The purpose of this paper is to show how the field of Jewish interlinguistics (Wexler 1987) and a case study of Jewish Russian (JR) in particular could contribute to the general understanding of ethnolects (Clyne 2002). The data come from my earlier research on JR.

JR is a set of post-Yiddish varieties of Russian spoken as L1 by Ashkenasic Jews in Russia. It is rather a range of ethnolects than one single ethnolect, which may be explained with a different degree of copying from Yiddish.

The case of JR allows the following general conclusions:
- the diffusion of ethnolectal features into the mainstream use is facilitated not only by dense social network and clustering in certain occupations, but also by a relatively sufficient number of speakers with a variety of occupations.
- in addition to ML turnover, lexical and prosodic features, an ethnolect may be characterized by new combinability rules: stems and derivational suffixes belong to the TL (Russian) but their combination patterns do not.
- a post-A ethnolect of a language B facilitates transfer of features of a language C into B, whereas C (1) has been in contact with A and (2) is related to B. This is how Polonisms and Ukrainisms via Yiddish enter JR and even non-Jewish varieties of Russian.