

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Portuguese-Spanish Interfaces: Diachrony, synchrony, and contact*.
Edited by Patrícia Amaral and Ana Maria Carvalho.

© 2014. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute, it is not permitted to post this PDF on the open internet.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at www.benjamins.com

Judeo-Spanish in contact with Portuguese

A historical overview

Aldina Quintana¹

Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Judeo-Spanish is the language spoken by Sephardim, the descendants of the Jews who were expelled from the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon in 1492 and found refuge in the Ottoman Empire. Judeo-Spanish has been in contact with several languages and is itself the outcome of pervasive contact among Ibero-Romance languages. This paper focuses on the contact between Judeo-Spanish and Portuguese following the immigration of Portuguese Jews and Crypto-Jews to the Ottoman Empire from the late 15th century to the 18th century. The outcome of these contacts was the integration of linguistic patterns and lexical items from Portuguese into Judeo-Spanish via accommodation in the pre-koine, or later through other pathways, before Portuguese speakers definitively shifted to Judeo-Spanish.

Keywords: Judeo-Spanish, language contact, Ibero-Romance

Judeo-Spanish is the language spoken by Sephardim, the descendants of the Jews who were expelled from the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon in 1492 and found refuge in the Ottoman Empire. Judeo-Spanish has been in daily contact with several languages that are highly conducive to language mixing, transfer, change, adaptation, and restructuring. Judeo-Spanish itself is the outcome of pervasive contact among Ibero-Romance languages. Other contact settings that have affected Judeo-Spanish yielded different outcomes.

A representative case of Judeo-Spanish contact involves various contact settings with Portuguese following the immigration of Portuguese Jews and Crypto-Jews to the Ottoman Empire from the late 15th century to the 18th century. This contact took place at different stages and places, and was conditioned by external factors, such as

1. The author is funded by grant 473/11 of the Israel Sciences Foundation (ISF), within the framework of whose project at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem this work has been carried out.

the general context of formation of the Sephardic communities, or the predominant social and religious differences between the Sephardic Jews of the Ottoman Empire and the development of a particular character of Portuguese Jewry due to the social conflict in Portugal after 1492. In all instances, the outcome of these contacts was the integration of several linguistic patterns and lexical items from Portuguese into Judeo-Spanish via accommodation in the pre-koine, or later through other pathways, before Portuguese speakers definitively shifted to Judeo-Spanish.

Introduction²

For more than five centuries, Judeo-Spanish was the language spoken by Sephardi Jews in the communities of the Balkan countries, Turkey, and the Levant, and also in the Sephardic communities in North Africa. Today, Judeo-Spanish is a severely endangered language (Quintana, 2012; Salminen, 2007, p. 225). Outside of Istanbul, which is the only numerically significant community that has remained in its traditional location (although linguistically, it shifted to French and then to Turkish), people who still have some knowledge of Judeo-Spanish are scattered around the world, with no social ties amongst them. Therefore, the speech community is long lost, and the death of the language seems inevitable. Diachronically Judeo-Spanish is related to 15th-century Castilian, but due to its development without contact with Peninsular Spanish, Judeo-Spanish differs to a great extent from old Castilian and from modern Spanish.

Considering the historical background and the diverse origins of the Sephardim, the variety of assimilated elements in Judeo-Spanish is not surprising. Besides containing Hebrew and Aramaic elements, as do all languages spoken by Jews, modern Judeo-Spanish, whose main base is the Castilian spoken in 1492 in the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon, shows influences of Hispanic Arabic, Aragonese, Catalan and Portuguese, and also of Italian and other languages, which are the result of contact with speakers in the Balkan Peninsula, Turkey, and the Middle East. In addition, it shows influences of French, as it was the language of culture since the second half of the 19th century. Linguistic factors, such as the nature of the relationship between languages in contact – specifically the degree of typological similarity between them – and relevant social and sociopolitical aspects of the contact which operated at both the individual and group level, involved varying degrees of influence first on the Castilian spoken by Jews expelled from the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon in 1492, and later on Judeo-Spanish.

Several grammatical patterns and lexical items from non-Castilian origins are detectable in modern Judeo-Spanish. The contact among Iberian speakers during the first generations after 1492, who spoke different languages and dialects that were

2. Abbreviations: ACC = Accusative, DAT = Dative, FEM = Feminine, MASC = Masculine, SG = Singular, PL = Plural, SL = Source language, TL = Target language, Cast. = Castilian, Port. = Portuguese, JSp. = Judeo-Spanish, Sp. = Spanish, Tur. = Turkish, Ott. Tur. = Ottoman Turkish.

generally very close typologically and mutually intelligible, gave rise to processes of leveling of dialectal differences, during which the non-Castilian speakers shifted to Castilian (Quintana, 2006, pp. 298–309). Nevertheless, the resulting language was marked by the absorption of non-Castilian linguistic elements; among these borrowed materials, those whose source is Portuguese are noticeable (Penny, 2000, pp. 189–190; Quintana, 2002, 2004, 2009).

Cases of (dia)lectal shift are detectable only when the shift is imperfect (Ross, 2001, pp. 157–158). There is no doubt that Portuguese speakers shifting to Judeo-Spanish acquired the bulk of the target language (TL) grammatical structure along with the TL vocabulary. But some of the linguistic features they carried over from Portuguese also led to slight changes in the Judeo-Spanish grammar and lexicon, without changing, as a whole, its Castilian background.

The contact of Judeo-Spanish speakers with Portuguese speakers involved not only those who arrived in the Ottoman Empire shortly after the Expulsion from Castile and Aragon in 1492, but also Crypto-Jews, i.e. Jews and their descendants who had been forced to convert to Christianity, and who decided to return to the open practice of Judaism, and especially those who emigrated from Portugal to the Ottoman Empire after the establishment of the Inquisition was approved in Portugal in 1536, up until the 18th century. Therefore, the contact of Judeo-Spanish with Portuguese took place in different socio-historical contexts and in various ways. Obviously, the linguistic outcomes are also varied; hence the study of this contact opens promising and fascinating perspectives for the field of languages in contact.

This chapter deals with Judeo-Spanish in contact with Portuguese in the Sephardic communities of the Ottoman Empire, and rather than trying to reach conclusive results, it raises questions as to how and when Portuguese patterns were transferred to Judeo-Spanish, what was the intensity of the contact, what was the social context in which language contact occurred and what linguistic outcomes are detectable.

1. Development of the Sephardic speech community

In order to understand the sociolinguistic situation of the Iberian Jews in the Ottoman Empire in the 16th and 17th centuries and the development of Judeo-Spanish, it is necessary to recall some historical facts that led to their mass emigration, and to describe the general framework in which the Sephardic community was created.

The expulsion of the Jews from Castile and Aragon in 1492 – many of whom fled to Portugal³ – and from Navarra in 1498, as well as the forced baptism of the Jews in Portugal in 1497 and the massacre in 1506, when two thousand New Christians were murdered in Lisbon, forced the Iberian Jews into a directional mass migration to

3. 23,320 Castilian Jews – the largest number of all refugees – entered Portugal (Benbassa & Rodrigue, 2000, p. xxxvii).

places in which the practice of Judaism was allowed, such as North Africa, a few states in Italy and in particular, the Ottoman Empire.⁴

During the first years after the expulsion of 1492, they retained the hope of returning to their homelands, but the developments in religious policy in Spain and Portugal – especially the establishment of the Inquisition in Portugal in 1536 – made it clear that this was impossible.

In the Ottoman Empire, the Iberian Jews encountered linguistic and religious tolerance. The Islamic policy toward minorities, based on their discrete coexistence,⁵ allowed the Iberian Jews to establish their own legislation within their community. Within this context, in which there was no any official language policy, the immigrants were not compelled to acquire the Turkish or Arabic languages. Furthermore, many Sephardic Jews attained high professional and social standing (Penny, 2000, p. 176;

4. Approximately 60,000 Iberian Jews reached the Ottoman Empire between 1492 and the middle of the 16th century. This figure includes people from the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon, as well as later departures from Portugal (Benbassa & Rodrigue, 2000, p. xxxvii). There were Portuguese synagogues in Istanbul, Salonika or Bitola since the early 16th century (Franco, 1897, p. 40; Luria, 1930, p. 6). On the distribution by groups of newcomers in the Ottoman Empire, there is no data. Révah (1961, pp. 149–150) mentions a Turkish source, according to which the *Lisbon* synagogue consisted of 200 heads of household, and the *Kal de Evora* of 96, between the years 1550–1560, i.e. about 1,500 people. The *Kal de los Katalanes* consisted of 218 household heads, the *Kal Aragon* of 315, and the *Kal Zaragoza* of 42. In addition there were synagogues with the names of Italian cities. Castilian Jews were spread over several synagogues. From these data it is not possible to draw any conclusions, since the grouping in synagogues was no longer based on the geographical origin of its members: only the names of the synagogues were preserved, many of which were founded in the years immediately after the arrival of the expelled.

5. This was based on the *dhimma*, the Arabic term in Muslim law and tradition that describes the legal status of certain categories of non-Muslims – the *dhimmi* (from the Arabic *ahl al-dhimma* ‘people of the treaty’; Tur. *zimmi*) – in Muslim society. *Dhimma* indicates the contractual character of the status, whereby the Muslim community granted protection and hospitality to *dhimmis* in exchange for their acknowledgment of Muslim sovereignty and dominance. The *dhimmi* was excluded from military service and was subject to other limitations. In exchange for communal recognition and autonomy, *dhimmis* paid taxes that represented acquiescence to Muslim dominion as well as subordination and humiliation.

Historically, *dhimmi* status has been applied quite broadly to Christians, Samaritans and Jews living in lands controlled by Muslims, such as the Ottoman Empire, where later, *dhimma* became the millet system (Ott. Tur. pl. *milel*; mod. Tur. pl. *milletler*). The term ‘millet system’, which originally meant both a religion and a religious community, is used only in reference to the set of administrative arrangements that allowed non-Muslim religious communities in the Ottoman Empire to enjoy a wide measure of religious and cultural freedom, as well as considerable administrative, fiscal, and legal autonomy under their own ecclesiastical and lay leaders. In the 19th century, it also came to denote such modern concepts as nation and nationality. As governments of Muslim countries increasingly reframed notions of political authority and legitimacy in the modern period, *dhimma* and *millet* became inadequate as a social construct and obsolete (Astre, 2010; Campo, 2009; Levy, 2010).

Schmid, 2007, pp. 10–11). Men who worked outside the community would have learned enough of the corresponding co-territorial spoken language to do business, but women who stayed within the community were likely to have been monolingual in Judeo-Spanish.

