

El Presente

Estudios sobre la cultura sefardí

La cultura Judeo-Española
del Norte de Marruecos

Editores: *Tamar Alexander • Yaakov Bentolila*

El Presente, vol. 2, diciembre de 2008



Universidad Ben-Gurion del Negev



Sentro Moshe David Gaon
de Kultura Djudeo-Espanyola

Índice

Prólogo	1
<i>Historia:</i>	9
Yom Tov Assis	
The Jews of the Maghreb and Sepharad: A Case Study of Inter-Communal Cultural Relations through the Ages	11
María José Cano, Beatriz Molina y Elena Mironesko	
La visión de la alteridad entre judíos, cristianos y musulmanes en los libros de viajes y las crónicas: El caso de Marruecos según las Crónicas de Expulsión hispano-hebreas	31
Gérard Nahon	
Tetuán, Alcázar y Mequines frente al “Mesías” José ben Sur: la opción entre <i>Turkya</i> y <i>Frankya</i> (1675)	53
Pablo Martín Asuero	
El encuentro de los españoles con los sefardíes de Marruecos a la luz de Pedro de Alarcón	67
Aldina Quintana	
El <i>Mellah</i> de Tetuán (1860) en <i>Aita Tettauen</i> (1905) de Benito Pérez Galdós: Cambios de actitud frente a los estereotipos antisemitas en la España de la Restauración	81
Alisa Meyuhas Ginio	
El encuentro del senador español Dr. Ángel Pulido Fernández con los judíos del Norte de Marruecos	111
Rena Molho	
The Moral Values of the Alliance Israélite Universelle and their Impact on the Jewish School World of Salonika and Morocco	127
Gila Hadar	
Gender Representation on the Dark Side of <i>Qidushin</i> : Between North Morocco and the Balkans (Monastir)	139

<i>Lingüística:</i>	157
Yaakov Bentolila	
La lengua común (coiné) judeo-española entre el Este y el Oeste	159
David Bunis	
The Differential Impact of Arabic on <i>Ḥaketía</i> and Turkish on Judezmo	177
Cyril Aslanov	
La haquetía entre hispanidad y aloglotismo: divergencia y convergencia	209
Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald	
Between East and West: Differences between Ottoman and North African Judeo-Spanish <i>Haggadot</i>	223
Isaac Benabu	
Jewish Languages and Life after Death: Traces of <i>Ḥaketía</i> among the Jews of Gibraltar	243
<i>Literatura, folclore y música:</i>	253
Paloma Díaz-Mas	
Las mujeres sefardíes del Norte de Marruecos en el ocaso de la tradición oral	255
Oro Anahory-Librowicz	
La imagen del musulmán y del cristiano a través de la narrativa popular sefardí de la zona norte de Marruecos	267
Nina Pinto-Abecasis	
El entramado de las relaciones entre las comunidades judías del Marruecos español en el espejo del chiste y el mote	283
Susana Weich-Shahak	
<i>Me vaya kapará</i> – La haketía en el repertorio musical sefardí	291
Lista de colaboradores	301

The Differential Impact of Arabic on Ḥaketía and Turkish on Judezmo

David M. Bunis

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

1. Distinctive Jewish Varieties of Ibero-Romance and their Removal to North Africa and the Ottoman Empire

In the Middle Ages, the Jews of Christian Spain spoke unique varieties of Castilian and other Ibero-Romance languages. The distinctiveness of these linguistic entities lay primarily in the domains of alphabet, component structure, lexicon, and register or style. After the 1492 Expulsion and the exodus of the Jews from Iberia, the characteristically Jewish types of Castilian continued to survive, developing predominantly in two regions of the Muslim world: the Ottoman Empire and North Africa, particularly Northern Morocco. At first glance, the contact situations between the language of the Spanish Jewish refugees and those of the new co-territorial host communities – Ottoman Turkish in the Balkans and varieties of North African Arabic in Morocco – appear to have been parallel. A primarily Ibero-Romance (i.e., Indo-European) minority language existed in contact with Turkish and Semitic majority languages respectively, as well as with other local languages spoken by non-Jewish and more veteran Jewish sub-culture groups in the regions – e.g., Greek and Judeo-Greek in the Ottoman Empire and Berber and perhaps Jewish Berber in Morocco. Given the apparent parallelism, one might expect an analogous outcome: partial or complete acquisition by the Sephardic communities of the predominant host language in each region, and either the eventual adoption of that language for in-group use – as also for inter-group communication with non-Jewish and non-Sephardic Jewish

* The research upon which the present article is based was supported by Israel Science Foundation grant no. 807/03.

neighbours – or the use of the contact language for inter-group exchanges and the native language as the in-group, Jewish language.

As is well known, the route followed in both regions corresponded to the first option: while the Sephardim – especially the male faction – acquired knowledge of the local majority language, they continued to employ their ever-evolving Jewish Ibero-Romance language for everyday in-group communication, along with Hebrew and Aramaic as the languages of liturgy, sacred study, and formal documentation. This was predictable in the Ottoman Empire where, even prior to the arrival of the Sephardic immigrants, a pattern had developed whereby each national-religious group cultivated its own language or languages. Even Jewish languages such as Judeo-Greek and Judeo-Italian were maintained in resistance to Turkish. As one of the last groups to arrive on the Ottoman scene, the Sephardim naturally adopted this practice. The maintenance of their own language in the face of the surrounding Arabic in Morocco may perhaps be considered less predictable in light of the fact that, centuries before, the more veteran Moroccan Jewish communities had adopted local Arabic, if in Jewish variants. Despite the general parallelism of the two Sephardic communities-in-exile with respect to the host languages – in both instances learnt but not adopted for in-group use – the two contact situations were from the outset distinct in several ways. Likewise, the influences from the predominant local languages on the two varieties of post-Expulsion Jewish Ibero-Romance were not completely analogous. The present paper will focus on the differential impact made by Ottoman Turkish on Judezmo¹ and North African Arabic on Ḥaketía,² endeavouring to account for the disparity through sociolinguistic and structural linguistic analysis.

- 1 One of the earliest scholarly articles which focused on Judezmo was Moritz Grünwald's "Über den jüdisch-spanischen Dialekt als Beitrag zur Aufhellung der Aussprache im Altspanischen", published in 1882 in *Zur romanischen Dialektologie*, a separate monograph of the *Jüdischen Centralblatt* (Belovar). For the earliest monograph-length study of a Judezmo regional variety, see Max L. Wagner, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Judenspanischen von Konstantinopel*, A. Hölder, Vienna 1914.
- 2 Scholarly attention was initially directed toward the existence of Ḥaketía in such notes as P. Meneu, "Dialecto hispánico-hebraico en el imperio de Marruecos", *El Archivo*, 4:4 (Denia, 1890), pp. 83-86; Isaac Benchimol, "La langue espagnole au Maroc", *Revue des écoles de l'Alliance Israélite Universelle*, 2 (1901), pp. 126-133. A dirge was documented in Ramón Menéndez Pidal and José Benoliel, "Endecha de los judíos españoles de Tánger", *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos*, 12 (Madrid, 1905), pp. 128-133. The first full-length monograph devoted to Ḥaketía was José Benoliel's *Dialecto judeo-hispano-marroquí o*

2. Differential Acquisition of New Co-Territorial Languages

2.1 Contact with a partially-familiar language in Morocco: North African Arabic

To commence, we note that at least some of the Spanish Jewish exiles who reached North Africa may be said to have been linguistically “pre-programmed” for their encounter with local Arabic. Their ancestors had for centuries spoken or been familiar with Jewish varieties of the same Arabic brought to Iberia by the North African conquerors. Among some Jews in Andalusia, daily contact with Arabic – and probably the use of a Jewish variety as a mother tongue – must have been the rule on the eve of the Expulsion itself. According to the traveler Hieronymus Münzer, who visited Granada in 1494-1495, some 20,000 Jews had been resident in Muslim-dominated Granada when it fell to the Christians in 1492.³ In Muslim-dominated Spain, Castilian – as used by Christians as well as Jews – had borrowed extensively from the North-African Arabic lexicon. In general terms, therefore, elements of the North African Arabic lexicon – and probably features of the language’s phonology, morphology, and syntax – must have been at least somewhat familiar to many Jewish exiles who reached Morocco. In their everyday language as well as in the special variety they used for sacred-text translation, the Sephardim of North Africa – as well as those in Ottoman regions – preserved a significant Iberian Arabic component into modern times.⁴

hakitia, Ameller, Barcelona 1977² (reprinted from *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* 1926-52). A regional variety was examined in detail by Juan Martínez Ruiz, *Lengua y literatura de los sefarditas de Alcazarquivir*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Madrid, 1951. Cynthia Crews paid attention to both Judezmo and *Ḥaketia* in “Some Linguistic Comments on Oriental and Moroccan Judeo-Spanish”, *Estudios Sefardies*, 2 (1979), pp. 3-20; see also David M. Bunis, “Modernization of Judezmo and *Hakitia* (Judeo-Spanish)”, Rachel S. Simon, Michael M. Laskier, and Sarah Reguer (eds.), *The Jews of the Middle East and North Africa in Modern Times*, Columbia University Press, New York 2003, pp. 116-128.

- 3 Hieronymus Münzer, *Viaje por España y Portugal 1494-1495*, Almenara, Madrid 1951 [Polifemo, Madrid 1991], cited in Haim Bainart, “Granada”, *Encyclopedia Judaica*, Keter, Jerusalem 1971, Vol. 7, col. 853.
- 4 On the Arabic component in Judezmo and Jewish Ibero-Romance in general, see Max L. Wagner, “Judenspanisch-Arabisches”, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 40 (1920), pp. 543-549; Kurt Levy, “Zu einigen arabischen Lehnwörtern im Judenspanischen”, *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 51 (1931), pp. 703-705; Cynthia M. Crews, “Some Arabic and Hebrew Words in Oriental Judaeo-Spanish”, *Vox Romanica*, 14 (1955), pp.

Evidence exists that lexemes of Arabic origin in the Jewish Ibero-Romance of Spain tended to bear a closer phonological and semantic resemblance to their etyma than the reflexes used by Christians. For example, among Ottoman Sephardim, Arabic-origin *alkunya*⁵—used in the sense of ‘surname’—still preserves the original form of its etymon (*al-kunya*) and is relatively close in meaning to the Arabic filonymic. In Christian Spanish, in contrast, the phonologically divergent form *alcurnia* is used in the rather distinctive sense of ‘ancestry; lineage’.⁶ In contrast to its reflection in Spanish as phonological zero, Arabic *ḥ* continues to be reflected as *ḥ* in Ḥaketía and as velar *x* in Judezmo, in such lexemes as Ḥaketía *alḥeña* : Judezmo *alxenya* : Spanish *alheña* (the last, realized [al’eḡa]) ‘privet (henna)’ (cf. Hispano-Arabic *al-ḥinna*). In both Ḥaketía and Judezmo, those Arabisms which in Castilian receive antepenultimate stress tend to be realized with final stress: e.g., Spanish *albóndigas* vs. Ḥaketía/Judezmo *albondiyás* ‘meatballs’. In the distinctive varieties of Ibero-Romance they employed, both Jews and Muslims in Spain rejected the name *domingo* for ‘Sunday’ because of the allusion they understood it to carry to Jesus as *dominicus* or ‘Lord’. To this day, the name for Sunday employed by Moroccan and Ottoman Sephardim reflects the Arabic: *alxaḍ* among Ottoman Sephardim and, phonologically more faithful to its Arabic

296-309; Isaac R. Molho, “La terminologie arabe du vocabulaire judéo-espagnol”, *Ošar Yəhude Səfarad*, 4 (1961), pp. lxiv-viii; Šim’on Marcus, *The Judeo-Spanish Language*, Kiryat Sefer, Jerusalem 1960, pp. 133-136 (Hebrew); Samuel G. Armistead and Joseph H. Silverman, “Arabic Refrains in a Judeo-Spanish Romance”, *Ibero-romania*, 2 (1970), pp. 91-95; Paul Wexler, *The Non-Jewish Origins of the Sephardic Jews*, State University of New York, Albany 1996 (see index of Arabisms, pp. 313-314).

