to the widest variety of literary contexts. While the main dynamics was between the terms *zhid* and *yevrey*, the word *iudey* preserved its restricted meaning -- Judean, reserved for appropriate Biblical contexts.

There are other examples of a low or popular term becoming derogatory, while a word that is perceived as more foreign acquires high status: such was the case with four letter words and words differentiating animals and their meat in Old English: the Anglo-Saxon words became unsavory while the newly borrowed French terms -- acceptable in official and 'proper' texts. sexual terms -- native -- unsavory in print, foreign proper... yet it is important to note that in the case of *zhid* -- *yevrey* both terms were borrowed, yet one became a part of Slavic languages -- earlier, phonologically more Slavic (although there has been no substratum- superstratum differentiation that existed in the newly conquered British isles).

The qualitative change in the meaning of *zhid* is characterized by the stylistic shift from median formal position on the stylistic continuum -- to informal one, and semantic shift from neutral to derogatory. while the stylistic and semantic changes were in some ways parallel I believe that the informal position of the word was in many ways prerequisite to its becoming derogatory. In the case of *zhid--yevrey* dichotomy it is the informal or 'low' style word that became derogatory. while this might not be true for all cases, I suppose that for most ethnic slurs in written language the situation is similar: given a variation, the 'low' or more colloquial form becomes derogatory. This means, on one hand, that the term originates with the 'masses'-- which implies, necessarily, in the colloquial spoken language. On the other hand, I believe that it does not become derogatory in the written language until appropriated by the upper classes, who, informed by the oral usage start using the word in a derogatory context in their texts. One example of this situation in English is the *nigger*-Negro dichotomy. *Nigger* did not become derogatory in written context until America writers and journalists started using it as derogatory in their works.
Importantly the semantic and stylistic change in meaning of zhid in written language was paralleled by the change in meaning of yevrey which remained mostly neutral semantically but shifted stylistically from most formal to less formal, also acquiring a more broad stylistic range. This qualitative change in meaning of the two terms has been paralleled by the quantitative change in usage: the use of zhid became increasingly restricted to specific types of literature and contexts while the use of yevrey -- increasingly broad (see char 2 attached).

The use of zhid became confined to antisemitic literature on the one hand and the satiric or ironic contexts of progressive literature by both Jews and non-Jews, mocking the antisemitic usage. In the contemporary literature these two trends are particularly evident in the increased use of zhid and its creative derivatives in perestroika and post-perestroika antisemitic literature and in the satirical use of zhid in progressive literature reacting against antisemitism. I have discussed the examples of these two trends in the context of the relative freedom of press and relaxation of censorship of the era of the Great Reforms. In the 20th century, the era of the new great reforms brought these trends to life in much the same way: the relaxation and the eventual demise of Soviet censorship allowed for the flourishing of both antisemitic literature and its opposition. While the antisemitic literature was originally responsible for the increase in the use of zhid in literature after its near disappearance in the Soviet period, eventually both the antisemitic writers and their progressive opponents contributed to the quantitative growth in its use. Qualitatively, however its meaning did not change in any significant way. As the status of Jews in society changed the status of language changed. although the language change was dependant upon and conditioned by social change, we can not construct neat parallels or make safe predictions.

**Averting the blow and turning the table: reducing derogatory force and rehabilitation**

Reducing derogatory force of a word, let alone its rehabilitation can not be achieved by simply enlightenment or education. Once derogation has occurred changing the meaning of a word takes an active stance and struggle on the part of the discriminated group. One of the tools of this struggle is satire. Satirical use of the word zhid by Jews and their allies may
significantly undermine its offensive power, yet it does not change its overall semantically derogatory and stylistically 'low' status. (low status). What radically changes the status of a word is its reclaiming by the group which it targets. The examples of successful re-claiming of a formerly derogatory terms are reclaiming of the word Negro during the Harlem Renaissance and the word black during the Civil rights era as descriptive terms by African-Americans, and the growing success of reclaiming of the word queer by gay/lesbian/bisexual/transsexual groups. Importantly, can not occur unless it is a political program of an organized group of individuals, committed to the cause, such as Black civil rights movement or gay liberation movement.

Necessity of reclaiming:

Thus reclaiming in the case of zhid depends on weather a there will emerge a group of Russian Jews who will see this as a necessity. If such a group does emerge and gains enough strength as a force in society, i dare say that reclaiming, at least partial, may become possible. Yet, one important factor that prompted successful reclaiming of the words Negro, black and queer is the absence of one generally recognized adequate term for either of the two groups. what considered adequate changed based on changing political agendas of the groups. In case of contemporary Russian Jews when a widely accepted literary term yevrey is available, which is well integrated into the written language without other alternatives the necessity for reclaiming might not arise.

Needless to say reclaiming can only occur in the country where Russian is the language of the majority and hence both the antisemites and the Jews express their political positions in Russian. Furthermore, Jews have to care to assert themselves in that particular society (as in "We are here, we're queer -- deal with it")\textsuperscript{6} this stance has been significantly undermined by the focus on emigration as opposed to

\textsuperscript{6} I recognize differences in political and social situations of ethnic and sexual minorities, and acknowledge that neat parallels are not possible or even legitimate, yet in this case I find a parallel helpful.
fighting for one's rights in Russia. An emigre myself, I do not wish to sound hypocritical in
this matter. I simply try to acknowledge and problematize the present state of affairs. Yet, as a
significant number of Jews stayed in Russia the re-claiming situation may still come to be.