Although the out-migrants⁶ were organized by families, and the emigration was effected by virtue of the support of the vast family networks, which established the destination and guaranteed the first adjustments in the new communities (Vàrvaro & Minervini, 2008, pp. 152–153), the early uprooting of people belonging to different dialectal communities and their regrouping into mixed communities, gave rise to dialectal contact and mixing, both of which features entailed important consequences, as occurred with the emergence of a new form of Castilian, known as Judeo-Spanish for researchers, separate from the source varieties spoken elsewhere (Penny, 1992).

Dialectal leveling is a case of extreme “catastrophic change,” to which (dia)lects with a high degree of similarity are subject (Ross, 2001, p. 157). This occurs because the dominant lect is not accessible to the shifting groups to the necessary degree or for sufficient time for its members to acquire native-like mastery. In such a situation, problems of communication will arise, and they will be compensated for by new strategies of intercommunication developed in the new social network. Such a situation is what caused the emergence of the Judeo-Spanish in the new Jewish communities of the Ottoman Empire. In these communities, the groups of speakers of Portuguese, Aragonese, Catalan and other Jewish groups of different linguistic background (Italian, Greek, Arabic or Yiddish) were compelled to shift to Castilian – the dominant language – without having acquired the competence of native speakers, *inter alia*, because its acquisition was not conducted in a regulated way. It can be assumed that the imperfect acquisition of Castilian by the Portuguese speakers – and by other Ibero-Romance languages speakers – followed initially similar patterns to those described by Van Coetsem (1988, pp. 59–60), in reference to Italian immigrants in the area of Mar del Plata, whose goal was the acquisition of Spanish, and that resulted in the emergence of Cocoliche, the Spanish spoken by the Italian immigrants.

According to Ross:

[c]atastrophe seems always to entail the enforced melding of groups with different ingroup lects into a new larger group, where enforcement is either by human intervention or by natural disaster. A new social network is abruptly created or rearranged, so that old groups are compelled to become more open, establishing multiplex relationship links with each other. (2001, p. 157)

Where there is a degree of mutual intelligibility among the ingroup (dia)lects of the old groups, a new lect may arise out of the fusion of the old. Koineization, i.e. the

6. This refers to individuals or groups of individuals, who move out of one country in order to reside in another.

leveling of differences, is one of the outcomes of the fusion process, as was the case in the Sephardic communities. In this type of process, the old (dia)lects cease to exist, usually together with the disappearance of the third generation of speakers who were involved in the process of leveling of dialectal differences. In fact, by the mid-16th century, spoken and written Judeo-Spanish – in the stage of a *nativized pre-koine*⁷ – had already become the vehicular language of the Mediterranean Jews, used in businesses and in everyday communication (Minervini, 2006, p. 21). As a result, the other languages and dialects – other Ibero-romance languages such as Aragonese, Portuguese, and Catalan, but also Judeo-Italian, Judeo-Greek or Yiddish – became marginalized to the familial domain before completely disappearing from the repertoire of languages used in the Sephardic communities in the last years of the 16th century (Quintana, 2002, pp. 133–134). However, Portuguese continued to be a language with which Judeo-Spanish was still in contact until the late 17th century, due to the repeated immigration of Crypto-Jews from Portugal (Penny, 2000, pp. 189–190; Quintana, 2004, 2009).

This linguistic process of koineization was part of a broader process of internal reorganization resulting in the formation of the Sephardic communities. The members' ethno-religious Sephardic identity and the definition of cultural and communal boundaries emerged via hybridization and from the assimilation of elements of diverse cultural origin (Ray, 2008, p. 18). This mutual adaptation between the dialectal modalities was aimed at their own social integration in a homogeneous community and at the elimination of unwanted group differences (Giles & Smith, 1979, pp. 45–65; Trudgill, 1986), which attests to an increasing ethno-linguistic saliency (cf. Fishman, 1999, pp. 153–154) within Sephardic society in the first generations after the expulsion.

2. The role of Portuguese in the process of leveling of dialectal differences

In order to investigate the role played by the Portuguese language in the process of leveling of dialectal differences whose outcome is Judeo-Spanish, we will first analyze a small corpus of documents written in the Ottoman Empire in the 1560s. The findings will be completed with a series of patterns and lexical items of modern Judeo-Spanish, which suggests previous contact with Portuguese.

7. According to Siegel's stages of the process of koineization (1985, pp. 373–374), an *expanded immigrant koine* (i.e. a literary language) emerged only in the 18th century. Thus, we can speak about a *nativized koine* with reference to 16th century Judeo-Spanish, and about a *stabilized koine* with reference to the Judeo-Spanish of the 17th century, which also developed without the incomers – other than the Portuguese – having contact with their original home.

2.1 Portuguese substratum influence in Judeo-Spanish documents of the 1560s

In the Sephardic communities of the 16th and 17th centuries, Hebrew was the language *par excellence* used by rabbis and sages in all kinds of written documents. Hebrew was also the only language taught formally, and it occupied an exclusive role in the formal instruction of men; Judeo-Spanish was often the language of instruction, but never a language taught formally, at least until the 19th century. Outside the rabbinic circle, however, Judeo-Spanish was the socially dominant language. Therefore, rabbis and sages were forced to write their works that addressed more general audiences in Judeo-Spanish. The documents in which we will analyze Portuguese borrowing,⁸ and in which the continuum of dialects and languages mentioned above still operate in orality, emerged in this context of diglossia without bilingualism (Fishman, 1967). They consist mainly of works written in the 1560s.

As noted above, Judeo-Spanish refers to the language of the *pre-koine* at its *nativized* stage, since individual variation stands out as the most marked characteristic. The language of these documents reveals close contact with other Iberian languages, and with Hebrew and Turkish (Quintana, 2002, 2004), but without emphasizing any particular linguistic background of the authors.⁹ A Portuguese substratum is clearly detectable in the language used in these documents.

According to Ross:

[w]here speakers are conscious of their membership of the new group rather than the old, features in which the old lects differ are suppressed, especially where these are emblematic of a particular old group. Sometimes this levelling has only minor effects. In more extreme cases, the outcome is koineization, i.e. the levelling of differences. (2001, p. 158)

An important factor in this context was the lack of contact with Peninsular Spanish, which, when added to the fact that Judeo-Spanish was not yet stabilized, and that several of the Portuguese speakers had acquired Castilian knowledge before joining the communities of the Ottoman Empire, prevented speakers of Judeo-Spanish from confronting

8. The Judeo-Spanish material quoted below, whose references are given explicitly, comes from a corpus consisting of books originally written in this language, and translations from Hebrew made between 1547 and 1568. See References at the end of this chapter. All other quotations come from oral and written texts, and dictionaries included in Quintana (2006, pp. 315–329). The lack of an annotated historical corpus of Judeo-Spanish does not allow for a more detailed study than what is offered here.

9. There are other documents belonging to the communication of immediacy (according to Koch & Oesterreicher, 2007) in which the author's linguistic background may be detectable, such as private and semi-private letters. One such letter, which was sent from Sofia before 1589, was published, with different transcription criteria, by Quintana (2007) and by Vårvaro & Minervini (2007). The original was written in Hebrew letters, like all Sephardic documents of the time, and it provides some examples of a causal, informal mixed language.

issues relating to possible “errors” in spoken Castilian by Portuguese Jews, and from recognizing Portuguese replications in their speech. On the contrary, at least in the first century after the Expulsion, Judeo-Spanish speakers probably perceived the Castilian variety spoken by Portuguese Jews as a prestigious standard worthy of imitation.

2.1.1 *Morphological substratum influence*

A morphologically marked feature detectable in 16th-century texts is the past imperfect of the verb *ir* ‘go’: *ía*, *ias*, etc. (1, 2). It appears in several documents in which the use of Castilian *iba*, *ibas*, etc., is predominant.¹⁰

- (1) ...que como aquel ombre vido a yosef que *ía* fuera de camino... (RV, p. 110)
... that when that man saw that Yosef *was* out of the way...
- (2) ...*ía* a trabajar en campo de otros... (HhL, p. 30)
...he *went* to work in fields of others...

This pattern would have been transferred to the Judeo-Spanish interlanguage of Portuguese speakers, then spread to Judeo-Spanish.¹¹ It seems to be no coincidence that the past imperfect *ía* occurs in the casual, informal Portuñol mixed language “of Brazilians or among descendants of Brazilians living outside the borders of their country” (Lipski, 2012, p. 16). According to Thomason and Kaufman (1988, p. 38), patterns belonging to an interlanguage – commonly considered errors made by members of a shifting group in speaking the target language – then spread to the TL when they are imitated by original speakers of that language.

In some communities like Salonika, the two variants of the past imperfect of the verb *ir* survived the leveling of dialectal differences and were accommodated as social group variants. To what extent the variant *ía* was retained due to the effect of the subsequent arrivals of Portuguese-speaking Jews or through contact with Portuguese traders is a question that cannot be answered. The aforementioned forms of past imperfect of *ir* are the only ones that have been retained in the western modern

10. The lack of an annotated historical corpus of Judeo-Spanish makes impossible to count the frequency of any language feature. In relation to the text from which the first example is quoted in (1), it may say that the occurrence *ía* appears once in the text, compared with the five occurrences of *iba*, in sentences like “... queriéndole amonestar que el mismo dar que él deseaba se *iba* apurando y deperdiendo, eçt.” (RV, p. 71) ‘... wanting to warn him that the same act of giving that he wanted, it was finishing up and disappearing, etc.’ Past imperfect *ía* is also documented in other Sephardic texts, such as letters and records of oral testimony gathered by the rabbinical courts.

11. The author of the quotation (1), R. Moshe Almosnino, came from Catalanian and Aragonese families; for many years he was in close contact with New Christians, who had arrived from Portugal to Salonika after 1539. R. Almosnino served as rabbi of the synagogue *Kal Liviat Hen*, which belonged to the Crypto-Jews returned to official Judaism (Révah, 1954, p. 24; Romeu Ferré, 1998, p. 5). The fact that he wrote his book in Judeo-Spanish, dedicated to his nephew, also a member of the Portuguese Jews, shows that these had acquired at least some degree of bilingualism.

Judeo-Spanish varieties of the Balkans,¹² where their speakers' contact with Portuguese speakers has been very intense,¹³ as we shall now see.