- 5 Unless otherwise indicated, documentation for the Judezmo lexemes cited in this article may be found in Joseph Nehama, *Dictionnaire du judéo-espagnol*, C.S.I.C.: Instituto ‘Benito Arias Montano’, Madrid 1977. The lexeme *alkunya* provides the base of the verb *alkunyar*, employed in Judezmo to denote ‘to give a name or nickname’—e.g., *alkunyar nombre malo a otro* ‘to give someone a malicious nickname’ ([Me’ir ben Šəmu’el Benveniste, tr.] *Livro lyamaḍo en lašon hakódeš Šulḥan ha-panim i en laḍino Meza de el alma*, Salonika 1568, f. 148b.
- 6 E.g., *de alta alcurnia* ‘of noble birth’, *una familia de alcurnia* ‘an old family’: see Carol Styles Carvajal and Jane Horwood (eds.), *The Concise Oxford Spanish Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2004³, p. 26. For historical documentation of the Castilian lexemes cited in the present article, see Joan Corominas, with the collaboration of J. A. Pascual, *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico*, Gredos, Madrid 1987.

etymon, *alḥad* in Morocco (the word has no reflex in Christian Spanish).⁷ Among speakers of both Judezmo and Ḥaketía, some pre-Expulsion Arabisms are used in specifically Jewish senses: e.g., *ziara/ziará* (cf. Arabic *ziyāra* ‘visit; pilgrimage’) denotes a ‘pilgrimage to holy sites in Eretz Israel or to the graves of Jewish saints’.⁸ Divergences also exist in the use of some Arabisms employed in Judezmo as opposed to Ḥaketía: for instance, Judezmo preserves some Arabisms in their pre-Expulsion, Hispanized form and sense, whereas the corresponding Ḥaketía lexeme or related word more closely reflects the North African Arabic etymon, probably as a result of direct interaction with Arabic speakers following the Expulsion: e.g., J[udezmo]. *xazino* ‘ill’ vs. H[aketía]. *ḥzen* ‘sorrow’ (cf. Cl[assical].A[arabic]. adj. *ḥazm* ‘sad’,

- 7 Ḥaketía has *alḥad/-t* alternants (Benoliel, *Dialecto*, pp. 171, 191 s. *día d'alḥat*) (above note 2). For reasons of space, the etymologies of the Arabisms and Turkisms in Ḥaketía and Judezmo will not be specified in the present article. Unless otherwise indicated, the pioneering work by Benoliel is the source of the Ḥaketía lexical examples cited; an alphabetically-arranged glossary appears there on pages 168-267. It is this glossary which provided the foundations for the Ḥaketía lexicons and general articles on that language that appeared after its publication, including: Max L. Wagner, “Zum Judenspanischen von Marokko”, *Volkstum und Kultur der Romanen*, 4 (1931), pp. 221-245; Carlos Benarroch, “Ojeada sobre el judeoespañol de Marruecos”, Jacob M. Hassán (ed.), in collaboration with María Teresa Rubiato and Elena Romero, *Actas del Primer Simposio de Estudios Sefardíes*, C.S.I.C., Madrid 1970, pp. 263-275; Jacob M. Hassán, “De los restos dejados por el judeoespañol en el español de los judíos del norte de África”, *Actas del XI Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y Filología Románica*, 4 (1965), pp. 2127-2140; E. Nández, “El español en Marruecos”, *Les langues néo-latines*, 59.175 (1965-1966), pp. 63-76; Haïm Vidal Sephiha, “Extinction du judéo-espagnol vernaculaire du Maroc ou Hakitia”, *Yod*, 2 (Paris 1976), pp. 83-88; Abraham Ramiro Bentes, *Os Sefardim e a Hakitia*, Mitograf Editora, Rio de Janeiro 1981; Alegría Bendelac, *Los nuestros: sejiná, letuarios, jaquetía y fraja*, Peter Lang, New York 1987; A. Bendayan de Bendelac, *Voces jaquetiescas*, Centro de Estudios Sefardíes de Caracas, Caracas 1990 (= *Biblioteca Popular Sefardí VIII*); idem, *Diccionario del judeoespañol de los sefardíes del norte de Marruecos (jaquetía tradicional y moderna)*, Centro de Estudios Sefardíes de Caracas, Caracas 1995; Esther Cohen Aflalo, “*Lo que yo sé*” (*Manual de Hakitia*), self-published, Madrid 2000; Isaac Benharroch Benmergui, *Diccionario de haquetía: Guía esencial del dialecto de los judíos del norte de Marruecos*, Centro de Estudios Sefardíes de Caracas, Caracas 2004.
- 8 E.g., “*Hayiti ba mi-beti še-hi bə-Andrinopla lə-vaddi la-ziara li-Yrušalayim*” ‘I used to come from my home, which is Adrianople, alone, on the pilgrimage to Jerusalem’ (Yosef Be Rav [c. 1474-1546], *Sefer šə'elot u-tšuvot ... Ya'aqov Be Rav*, Venice, 1663 [reprinted Jerusalem, 1958], no. 22 (Hebrew).

m.sg. *ḥuzn*, *ḥazan* ‘sorrow’), J. *alvrisyas* ‘(good) news’ (cf. Hispano-Arabic *al-bušra* + S[panish]. pl. -s) vs. Ḥ. *bšara* ‘news’ (cf. Cl.A. *bišāra*).⁹

Prior to the Expulsion, Christian Spaniards tended to perceive Muslims and Jews as largely comparable, Spanish legislation occasionally referring to them both in the same clauses. Spaniards referred to both Jewish and Muslim quarters of Spanish cities, as well as to gatherings of Moors or Jews, by the Arabic-origin *alḡama*. They likewise designated the writing of Ibero-Romance by both Muslims and Jews – in Arabic and Hebrew letters respectively – by the derivative terms *alḡamía* or *alḡamiado*. Since they probably connected the Jewish expulsion from Spain with the final defeat of the Muslims in Granada – at least chronologically, and perhaps also on a deeper psychological level; and given that both Jews and a section of the Andalusian Muslim aristocracy left Spain at the same time – it is possible that the Jews themselves felt a degree of identification with the Moors. Although the Sephardim did not adopt the language of the latter for their own group use upon their arrival in Morocco, throughout the centuries following the Expulsion they demonstrated an openness to Arabic influence on their evolving Jewish Ibero-Romance language and culture. This was manifested especially through extensive lexical borrowing and other linguistic adaptations, as well as acculturation of other sorts. Such openness may be attributed to a number of factors, including prior knowledge of the language among some immigrants and the acquisition of it among others, who imitated the native phonology, morphology, and syntax they encountered among the Moors, as well as among the more veteran, so-called *forasteros* or Arabicized Jews, whose ancestors were already resident in North Africa prior to its conquest by the Arabs. Likewise, the establishment of daily commercial and social contact with the latter groups, and perhaps a certain identification with the Moors, as opposed to the Christian Spaniards who had expelled them, also probably played a role.¹⁰

9 On the Arabic component in Ḥaketía, see Benoliel, *Dialecto* (above note 2), passim; Juan Martínez Ruiz, “Arabismos en el judeoespañol de Alcazarquivir (Marruecos) 1948-1951”, *Revista de Filología Española*, 49 (1966), pp. 39-71; and the sources cited in footnote 7 above. The use of Arabisms in Ḥaketía is well exemplified in Juan Martínez Ruiz, “Textos judeo-españoles de Alcazarquivir (Marruecos)”, *Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares*, 19 (1963), pp. 78-115; Solly Lévy, *Yaḥsará: Escenas haquetiescas*, E.D.I.J., Montreal 1992.

10 On the contact between Ḥaketía and Jewish Arabic in Morocco, see Joseph Chetrit, “Judeo-Arabic and Judeo-Spanish in Morocco and their Sociolinguistic Interaction”, Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Jewish Languages*, Brill, Leiden 1985, pp. 261-279.

2.2 Contact with an unfamiliar language in the Ottoman Empire: Ottoman Turkish

The case of the Sephardic refugees who reached the shores of the Ottoman Empire was quite different. Few would have acquired much prior knowledge of Ottoman Turkish, although many of its Arabisms would not perhaps have been entirely foreign. Initially, such Indo-European languages as Greek – used by the Empire’s Romaniote community and known to some of the Sephardic immigrants – and varieties of Italian, spoken by some Jews in the Empire, may have served as bridges to communication with local Jews and, through them, with the Turks.

Although evidence exists that members of the first generations of Sephardim born in the Ottoman Empire began to acquire Turkish with varying degrees of aptitude, the structure of Turkish differed on all linguistic levels from the language the Sephardim collectively continued to use as their primary mode of in-group communication into the twentieth century. Perhaps following the example set by the Empire’s other, more veteran ethnic groups – many of whom undoubtedly spoke Turkish with a foreign-sounding phonology and interference of various other kinds from their own native languages – the Sephardim appear not to have striven to speak Turkish in precisely the same fashion as the Turks. They rather preserved something of their native Ibero-Romance phonology and syntax, in what was to become a distinctly Sephardic rendition of Turkish. This was recognized by the Turks as characteristic of Jews, the popular Turkish shadow theatre placing it in the mouths of Jewish characters. While thankful to the Ottomans for having granted them asylum in the Empire, the Sephardic refugees shared no meaningful historical or social experiences with the Ottomans – such as, in certain respects, they had experienced with the Moors in Spain. Given the segregated nature of Ottoman society, the first generations of Jews born in the Empire had no reason to identify with the Turks to such an extent as to collectively motivate them to acquire a completely native-level Turkish. They were certainly not driven by any incentive to substitute it for their own language – which, among the Ottomans, came to be called “the Jewish language” (*Yahudice*). A desire to accommodate linguistically to their new surroundings in the manner adopted by the other Ottoman minorities may nonetheless have served as a motivating factor behind their extensive borrowing from the Ottoman lexicon when using their own language. This phenomenon was possibly even more pronounced amongst the Jewish community than within other minority

cultures in the Empire¹¹ – a comprehensible circumstance, perhaps, in view of the fact that the latter had been conquered by the Ottomans and continued to bear a measure of resentment towards them into the modern era, whereas the Jewish refugees from Spain had settled in the Empire by royal invitation.

3. Co-territorial loans in Morocco and the Ottoman Empire: North African Arabisms in Ḥaketía and Ottoman Turkisms in Judezmo

The significant morphological, lexical, and other structural borrowings from the dominant contact languages into the evolved Ibero-Romance of the Sephardim in

- 11 On the Ottoman Turkish component in Modern Judezmo, see Abraham Danon, “Essai sur les vocables turcs dans le judéo-espagnol”, *Keleti Szemle*, 4 (1903), pp. 215-229; *Keleti Szemle*, 5 (1904), pp. 111-126; Marcus, *Judeo-Spanish* (above note 4), pp. 135-144; Michael Molho, “Penetración de extranjerismos en el español de Oriente”, *Presente y futuro de la lengua española: Actas de la Asamblea de Filología del I Congreso de Instituciones Hispánicas*, Ediciones Cultura Hispánica, Madrid 1964, Vol. 1, pp. 325-334; Edward Stankiewicz, “Balkan and Slavic Elements in the Judeo-Spanish of Yugoslavia”, *For Max Weinreich On His Seventieth Birthday*, Organizing committee: Lucy S. Dawidowicz, Alexander Erlich, Rachel Erlich and Joshua A. Fishman, Mouton, The Hague 1964, pp. 229-236; Marius Sala, “Elementos balcánicos en el judeoespañol”, *Actas del XI Congreso Internacional de Lingüística*, 4 (Madrid 1965), pp. 2151-2160; Isak Moscona, “Influences on ‘Judezmo’: The Language of the Balkan Jews”, *Annual[of the Social, Cultural and Educational Association of Jews in the People’s Republic of Bulgaria]*, 11 (Sofia, 1971), pp. 173-194; Avner Levy, “The Turkish Element in Ladino Suffixes”, *Mi-qedem u-mi-yam: Studies in the Jewry of Islamic Countries*, Vol. 1 (Haifa, 1981), pp. 155-165 (Hebrew); Pascual Pascual Recuero, “Primeros turquismos en ladino”, *Homenaje al Prof. Darío Cabanelas Rodríguez, O.F.M., Con Motivo de Su LXX Aniversario*, Departamento de Estudios Semíticos, Universidad de Granada, Granada 1987, Vol. 2, pp. 451-470; Pilar Romeu, “Turquismos en la *Crónica de los Reyes Otomanos* de Mosé ben Baruj Almosnino”, *Miscelánea de Estudios Arabes y Hebraicos*, 37-38 (1988-1989), pp. 91-100; Isak Papo, “Turcizmi u jevrejsko-španjolskom Sefarada Bosne i Hercegovine”, *Sefarad ’92*, Institut za istoriju, Jevrejska zajednica Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo 1995, pp. 241-252; Marie-Christine Varol-Bornes, “Influencia del turco en el judeoespañol de Turquía”, Winfried Busse, Heinrich Kohring, and Moshe Shaul (eds.), *Hommage à Haim Vidal Sephiha*, Peter Lang, Berne 1996, pp. 213-234; David M. Bunis, *Voices from Jewish Salonika*, Misgav Yerushalayim-Etz Chaim Foundation, Jerusalem-Thessaloniki 1999, pp. 89-98. The Turkish component in Judezmo is well illustrated, if with some exaggeration, in the texts by Moshe A. Cazés presented in Bunis, *Voices from Jewish Salonika*.

the Ottoman Empire and Northern Morocco indirectly provide us with a basis for an examination of the differential acquisition of Arabic amongst the Sephardim in Morocco and Turkish amongst those in the Ottoman Empire. More directly, they enable an analysis of the type and extent of the influence the contact languages exerted on the two major regional variants of post-Expulsion Jewish Ibero-Romance spoken in the two locations.