While not directly advocating the necessity of re-claiming I would like to discuss and
problematize the idea because I see it as a part of bringing the theoretical and scientific
analysis of language to the concept of agency. individuals have power to change the
language. Of course this power is restricted mostly to the area of lexicon. in addition to
already discussed cases of group reference changes we can see the examples of conscious
efforts to change certain aspects of vocabulary in feminist language reform -- which concerns
personal reference terms. Romaine notes that because of the social significance of personal
reference, personal pronouns are particularly susceptible to modification in response to social
and ideological change (Romaine 124). As group reference is directly connected to personal
reference we can extend this argument to the case of re-claiming of ethnic slurs and problem
of zhid in particular.

The struggle against ethnic religious and sexual discrimination is one of the important
factors of social and ideological change in society. Reclaiming is one of the strategies that
returns the agency to those who have been subject to the linguistic discrimination, which is
usually part of other types of discrimination. What i see as one of the most important roles
of socio-historical linguistic inquiry is to question the foundations of oppressive structures,
such as taboos and prejudices.

Gender Bias

I would like to note that as my paper stands now, it has one major bias: most of the
authors I cite are male. the reason for this exclusion is first and foremost the difficulty of
research: the anthologies on Jews in Russian literature hardly mention women, and
researching through some recent general anthologies of Russian women writers would be no
small task, though definitely a very worthwhile one. Undoubtedly this male-bias in many
ways reflects the state of the matters with respect to writer's profession before the modern
period. even though there were many talented women writing in the century Russia, which is
the period crucial in the actual process of the derogation of the word *zhid*, it was the men whose voice was loud and influential. For this reason, I suppose that women's writing would reflect the same main patterns with respect to high-low dichotomy. And yet, one would have to research a good number of women's works to test this, as well as to see if there are any differences particularly in reference to Jewish women.

Another question that one might ask before surveying women's writing is whether they were less likely to use the low word *zhid*, in light of the fact that women were supposed to talk "like ladies" and use more elevated and also more standard, language? Romaine observes that women have always played an important role in linguistic change in Western society, by using more advance forms in their casual speech as well as correcting more sharply in formal styles (Romaine 264) Yet one would have to test to what extent this observation is true about written language, where men have set the standards for centuries. Overall, considering women's writing would be not only an interesting endeavor but first and foremost a matter of scientific justice on the part of a researcher.

**Methodology and personal agenda:**

One of the purposes for my discussion of the word *zhid* is development of a methodology for a critical approach to linguistic discrimination. I also acknowledge that my agenda as a researcher is informed and necessarily biased by my personal identity as a Russian Jew. The subject of my research belongs not only to the area of my academic and cultural expertise, but also to the sphere of my personal struggle for empowerment, and against the legacy of ethnic and linguistic discrimination. I see my contribution, if any, not only in describing a particular linguistic phenomena but also in participating with my work in the struggle for more informed, critical, open and fair communication. In light of Menz’z call for critical linguistics I do not strive towards objectivity which is never truly possible in science, but instead -- towards pluralistic critical inquiry that can be informative both as a socio-historical survey and a possible model for further work.
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Zhid as an example of socio-historical development of DEL’s (derogatory ethnic labels)

1. Critical inquiry

   a. Critical linguistics

   S. Romaine and Menz both refer to Popper. Popper: all knowledge is theory impregnated

   must reject essentialism -- instead, according to Romaine, description of origins of
   language structures and their use

2. Historical overview

   a. Up till late 18th century (annexation of parts of Poland, Ukraine and Belorussia with
      significant Jewish populations by the Russian empire): zhid -- non-derogatory

   b. Late 18th -- mid 19th century -- zhid becomes somewhat ‘unsavory’.

   c. Mid 19th -- late 19th century -- becomes a mostly derogatory term, appropriated widely
      by the anti-semitic press.

   Enlightened Jews start using zhid as an in-group term to differentiate between themselves and the
   unenlightened co-religionists (and co-nationals)

   d. Late 19th century -- late 20th century: zhid -- integral part of antisemitic and pogrom-
      makers’ rhetoric.

   ‘creative’ anti-semitic discourse e. g. ‘zhidocracy’ for contemporary post-perestroika ‘democracy’
3. Contemporary implications

a. American implications
   other DEL's
b. Goffman's 'team' theory
   ethical dimensions, Cornel West on inter-group relations
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**Chart 2**

(based on Romaine, 123; relationship between social and stylistic variation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Informal</th>
<th>Formal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantics Neutral</td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Circle Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Circle Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogatory</td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Circle Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Circle Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zhid shifted from being on the median formal level (still acceptable in official language) to quite informal. Consequently, from Neutral to Derogatory. Meanwhile, yerey shifted from most formal (used in religious literature and other high style texts) to Zeos Formal, also acquiring a broad spectrum of stylistic acceptability. Yerey remained a mostly neutral descriptive term.

This chart is applicable specifically to written language and presumes the shifts for one broad social category (or class) of literati and their highly educated audience.