One of the most striking morpho-syntactic patterns from Portuguese reproduced in 16th-century Judeo-Spanish involves the Portuguese personal infinitive constructions with the verb *seer*, modern Judeo-Spanish *ser* 'to be', which combine an anteposed pronominal or nominal subject with an infinitive containing a morphological suffix (3, 4), rather than Castilian constructions involving the complementizer *que* and a finite verb usually in the subjunctive as in final clauses (3), an infinitive construction without inflexion as in causal clauses (4, 5), or in reduced infinitive clauses (6) and others:

- (3) No menor te la hizo en te proveer de tal madre
 Not unless you-DAT it-ACC did in you-ACC to provide of such a mother,
 No menor es el bien que te hizo al proveerte de tal madre, Cast.
 Not unless he did to provide you with such a mother,
 cuyas virtudes por atodos seren notorias. (RV, p. 14)
 so that such virtues *be*-3.PL to all notorious-FEM-PL
 para que tales virtudes sean a todos notorias. Cast.
 so that such virtues are notorious to everyone.
- (4) ...por seren ambas açerca de cozas grandes. (RV, p. 35)
 ...because *be*-3.PL both about great things.
 ...por ser ambas acerca de cosas grandes. Cast.
 ...because they are both about great things.
- (5) ...muchos ombres que por seren engratos... (HhL, p. 27)
 ...many humans, that because *be*-3.PL ungrateful.....
 ...muchos hombre que por ser ingratos... Cast.
 ...many humans, who because of being ungrateful ...

12. Judeo-Spanish was divided into two phonetic areas: The Eastern area included the varieties spoken in Turkey, Greece, and eastern Bulgaria. The varieties spoken in the Sephardic communities in northern Bulgaria, Romania, Serbia, Bosnia, Bitola, Dubrovnik and Split belong to the Western area. Some changes propitiated by contact with Slavic languages and with Portuguese are detectable in this area. In relation to the composition of the lexicon, Judeo-Spanish consists of three areas: The Eastern area includes the communities of Turkey, east of Bulgaria and Israel. Here the Castilian lexical items are predominant, and the intense contact with Turkish led to lexical borrowing. The Central area includes the communities of Greece, Macedonia, western Bulgaria, Serbia and Romania, with Salonika as the center from which several innovations spread to the other communities. The Western area includes the communities of Bosnia and the communities located in the port cities on the Adriatic Sea. According to the characteristics of vocabulary, the Judeo-Spanish spoken in Bitola constituted a bridge between the Central and the Western areas. For more specific information see Quintana (2006, pp. 109–127, pp. 276–284).

13. For the distribution of this feature in modern Judeo-Spanish, see Quintana (2006, p. 398).

- (6) ...ya se a espirimentado en muchas no seren platicas... (MA, p. 3)
 ... already been experienced in many not *be*-3.PL practical ...
 ... ya se ha experimentado que muchas (de ellas) no son prácticas ... Cast.
 ... already been experienced that many of them are not practical ...

In reduced temporal clauses with an infinitive beginning with *hasta* 'until', inflected *ser* can be found even in Sephardic Bible translations of the time (7). Here, translators used the singular second person inflection borrowed from Portuguese (*seres*) in order to imitate the Hebrew structure, and to explicitly facilitate this morphological information, which the structure of Castilian could not provide: who should bear the action, and which temporal limit is expressed with *hasta*:

- (7) ...'ad hiḥfāmedāx (Deut. 28,24; 28,51 in Hebrew)
 ...hasta seeres estruido (Penta)
 ...fasta seeres destruydo (BF)
 ...until *be*-2.SG destroyed
 ...hasta que perezcas/hasta destruirte (Biblia Valera, 1602 in Cast.)
 ...until thou be destroyed

The inflected infinitive *seer* does not seem to be extended beyond the thresholds of these texts, or to have spread beyond the circles of Sephardic intellectuals, since it was not accommodated into Judeo-Spanish. Later Sephardic Bible translations show the Castilian structure in such reduced clauses, i.e. by use of the accusative verb *destruir* 'destroy'. Of course, this does not match the future subjunctive *fuere*, which is also abundant in these texts, and which in Salonika, for example, was retained until the last generation of Judeo-Spanish native speakers.

2.1.2 Lexical substratum influence

The detectable Portuguese lexical items in the language of Sephardic documents written in the 1560s constitute more frequent evidence of contact among Judeo-Spanish and Portuguese speakers. Here we should distinguish between words that are incorporated and those that are nonce borrowings.¹⁴ The first group includes words such as *apetite* (HhL, p. 33; SN, p. 52; Cast. *apetito*), 'appetite, desire'; *bico* (HhL, p. 72v; MA, p. 48v; Cast. *pico*) 'peak'; the adjective *contente* (HhL, p. 141; RV, pp. 21, 37v, 137; MA, p. 78v; Cast. *contento*) 'satisfied'; *entropçar/ entronpeçar* (MA, pp. 18v; 133; HhL, pp. 14v; 27; 153v; Cast. *tropeçar*) 'stumble, get into trouble'. Small differences in the form of cognates usually give rise to new hybridized forms, and as occurs in other Spanish varieties in contact with Portuguese, the free morpheme constraint is observed, borrowing only stems such as in *lembración* (HhL, p. 54b) 'act of remembering' (Port. stem *lembrar*- + Sp. suffix *-ión*), but *lembrança* (HhL, p. 34v) 'remembrance'.

14. Given the impossibility of counting the number of occurrences, we mention words that are used in more than one document.

Portuguese nonce borrowing is also detectable in these documents: nouns such as *emprestimo* (RV, p. 102) 'loan', *beçoç* (MA, p. 12) 'lips' (Port. *beiços*), *çerbeja* (MA, 36) 'beer', *legumes* (SN, p. 313) 'legumes', *plaina* (MA, p. 2v) 'sander', *bafo* (MA, p. 48) 'vapor; mild blowing', *alfinete* (MA, p. 55) and *alfilete* (MA, pp. 54, 55) 'brooch', *risco* (MA, p. 109) 'line', *esturmentos* (HhL, p. 4) 'torments', *amañana* (MA, p. 83v) 'very early part of the morning'; adjectives: *somenos* (HhL, p. 53v) 'minor, inferior in quality or value', *sequiozo* (RV, p. 144v) 'thirsty', *escuro* (MA, p. 152) 'dark, somber', *afastado* (RV, p. 35v) 'departed from, deviated', *arreigado* (RV, p. 102v) 'rooted'; *adoesto* (RV, p. 44) 'misfortune, dishonor'; and verbs such as *anojar* (RV, p. 55v) 'to nauseate, to dislike', *fadar* (MA, p. 4) 'to predestine', *salprezar* (MA, p. 80) 'to salt lightly', *esfriar* (MA, p. 98) 'to become less hot; fig.: to discourage'. However, all these nonce borrowings, most of which are related to objects and activities of the everyday life of the speakers, transitory states of persons and things, appreciative words, etc., as are most of the lexical items of daily speech, were incorporated in the lexicon of standard Judeo-Spanish, and only *legumes* is now regionally marked. The words *adoesto*, *natureza* and *somenos* have not been accepted in the Judeo-Spanish koine.

A possible phonological influence from Portuguese appears in the reflected pronunciation of the stressed vowel of some verb forms, whose roots diphthongize in Castilian: *amostre* (HhL, p. 8) 'that he show', *desperte* (HhL, p. 8) 'that he wakes', *pénçase* (HhL, p. 11v), *se pençan* (HhL, p. 26) 'one thinks that', *bolan* (HhL, p. 31) 'they fly', *se esforça* (HhL, p. 83) 'they strive'.¹⁵ The same phenomenon, both with and without fluctuation between forms with diphthong, can be observed in other kinds of words, both during the 16th century and subsequently. The most significant of them is the *wh*-operator *ken* 'who', which only in the varieties of Salonika and its area has retained the Spanish form, i.e. *kien*.

In addition, there is frequent use of the Portuguese variant *tres-* (*tre-* variant) of the prefix *tra(n)s-* (lat. *trans*; cast. *trans-* and *tras-*), and also the use of the root prefix *tres-* (cast. *tri-*) 'three', in verbal formations and the corresponding deverbals: *trespaça* (RV, p. 43v) 'he oversteps' (Port. *trespassa*), and especially in hybrid new forms such as *tresquilar* (MA, p. 131) 'to scalp, to shear' (*tres-* + Sp. (*tras*)*quilar*), *tremudaçion* (RV, p. 77) 'change, move'; *trespone* (Port. *trespoer-se*) 'he transposes, the sun sets'; *trestornose* (RV, 25v) 'he went crazy'; *trespaçar* (RV, p. 44v) 'to transfer', *tresbariar* (RV, p. 103) 'to rave' (Port. *desvairar*), and *tresdoblado* (HhL, p. 96v) 'to triple'. This morphological innovation in Judeo-Spanish was introduced indirectly through lexical borrowing. According to Winford (2005, p. 386), "structural innovations in an RL appear to be mediated by lexical borrowing, and are therefore not clear cases of direct structural borrowing". In fact, the borrowing of these and of other words from Portuguese such as verbs like *tresudar* (Port. *tressuar* 'sweat much'), *tresgastar* 'overspend', *tresvariar* 'rave; speak

15. Another possible influence from Portuguese would be the nasalization of vowels before nasal consonants, which although not documented in these texts, is detectable, due to the lack of the nasal grapheme, in documents written by uneducated people.

or act nonsensically', etc., resulted in the derivational prefix *tre(s)-* in Judeo-Spanish. This prefix, besides retaining the idea expressed by the prefix *tra(n)s-* 'across; on the other side of', and the root prefix *tri-* 'three' in Portuguese and Castilian, has been re-interpreted as a prefix that adds intensity to the meaning of the lexical stem, including the denotation of excess. As a prefix, it also became relatively productive, as shown by the following lexical compositions that have arisen in Judeo-Spanish: *tresalir* (*tres-* + *salir* 'go out') 'be crazy' and *tresalido* 'maddened', probably by analogy to the Portuguese *tresloucar* and *tresloucado*; *trespizar* (*tres-* + *pizar*; JSp. *pisar* 'to tread') 'to trample', *trespizado* 'trampled', and *trespizamiento* 'trampling action of trample'; *trespajar* (*tres-* + Port. *pajonero* 'defamer') 'to degrade, to defame with lies'; *tresboltarse* (*tres-* + *voltar-se* 'to roll over') 'to recant'; *trezbuyir* (*tres-* + *buyir* 'to boil') 'to boil until the liquid is absorbed'; *trezojar/se* (*tres-* + JSp. *ojo* 'eye') 'be very tired' because it manifests itself through the dark shadows under the eyes.