Such borrowings begin to appear in the Hebrew-letter writings of the two groups from the first century of their settlement in Morocco and the Ottoman Empire. The documentation in Judezmo is substantial, beginning in the sixteenth century and continuing through to our own century. Before the twentieth century, the principal sources are rabbinical works in Judezmo and the Ottoman Sephardic rabbinical responsa literature in Hebrew, which contains occasional vernacular testimony. From the mid-nineteenth century, periodicals in Judezmo also appear. These sources bear witness to the gradual ascent of the Ottoman Turkish component in Judezmo throughout this period. Material in Ḥaketía from the same period – primarily consisting of vernacular passages in collections of communal regulations and rabbinical responsa – is far sparser and lacks analogues to the secular- and popular-oriented texts produced in the Ottoman regions from the mid-nineteenth century, thus hampering precise historical-comparative analysis.¹² Thanks to native writing produced amongst both Ottoman and Moroccan Sephardim, as well as descriptive monographs and lexicons by scholars documenting the languages of both groups in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the corpora of borrowings at our disposal since the turn of the twentieth century reach into the thousands, giving us a firm foundation for a comparative analysis of those in the modern varieties of Judezmo and Ḥaketía.

- 12 For remarks on some extant texts, see Jimmy Pimienta, “Une chronique en ‘haketía’”, *Yod*, 33-34 (1993), pp. 99-114; Sidney Pimienta, “‘Actas’ de la Communauté Juive de Tanger (1860-1875): Réflexion autour de la transcription du texte en ‘solitreo’”, *Yod*, 33-34 (1993), pp. 115-131; Gladys Pimienta, “Le ‘Registre des Actas’ (comptes-rendus de réunions) du premier Comité de la Communauté de Tanger de 1860 à 1875: Analyse de la langue”, David M. Bunis, Yaakov Bentolila, and Efraim Hazan (eds.), *Languages and Literatures of Sephardic and Oriental Jewry*, Misgav Yerushalayim, Jerusalem (forthcoming). For linguistic observations on songs in Ḥaketía, see Gladys Pimienta, “Espagnol et ‘haketía’ à travers les chansons judéo-espagnoles du Maroc”, *Yod*, 33-34 (1993) pp. 133-139. Brief notes on Ḥaketía manuscripts have appeared over the years in the Judezmo periodical *Aki Yerushalayim*.

3.2 Observations on phonology

3.2.1 *Ḥaketía*

3.2.1.1 Preservation of Arabic phonemes in borrowed lexemes

As documented in such texts as the communal ordinances from the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries published by Shalom Bar-Asher,¹³ the written forms of the Arabisms in early *Ḥaketía* appear to reflect an accurate phonological realization among the Sephardim of Arabic phonemes foreign to fifteenth-century Castilian. Later, as further elements were assimilated into *Ḥaketía*, these too preserved much of their original phonology.¹⁴ Thus, from the sixteenth century onwards, the Arabic component of *Ḥaketía* included phonemes identical in realization to those of North African Arabic

- 13 Shalom Bar-Asher (ed.), *Sefer Hataqanot: The Book of Communal Ordinances*, Academon, Jerusalem 1990 (Hebrew). The pre-modern *Ḥaketía* passages presented there include the following apparent Arabisms, also recorded for the modern language: [in texts from 1602-1609:] p. 131 – ענאיא (cf. Bendelac, *Diccionario* [above note 7], p. 34 *anaya* ‘endearing term for husband’); p. 132 – אללאה (cf. Benoliel, *Dialecto* [above note 2], pp. 172-173 *Allah*; Bendelac, *Diccionario*, pp. 26-27 *Al.lah* ‘God’); p. 136 – כ'אלכ'אליס (cf. Benoliel, *Dialecto*, p. 216 *jaljál*; Bendelac, *Diccionario*, p. 373 ‘bracelet’), אלג'ופ'אר (cf. Benoliel, *Dialecto*, p. 170 *ažžófar*; Bendelac, *Diccionario*, pp. 17-18 *ažžófar* ‘pearl’), אלעובה (cf. Bendelac, *Diccionario*, p. 30 *al' ažba* ‘maiden’); p. 137 – אלכ'ורסאס (cf. Benoliel, *Dialecto*, p. 172 *aljorsa*; Bendelac, *Diccionario*, p. 26 *aljorsas* ‘rings’), כ'מאר [cf. Benoliel, *Dialecto*, p. 218 *jemár*; Bendelac, *Diccionario*, p. 376 *jem(m)ar* ‘bride’s crown’], מכ'זאן [cf. Benoliel, *Dialecto*, p. 228 *majzen*; Bendelac, *Diccionario*, p. 434 *maghžén* ‘Moroccan authorities’]; p. 145 – ג'רבי [cf. Benoliel, *Dialecto*, p. 203 *yarbí*; Bendelac, *Diccionario*, p. 302 *gharbí* [with metathesis] ‘western’] → מתקאל, ג'ברי (cf. Benoliel, *Dialecto*, p. 192 *metsgal* [s. *duccuado*]; Bendelac, *Diccionario*, p. 478 *metsgal* ‘ducat’); [in texts from 1610-1655:] p. 167 – טראה (cf. Benoliel, *Dialecto*, p. 252 *tarráh*; Bendelac, *Diccionario*, p. 680 *tarraḥ* ‘baker’s assistant’); p. 168 – אלחאג'א (cf. Benoliel, *Dialecto*, p. 209 *haja*; Bendelac, *Diccionario*, p. 340 *ḥaža* ‘jewel’); p. 169 – (diminutive) אלכ'ורסיטה; p. 178 – קעאה (cf. Benoliel, *Dialecto*, p. 240 *qá'a* ‘bottom’); p. 200 – כ'אנויאר/כ'אזניאר (cf. Benoliel, *Dialecto*, p. 217 *jazzana* [the second form, with metathesis] + verbalizing Hispanic-origin *-ear* ‘to store’); [texts from 1712-1732:] p. 277 – זמאם לקוטעא – זמאם לפלוס (cf. Benoliel, *Dialecto*, p. 199 *flus*; Bendelac, *Diccionario*, p. 278 *flus* ‘money’).
- 14 On the phonology of *Ḥaketía*, see Benoliel, *Dialecto* (above note 2), pp. 8-35; Paul Benichou, “Observaciones sobre el judeo-español de Marruecos”, *Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 7 (1945), pp. 209-258; idem, “Notas sobre el judeo-español de Marruecos en 1950”, *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica*, 14 (1960), pp. 307-312; Juan Martínez Ruiz, “F-, h- aspirada y h- muda en el judeo-español de Alcazarquivir”, *Tamuda*, 5 (1957), pp. 150-161.

ħa – depicted in written Ḥaketía by <ħ> (e.g., *ħammal* ‘porter’), *xa* <χ> (e.g., *xátar* ‘consideration’), *ha* <h> (e.g., *huá* ‘air’), ‘*ayn* <ʿ> (e.g., ‘*ažmía* ‘Castilian [literally, “foreign language”]), and *qof* <q> (e.g., *qadí* ‘Muslim judge’).¹⁵ The presence of *h* in Arabic probably aided Ḥaketía speakers in preserving the phone *h* (reflecting Latin F → Old Spanish *f* → *h*) in Hispanisms (e.g., *hazer* ‘to do’)¹⁶ and Hebrew-Aramaisms (e.g., *halaxá* הלכה ‘Jewish law’). (This phone disappeared in Judezmo, Latin F being reflected regionally as either *f* or zero, e.g., *fazer/azer* ‘to do’,¹⁷ and Hebrew-Aramaic *he* <h> realized as zero, e.g., *alaxá*.) In Ḥaketía, specifically local Jewish Arabic (*t/ħ* → *ts*) is reflected in lexemes such as *metsgal* (Cl.A. *mitqāl* ‘weight for measuring’) ‘ducat, money’ (vs. J. *metekal*, reflecting the Old Spanish reflex *metical*),¹⁸ *kwitrá* ‘type of Moroccan stringed instrument’ (A. *kwitrá*), *keftsá* ‘meat patty’ (vs. J. *k[ʃy]efté* and variants; cf. T. *köfte*, P. *kūfta*).

Arabic phonology also reinforced the phonemic status enjoyed in pre-Expulsion Jewish Ibero-Romance speech – originally as a result of loans from Hebrew-Aramaic and Arabic – by the four phonemes /d/ (e.g., *fidearse* to ‘spill, boil over’) vs. /ð/ (*fiðeo* ‘noodle’), and /g/ (e.g., /ger/ ‘proselyte’ [< Hebrew גר]) vs. /ɣ/ (/yer/ ‘only’),¹⁹ as opposed to the two phonemes /d/ and /g/, reflected in Castilian as *d* or *ð* and *g* or *ɣ*, respectively, according to the phonological environment (e.g., [ð] and [ɣ] after vowels, [d] and [g] after /n/).

- 15 It should be noted that while these phonemes had probably existed in both the Arabic and Hebrew-Aramaic components of the Jewish Arabic spoken in Muslim Spain, the influence of Hispanic phonology led to the realization in Ḥaketía Hebrew-Aramaisms of Hebrew *qof* as *k* rather than as *q* (e.g., *kaddis*/-š קדיש ‘mourner’s prayer’).
- 16 In most varieties of Modern Spanish, the reflex is generally realized as zero.
- 17 For the Judezmo regional reflections of Latin F, see Aldina Quintana Rodríguez, *Geografía lingüística del judeoespañol: Estudio sincrónico y diacrónico*, Peter Lang, Bern 2006, pp. 93-100.
- 18 Benoliel, *Dialecto* (above note 2), p. 192, s. *duccuado*. The word seems to have been known in pre-Expulsion Judezmo in the form *metikal*; it translates *beqa* בקע ‘half a sheqel weight’ (Gen 24:22) in the Constantinople Pentateuch of 1547, cf. Moshe Lazar (ed.), *The Ladino Scriptures [1540-1572]*, Labyrinthos, Lancaster, Ca. 2000, Vol. 1.
- 19 The glossary at the end of Benoliel, *Dialecto* (above note 2), offers 61 lexemes with initial occlusive /g-/ (realized as such even when following a vowel) and 117 with fricative /ɣ-/.