These suggest that the Portuguese elements integrated into the modern Judeo-Spanish standard, i.e. as regional or local unmarked features, derived from language shift and fall under a substratum influence, while elements with regional and local marks are related to the contact among speakers of Portuguese and Spanish. This contact took place from the mid-16th century, once the Sephardic communities had already succeeded in building their own identity, and Judeo-Spanish started to serve as the language carrying this identity. Therefore, it may be asserted that the grammatical patterns and lexical items of this origin displayed by modern standard Judeo-Spanish are the outcome of contact with Portuguese in the phase of leveling of dialectal differences, although these elements are not documented in the small 16th-century corpus that we have at our disposal.

2.2 Other substratum influences detected in modern Judeo-Spanish

2.2.1 *The subsystem of sibilants*

One of the outstanding phonetic features that Judeo-Spanish shares with other Castilian historical dialects (Andalusian and American Spanish) is *seseo*. Many Sephardic emigrants arrived in the Ottoman Empire from areas in the Iberian Peninsula where the apico-alveolars /s : z/ and the dental sibilants /s̺ : z̺/ had merged or were in the process of merging. In contrast to Andalusian and American Spanish, where the resulting voiced phoneme merged with the unvoiced one, in Judeo-Spanish the contrast of sonority persisted, and the outcome was a pair of dental fricatives, just like in Portuguese (Penny, 2000, pp. 185–186; Quintana, 2009, pp. 244–245). The outcome in Judeo-Spanish, in which the contrast of sonority between the pair of sibilants is maintained, and a dental articulation is selected, is a reflection of the Portuguese norm (Ariza, 1994, p. 218), with its more stable system of sibilants than that which most of the Jews of Castilian origin living in the communities of the Ottoman Empire in the 16th century had at their disposal. In this process, the distinction between /s̺ : z̺/ of the SL – the dominant language of Portuguese bilingual speakers – was transferred through a long

list of word cognates to the TL. This distinction, made through the lexicon, would have been imitated by the Judeo-Spanish speakers in face-to-face communication, which led to the restoration of symmetry sonority in the subsystem of sibilants by all speakers of the community, including those who previously used other variants. Attitudinal factors of the Judeo-Spanish speakers must have played a crucial role in the selection of this phonological pattern by identifying the contrast of sonority made by Portuguese speakers from the viewpoint of a pre-existing structure.

2.2.2 *The syntactic construction se k(i)ere + participle*

Modern Judeo-Spanish shows some syntactic constructions which, no doubt, are a consequence of contact with Portuguese (Crews, 1935, p. 233; Quintana, 2004, 2009; Gabinsky, 2008), for example one of the possible ways of expressing deontic modality in Judeo-Spanish. One of the forms with a deontic value is the use of the impersonal phrasal verb *se k(i)ere* + participle (8, 9). This periphrasis does not exist in Castilian, but it resembles the use in some sentences of Portuguese with the verb *querer* + participle in passive reflexive constructions, where the subjective complement agrees with the patient subject, as in the example, *estas cousas querem-se tractadas com cuidado* (Crews, 1935, p. 233; Wagner, 1930, p. 76) ‘these things must be treated with care’:

- | | |
|---|-------|
| (8) <u>Se kere dicho</u> | JSp. |
| <i>se want-SG said-MASC-SG</i> | |
| Quer-se dito (<i>up until the 19th century</i>) | Port. |
| Hay que decirlo | Sp. |
| It must be said | |
| (9) <u>Se kere tashedeado</u> a otra kaza | JSp. |
| <i>se want-SG moved-MASC-SG to another house</i> | |
| Quer-se mudado para outra casa (<i>up until the 19th century</i>) | Port. |
| Hay que mudarse a otra casa | Sp. |
| One must be moved to another house | |

In these clauses, based on a Portuguese construction but preserving the Judeo-Spanish sentence constituent order, the concealment of the explicit nominative and agent occurs in the grammar, so that they are impersonal only from the pragmatic point of view. The characterization of this construction is recognized for its sense of ‘impersonal obligation’, in which the agent subject is not made explicit through any lexical category. The obligation is imposed by non-specific external actors which are unrelated to the modalized agent.

2.2.3 *Lexical substratum influences: Calques, transfer of lexical items and meaning extensions*

Of all the units of the different levels, lexical items are the most transferred from Portuguese to Judeo-Spanish and of these, loanwords rank first, as it has been noted on

several occasions (e.g. Curnow, 2001, p. 426). However, calques and extensions of meaning were also transferred.

Calques from Portuguese, too, were transferred to Judeo-Spanish, as shown in the following examples (10, 11):

- | | | |
|------|---|-------|
| (10) | Yo meldi un livro <u>mu(n)cho</u> interesante | JSp. |
| | I read a book <i>much</i> interesting | |
| | Eu li um livro <i>muito</i> interessante | Port. |
| | He leído un libro <i>muy</i> interesante | Sp. |
| | *Yo meldi un livro <i>muy</i> interesante | JSp. |
| | *He leído un libro <i>mucho</i> interesante | Sp. |
| | I read a very interesting book | |
| (11) | Ya es <u>mu(n)cho</u> tadre | JSp. |
| | Already (it) is <i>much</i> late | |
| | Já é <i>muito</i> tarde | Port. |
| | Ya es <i>muy</i> tarde | Sp. |
| | *Ya es <i>muy</i> tadre | JSp. |
| | *Ya es <i>mucho</i> tarde | Sp. |
| | It is already very late | |

This refers to the quantifier *mu(n)cho*, the cognate of Portuguese *muito*, and affects only its contextual distribution with the degree adverb *muy*. *Mu(n)cho* is used in semantic contexts in which the Spanish rule only supports the degree adverb *muy*. This occurs in adjectival and adverbial phrases where *mu(n)cho* functions as a pre-adjectival quantifier (10) and as a pre-adverbial intensifier of the adverb (11). This extensive function of *mu(n)cho* in Judeo-Spanish seems to have some parallel in Portuñol (Lipski, 2006, p. 5).

The use of plural of the word *ora* 'hour' in partial interrogatives intended to ask the time (12) also belongs to the calques from Portuguese transferred to Judeo-Spanish.

- | | | |
|------|------------------------------------|-------|
| (12) | <u>A ke oras</u> sale el tren? | JSp. |
| | At what hour-PL go-3.SG the train? | |
| | <i>A que horas</i> sai o trem? | Port. |
| | ¿ <i>A qué hora</i> sale el tren? | Sp. |
| | What time does the train leave? | |

The transfer of the Portuguese adverbial locution *amanhã de manhã* 'tomorrow morning' originated in *amanyana demanyana* in Judeo-Spanish (first, *amanyana de manyana*). The preposition *de* + *manyana* led to the lexicalization of the noun *demanyana* '(the) morning'.

Many words were transferred from Portuguese into Judeo-Spanish instead of Castilian variants or variants from other language sources, with which they competed in the process of dialectal leveling. We will mention only a few words from this group:

abafar ‘with steam cooking’, *murcharse* (Sp. *marchitarse*) ‘wither, become shriveled’, *embirrarse* ‘rage, be furiously angry’, *apokar* (*apocar*) ‘to reduce’, *karpir* (*carpir*) ‘to cry, to whine, to lament’, *chokar* (*chocar*) ‘incubate’, *graya* (*gralha*) ‘jackdaw’, *enguyo* (*engulho*) ‘nausea’, *fronya* (*fronha*) ‘holster’, *birra* ‘obstinacy, anger’, *mesherico*, *mesherikear*, *mesherikero* (*mexerico*, *mexericar*, *mexeriqueiro*) ‘gossip, intrigue, to tell a secret, gossip’, *movito* (*móvito*) ‘abortion’, *monturo* ‘rubbish heap’, *faiska* (*faísca*) ‘spark’, *ranyozo* (*ranhoso*) ‘snotty-nosed’. In languages with the same origin and typologically as similar as Castilian and Portuguese, it is precisely at the lexical level that false similarities can lead to minor transfer within the communication.

The largest group is represented by heterophonic items, i.e. cognate Castilian-Portuguese words with minimal differences in pronunciation, from which the Portuguese phonic forms were integrated unmixed into Judeo-Spanish according to its phonetic rules. This group includes words such as *baptismo* (Sp. *bautismo*) ‘baptism’, *bragante* (Port. *bargante* + metathesis; Sp. *bergante*) ‘scoundrel, rascal’, *chapeo* (Port. *chapéu*) ‘hat’, *lampa* (Sp. *lámpara*) ‘lamp’, *apetite* (Sp. *apetito*) ‘appetite’, *milagre* (Sp. *milagro*) ‘miracle’, *impo* (Sp. *hipo*) ‘hiccup, hiccough’, *remendo* (Sp. *remiendo*) ‘patch’, *renda* (Sp. *renta*) ‘income’, *naniko* (Port. *nanico*; Sp. *enano*) ‘dwarf’, *simiterio* (Port. *cemitério*; Sp. *cementerio*) ‘cemetery’, *entro(n)peso* (Port. *entropço*; Sp. *tropiezo*) ‘unfortunate encounter’, *biko* (Port. *bico*; Sp. *pico*) ‘peak’, *choka* (Port. *choca*; Sp. *chuoca*) ‘broody hen’, *entro(m)pesar* (Port. *entropçar*; Sp. *tropezar*) ‘trip up’, *deskaer* (Port. *descair*; Sp. *caer*) ‘to lose (the wealth, health, strength, etc.)’, *bater* (Sp. *batir*) ‘hit, knock’, *arrastar* (Sp. *arrastrar*) ‘to drag, to lug’, *mesher* (Port. *mexer*; Sp. *mecer*) ‘to rock, to swing’, *resgatar* (Sp. *rescatar*) ‘to rescue’, *resfolgar* (Old. Cast. *folgar*) ‘to rest’, *abafar* ‘with steam cooking’, *aplainar* ‘to smooth, to flatten’ (Sp. *aplanar*), ‘to smooth, to flatten’, *mundjir* (Port. *mungir*) ‘to milk’, *kontente* (Port. *contente*; Sp. *contento*) ‘happy’.

On other occasions, such cognates have resulted in hybrid forms without changing their meaning, i.e., new lexical forms or lexical inter-dialectalisms which are accommodated to the phonetic and morphological rules of Judeo-Spanish: (*des*)*koneser* (Port. (*des*)*conhecer*; Sp. *conocer*) ‘know, etc.’, *rengrasiar* (Port. *regraciar*) ‘to thank’, *bostejar* (Port. *bocejar*; Sp. *bostezar*) ‘yawn’, *pedar* (Port. *peidar*) ‘to break wind’, *tanyedera* (Port. *tangedeira*; Sp. *tañedora*) ‘traditional female musician’, *cantadera* (Port. *cantadeira*; Sp. *cantadora*) ‘traditional female singer’, *fedoriento* (Port. *fedorento*; Old Sp. *fediondo*) ‘which exudes stench; stinking’, *entremientres* (Port. *entrementes*) ‘meanwhile, meantime’, *amanyana* (Port. *amanhã*; Sp. *mañana*) ‘tomorrow’.