3.2.1.2 Arabic interference in the phonological realization of non-Arabic-origin elements, and vice-versa

Under the influence of local Arabic phonology, the Old Judezmo (as in Old Spanish) *ğ* and *ž* allophones of the /*ğ*/ phoneme merged in Haketía as *ž*, encountered in lexemes of both Hispanic origin (e.g., *žudýó* ‘Jew’ vs. Judezmo *ği-/ğudýó*) and Arabic origin (e.g., *žuáb* ‘reply’, vs. Judezmo *ğóáp* [T. *cevap* ← A. *ğawāb*]). Arabic phonology appears to have had some further effect on the realization of Haketía elements of other origins: Arabic consonant gemination, common in Arabic loans (e.g., ‘*assás* ‘sentinel’, ‘*azzáf* ‘broom’), also occurs in word-medial position in the lingual consonants of some lexemes of Hispanic origin (e.g., *azzul* [S. *azul*] ‘blue’, *mezza* [S. *mesa*] ‘table’, *bašezza* [Old S. *baxeza*] ‘lowness’, *assar* [S. *asar*] ‘to roast’, *korassón* [S. *corazón*] ‘heart’, *mal:oyrarse* ‘to die young’, *toddo!* ‘everything!’). Word-medial sequences of vowels in hiatus in Hispanic elements are sometimes interrupted by the insertion of Arabic-origin (or Arabic-supported) *h* (e.g., *dihablo/-a* ‘devil’; cf. S. *diablo*) or ‘ (e.g., *ma’uyar* ‘to miaow’, *ma’uyo* ‘miaow’; cf. S. *maullar*). The Arabic-origin glottal stop is also sometimes added word-initially to reinforce Hispanic-origin exclamations or words of encouragement: e.g., ‘*ay!* ‘alas!’, ‘*anda!* ‘go on!’, ‘*arsa* ‘lift it!’ (cf. S. *ay*, *anda*, *alza*).²⁰ In borrowings from Arabic, even those phonemes occurring in Spanish enjoy a privilege of occurrence distinct from that in Spanish. For example, consonant clusters in word-initial position such as those illustrated by *yzal* ‘handsome young person’ and *kbir* ‘notable, chief’, and consonants occurring in word-final position such as occlusive *b* in *yríb* ‘foreigner’ and nasal *m* in *hram* ‘(something) prohibited’, are prohibited in Spanish. Some features of Arabic phonology were nevertheless lost through accommodation to the primarily Castilian-based phonology of Haketía: e.g., pharyngealized *ṭ* was replaced by *t* (e.g., *xátar* ‘good will’; cf. A. *xāṭir*) and *ṣ* by *s* (e.g., *safi* ‘pure’, cf. A. *ṣāfi*).

3.2.1.3 Arabic vs. Castilian phonological influence on the Hebrew-Aramaic of Haketía speakers

The interaction with Arabic in Morocco also had an impact on the realization of Whole and Merged Hebrew²¹ within the Sephardic community. Amongst the late-

²⁰ Benoliel, *Dialecto* (above note 2), p. 27.

²¹ On these terms, see Max Weinreich, “Prehistory and Early History of Yiddish: Facts and Conceptual Framework”, Uriel Weinreich (ed.), *The Field of Yiddish [One]*, Linguistic

fifteenth-century Sephardic refugees from Islamic-controlled Andalusia, it must have strengthened the (partially?) Arabicized realization of Hebrew, which had probably been employed there up until the Expulsion.²² Amongst those from other areas, it restored the partly Arabicized realization which had been used earlier throughout Muslim Spain.²³ In the modern era, this realization is noted in the Whole Hebrew reading tradition of Ḥaketía speakers, as well as in the Hebrew-Aramaisms of Ḥaketía (as opposed to those of Judezmo), which include an Arabicized realization of the Hebrew consonants *het* <ח> = *ḥ* (*ḥatán* חתן ‘bridegroom’, vs. Judezmo *x*: *xatán*), and ‘*ayin* <ע> = ‘ (e.g., ‘*olam* עולם ‘world’, *téva* טבע ‘nature’, vs. Judezmo zero: *olam* or syllable-final *x*: *téva*x). Perhaps under local Arabic influence, Hebrew *tav* is realized in Ḥaketía (as among North African Judeo-Arabic speakers) as occlusive *t*, whether it opens or closes a syllable (e.g., *zexut* זכות ‘merit’). This diverges from the tradition of Southeast Judezmo speakers, as also apparently from the pre-Expulsion tradition, where one finds occlusive *t* in syllable-initial position but *ḏ* or *θ* at the close of a syllable (e.g., *zexuḏ*/*-θ*). Arabic influence is further reflected in the gemination of consonants with *dagesh forte* (vs. lack of gemination in Judezmo): e.g., Ḥ. *gibbor* גיבור ‘hero’ (vs. J. *gibor*), Ḥ. *maggefá* מגפה ‘plague’ (vs. J. *magefá*).

No less than Arabic, Castilian phonology may have contributed to the realization of Hebrew-origin *vet* <ב> as /b/ – i.e., Modern Ḥaketía shows a collapse of the medieval /b/ <ב> and /v/ <ב> phonemes, in Hebraisms as well as in elements of other origins, both realized today as [β] intervocally: e.g., /kaboḏ/ [ka’βoḏ] כבוד ‘respect’, and

Circle, New York 1954, pp. 73-101, esp. p. 85; on their use with respect to Judezmo, see David M. Bunis, “Whole Hebrew: A Revised Definition”, Erika Timm, Galit Hasan-Rokem, Ada Rapaport-Albert and Israel Bartal (eds.), *Festschrift in Honor of Chava Turnianski*, Jerusalem-Trier (forthcoming).

- 22 A similar situation held in other centres of immigration in which Judezmo co-existed with Arabic – e.g., in Syria and Egypt.
- 23 See Irene Garbell, “The Pronunciation of Hebrew in Medieval Spain”, *Homenaje a Millás Vallicrosa*, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Barcelona 1954, Vol. 1, pp. 647-696; Amos Dodi, *Studies in the Hebrew Tradition of the Jews in Spain before the Expulsion*, Ben Gurion University, Beer Sheva 2002 (Hebrew); Shelomo Morag, “The Spanish Communities and the Living Tradition of the Hebrew Language”, Moshe Bar-Asher, Yochanan Breuer and Aharon Maman (eds.), *Studies in Hebrew*, Magnes Press, Jerusalem 2003, pp. 28-41, 61-74 (Hebrew); idem., “The Linguistic Heritage of the Spanish Communities”, idem, pp. 61-74 (Hebrew).

as [b] following m: e.g., /arrambam/ [arram'bam] הרמב"ם 'Maimonides' – and likewise to the preservation of *gimel refuya* <ג> as γ and *dalet refuya* <ד> as δ (both illustrated in *mayén daviδ* מגן דוד 'Star of David').²⁴ In most regions of the Ottoman Empire where Sephardic contact with Arabic was minimal or completely absent, whatever Arabicized realization of Hebrew which might have been used among earlier generations in Muslim Spain disappeared virtually without trace. Interactions with local languages such as Turkish, Greek, and South Slavic, on the other hand, changed the face of the Whole and Merged Hebrew of Judezmo speakers in new ways.²⁵

3.2.2 Judezmo

3.2.2.1 Sound substitution

The Turkisms that begin to appear in Ottoman Sephardic sources in the sixteenth century demonstrate the characteristic substitution of Ottoman phonemes and phoneme sequences foreign to Ibero-Romance phonology by their closest native

- 24 The influence of Castilian phonology, as well as the realization of Hebrew in pre-Expulsion Christian Spain, may also lie behind the non-Arabicized reflection of the following Hebrew consonants in Ḥaketía (as in Judezmo, as opposed to the Whole Hebrew of neighbouring Judeo-Arabic speakers): 'alef <א> as zero rather than Arabicized glottal stop (e.g., *geul:á* גאולה 'redemption [of the Jewish people]', cf. J. *geulá*); waw <ו> as v, not w (e.g., *vadday* ודאי 'sure'; cf. J. *vaday*); tet as t, not t̥ (e.g., *terefá* טרפה 'food or drink unfit for Jewish consumption'), šadi <צ> as s, not š (e.g., *saddik* צדיק 'saint', Southeast J. *sadik*), and qof <ק> as k, not q (e.g., *mekubbal* מקובל 'kabbalist', J. *mekubal*). In common with the popular realization of Hebrew in pre-Expulsion Christian Spain, as among Judezmo speakers, Ḥaketía tends to realize Hebrew šin <ש> as s (e.g., *sammás* שמש 'beadle of a synagogue', J. *samás*).
- 25 For some of these, see Cynthia M. Crews, "The Vulgar Pronunciation of Hebrew in the Judeo-Spanish of Salonica", *The Journal of Jewish Studies*, 13 (1962), pp. 83-95; David M. Bunis, *A Phonological and Morphological Analysis of the Hebrew-Aramaic Component of Judezmo*, Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1981.
- 26 For a detailed analysis of Judezmo phonology, see J. I. Cheskis, *Phonological Studies in Judeo-Spanish*, M.A. thesis, Harvard University, 1917; Marius Sala, *Phonétique et phonologie du judéo-espagnol de Bucarest*, Mouton, The Hague 1971; idem, "Innovaciones del fonetismo judeoespañol", *Revista de Dialectología y Tradiciones Populares*, 32 (1976), pp. 537-549; Iván Kunchev, *Phonetics and Phonology of the Spanish-Jewish Speech in Bulgaria*, Ph.D. dissertation, [University of Sofia], 1974; idem, "El sistema fonológico del dialecto judeo-español de Bulgaria", *Español Actual*, 28 (Madrid, 1974), pp. 1-17; idem, "On some Problems of Bulgarian-Sefaradic Language Contacts", *Annual*

counterparts.²⁶ Such a phenomenon is still echoed today in the Judezmo of many Jews of the former Ottoman regions, especially those born before World War II.²⁷ This parallels the way in which Turkisms were phonologically incorporated into the other minority languages of the Ottoman Empire – in general principle if not in precise phonological detail. Such substitutions are noted in vocalism: e.g., T[urkish]. *ö* → J. *yu*: *köşe* → *kyušé* ‘corner’, *ü* → *i*: *köprü* → *kyuprí* ‘bridge’, *ı* → *i*: *kadı* [A. *qāđī*] → *kadí*²⁸ ‘Muslim judge’ – as well as in consonantism: e.g., T. *h* (from Arabic *h*, *h*, *x*) → J. *zero/x*: *hava* [A. *hawā*] → *xavá* ‘air’, *hammal* [A. *ḥammāl*] → *amal/xamal* ‘porter’, *hatır* [A. *xātīr*] → *xatír* ‘consideration’, geminated consonants → non-geminates (e.g., T. *muhabbet* [A. *maḥabbat*] → J. *mwabet* ‘conversation’). The relatively minor influence of the Turkish phonological system on Judezmo may explain the loss of the Old Judezmo *h* phone in Ottoman Judezmo, despite its presence in Turkish: in contrast with Ḥaketía, *h* completely disappeared in Judezmo Hispanisms (e.g., Old Spanish *fazer/hazer* vs. Modern Judezmo *fazer/azer* ‘to do’) and, as illustrated, was replaced by zero or *x* in Turkisms and other local borrowings, and by zero in Hebraisms (e.g., *alaxá* הלכָה ‘Jewish law’).²⁹ Systematic tendencies in the Hispanic component of Judezmo also affect borrowings from Turkish. For example, there is characteristic metatheses with *r* in J. *truší* ← T. *turşu* ‘brine’, (Salonika) J. *estrepil* ← *trespil* ← T.

[of the Social, Cultural and Educational Association of the Jews in the People's Republic of Bulgaria], 9 (Sofia, 1974), pp. 153-166; idem, *Fonética y fonología del judeo-español en Bulgaria*, Sofia 1975; idem, “Archaisms and Innovations in the Phonetic System of the Spanish-Jewish Speech in Bulgaria”, *Annual [of the Social, Cultural and Educational Association of the Jews in the People's Republic of Bulgaria]*, 11 (Sofia, 1976), pp. 141-171. On the phonology of the Turkisms in Judezmo, see Julie F. Nemer, *Sound Patterns and Strategies: Loanwords in Judeo-Spanish*, Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1981. For an overview of regional variation in Judezmo phonology, as well as morphology, syntax, and lexicon, see Quintana Rodríguez, *Geografía* (above note 17).