By contrast, accommodation of lexical meaning is problematic, because it may often cause the semantic change of a word under the influence of a similar word from another language. Heterosemantic words integrate loan homonyms and loan synonyms, also known as false cognates. These are abundant between Portuguese and Spanish, so presumably they were a problem for Portuguese and Judeo-Spanish speakers in face-to-face communication, which lead to semantic changes. This may have been the case of the homonym old Castilian verb *aparar* ‘stop, end, cease’, a false cognate of Portuguese *aparar* ‘to sharpen a pencil’ – a meaning extension which

Judeo-Spanish borrowed from Portuguese, and from which developed the derivative noun *aparador* 'sharpener', *apara-lápis* in Portuguese.

Especially interesting is the case of *lonso* 'bear; stupid person, idiot': This is the Aragonese *onso* 'bear', and it is also documented in the Castilian literature of the 15th and 16th centuries, but without the bear serving as a reference point for the stupid character of humans. In the Hispanic cultural framework, it is the human physical ugliness which is related to the bear, as is emphasized in some Spanish proverbs. In Judeo-Spanish the contracted article *el*, as in *l'onso*, was interpreted as part of the lexical root. Its acoustic analogy with the Portuguese *Alonso* 'stupid person, idiot', probably led to the reorganization of this semantic pattern, causing the extension of its meaning borrowing from the Portuguese *Alonso*. The reorganization of semantic patterns was not limited to *lonso*, but the lexical extension continues to the formation of new words such as the abstract derivative noun *lonsedad* 'beastliness, brutishness' and the adjective *lonson(a)* 'naive; harmless', the augmentative form of *lonso* before lexicalization (Quintana, 2006, p. 271).

Restriction of meaning is observed in *embrinearse* (Port. *embrenhar-se* 'involve oneself'), used in Judeo-Spanish with the limited meaning 'fall in love'. A change of meaning happened in words such as *adiar* (Old Castilian 'setting the day for an appointment'), which adopted from the Portuguese false cognate the more general meaning of 'to delay', or *acavidar* (Port. *cavidar* 'advise'), which acquired the meaning of 'to warn' in Judeo-Spanish.

The adoption of elements of the Portuguese culture by Sephardim also resulted in neologisms. One such case was that of *fular* (Port. 'a loaf that the godparents give their godchildren or parishioners at Easter') which in Judeo-Spanish refers to the loaf made on the occasion of the Jewish feast of Purim (Wagner, 1950, p. 194).

In essence, the Judeo-Spanish koine especially accommodated vocabulary from Portuguese, both purely lexical forms as well as lexical meaning. There is only one case in which the lexical borrowing from Portuguese induced morphological change. However, this change refers only to the extension of the meaning of the prefix *tre(s)-*. By contrast, Portuguese personal infinitive constructions, of which there is evidence in 16th-century Sephardic texts, were rejected in Judeo-Spanish. Language shift from Portuguese to Castilian also contributed to the transfer of the Portuguese system of sibilants to Judeo-Spanish, probably linked to the imitation of the pronunciation of lexical items that contain any of their phonemes by the various immigrant groups. In the process of dialectal leveling, the old dialects ceased to exist. However, Portuguese continued to be a language with which Judeo-Spanish was still in contact for some generations, but in a different way.

3. The emigration of Portuguese Crypto-Jews to the Ottoman Empire

By the mid-16th century, a Sephardic community had been created, and Judeo-Spanish had become the socially dominant language. For the Jews who remained in Portugal or

in other places in which traditional Jewish law could not be observed, and for the Jews who wished to move to the communities of the Ottoman Empire, forced integration was the only option. Furthermore, Portuguese Jews considering emigration to the Ottoman Empire constituted a social group with unique characteristics. In order to understand the sociolinguistic contexts of this migration, it is necessary to summarize the circumstances under which Portuguese Crypto-Judaism developed and some of the main characteristics of this social group.

3.1 The emergence of Crypto-Judaism in Portugal

Aside from the establishment of the Inquisition in Portugal in 1535, various historical events occurred in the 16th century; the partial expulsion of the Jews from Antwerp in 1550, and the conquest of the city by the Spanish army in 1585, which led to the mass migration of Crypto Jews to Italy, North Africa and the Ottoman Empire, especially prior to 1609 – the year of the signing of the armistice agreement between Spain and Holland, subsequent to which Amsterdam became the most important destination of Portuguese Crypto-Jews (Kaplan, 1993, p. 253). After 1609, the migration of the Sephardic communities to the Ottoman Empire began to decline.

Portuguese Jews who now migrated to the Ottoman Empire belonged to a Jewish group that had gone through the experience of Crypto-Judaism, after forced conversion to Christianity in 1497, without altering their deeply held allegiances to Judaism. This new situation led to the emergence of Crypto-Judaism, i.e. the secret practice of Judaism, characterized by a particular type of conduct,¹⁶ which developed in different

16. Upon conversion, the New Christians were promised that for twenty years there was to be no examination of their religious practices. Nevertheless, many of them chose the first opportunity to leave the country in order to return to Judaism, and most of them joined the rest of Iberian Jewry already established in the Ottoman Empire or in North Africa. Alarmed, the king of Portugal took the decision to forbid emigration in 1499, with the intention of preventing the weakening of the emerging middle class in Portugal. Discrepancies of all kinds between the new Christians who quickly adapted to the new situation and those who more vigorously clung to their Judaism, and the jealousy and hatred of the Old Christian population towards the New Christians led to the massacre of 1506, when two thousands of the latter were murdered in Lisbon. Emigration was temporarily permitted in 1507, when many managed to avail themselves of the opportunity to flee to the Ottoman Empire or to the Jewish communities of North Africa. The Judaizing heresy that Crypto-Judaism represented called for extreme measures, and finally, after many appeals on the part of the crown, the papacy authorized the establishment of the Inquisition in 1535 (Benbassa & Rodrigue, 2000, pp. xxxviii-xl). As was the case in Spain, the Inquisition did not solve the problem of Crypto-Judaism in Portugal. On the contrary, the social conflict between Old Christians and New Jews affected especially the latter, *inter alia* due to the fact that the Inquisition tracked down the so-called heretics. The strong social and religious pressure to which the New Christians were subjected transformed them into a social class. This was a strong factor in the maintenance of the group identity and its intensification. Portuguese New Christians would soon to be found throughout Europe, primarily in Spain.

ways over time, especially in Portugal. In the first decades after the expulsion from Castile and Aragon in 1492, and after the forced conversion of the Jews to Christianity in 1497 in Portugal, their adherence to Judaism remained paramount in importance and implied the observance of rabbinical norms. However, with the passage of the time, and with the cessation of the transmission of these norms, as well as the decline in the knowledge of Hebrew and the impossibility of fulfilling many of the religious commandments in extraordinarily hostile surroundings, Crypto-Judaism evolved into particular forms of behaviors, practices, and beliefs that no longer had any relationship with traditional Judaism (Benbassa & Rodrigue, 2000, p. xl).

Portuguese New Christians or Crypto-Jews were found throughout Europe, in the port cities on the Atlantic seaboard, and on the western Mediterranean between the late 16th and mid-18th centuries, due to their trade activities around the world, hence they are also referred to as “Port Jews” in research.¹⁷

3.2 The immigration of Crypto-Jews to the Ottoman Empire and the non-linguistic consequences of language contact

Some Crypto-Jews eventually integrated into the Sephardic communities, particularly in Salonika and Smyrna during the 17th century. From an economic standpoint, and due to their socio-religious conditions, they were a very dynamic entity, and by the time of their arrival in the Ottoman Empire they had already established commercial connections with other *membros da nação* residing in Italy or in western Europe, where they were tolerated, or in the Iberian Peninsula itself, where they lived outwardly as Christians, and also in the Jewish communities in North Africa (Kaplan, 1993, pp. 249–252). A consequence of this dual identity was that while the more liberal Sephardic intellectuals admired the commercial ability of the Portuguese Jews, the

While Crypto-Judaism in Spain proper seems to have slowly begun to disappear by the middle of the 16th century, it was replaced by a stronger, more vibrant Crypto-Judaism phenomenon coming directly from Portugal, which gave it an additional life for at least another century and kept the Inquisition busy. In fact, the word “Portuguese” became associated with New Christians and a synonym for Crypto-Jew (Benbassa & Rodrigue, 2000, pp. xli-xlii).

17. “Port Jew” defines a ‘social type’ of Sephardim, originating as New Christians and Crypto-Jews in the Iberian Peninsula, who settled in port cities on the Atlantic seaboard – and on the Western Mediterranean – between the late sixteenth and mid-eighteenth century, who were permitted by the local authorities to emerge and to live openly as Jews by virtue of the economic benefits that they brought with them. Many had previously lived a double life as secret Jews or even as non-Jews and had a distanced or skeptical view of Judaism. Because of the absence of ‘Jewry laws’, membership of Jewish communities tended to be voluntary; this fact weakened the control of the rabbinate and lay leadership. For a definition of “Port Jew,” see Dubin (2006, pp. 15–17). On differences in mentality, customs, etc., among Levantine Jews – Sephardim living in the Ottoman Empire – and the Western Sephardim, especially, the Livornese – more representative of the Port Jew – see also the works of Lehmann (2005, 2007).

more orthodox religious elites questioned the unconditional loyalty of these Jews to the principles of traditional Judaism. In a conflict with a religious background similar to that which had been dominant in Iberian society, the integration of the Portuguese Jews into the Jewish communities of the Ottoman Empire not only required their sincere return to Judaism, but it demanded unimpeachable conduct as Jews. In sociolinguistic terms, the use of Portuguese recalled the questionable religious past of these Jews, since Judeo-Spanish had acquired a central role in defining an identity of true Judaism. The almost immediate displacement of their native language by the language that conferred Sephardic identity was the price they would have to pay for their social and religious integration. All this may also explain why not a single Portuguese text was printed over the centuries in the communities of the Ottoman Empire.¹⁸

Language shift of the Portuguese speakers occurred mostly in relation to individuals in mixed households, as a result of the many mixed marriages. Borrowing may have played a central role in the transfer of lexical items through imperfect learning by the non-native Judeo-Spanish speakers, which mostly did not spread beyond the circles of family and friends. To the social pressure to acquire the language of the host community – this was not only a question of Judeo-Spanish social status, but also a matter of attitude on the part of members of these communities, where the Judeo-Spanish koine had become one of the most prominent symbols defining identity – should be added the desire of the immigrants to fit into the Sephardic society, which led to the rapid linguistic assimilation of newcomers (probably only one generation) and their descendants became monolingual speakers of Judeo-Spanish.

In this situation, the influence of immigrant languages on the language to which immigrants have shifted tends to be rather limited (Winford, 2003, p. 17), except when descendants of particular immigrant groups are numerically dominant, or in a position such that their speech patterns influence those of the wider community rather than the reverse (Sankoff, 2007). In fact, the emigration of Crypto-Jews to the communities of the Ottoman Empire had no linguistic consequences; however their prolonged stay in the cities of the western Balkans, especially on the Adriatic Sea, and their numerical importance, significantly affected the Judeo-Spanish spoken in the region.

3.3 The Crypto-Jews in the Western communities of the Balkans

Portuguese was the dominant language of the Crypto-Jews, known as “Port Jews”, who lived outside the Ottoman Empire and were involved in transoceanic trade. Some of them eventually founded the communities consisting almost exclusively of Portuguese people in the major ports in the Adriatic Sea, e.g. the Republic of Dubrovnik (Bonfil, 1993, pp. 231–232), under the Ottoman Empire sovereignty between 1526 and 1806

18. Handwritten documents in Portuguese using the Hebrew alphabet, which contain correspondence between Portuguese traders residing in Salonika and traders from Dubrovnik, Ancona, Pesaro, and other Adriatic ports, are known.

(Kovačec, 1972–1973, p. 503). In particular, those living in the Italian port cities, including the cities on the Adriatic Sea, developed trading ties within the Ottoman Empire. Their trade relations were particularly close with other Port Jews residing in cities like Salonika and Smyrna, and with those Sephardic Jews engaged in similar activities within the Ottoman Empire. They used Judeo-Spanish as their lingua franca in the Mediterranean trade, as noted. On the western border of the Ottoman Empire, on the other hand, in the port cities on the Adriatic Sea, Italian was the language of government, and the Portuguese Crypto-Jews moved in a continuum of varieties between Italian, Portuguese and Castilian with transmission of features from one language to another, as shown by records of Dubrovnik and Split, written in a mixed language in the mid-17th century.¹⁹ This was a very slow process, which finally gave rise to a local mixed language, of which next to nothing is known. According to Subak (1906, p. 18), *Old Ragusano* was extinct in the 1860s. When both Dubrovnik and Split finally became part of the Austrian Empire in 1806, Croats replaced the local population. The Jewish population was also transformed with the arrival of Jews coming primarily from the Jewish communities of the interior, such as Sarajevo, Belgrade, etc., who imposed their Judeo-Spanish varieties, albeit with several substratum influences transmitted through the extinct mixed languages. Prior to these socio-political changes, contact between the Jews living in this city on the Adriatic Sea and the Jewish communities of the interior of the Western Balkans was dominated by close relations, as deduced from rabbinic response. Greater intensity of contact generally means more borrowing, and long-term-contact facilitates the transfer of structural features from one language into the other (Winford, 2003, pp. 11–12). These may explain why, in addition to lexical items, phonetic and grammatical features from Portuguese are only detectable in the Judeo-Spanish western varieties, as we shall now see.

3.3.1 *Raising of [o] and [e] in unstressed syllables*

Although in modern Portuguese we only find the raising of unstressed [o], and [e] to [ə], their pronunciation as [u] and [i] respectively in unstressed syllables and in word-final position is well documented in Old-Portuguese. In 1734 it was still documented by Caetano de Lima as one of the most salient features of the Italian spoken by Portuguese Jews (Teyssier, 1984, pp. 24–25). This pattern was observed in Judeo-Spanish spoken in northern and western areas of the Balkans with the exception of Salonika's Judeo-Spanish (Wagner, 1950, p. 190; Quintana, 2006, pp. 40–57); a fact that can be easily explained by the role of Judeo-Spanish as the socially dominant language and by the strong pressure it exerted. Therefore, it may be assumed that this phonetic transference from Portuguese SL was not only found in the Italian spoken by Portuguese Jews, but also in the Judeo-Spanish spoken by them, as occurs today in the inter-language of Portuguese-Spanish learners (Andrade Neta, 2012). Although the raising of [o] and [e] in unstressed syllables responds to an internal tendency of Spanish – a

19. Some of these documents were published by Tadić (1937, p. 435).

feature that is still evident in diastatic substandard varieties of Peninsular and American Spanish (Munteanu Colán, 2002) – the contrast of degree of aperture to the high vowels takes a very marginal position in the phonological system. The contact of Judeo-Spanish speakers with the Portuguese spoken by Jews in the referred area should not be ignored as a case of contact-induced change.

Here, the result of the influence of Portuguese speakers on Judeo-Spanish was simplification through the loss of the marked feature of contrast between [e] > [i] and [o] > [u] in unstressed syllables, e.g. *semejante* [simi'ʒaṁti] (Old Sp. [seme'ʒaṁte]) or *poderozo* [pudi'rozu] (Old Sp. [pode'rozo]).

3.3.2 *Transfer of the past imperfect forms*

Another marked feature present in the above-mentioned Judeo-Spanish geographical area and also documented in Portuñol (Lipski, 2012, p. 18) is the use of a hybrid past imperfect of the verb *ir* 'go' according to the Portuguese pattern, but with the Castilian conjugation: *ia, ias, ia, iamos, iash* (Port. *íeis*), *ian* (Port. *iam*), which already in the 16th century the spoken language of Sephardim competed with the Castilian *iba, ibas, iba, íbamos, ibais, iban* as mentioned above.

3.3.3 *Accommodation of the o que wh-operator induced structural change*

A Judeo-Spanish pattern borrowed from Portuguese was the *o que* wh-operator, first reinterpreted through the heterophonic *lo que* in Judeo-Spanish, whose function is that of a neutral relative pronoun.²⁰ Like the Castilian *qué* wh-operator and the modern Judeo-Spanish *loke/ke/kualo*,²¹ Portuguese *o que* [–human] and [± animate] introduces the interrogative clause, in which the interrogative constituent bears the nuclear stress and may be classified as the expression of a type of narrow focus (Brito, 2003, p. 464).

- | | | |
|------|---------------------|---------------------|
| (13) | <u>Loke</u> fazes? | JSp. (north & west) |
| | <i>O que</i> fazes? | Port. |
| | ¿ <i>Qué</i> haces? | Sp. |
| | What are you doing? | |

Possibly due to homophony between the borrowed *lo qué* (wh-operator) and the *lo que* (neutral relative pronoun) pre-existing in Judeo-Spanish, at least in subordinate partial interrogative clauses, *qué* was replaced by *lo qué* not only as an wh-operator in main interrogative clauses (13), but also in subordinate interrogative nominal relative clauses dependent on a transitive verb (14), which previously had required a type of nominal relative clause.

20. It does not seem accidental that *lo que* wh-operator rather than the Spanish *qué*, is also documented in Portuñol.

21. These wh-operators are geographical variants (Quintana, 2006, p. 182).

- | | | |
|------|---|------|
| (14) | Yo li dimandi <u>luke</u> el dimandava | JSp. |
| | (Yo) le pregunté <i>qué es/era lo que</i> preguntaba él | Sp. |
| | *(Yo) le pregunté <i>lo qué</i> él preguntaba | Sp. |
| | I asked him what he had asked | |
| | (Yo) le pregunté <i>lo que</i> preguntaba él | Sp. |
| | I asked him the same thing, he asked | |

Here the result is that borrowing of a wh-operator triggered a structural change: *lo que* (< Port. *o que*) in the TL version of the Portuguese shifting group then spread to the TL as a whole, and replaced the equivalent Judeo-Spanish wh-word; finally *lo que* engendered changes in relative clauses like Judeo-Spanish spoken in the Sephardic communities of Bitola, Pristina, Sofia, Pazardzhik or Bucharest shows.

3.3.4 Retention of clitic placement in subordinate infinitive clauses

A syntactic divergence between modern Spanish and modern Portuguese involves clitic placement in constructions related to a subordinate infinitive with a “semi-auxiliary” matrix verb. In Spanish, the clitics are post-verbal, placed after the infinitive, and in Portuguese they are preverbal. The difference of the order in such clauses has existed since the 16th century, when the post-verbal position of the clitic was being fixed in Castilian. This was also the solution in Judeo-Spanish spoken in the eastern communities, but Judeo-Spanish speakers of the western communities also preferred preverbal clitics rather than post-verbal clitics as in Portuguese.²²

In view of the areal coincidence with other features mentioned here (see §§ 3.3.1., 3.3.2., 3.3.3.), it may be suggested that this pattern was one of the features of the subset incorporated from the shifting groups version in western Judeo-Spanish. This pattern is also found in border areas where the contact between Portuguese and Spanish had resulted in a third language or inter-dialect. For example, Lipski mentions that Fronterizo speakers living on the Uruguay-Brazil border “prefer the Portuguese-like *al pájaro quiero lo sacar du su jaula* to the Spanish *...quiero sacarlo/lo quiero sacar...* or *Juan quiere se casar con su novia* to *Juan quiere casarse...*” (2006, footnote 12).

3.3.5 Lexical borrowing

Portuguese lexical items accommodated in the Judeo-Spanish standard variety (see § 2.2.3.) were also included in the Judeo-Spanish spoken in the western communities of the Balkans. This variety also borrowed lexical items from the languages spoken by the Port Jews. Words such as *fijon* (Port. *feijão*) ‘bean’, *asukre/i* (Port. *açucré*) ‘sugar’, *almesha* (Port. *ameixa*) ‘plum’, *trempe/trempis* (Port. *trempe*) ‘trivet’, *medku* (Port. *médico*) ‘physician’, *sambashuga* (Old Port. *sambesuga*) ‘leech’, *luito/lutiu* (Port. *luto*)²³

22. For the spatial distribution of this feature, see Quintana (2006, p. 399).

23. The word *luto* is pronounced [ˈlɥitu] in northern Portugal.

'mourning', *enfulinyar* (Port. *enfulinhar*)²⁴ 'sweep, chimney sweeping, clean the cobwebs', *anujar* (Port. *anojar*) 'nauseate, disgust, cause repugnance', *londje/i* (Port. *longe*) 'far', and others, were used only in the western Sephardi communities of the Balkans – some of them also in Salonika. Especially interesting is the word *pandelon*, a contraction of *pan de León*, a calque of Port. *pão de ló* 'sponge cake' after its accommodation to Judeo-Spanish phonetic rules.