- 27 The phonology of Turkish as spoken by Jews born in Turkey after World War II, as well as the realization of the Turkisms in their Judezmo, generally displays no divergence from Turkish as spoken by Turkish Muslims.
- 28 It will be noted that Ḥaketía and Judezmo share many elements ultimately of Arabic origin in addition to those preserved from the language of the Jews in medieval Spain: while Ḥaketía borrowed these directly from North African Arabic, they entered Judezmo through Ottoman Turkish.
- 29 The absence of *h* in Greek and in the Jewish varieties of it used in the Ottoman Empire may have influenced its disappearance in Judezmo.

tesbih (A. *tasbīh*) ‘worry beads’; and epenthetic dental-stop insertion between a sibilant and *r*: e.g., J. *maštrabá*³⁰ ‘cup, mug’ ← T. *mašraba* (A. *mašraba*), J. *mizdrap* ‘plectrum’ ← T. *mizrap* (A. *mizrāb*).³¹

3.2.2.1 Turkish phonological influence on Judezmo

Contact with Turkish, as well as with Greek and other Balkan languages, nevertheless exerted some influence on the sound system of Judezmo. In places such as Salonika and Istanbul, it undoubtedly strengthened the independent pre-Expulsion phonemic status of intervocalic /d/: e.g., *adás* (T. *ada* + S. *-s*) ‘islands’ vs. /ð/: e.g., *aðás* (H[ebrew]. מרת) ‘myrtle’ (/d/ exists as an independent phoneme in Turkish, and there is a /d/ vs. /ð/ opposition in Greek), and /g/: e.g., *gani* ‘lavish’ (T. *gani* [← A. *ḡanī*]) vs. /ɣ/: e.g., *ḡani* ‘I earned’ (*g* and *ɣ* phones exist in Ottoman and modern rural Turkish as well as in Greek).³² Old Castilian possessed a single /ž/ phoneme, realized as *ž* or *ǰ* according to phonological environment (e.g., word-initial *ǰ* as in <justo> *ǰusto* vs. -medial *ž* as in <ajo> *ažo* ‘garlic’). Due to its contact with Turkish, the reflexes of both phones acquired independent phonemic status in Judezmo, as exemplified in the minimal pair *maǰar* ‘Magyar (a Hungarian coin)’ vs. *mažar* ‘to crush’ and in numerous near pairs (*ǰ* and *ž* are independent phonemes in Turkish as well).³³ As in Ḥaketía, the privilege of occurrence of phonemes existing in Castilian is more extensive in Judezmo than in Castilian, due to loans from Turkish. This is illustrated in the final consonants and consonant clusters in *garip* (T. *garip* [A. *ḡarīb*]) ‘foreigner’, *xak* (T. *hak* [A. *ḡaqq*]) ‘right, due’, *xaram* (T. *haram* [A. *ḡarām*]) ‘prohibited’, *kyošk* (T. *köşk*) ‘pavilion’, *ǰumert* (T. *cömerd* [P. *ǰevān-merd*]) ‘generous’. Contact with Turkish phonology has also resulted in changes in the realization of some elements of non-Turkish origin in Judezmo: e.g., *g* + front vowel → *gy/y* + front vowel, as in the

30 Danon, “Essai” 1904 (above note 11), p. 118.

31 Informant, born Constantinople.

32 Nehama, *Dictionnaire* (above note 5), documents 65 lexemes with word-initial /g-/ and 135 with /ɣ-/ , both occurring irrespective of the phonological environment. The highly fricative quality of /ɣ/ in such places as Salonika and Izmir was probably influenced by the realization of /ɣ/ in Greek.

33 Nehama, *Dictionnaire* (above note 5), documents 23 lexemes with word-initial /ž-/ and 183 with /ǰ-/.

eighteenth-century variant Judezmo Hispanism *gyerra/yerra*³⁴ (vs. S. *guerra*) ‘war’, and twentieth-century variant Judezmo Hebraisms such as *gyevir* ‘wealthy man’, *gyevirá* ‘wealthy woman’ (vs. *Ḥaketía gevir, gevirá*), reflecting H. *gəvir/-á* גביר/אה. ³⁵ This reflects the palatalized realization of velars preceding a front vowel in Turkish: e.g., *gelmek* (realized [g’elmek’]) ‘to come’. As in Turkish, a tendency to realize Judezmo *l* as dark *ɫ* rather than light *l* after a central or back vowel – e.g., *kavesat* ‘pillow’ (vs. *Ḥaketía*, Spanish light *-l*) – prevails. *L* is one of the few consonants that exhibit gemination in Judezmo (e.g., *destil:ar* ‘to distil’ [S. *destilar*], *yal:a!* ‘Get going!’ [T. *yallah* (A. *yā* ‘*Allāh*)]). This phenomenon may reflect the influence of geminated *l* in Turkish – found, for example, in many compounds with Arabic-origin *Allah* ‘God’.

3.3 Observations on morphology

3.3.1 *Ḥaketía*

Significant differences in the incorporation of material from Arabic in *Ḥaketía* and Turkish in Judezmo also obtain on the level of morphology. Here, however, the root of the divergence most probably does not derive from the differential nature of the Sephardic acquisition of the two contact languages in Morocco and the Ottoman Empire but from the structures of the contact languages themselves. As in Castilian and other Indo-European languages, the lexemes belonging to the Ibero-Romance component of *Ḥaketía* and Judezmo take the form of linear concatenations of discrete morphemes (bases, derivational affixes, inflectional endings), each of which can be easily isolated and manipulated – an affix or inflectional ending added to a base, deleted from it, replaced by another, and so on – according to the rules governing the language.³⁶ As an example, we can take the morphemic structure of the following *Ḥaketía* lexemes relating to ‘bewitchment’: *feč+izzo(+s)* ‘magic spell(s)’,

34 E.g., Ya‘aqov Xulí, *Sefer me‘am lo‘ez ... Bərešit*, Constantinople 1730, f. 8a: גיירה *gyer[r]a*; Šabbətay ben Ya‘aqov Vitas, *Sefer məšivat nefes*, Constantinople, 1744, Vol. 2, f. 38a: יירה *yer(r)a*.

35 Crews, “Vulgar Pronunciation” (above note 25), p. 86: *gyevir* גייביר; *Bos de la verdad* 3: 210 (Edirne, 1912), p. 4: *yevirá* ייבירה.

36 On *Ḥaketía* morphology, see Juan Martínez Ruiz, “Morfología del judeo-español de Alcazarquivir”, *Miscelánea Filológica dedicada a Mons. A. Griera*, 2 (1960), pp. 103-128.

feč+izz+er+o ‘sorcerer’ (f. *-a* ‘-ess’), *feč+izz+er+ía* ‘sorcery’, *en+feč+izz+ar* ‘to bewitch’, *en+feč+izz+amyento* ‘bewitchment’, *en+feč+izz+ađo* ‘bewitched’.³⁷

On the other hand, similar to those of other Semitic languages, Arabic lexemes are generally constructed of consonantal roots incorporated within discontinuous morphological patterns consisting of fixed arrangements of consonants and vowels, yielding parts of speech (e.g., nouns, adjectives), inflected forms (e.g., plurals), and derivatives (e.g., diminutives) the morphological components of which cannot easily be separated.³⁸ Again, this may be illustrated through lexemes connected with ‘bewitchment’: cf. Classical Arabic verbal root *s-h-r* + verbal *CaCaCa*³⁹ → *saḥara* ‘to bewitch’; nominal *CiCC* → *sihr* ‘bewitchment’, pl. *aCCāC* → *ašḥār*, *CuCūC* → *suḥūr* ‘magic’, *CaCCāC* (f. *-a*) → *saḥḥār* (f. *-a*) ‘magician’ (sorceress’), *CāCiCa* → *sāḥira* ‘sorceress’; adjectival *CiCCī* → *siḥrī* ‘magical’, *CāCiC* → *sāḥir* ‘enchanting’, *maCCūC* → *mašḥūr* ‘bewitched’.⁴⁰

Thus, reminiscent of the Ibero-Arabic borrowings in Old Spanish, the North African Arabic loans in Ḥaketía tend to be of two types, as we shall now discuss.

3.3.1.1 Prefabricated borrowings entirely of Arabic morphemic structure

The first type of loan is entirely of Arabic morphemic composition, borrowed in a prefabricated or “ready-made” form structurally paralleling the Arabic etymon. The most fundamental of such structures is the simple root + pattern: e.g., *ž-r-b* + *CeCCā* → nominal *žerbā* ‘attempt’, *ž-r-b* + *teCCiCa* → *težriba* ‘test’. Among such borrowings, Ḥaketía incorporates diminutive forms representing the characteristic Arabic rearrangement of the consonants and vowels of the primitive form: e.g., *driweš* from *derwiš* ‘dervish’. It also uses adjectival forms displaying changes in the base accompanied by an enclitic addition – such as feminine *driyf+a* ‘nice, charming’ as compared with masculine *driyyef*.⁴¹ According to Benoliel, some forty Ḥaketía nouns

37 Cf. Spanish: *hech+izo(+s)* ‘magic spell(s)’, *hech+ic+er+o* (f. *-a*) ‘sorcerer(-ess)’, *hech+ic+er+ía* ‘sorcery’, *hech+iz+ar* ‘to bewitch’, *hech+iz+ado* ‘bewitched’.

38 For some examples of substantive-formation patterns in North African Arabic, see Norbert Tapiéro, *Manuel d’arabe algérien moderne*², C. Klincksieck, Paris 1978, pp. 48-49.

39 C = consonant.

40 Hans Wehr, *Arabic-English Dictionary*⁴, J.M. Cowan (ed.), Spoken Language Service, Urbana Il., Ithaca, NY 1994, pp. 465-466.

41 On adjective formation in North African Arabic, see Tapiéro (above note 38), pp. 52-53.

borrowed from Arabic are used in their characteristically Arabic broken plural forms, involving segmental rearrangement, reduplication, and other pluralizing devices: e.g., m.sg. *ħaž* ‘Muslim pilgrim to Mecca’ → m.pl. *ħožžāž*; m.sg. *ħaddad* ‘ironsmith’ → m.pl. *ħaddada*.⁴²

As in other varieties of Arabic, Mughrabi also contains a number of fairly discrete suffixes and inflectional endings, several of which appear in some *Ĥaketía* borrowings. These include: agent-like *-awi* (e.g., *ħadr+áwi* ‘conversationalist’ ← *ħadrá* ‘conversation’), adjectival *-i/-í* (e.g., *nefnáf+i* ‘nasal’, *mesk+i* ‘muscatel’ [f. *mesk+iy+a*]), and the respectively masculine and feminine plural markers *-ín* (e.g., *em’akkés* ‘contrary’ → *em’aks+ín*) and *-at* (*ataim+at* ‘artichokes’).⁴³ Although these morphemes could also hypothetically have been fused to bases of non-Arabic origin, the sources do not record any such occurrences. This circumstance may be due to the influence of Arabic, which tends not to use Arabic derivational morphemes with non-Arabic bases. Thus the loanwords containing these morphemes should also probably be considered “ready-made” borrowings.

3.3.1.2 Fusions with Arabic-origin stems and Hispanic-origin affixes or inflectional endings

The second type of borrowing is composed of simple Arabic nominal, adjectival, and verbal bases (lacking derivational affixes) – among the more easily “separable” elements of Arabic – to which are fused discrete and easily-attached derivational affixes or inflectional endings of Castilian origin only. Substantives and adjectives femininize with final *-a*⁴⁴ (e.g., m.sg. *xottab* ‘marriage maker’, f.sg. *xottab+a*).⁴⁵

42 On the use of broken plurals in *Ĥaketía*, see Benoliel, *Dialecto* (above note 2), p. 60; on broken plurals in North African Arabic, see Tapiéro (above note 38), pp. 62-64.

43 For plural formation with *-ín* and *-at* in *Ĥaketía*, see Benoliel, *Dialecto* (above note 2), p. 60; for pluralization with *-ín* and *-āt* in North African Arabic, see Tapiéro (above note 38), p. 59.

44 On the feminization of elements of Arabic and other origins in *Ĥaketía*, see Benoliel, *Dialecto* (above note 2) pp. 53-55.

45 It might be argued that in these feminine lexemes *-a* may just as likely reflect the Arabic as the Hispanic feminine marker. Since the same marker denotes the feminine in the Hispanisms of *Ĥaketía*, and these constitute the majority of its lexicon, however, it would seem more logical to interpret *Ĥaketía -a* as Hispanic rather than as Arabic.

Aside from the forty nouns referred to above, the plurals of which are broken forms, the other nominal borrowings – as also the borrowed adjectives – pluralize with *-(e)s*: e.g., *derwiš* → pl. *derwiš+es*.⁴⁶ Ḥaketía is rich in derived verbs and deverbal derivatives constructed from an Arabic-origin adjectival, nominal, or verbal base fused to Hispanic-origin verbalizing *-ear* and other derivational suffixes: e.g., *basel* ‘fastidious, importunate’ → *bas-/besl+ear* ‘to importune, annoy’, derived abstract *-umbre*: *basl+umbre* ‘annoyance, impertinence, bother’; *daḥs* ‘forced penetration’ → *daḥs+ear* ‘to penetrate’, and derived abstract nominalizing *-ura*: e.g., *daḥs+ura* ‘narrowness’. Some agent forms are created with *-dor/-dor*: e.g., *xaml-* → *xaml+ear* ‘to clean (latrines, etc.)’ → *xaml+ea+dor* ‘cleaner of latrines’; instrumentals and agent-like forms are created with *-ero*: e.g., *kuskusú* ‘couscous’ → *kuskus+ero* ‘vessel for couscous’, *ḥalwa* ‘Moroccan sweets’ → *ḥalwin+ero* ‘seller/maker of sweets’. Adjectives (from past participles) are formed with *-eaḏo*: e.g., *ḥarr-* → *ḥarr+ear* ‘to give a vacation’ → *ḥarr+eaḏo* ‘freed’. Ḥaketía also uses Hispanic-origin emotive and other derivational suffixes with some Arabisms: e.g., *haža* ‘object’ accepts diminutizing *-ita* (*haž+íta*) and augmentative/pejorative *-ona* (*haž+ona+s*), and *faqsá* ‘cry’ accepts augmentative/emotive *-ina* in *faqs+ina* ‘great sadness’.⁴⁷

46 On the pluralization of Arabisms in Ḥaketía with Hispanic-origin *-(e)s*, see Benoliel, *Dialecto* (above note 2), pp. 59-60. For a comparative analysis of plural formation in Ḥaketía and Moroccan Jewish Arabic, see Simon Lévy, “Judéo-espagnol et judéo-arabe marocains: le sort des morphèmes de pluriel et d’emprunts au terme de quatre siècles de plurilinguisme”, *Yod*, 33-34 (1993), pp. 141-155.

47 Some additional Hispanic-origin affixes are employed in Ḥaketía fusion formations, but seemingly not with Arabic-origin bases: e.g., Hebrew-origin *ḥamés* חָמֵשׁ ‘leavened food’ → *deshamessar* ‘to get rid of leavened food before Passover’, *deshamesseamyento* ‘the getting rid of leavened food’ (Benoliel, *Dialecto* [above note 2], p. 190); Hebrew-origin *ka‘as* כַּעַס ‘anger’ → *enka‘asarse* ‘to become angry’, *enka‘asaḏo* ‘angry’ (ibid, p. 194). On such fusions with bases of Hebrew origin, see Yaakov Bentolila, “Le composant hébraïque dans le judéo-espagnol marocain”, Isaac Benabu and Joseph Sermoneta (eds.), *Jerusalem Studies in Judeo-Romance Languages*, Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1985, pp. 27-40; David M. Bunis, “Judezmo and Ḥaketía Inanimate Nouns With Hebrew-Origin Bases and Romance-Origin Affixes”, A. Maman, S.E. Fassberg and Y. Breuer (eds.), *Sha‘arei Lashon: Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Jewish Languages Presented to Moshe Bar-Asher*, Bialik Institute, Jerusalem 2007, Vol. 3, pp. 40-63.

Some Arabic roots have been incorporated in both structural forms: thus the radical *t-h-r* ‘(Muslim) to circumcise’ is reflected in “ready-made” *thara* ‘(Muslim) circumcision’ (cf. Arabic *t-h-r* + CCaCa), as well as derived *tahr+ear* ‘(Muslim) to circumcise’.

3.3.2 Judezmo

Although Turkish and post-Expulsion Jewish Ibero-Romance differ structurally in many ways, the Turkish tendency toward agglutination makes it more similar to Judezmo in respect to morphemic structure and its management than Arabic is to Ḥaketía. This may be illustrated by Judezmo lexemes relating to ‘bewitchment’ and Turkish lexemes relating to ‘culture’ and ‘manners’.⁴⁸ In Judezmo, affixes precede or follow the invariant base (-)feč+iz-, just as suffixes and compound-forming elements follow invariant *terbiye(t)* in Turkish:

Salonika Judezmo: *feč+izo(+s)* ‘magic spell(s)’, *feč+iz+er+o* (f. -+a) ‘sorcerer (-ess)’, dimin. *feč+iz+er+iko* ‘little sorcerer’, *feč+iz+er+ia* ‘bewitchment’, *en+feč+iz+ar* ‘to bewitch’ (passive *en+feč+iz+ar+se* ‘to become bewitched’), past part./adj. *en+feč+iz+ađo* (f.sg. -a, m.pl. -os, f.pl. -as) ‘bewitched’, pres. part./adj. *en+feč+iz+ante* ‘bewitching’ (apocopated *en+feč+iz+án*), gerund *en+feč+iz+ando* ‘bewitching’, *en+feč+iz+amyento* ‘bewitchment’.

Turkish: *terbiye(t)* ‘culture; manners; seasoning’ (cf. pl. *terbiye+ler* ‘sauces’), *terbiye+ci* ‘pedagogue’, *terbiye+le+me(k)* ‘to season’, *terbiye+li* ‘well-educated/-behaved’, *terbiye+li+lik* ‘politeness’, *terbiye+siz* ‘impolite’, *terbiye+siz+ce* ‘impolitely’, *terbiye+siz+le+ş+me(k)* ‘to be impolite’, *terbiye+siz+lik* ‘impoliteness’, *terbiy+evi* ‘pedagogical’, *terbiyet+kerde* ‘educated’, *terbiyet+pezir* ‘teachable’.

3.3.2.1 Prefabricated borrowings composed entirely of Ottoman structure

Paralleling most of the Arabisms in Ḥaketía, Judezmo has borrowed many Ottomanisms in “ready-made” form: e.g., *derviř* (T. *derviř* [P. *darvīř*]) ‘dervish’, *terbiyé(t)* (T. *terbiye[t]* ← Persian ← Arabic *tarbiya* [cf. *r-b-b* + taCCiya] + *ta marbuta*) ‘culture, manners’. Also as in Ḥaketía, these attract Hispanic-origin inflectional

48 The Turkish word for ‘bewitchment’ – *büyü* – also attracts a host of derivational morphemes: *-cü*, *-cü+lük*, *-leyim*, *-le+me*, *-le+n+me*, *-leniş*, *-leyiş*, *-le+mek*, *-le+n+mek*, *-le+t+mek*, *-leyici*, *-lü*, *-cül*, *-sel*. This word has not been borrowed into Judezmo, however.

endings, pluralizing with *-(e)s*: e.g., *derviř* → *derviř+es*,⁴⁹ and feminizing with *-a*: e.g., *derviř+a* ‘female dervish’. In Turkish, such elements often serve as bases accepting an assortment of etymologically Turkish discrete inflectional endings and derivational suffixes: e.g., *terbiye* + pluralizing *-ler*, agentive *-ci*, adjectivizing (and substantivizing) *-li[+lik]*, adjectivizing (and substantivizing or adverbializing) *-siz[+lik* or *+ce]*, verbal infinitive-marking *-le+mek* and *-le+ř+mek*, as indicated above. Many of these derived forms have also been assimilated into Judezmo in prefabricated form, perhaps directly from Turkish.

3.3.2.2 Fusions of diverse component structure

Turkish bound morphemes with non-Turkish stems. Extrapolating from such morphemically-complex lexemes the meanings of their easily isolable Ottoman suffixes, Judezmo speakers not only employed them in lexemes with Ottoman stems – to which are added Hispanic-origin inflectional endings specifying number and gender (e.g., m.sg. *terbielí* [f.sg. *-lí+a*; m.pl. *terbielí+s*, f.pl. *terbielí+a+s*] ‘well-educated/behaved’, m.sg. *terbiesís* [f.sg. *-siz+a*] ‘impolite’, m.sg. *terbiesizlik* ‘impoliteness’ [m.pl. *terbiesizlik+es*]) – but also applied them to bases of non-Ottoman origin, such as Hispanic-origin *pleto* ‘quarrel’, *veđre* ‘green’ (cf. S. *pleito*, *verde*), and Hebrew-origin *masá* מַצָּה ‘matzah’, *aver* אוויר ‘air’, *purim* פּוּרִים ‘Purim holiday’, *muxar* מוּבָחַר ‘choice’, in fusion formations such as *plete+ǵí* ‘quarrelsome person’, *masa+ǵí*⁵⁰ ‘matzah baker’,⁵¹ *purim+lik* ‘Purim present’,⁵² *veđro+lí* ‘greenish’ *aver+lí* ‘airy; nice’,

49 On plural formation in Judezmo, see David M. Bunis, “Plural Formation in Modern East Judezmo”, *Jerusalem Studies* (above note 47), pp. 41-67.

50 Unless otherwise indicated, documentation for the Judezmo Hebraisms noted in the present article may be found in David M. Bunis, *A Lexicon of the Hebrew and Aramaic Elements in Modern Judezmo*, Magnes Press, Jerusalem 1993.

51 On the use in Judezmo of Turkish-origin *-ǵí* with bases of Hebrew origin, see Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald, “The Fusion of the Hebrew-Aramaic Lexical Component in Judeo-Spanish”, *Jerusalem Studies* (above note 47), pp. 139-159; David M. Bunis, “A Theory of Hebrew-Based Fusion Lexemes in Jewish Languages as Illustrated by Animate Nouns in Judezmo and Yiddish”, *Mediterranean Language Review*, 16 (2005), pp. 1-115. The Turkish-origin agentive suffix *-ci* is reflected in Ḥaketía *qahwáři* ‘coffee seller, coffeehouse keeper’ (Benoliel, *Dialecto* [above note 2], p. 214), presumably originating in a Turkish borrowing in North African Arabic.

52 On the use in Judezmo of Turkish-origin *-lik* with bases of Hispanic and Hebrew origin, see David M. Bunis, “Judezmo Inanimate Fusion Nouns with Non-Romance Affixes”, *Yod – Monde judéo-espagnol*, 11-12 (2006-2007), pp. 359-410.

aver+sís ‘lacking in air’, *muvxar+ğe* ‘choice’ and other derivatives. This takes place in a manner highly reminiscent of the fusions of elements of Turkic and non-Turkic origin so widely used in Ottoman; e.g., *terbiy+evi* ‘pedagogical’ (*terbiye* + *-evi*; cf. A. adjectivizing *-awī*, *tarbawī* ‘pedagogical’]), *terbiyet+kerde* ‘educated’ (cf. T. ← P. *-kerde* ‘made’), *terbiyet+pezir* ‘teachable’ (T. ← P. *-pezir* ‘accepting’). Thus, unlike Ḥaketía, which uses no Arabic-origin inflectional or derivational endings with non-Arabic bases, the Ottoman component in Judezmo includes widely-used *suffixes* of Ottoman origin added to non-Turkish bases, as well as ready-made lexical borrowings and stems.

Turkish stems with non-Turkish bound morphemes. Perhaps because of their identification of native derivational morphemes of Hispanic and Hebrew-Aramaic origin with synonymous analogues in Turkish, Judezmo speakers appear to innovate lexically with much greater facility than Ḥaketía speakers. This achievement is accomplished through the fusing of affixes of Hispanic and Hebrew-Aramaic origin to Turkish-origin bases, resulting in seemingly many more derivatives with such affixes than in Ḥaketía.