To these patterns and structural changes in the syntax of western Judeo-Spanish we could add others, as well as additional lexical items that may attest to the intense language contact among Judeo-Spanish and Portuguese speakers or speakers of extinct languages spoken in Split and Dubrovnik. It may be suggested that these language innovations and changes occurred first in the Portuguese mixed with Castilian and Italian elements spoken by the Portuguese Port Jews living in the port cities of the Adriatic Sea; from there they spread to the Judeo-Spanish varieties spoken in the Sephardic communities of the interior of the Balkans. In the 19th century, the Jews of Split and Dubrovnik shifted to western Judeo-Spanish because of the arrival and settlement of Sephardim coming from the hinterland communities of the Balkans. As a consequence, in the 1860s the old local varieties spoken in Split, Dubrovnik and other port cities on the Adriatic Sea became extinct.

3.4 The Judeo-Spanish variety of Bitola (Macedonia)

The nearly extinct Judeo-Spanish spoken in Bitola also deserves special attention. A numerically important group of Jews of Portuguese origin arrived in Bitola in 1740,²⁵ which led to the leveling of dialectal differences among the local Judeo-Spanish speakers and the Portuguese fugitives, who probably spoke Portuguese mixed with Castilian and Italian elements. The leveling of these differences led to the emergence of a mixed Spanish-Portuguese local variety at the phonological level, marked by the simplification of Judeo-Spanish /e/ and /o/ to /i/ and /u/ in unstressed syllable, as likewise occurred in the Western Judeo-Spanish (see, § 3.3.1). This leveling also induced a new change, which affected the distribution of /a/ in final unstressed syllable. In this position, with few exceptions, only [e] can appear (Quintana, 2006, pp. 57–60):

24. This verb is used in some varieties spoken in northern Portugal.

25. According to Arbell (2002a, 2002b), when the Venetians occupied Valona (Albania) in 1688 – then under the jurisdiction of the Ottoman Empire – the Jews fled to Berat, and in 1740, after a series of epidemics, those of Spanish and Italian origin settled in Kastoria, and Greek Jews in Janine; the Portuguese Jews moved to Bitola.

In the late 15th century, Jews of Castile, Catalonia and Portugal were established in Valona, where there was an old community of Greek Jews. Jews from Ancona joined them in 1555. During the 16th century the Jewish population accounted for over fifty percent of the total population of Valona. The Jews were engaged in trade, in which Port Jews were also involved. The port of Valona was part of the Mediterranean trade routes.

(15)	koza	>	koze 'thing'
	kara	>	kare 'expensive'
	agora	>	agore 'now'
	afuera	>	afuere 'outside'
	kozas	>	kozes 'things'
	favlas	>	favles 'you speak'
	favlan	>	favlen 'they speak'
	favlávamos	>	favlávemus 'we were talking'

This means that [i], [e] and [u] constitute the subsystem of the vowels in final unstressed syllable of Judeo-Spanish spoken in Bitola. This change, however, did not affect the structure of the phonological system, but the contextual distribution of unstressed vowels. Furthermore, prosodic features of Portuguese seem to be detectable in this Judeo-Spanish variety.²⁶

To the lists of Judeo-Spanish lexical items of Portuguese origin already mentioned, we should add others used only in Bitola, such as *tramusu* (Port. tremoço) 'lupine', *alsireje* (Port. cereja), 'cherry', *fadariu* (Port. fadário) 'fate, destiny', *achadu* (Port. achado) 'found', *ranyu* (Port. ranho) 'mucus', *acusar* (Port. coçar) 'to scratch', *inde* 'still, as yet', *indeagore* (Port. inda agora) 'this very minute', *indemas* (Port. ainda mais) 'still more', and others.²⁷

According to Luria (1930), Crews (1935), and Faingold (1996), it would probably be more appropriate to classify the Judeo-Spanish spoken in Bitola as a mixed language between Judeo-Spanish and Portuguese. This assertion, however, seems problematic, since beyond the mentioned features that affected the pronunciation and vocabulary of this variety, the morphological and syntactic systems of Bitola Judeo-Spanish did not differ from those of other varieties.

4. Final remarks

Returning to the questions posed at the beginning of this paper, we can say that contact of Judeo-Spanish with Portuguese took place in different socio-historical contexts and in various ways, which resulted in different linguistic outcomes.

1. The first contact took place in the first decades after the establishment of the Iberian Jews in the Ottoman Empire. Here, Islamic policies regarding minorities allowed the newcomers to develop a new identity, based on their own roots and cultural experiences without necessarily assimilating into the host society. As usually happens in cases of extreme "catastrophic change", as represented by this forced migration, the process of internal reorganization of the Iberian groups oriented to the elimination of differences and to their integration into a single

26. The only existing sound recordings of Bitola Judeo-Spanish were made by Luria in 1927. These have been recently published by Liebl (2009).

27. These patterns and lexical items are cited in Luria (1930).

homogeneous group resulted in the creation of the Sephardic community. Within this broader process, all the groups – including Portuguese – shifted to Castilian, the language of the majority group. Through this shift, some language patterns of the shifted dialects were also transferred to the social dominant dialect (Castilian) giving rise to Judeo-Spanish, which became the socially dominant language of the new speech community, and the old dialects ceased to exist. Direct transfer of lexical items – calques, loanwords and extensions of meaning – was very important. In addition, the borrowing of certain words in Judeo-Spanish induced the accommodation of the Portuguese system of the sibilants and the borrowing of some words with the prefixes *tre(s)-* from Portuguese, which induced a morphological change in Judeo-Spanish afterwards. Portuguese language patterns, and especially the lexical items that have become accepted in Judeo-Spanish as outcomes of the process of leveling of dialectal differences, fall under the substratum influences.

2. Language contact between Judeo-Spanish and Portuguese or new varieties which developed from it, also occurred later – between the middle of the 16th century and the 19th century – in various places under different conditions and with greater or lesser degrees of intensity:
 - a. The unfavorable social conditions to which the New Jews in Portugal were subjected led to the emergence of Crypto-Judaism – a type of Judaism clearly differentiated from official Judaism – and to the immigration of numerous Crypto-Jews to territories in which the practice of Judaism was permitted or tolerated. One result of this was the emergence of the Port Jew. Some groups of Crypto-Jews immigrated to the Sephardic communities in the Ottoman Empire, into which they integrated rapidly. In these cases, language shift of the Portuguese speakers occurred mostly for individuals in mixed households, thanks to the many mixed marriages. Borrowing may have played a central role in the transfer of lexical items through imperfect learning by the non-native Judeo-Spanish speakers, which mostly did not spread beyond the family and friends circles. This emigration seems not to have had linguistic consequences for Judeo-Spanish.
 - b. The immigration of Port Jews, – some of whom eventually founded the communities consisting almost exclusively of Portuguese people to cities on the Adriatic Sea, such as Dubrovnik – coupled with their contact with Castilian and Italian, led to the formation of a mixed language, through which some linguistic patterns and lexical items from Portuguese were transmitted to the hinterland communities of the Balkans, such as Sarajevo. Due to long-term-contact, the linguistic outcomes detectable in Judeo-Spanish spoken in the western communities of the Balkans included a phonetic change; for example, the raising of [o] and [e] in unstressed syllables, the borrowing of the Portuguese *o que* wh-operator which later triggered a morpho-syntactic

change, the retention of old Castilian and Portuguese clitic placement in subordinate infinitive clauses and the transfer of several Portuguese words.

- c. Furthermore, the immigration of Judeo-Spanish speakers from the Jewish communities in the interior of the Balkans to the communities of Split and Dubrovnik in the 19th century gave rise to the shift of the local speaker group to the Judeo-Spanish variety of the incomers, which promoted substratum influences.
- d. Another outcome of language contact between Portuguese and Judeo-Spanish is documented through the nearly extinct variety of Bitola. The arrival of a numerically important group of Jews of Portuguese origin in 1740 led to the leveling of dialectal differences and thereby to a new Judeo-Spanish variety.

Winford (2003, p. 17) noted that group shifts promote substratum influence in a TL. In effect, only group shifts to Judeo-Spanish left Portuguese substratum influences in the TL, as pointed in 1, 2c, 2d. But long-term-contact led also to borrowing of Portuguese patters in western Judeo-Spanish (2b).

As it is common in contact between dialects, the transfer of language patterns from Portuguese or of Portuguese origin via intermediate dialects to Judeo-Spanish in no way violated the grammatical norm of the socially dominant language. The state of the research on this subject does not allow for the provision of more accurate results than those offered in this chapter. What is certain is that the study of Judeo-Spanish in contact with Portuguese or with other languages – both closely related (Italian, French, Romanian) and typologically unrelated (Hebrew, Arabic, Turkish, Greek, Serbian, Bulgarian) – opens up endless perspectives, especially from the diachronic viewpoint.

Contact between Judeo-Spanish and Portuguese represents a unique case in the Luso-Hispanic ambit, especially because the encounter between these two related languages takes place away from the homeland of their speakers who were moving within minority communities, in which religious affinity dictated the membership. Their descendants would not be subject in any way to the normative pressure of the peninsular standards, but rather to the sociolinguistic rules governing the community itself. Therefore, in the different situations of contact among the Judeo-Spanish and Portuguese speakers, the relationship was not one of conquered and conquerors, but of belonging to an ethno-religious network in the case of the communities of the Ottoman Empire, and to a religious and commercial network in the case of those on the port cities of the Adriatic Sea.

Primary Judeo-Spanish sources of the 16th century

BA: *Sefer 'arba 'a ve 'esrim* (= *Biblia de Asa*). Constantinople, 1739.

BF: *Biblia de Ferrara*. Ferrara, 1553.

HhL: Paquda, Baḥye Ibn (1569). *Sefer Hovath haLevavoth*. Constantinople.

- MA: *Sefer Shulḥan haPanim yamado en ladino* Meza de el alma. Salonika 1568.
 Penta: *Constantinople Pentateuch*. Constantinople, 1547.
 RV: Almosnino, Moshe ben Barukh (1564). *Livro intitulado* Regimiento de la vida. Salonika.
 SN: *Seder Nashim*. Salonika, around 1550.