Derivational suffixes of Hispanic origin. Paralleling the fusion of Turkish bound morphemes to stems of Arabic, Persian, and other origins in Ottoman Turkish (e.g., *terbiye+ci*, *+li*, *+siz*), most of the Judezmo affixes which have fused with Turkish-origin stems are of Hispanic origin. Nominal, adjectival, and adverbial stems attract hypocoristic suffixes such as diminutive/endearing *-iko* (e.g., *derviš+iko* ‘little/dear dervish’) and argumentative/pejorative *-ón* (*derviš+ón* ‘big/awful dervish’).⁵³ Other Hispanic-origin derivational suffixes added to Ottoman bases include agent-like *-ero*: *teneké* ‘tin’ → *tenekel+ero* ‘tinsmith’, *kondurya* (T. *kundura*) ‘shoe’ → *kondury+ero* ‘shoemaker’; workplace-denoting *-eria*: *kondury+eria* ‘shoemaker’s’; and adjectivizing *-ozo* (S. *-oso*): *merak* ‘depression’ (T. *merak* ← A. *merāq*) → *merek+iozo* ‘depressed’, *-esko* (S. *-esco*): *Selanik* ‘Salonika’ → *selanikli* ‘Salonikan’ → *selanikl+esko* ‘(adj.) Salonikan; (m.) Salonika Judezmo dialect’. Numerous nominal

53 On Judezmo hypocoristics, see David M. Bunis, “Ottoman Judezmo Diminutives and Other Hypocoristics”, Frank Alvarez-Pereyre and Jean Baumgarten (eds.), *Linguistique des langues juives et linguistique générale*, CNRS, Paris 2003, pp. 193-246.

and verbal bases accept verbalizing *-ear* and reflexive/passive *-earse*:⁵⁴ e.g., *boyá* ‘paint’ (cf. T. past definite verbal stem *boyadı-* ‘painted’) → *boyad+ear* ‘to paint’; with the agentivizing suffix *-dor*: *boyad+ea+dor* ‘painter’; the action-denoting suffix *-dura*: *boyad+ea+dura* ‘act of painting’, and past participle-marking/adjectivizing *-eado*: *boyad+eado* ‘painted’; *aǵí* ‘pain’ (cf. T. past definite verbal stem *acıdı-*) → *aǵid+ear+se* ‘to pity’; and with the deverbal nominalizing suffix *-syón* (S. *-ción*): → *aǵid+ea+syón* ‘compassion’; *šišir* ‘to make dizzy’ (reflexive *šišir+ear+se* ‘to become dizzy’; cf. T. *şaşır-*); with the adjectival/adverbial (= present participial) suffix *-ante*: *šišereante* ‘dizzying’; (*d*)*ez+vač+ear* ‘to renounce’ (cf. S. negating prefix *des-* + T. *vaz geçmek* ‘to renounce’) → *ez+vač+ea+myento* and *ez+va+čeo* ‘renunciation’ (with the deverbal nominalizing suffixes *-myento* [S. *-miento*] and *-eo*).

Inflectional endings and derivational suffixes of Hebrew origin. Judezmo has also innovated through the fusion of inflectional endings and derivational suffixes of Hebrew origin to Ottoman bases. For example, *katrán* ‘tar’ accepts the action- and abstraction-denoting suffix *-uθ* תי-: e.g., *katran+uθ* ‘tarring’. Several substantives bearing a phonological resemblance to certain Hebrew nouns pluralize with ordinarily masculine plural-denoting *-im* םי-: e.g., m.sg. *papás* ‘priest’ (T. *papaz/-s*) → pl. *papaz+im*; or feminine plural-denoting *-oθ* תי-: e.g., f.sg. *kasabá* ‘town’ (T. *kasaba* [A. *qaşaba*]) → f.pl. *kasab+oθ*. Analogues of these constructions exist in Ottoman Turkish – for example, with bases of Turkic or Balkan origin and suffixes derived from Arabic, e.g., *Bosna* ‘Bosnia’ + *-evi* (A. *-awī*) → *Bosnevi* ‘a Bosnian’. Although Ḥaketía does not appear to possess analogues, partly due, perhaps, to the fact that parallel forms are rare in North African Arabic, it is also possible that these once existed in Ḥaketía without ever having been documented.

3.4 Observations on syntax

Arabic syntax does not appear to have exerted a significant impact on traditional Ḥaketía. Nor, aside from the incorporation of verbal and other idioms as loan

54 On Judezmo verbs of Turkish origin, see Haïm Vidal Sephiha, “L’hispaniseur *-ear* en judéoespagnol”, *Travaux X, Aspects des civilisations ibériques*, C.I.E.E.R.E.C., Université de Saint-Etienne, Saint-Etienne 1974, pp. 85-93; Michael Studemund, “Balkanspanisch und Balkanlinguistik: Die balkanspanischen Verba auf *-ear*”, D. Gergardt, P. Hill and G. Kratzel (eds.), *Forschung und Lehre* (Festschrift Johannes Schröpfer), Slavisches Seminar, Hamburg 1975, pp. 400-409.

translations, does Turkish syntax seem to have exercised a great effect on traditional Judezmo syntax.⁵⁵ This contention requires further exploration, however.

3.5 Observations on the lexicon and semantic fields represented by the borrowings

3.5.1 Realia

The impact of Arabic on Ḥaketía and Turkish on Judezmo appears to be closest in the lexical and semantic fields. Here, formal structural divergences between the donor and borrowing languages appear to be irrelevant. Taking into consideration the findings of language-contact research – such as the pioneering work of Uriel Weinreich⁵⁶– it is not surprising to find that the majority of the borrowings from the co-territorial languages in both Ḥaketía and Judezmo are substantives. The remainder, in decreasing order, are verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and others. Naturally, the various fields of realia are especially well represented in both languages. As would be expected, objects first encountered by the Sephardim upon their arrival in “Sepharad II”– to borrow Max Weinreich’s term for the regions in which the Sephardim first settled after the Expulsion – were early on referred to by their local names. Thus the characteristic burnoose worn by Moroccan men is known as *žillabía* or *žillaba* in Ḥaketía (as in Moroccan Arabic) – just as the robe-like coat once worn by men of the Ottoman Empire was called *anterí* or *entari* in Judezmo (cf. T. *entari*, regional *anteri* [A. ‘*antari*]). More interestingly, some items already familiar to the Jews in Spain and formerly called by names of Iberian origin came to acquire names of local

55 Various kinds of syntactic influence by Turkish on post-World War II Judezmo in Turkey have been reported by Marie-Christine Varol-Bornes: see, for example, her articles “Calques morphosyntaxiques du turc en judéo-espagnol: mécanismes et limites”, *Faits de Langues: Langues de diaspora – Langues de contact*, 18 (Paris, 2001), pp. 85-99; idem, “Contact de langues et ordre des mots en judéo-espagnol (Turquie) et espagnol andin (Pérou)”, C. Canut and D. Caubet (eds.), *Comment les langues se mélangent*, Harmattan, Paris 2001, pp. 33-47; idem., “El judeoespañol en contacto: el ejemplo de Turquía”, *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana* 4:2 (8) (2006), pp. 99-114. Such influences do not seem to be encountered in Judezmo texts from before the War, however, or even in literary texts from the post-War period. It would seem to be characteristic of the spoken language of individuals of recent generations whose primary language is Turkish rather than Judezmo.

56 Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact*, Mouton, The Hague 1953.

origin. Some of these co-existed with the older names as synonyms or near-synonyms, while others eventually supplanted the former names entirely. In many instances this phenomenon resulted in lexical divergence between Ḥaketía and Judezmo.

Many of the borrowings relate to elements of local and universal flora and fauna. For example, ‘vegetables’ – bought and sold in similar public markets in North Africa and the Ottoman regions – are generically referred to as Arabic-origin *xódra* in Ḥaketía and Ottoman-origin *zarzavá* (cf. T. *zerzavat* ← P. *sebzavat*) in popular Judezmo. However, speakers also use Hispanic-origin *verduras* in Ḥaketía and *varduras* (in Sarajevo) or characteristically metathesized *ve-/viδruras/-druras* in other regional varieties of Judezmo. ‘Greens’ (H. *γῆραqot* ירקות) are denoted by the latter in the centuries-old instructions for participants in the Passover Seder service traditionally printed in Ladino translations of the Haggadah.⁵⁷

These two specific parallels should not be understood to represent entirely analogous situations in the two languages, however. For example, turning to the world of fauna, one of the names for ‘monkey’ in Ḥaketía is *z-/žaatot*, apparently reflecting the Hebrew *za(’)-/za(’)atut* ‘youngster’. Since at least the early eighteenth-century, in contrast, the everyday Judezmo synonym has been the Ottoman-origin *maymón(a)* (cf. T. *maymun* [+ Hispanic-origin femininizing *-a*]). While both languages also use these terms figuratively, they do so in divergent senses. According to Bendelac,⁵⁸ *žaatot* also denotes a ‘crucifix’ (perhaps because of the image often appearing on it) as well as a ‘porcelain pitcher for washing oneself’; while according to Nehama,⁵⁹ *maymon(a)* designates a ‘buffoon’ or an ‘ugly person’. In both languages, the simian is also referred to as Hispanic-origin *mono*. In Judezmo, however, the use of this word is rare, and when employed in the press it tends to be accompanied by parenthetical *maymón* – as though the writer does not expect readers to understand the Hispanic word without a Judezmo “translation”.⁶⁰

57 An exhaustive inventory of the translations of *γῆραqot* in editions of the Ladino haggadah will appear in the forthcoming comprehensive lexicon by Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald.

58 Bendelac, *Diccionario* (above note 7), p. 750.

59 For example, see Nehama (above note 5), s. *maymón*.

60 E.g., Michael Papo, *El tražomán o libro de konverzasyón en ešpanyol i alemán (nimtsesko) por provečo de mučos sinyores del oryente ke viažan a la Nemtsía*, J. Schlossberg, Vienna 1884, p. 21. Judezmo incorporates *maymón(a)* in assorted expressions, some of them apparent calques of Turkish: e.g., (*kompportarse*) *komo (la) maymona* ‘(to act) like a monkey (i.e., foolishly)’, comparable to Turkish *maymun gibi*. In humorous texts

The lexicons of Ḥaketia and Judezmo also attest to centuries of accommodation by Moroccan and Ottoman Sephardim to the dominant Muslim society and its institutions through the adoption of local terminology. In some instances, reflexes of the same Arabic etyma are encountered in both languages as a result of the significant Arabic component in Ottoman Turkish; in others, analogous objects and concepts are expressed in the two languages by means of etymologically unrelated but nearly synonymous borrowings. Many of these relate to: the ruling administration (e.g., Ḥ. *báša* : J. *pašá* ‘governor’), its military forces (e.g., Ḥ. *‘askrí* : J. *askyer* ‘soldier’), its monetary system and units of weights and measures (e.g., Ḥ. *derham* ‘monetary unit’ : J. *pará* ‘piaster’), its taxation practices (e.g., Ḥ. *geziá* : J. *gēzyá* ‘tax’, reflecting the North African *g* versus Ottoman *ğ* realization of Arabic *ğim* in this lexeme), its legal and penal systems (e.g., Ḥ. *faláqa* : J. *falaká* ‘punishment through beating of the feet’), and the institutions and methods by which it enforced its laws (e.g., Ḥ. *da’wá* : J. *davá* ‘lawsuit’); commerce (e.g., Ḥ. *fáida* : J. *fayda* ‘profit, benefit’, occurring in both languages in the idiom *no ver fáida/fayda* ‘to obtain no benefit’), the practitioners of professions, trades and vocations common to the region (e.g.,

from early twentieth-century Salonika, a plural form of *maymón* is *maymonim*, with the Hebrew-origin plural morpheme – whereas Arabisms pluralizing with Hebrew plural markers do not seem to exist in Ḥaketia. *Maymón* also serves as the stem of the innovative noun *maymonería*, with Hispanic-origin abstract nominalizing *-ería*, used in Salonika in the sense of ‘buffoonery’ (Nehama, *Dictionnaire* [above note 5], p. 351), and of the verb *maymonear*, with the Hispanic-origin verbalizer *-ear*, used in Sofia to mean ‘to joke about’ (Isaac Moskona, “On Some Influences on ‘Judezmo’– The Language of the Balkan Jews”, *Annual [of the Social, Cultural and Educational Association of the Jews in the People’s Republic of Bulgaria]*, 11 [Sofia, 1976], p. 184), as well as of the nouns *maymunluk* ‘apishness, drollery’ (informant, b. Istanbul) and *maymunğuluk* ‘subject of mockery’ (Nehama, *Dictionnaire* [above note 5], p. 351), exhibiting derivational morphemes of Turkish origin. Wagner noted that the diminutive form *maymunikas*, incorporating the Judezmo default diminutive suffix *-iko*, was used to denote the ‘cartoons’ or ‘caricatures’ appearing in newspapers (Max L. Wagner, “Espiguelo judeo-español”, *Revista de Filología Española*, 34 [1950], p. 73). Ḥaketia does not appear to employ a local word for monkey and thus possesses no exact parallels to the preceding expressions or derivatives. Certain other animals are denoted in Ḥaketia by Arabisms, however, some of which occur in similes such as *gorđo komo un ħalluf* ‘fat as a pig’, used for an obese person, and *bonita komo una yzala* ‘lovely as a gazelle’, denoting a beautiful woman (Benoliel, *Dialecto* [above note 2], pp. 70-71).

Ḥ. *fellah* : J. *felax* ‘peasant; agriculturist’, Ḥ. *ḥammal* [and derivative verb *hamlear* ‘to carry’] : J. [*x*] *amal* ‘porter’,⁶¹ as well as their tools (e.g., Ḥ. *šaqqor* : J. *baltá* ‘ax’); local institutions and places of business and leisure (e.g., Ḥ. *ḥammám* [and the derivative reflexive verb *ḥammearse* ‘to bathe oneself’] : J. *xamam* ‘Turkish-style bath’); terminology relating to the geographic surroundings and various natural phenomena (e.g., Ḥ. *žbel* ‘mountain’ : J. *tepe* ‘mountain top’); the names used by Jews for neighbouring ethnic groups (Ḥ. ‘*árab* ‘Arabs’ : J. *arap* ‘Arab; Negro’), their various members and languages (e.g., Ḥ. *bel’ažmía* ‘Spanish’, *bel’arbia* ‘Arabic’ : J. *ağemí* ‘Persian’, *arabí* ‘Arabic’), their religious concepts and practices (e.g., Ḥ. *ḥram* : J. *xaram* ‘unlawful, especially according to Islamic law’), and for local identification (e.g., Ḥ. *erbatí* ‘native of Rabat’ : J. *rodezlí* ‘native of Rhodes’); folk beliefs (e.g., Ḥ./J. *fal* ‘luck, fortune’); benedictions (including numerous expressions incorporating Ḥ. *Al:ah* : J. *Al:ax* ‘God’ such as Ḥ. *un-ša-al:ah!* : J. *inšal:ax!* ‘May it be God’s will!’), Ḥ. *ma-ša-al:ah!* : J. *mašal:ax!* ‘No evil eye!’); as well as abstract concepts (e.g., Ḥ. *ḥal* : J. *xal* ‘state, condition’), adjectives (e.g., Ḥ. *doyrí* : J. *doyrú* ‘straight, right’, Ḥ. *sáhel* : J. *kolay* ‘easy’, Ḥ. *wá’er* : J. *yuč* ‘difficult’, Ḥ./J. *naranđí* : ‘orange-coloured’); and many more.

The lexicons of Ḥaketía and Judezmo also respectively reflect the acculturation of their speakers to Moroccan Arabic and Ottoman Turkish folklore and folk life. The lexical borrowings in this context refer not only to the traditions and elements of material culture found amongst the neighbouring Muslims but also to elements incorporated from these into local Jewish tradition. The spheres in which acculturation occurred include those of traditional costume (e.g., Ḥ. *albornós* ‘black hooded cloak worn during Jewish days of mourning’⁶² : [Istanbul] J. *mema* [←A. *al-amama*] ‘rabbinical turban’), cuisine (e.g., Ḥ. *ḥálwa* ‘sweets, halvah’ : J. *xe-/xalvá* ‘halvah’), architecture and residential organization (e.g., Ḥ. *ḥara* ‘street; quarter’ : J. *malé* ‘quarter’), oral folk genres (including stories concerning Ḥ. *Žóḥa* : J. *Ĝoxá* ‘the clever-foolish folk hero based on Nasreddin Hodja’),⁶³ instrumental music (e.g.,

61 On the names of professions in Judezmo, see Haïm Vidal Sephiha, “Noms de métiers en judéo-espagnol: Corpus pour une étude ultérieure”, *Cahiers Balkaniques*, 2 (publications ‘Langues’) (1981), pp. 171-205.

62 The corresponding Judezmo *burnús* simply denotes a cloak or robe of any kind.

63 For Ḥaketía proverbs incorporating Arabisms, see Raphaël Benazeraf, *Recueil de “refranes” (proverbes) judéo-espagnols du Maroc (Ḥakitía)*, Imprimerie Continentale,

Ḥ. *gembri* ‘Moroccan two-stringed instrument’: J. *tambur* ‘kind of Turkish lute’), popular healing and fortune-telling (e.g., Ḥ. *fqira* ‘elderly woman officiating at the *žuari* or party celebrated on the eve of a wedding’:⁶⁴ J. *falǧia* ‘woman fortune-teller’), and other areas of popular culture and civilisation.

3.5.2 Communication

Local borrowings are by no means limited to realia. A field of more abstract nature in which elements of local origin figure prominently in the lexicons of both Ḥaketia and Judezmo is that of communication and the art of conversation, held in esteem both by the Jews and their neighbours. Since Arabic played an important role in Ottoman Turkish, some communication references in both Judezmo and Ḥaketia are denoted by “cognate” terms, each reflecting the local realization of the Arabism, occasionally in distinctly Hispano-Jewish adaptations. For example a ‘news item’ is referred to in Ḥaketia as singular *xbar*, reflecting North African Arabic (cf. Cl.A. *xabar*), while ‘news’ in general is frequently expressed by the plural *xbares*, with the Hispanic-origin pluralizer. Judezmo uses parallel terms: *xaber* and plural *xaberes*, the base form of which reflects the Ottoman adaptation of the Arabism – *haber* (← A. *xabar*). Here, too, derivatives are not lacking, although once again the situations in Ḥaketia and Judezmo are not entirely identical. As a Semitic language, Arabic prefers synthetic verbs incorporating roots and morphological constituents in a single lexeme to analytic or periphrastic verbs composed of an auxiliary verb and complement. Apparently under its influence, Ḥaketia displays a wealth of synthetic verbs constituted by an Arabic base and Hispanic-origin verbalizing affixes. For example, from the Arabic

Paris 1978; Amram Benarrosh, *Paroles d’ailleurs: Une saveur de Haketia*, Impr. Ya’il, Rehovot 2004; Tamar Alexander, “*Words are Better than Bread*”: A Study of the Judeo-Spanish Proverb, Ben-Gurion University and Magnes Press, Beersheva and Jerusalem 2004 (Hebrew); idem, “‘Cast Thy Bread Upon the Waters’: Between Judeo-Spanish Proverb and Canonic Source”, D. Bunis, Y. Bentolila, and E. Hazan (eds.), *Languages and Literatures of Sephardic and Oriental Jewry*, Misgav Yerushalayim, Jerusalem (forthcoming); Tamar Alexander and Yaakov Bentolila, *La palabra en su ora es oro: The Judeo-Spanish Proverb in Northern Morocco*, Ben-Zvi Institute, Jerusalem 2008. Although a significant body of literature exists on Ḥaketia ballads and other sung genres, space limitations prevent its citation here.

64 Benoliel, *Dialecto* (above note 2), s. juari.

root *x-b-r* Ḥaketía created the fusion verbs *xabrear* ‘to inform’ and, with the addition of a Hispanic-origin prefix, *esxabrear* ‘to be informed’— both corresponding to Arabic synthetic verbs such as *xábara* ‘to inform’. A person who engages in the actions expressed by the latter verb receives the Ḥaketía agent-name *esxabreaḏor*, displaying the Hispanic agent suffix.

In contrast to Arabic, Turkish tends to incorporate non-Turkish elements in analytic verbs composed of an auxiliary verb of Turkish origin and an invariant complement, rather than in synthetic constructions. The transmission, acquisition, and possession of news is thus expressed in Turkish by means of analytic constructions with invariant *haber* and various Turkish-origin auxiliaries. In similar fashion, Judezmo possesses no synthetic verbs derived from Arabic *x-b-r*. Like its Turkish etymon *haber*, the Judezmo *xaber* is rather incorporated in analytic or periphrastic verbal idioms of similar meaning,⁶⁵ using auxiliaries of Hispanic origin: e.g., *dar xaber* ‘to inform’ (literally, “to give news”; cf. T. *haber ver-*), *tomar xaber* ‘to be informed, receive news’ (“to take news”; cf. T. *haber al-*), *mandar xaber* ‘to announce’ (“to send news”; cf. T. *haber göster-*), and *tener xaber* ‘to know about’ (“to have news”; cf. T. *haberi var*).⁶⁶ For ‘messenger’, as well as ‘gossip’, Judezmo incorporates Turkish-origin *xaberġí* (f. *xaberġía*; cf. T. *haberci*); in twentieth-century Judezmo, *muxbir* is also documented in the sense of ‘reporter’ (cf. T. *muhbir* [A. *muxbir*]). Other derivatives assimilated into Judezmo include the adjectives *xaberdar* ‘up-to-date’, and, according to Albert M. Passy, *xaberlí* ‘informed’ and its antonym, *xabersíz* ‘uninformed, ignorant’.⁶⁷ Judezmo *xaber* also participates in various idiomatic constructions such as *Ke xaber?* ‘What’s new?’ (literally reflecting T. *Ne haber?*) and blessings such as *Xaberes bwenos!* ‘(May you have) good news!’

65 While *haber* is incorporated in the Turkish synthetic verbs *haberleş-* ‘to correspond, communicate with one another’, and causative *haberleştir-*, many Arabisms in Turkish do not enter into such synthetic constructions.

66 While Ḥaketía also makes use of some analytic verbs incorporating Arabisms: e.g., *hazer* ‘*ažeb* ‘to make fun’, *hazer zenzlá* ‘to be an earthquake’ (Benoliel, *Dialecto* [above note 2], pp. 206-207), it does so to a lesser extent than Judezmo.

67 Albert M. Passy, *Sephardic Folk Dictionary: English to Ladino, Ladino to English*², Self-published, Los Angeles 1994, pp. 161, 283.

4. Concluding remarks

The wealth of North African Arabisms in *Ḥaketia* and Ottomanisms in *Judezmo* testify to centuries of Sephardic openness to the surrounding peoples and their cultures. The Sephardic community appears to have identified to a considerable extent with the latter, especially prior to the onset of the modern era when contact with European societies led to the westernization of the Moroccan and Ottoman Sephardic communities. The linguistic elements of local origin incorporated into their languages – particularly in their more popular variants – would appear to reflect the desire, or at least willingness, of the Sephardim to partially acclimate themselves to their environment. On the other hand, the persistence into the modern era of the distinctive Jewish languages into which those elements were incorporated has served as one of the strategies used by the Sephardim to maintain the clear boundaries between themselves and their neighbours called for by their religious beliefs and practices and their desire to preserve a unique national-ethnic identity.

The same “selective openness” to the world around them and awareness of and sensitivity to changes in the value systems and aesthetics of that world, has facilitated the decision by recent generations of Sephardim in Morocco and the former Ottoman regions to remove from their language the thousands of Arabisms and Turkisms that for centuries gave their unique languages their distinctive local character. Having done so, they are prone to deride those members of the community who continue to use such elements, now considered “barbarisms” – they themselves striving to speak “pure Castilian” or even “pure Arabic” (in Morocco), or “pure French”, “pure Turkish”, or “pure” forms of other Balkan languages. Unlike the situation prevailing in Morocco and the Ottoman Empire from the early sixteenth century through the late nineteenth century, “mixed languages” – and especially Jewish so-called “jargons” written in the Hebrew alphabet – are no longer in vogue today, except among linguists, folklorists, and a few descendants of the speech communities who still remember their traditional languages with nostalgia and affection. Although the contributions of the *Ḥaketia* community’s native researchers – many of them alluded to directly or indirectly in the present paper – have been great, one senses that much of the traditional language still remains undocumented. It is to be hoped that the community’s researchers will regard that task as one of their primary future goals.



כיס תפילין, רקמת חוט כסף על עור; טיטואן (?) בקירוב 1925 – מאוסף משפחת גרוס
Bolsa de *Tefillin*; bordado de plata sobre piel; Tetuán (?), c. 1925
Colección de la familia Gross