References

- Andrade Neta, N.F. (2012). Aprender español es fácil porque hablo portugués: Ventajas y desventajas de los brasileños para aprender español. *Cuadernos Cervantes de la Lengua Española*, 3, 17 pp. Retrieved June 12, 2012, from <www.cuadernos cervantes.com/lc_portugues.html>
- Arbell, M. (2002a). Los djudios de Avilona (Valona) en Albania. *Aki Yerushalayim*, 69, 13–14.
- Arbell, M. (2002b). The Jewish communities of Vlora (Valona, Avalona) and its role in the Adriatic. Presented at *The Fourth Conference Society and Culture of the Jews on the East of the Adriatic Coast, Dubrovnik, August 2002*. Unpublished manuscript (14 pp).
- Ariza, M. (1994). *Sobre fonética histórica del español*. Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- Astre, F. (2010). Dhimma. In N.A. Stillman (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Jews in the Islamic World* (Vol. 2; pp. 70–72). Leiden: Brill.
- Benbassa, E., & Rodrigue, A. (2000). *Sephardi Jewry: A history of the Judeo-Spanish community, 14th–20th Centuries*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Bonfil, R. (1993). Los judíos españoles y portugueses en Italia. In H. Beinart (Ed.), *El legado de Sefarad* (Vol. 2; pp. 223–247). Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- Brito, A.M. (2003). Frases interrogativas. In M. Mira Mateus, A. Brito, I. Duarte, & I. Hub Faria, *Gramática da Língua Portuguesa* (7th ed.; pp. 460–479). Lisboa: Editorial Caminho.
- Campo, J.E. (2009). Dhimmi (from the Arabic ahl al-dhimma, people of the treaty). In J.E. Campo, *Encyclopedia of Islam* (pp. 194–196). New York, NY: Facts On File.
- Crews, C. (1935). *Recherches sur le Judéo-Espagnol dans les Pays Balkaniques*. Paris: Droz.
- Curnow, T.J. (2001). What language features can be ‘borrowed’? In A.Y. Aikhenvald & R.M.W. Dixon (Eds.), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance. Problems in comparative linguistics* (pp. 412–436). Oxford: OUP.
- Dubin, L.C. (2006). ‘Wings on their feet... and wings on their head’: Reflections on the study of port Jews. In D. Cesarani & G. Romain (Eds.), *Jews and port cities, 1590–1990. Commerce, community and cosmopolitanism* (pp. 14–30). London: Vallentine Mitchell.
- Faingold, E. (1996). *Child language, creolization, and historical change: Spanish in contact with Portuguese*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Fishman, J.A. (1967). Bilingualism with and without diglossia; Diglossia with and without bilingualism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 23, 29–38. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1967.tb00573.x
- Fishman, J.A. (1999). Sociolinguistics. In J.A. Fishman (Ed.), *Handbook of language and ethnic identity* (pp. 152–163). Oxford: OUP.
- Franco, M. (1897). *Essai sur l’histoire des Israélites de l’empire Ottoman depuis les origines jusqu’à nos jours*. Paris: Librairie A. Durlacher.
- Gabinsky, M.A. (2008). Algunos enigmas de la especificidad lingüística común rumano-judeoespañola. *Revista de Filología Románica*, 25, 157–163.

- Giles, H., & Smith, P. (1979). Accommodation theory: Optimal levels of convergence. In H. Giles & N. St. Clair (Eds.), *Language and social psychology* (pp. 45–65). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Levy, A. (2010). Millet. In N.A. Stillman (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Jews in the Islamic world* (Vol. 3; pp. 423–428). Leiden: Brill.
- Kaplan, Y. (1993). Los sefardíes en el noroeste de Europa y en el Nuevo Mundo. In H. Beinart (Ed.), *El legado de Sefarad* (Vol. 2; pp. 249–297). Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- Kerswill, P., & Williams, A. (2000). Creating a new town koine: Children and language change in Milton Keynes. *Language in Society*, 29, 65–115. DOI: 10.1017/S0047404500001020
- Koch, P., & Oesterreicher, W. (2007). *Lengua hablada en la Romania: Español, francés, italiano*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Kovačec, A. (1972–1973). Un texto judeoespañol de Dubrovnik. *Studia Romanica et Anglicae Zagabienis*, 33–36, 501–531.
- Lehmann, M.B. (2005). A Livornese “port Jew” and the Sephardim of the Ottoman empire. *Jewish Social Studies*, 11(2), 51–76.
- Lehmann, M.B. (2007). “Levantinos” and other Jews: Reading H. Y. D. Azulai’s travel diary. *Jewish Social Studies*, 13(3), 1–34. DOI: 10.2979/JSS.2007.13.2.1
- Liebl, C. (2009). *Judeo-Spanish from the Balkans: The recordings by Julius Subak (1908) and Max A. Luria (1927)*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Lipski, J.M. (2006). Too close for comfort? The genesis of “Portuñol/Portunhol”. In T. Face & C. Klee (Eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 8th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* (pp. 1–22). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Lipski, J.M. (2012). Geographical and social varieties of Spanish: An overview. In I. Hualde, A. Olarrea, & E. O’Rourke (Eds.), *The handbook of Hispanic linguistics* (pp. 1–26). Oxford: Blackwell. DOI: 10.1002/9781118228098.ch1
- Luria, M. (1930). *A study of the Monastir dialect of Judeo-Spanish based on oral material collected in Monastir, Yugo-Slavia*. New York, NY: Instituto de las Españas.
- Minervini, L. (2006). El desarrollo histórico del judeoespañol. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana (RILI)*, 8, 13–34.
- Munteanu Colán, D. (2002). Vectores en el contacto lingüístico. Dominio hispano. *Revista de Filología Española*, 82(1), 63–85. DOI: 10.3989/rfe.2002.v82.i1/2.144
- Penny, R. (1992). Dialect contact and social networks in Judeo-Spanish. *Romance Philology*, 46, 125–140.
- Penny, R. (2000). *Variation and change in Spanish*. Cambridge: CUP. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139164566
- Quintana [Rodríguez], A. (2006). *Geografía lingüística del judeoespañol: Estudio sincrónico y diacrónico*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Quintana, A. (2002). Geografía lingüística del judeoespañol de acuerdo con el léxico. *Revista de Filología Española*, 82(1), 105–138. DOI: 10.3989/rfe.2002.v82.i1/2.146
- Quintana, A. (2004). El sustrato y el adstrato portugueses en judeoespañol. *Judenspanisch*, 8, 167–192.
- Quintana, A. (2007). *Responsa* testimonies and letters written in the 16th Century Spanish spoken by Sephardim. *Hispania Judaica Bulletin*, 5, 283–301.
- Quintana, A. (2009). Aportación lingüística de los romances aragonés y portugués a la coine judeoespañola. In D. Bunis (Ed.), *Languages and literatures of Sephardic and Oriental Jews* (pp. 211–273). Jerusalem: Misgav Yershalayim, The Bialik Institute.

- Quintana, A. (2012). 'La muerte avla por mi boca.' Marcel Cohen y la agonía del judeoespañol. *eHumanista (Journal of Iberian Studies edited by the department of Spanish and Portuguese, University of California, Santa Barbara)*, 20, 296–320. Retrieved April 18, 2012, from <www.ehumanista.ucsb.edu/>
- Ray, J. (2008). New approaches to the Jewish Diaspora: The Sephardim as a sub-ethnic group. *Jewish Social Studies*, 15(1), 10–31.
- Révah, I.-S. (1954). *Le lexique de M. Almosnino: Contribution à l'histoire du castillan*. Mémoire présenté pour l'obtention du diplôme de l'Ecole Partique des Hautes-Etudes Ve section. Paris. Unpublished manuscript.
- Révah, I.-S. (1961). Formation et évolution des parlers judéo-espagnols des Balkans. *Ibérica*, 6, 173–196.
- Romeu Ferré, P. (1998). *Moisés Almosnino: Crónica de los Reyes Otomanos*. Barcelona: Tirocinio.
- Ross, M. (2001). Contact-induced change in Oceanic languages in North-West Melanesia. In A.Y. Aikhenvald & R.M.W. Dixon (Eds.), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: Problems in comparative linguistics* (pp. 134–166). Oxford: OUP.
- Salminen, T. (2007). Endangered languages in Europe. In M. Brenzinger (Ed.), *Language diversity endangered* (pp. 205–232). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sankoff, G. (2007). Linguistic outcomes of language contact. In J.K. Chambers, P. Trudgill, & N. Schilling-Estes (Eds.), *The handbook of language variation and change*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2003. Blackwell Reference Online. 31 December 2007 <www.blackwellreference.com/subscriber/tocnode?id=g9781405116923_chunk_g978140511692334>
- Schmid, B. (2007). De Salónica a Ladinokomunita: El judeoespañol desde los umbrales del siglo XX hasta la actualidad. In G. Colon & L. Gimeno Betí (Eds.), *Ecología lingüística i desaparació de llengües* (pp. 9–33). Castelló de la Plana: Universitat Jaume I.
- Siegel, J. (1985). Koines and koineization. *Language in Society*, 14, 357–378.
- Subak, J. (1906). Judenspanisches aus Salonikki, mit einem Anhang: Judenspanisches aus Ragusa. *Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum LX. Jahresbericht über die Handelssektion der k. k. Handels- und Nautischen Akademie in Triest 1905–1906*. Triest: Handelssektion der k. k. Handels- und Nautischen Akademie.
- Tadić, Đ. (1937). *Jevreji u Dubrovniku do polovine XVII stoljeca*. Sarajevo: La Benevolencia.
- Teyssier, P. (1984). *História da língua portuguesa*. Lisboa: Livraria Sá da Costa Editora.
- Thomason, S.G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Trudgill, P. (1986). *Dialects in contact*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Valera, C. (1602). *La Biblia, que es, los sacros libros del Vieio y Nvevo Testamento: Revista y conferida con los textos Hebreos y Griegos y con diversas translaciones. Por Cypriano de Valera*. Amsterdam: Casa de Lorenzo Iacobi.
- Van Coetsem, F. (1988). *Loan phonology and the two transfer types in language contact*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Várvaro, A., & Minervini, L. (2007). Orígenes del judeoespañol (I): Textos. *Revista de Historia de la Lengua Española*, 2, 147–172.
- Várvaro, A., & Minervini, L. (2008). Orígenes del judeoespañol (II): Comentario lingüístico. *Revista de Historia de la Lengua Española*, 3, 149–195.
- Wagner, M.L. (1930). *Caracteres generales del judeoespañol de Oriente*. Madrid: Hernando.

- Wagner, M.L. (1950). As influências recíprocas entre o português e o judeo-espanhol. *Língua Portuguesa*, 15, 189–195.
- Winford, D. (2003). *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Winford, D. (2005). Contact-induced changes: Classification and processes. *Diachronica*, 22(2), 373–427. DOI: 10.1075/dia.22.2.05win