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LANGUAGE AND ALJAMIA
JEWISH AND ARAB MEDIEVAL
IBERO-ROMANCE:
TOWARD A COMPARATIVE STUDY

DAVID M. BUNIS
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM*

In fond memory of Samuel G. Armistead ז"ע (1927-2013), whose
penetrating studies bridged cultures, religions and worlds.

The Arab conquest of much of Iberia beginning in 711, and the
subsequent return of the conquered territories to Christian hands, led to the
rise among the Christians, Muslims and Jews of medieval Spain of closely
related but nonetheless divergent Ibero-Romance religiolects.¹ With the
expulsions of the Jews and Muslims from Iberia at the end of the fifteenth
century, these religiolects suffered different fates: the Ibero-Romance of
Christians underwent significant modification at all linguistic levels, both
in the peninsula and in newly-established colonies in Latin America; the
exiled Hispanized Jews settled mostly in other regions of the
Mediterranean basin, where they continued to maintain evolved forms of
their Ibero-Romance into the modern era; while the Hispanized Arabs
returned to their ancestral homeland, North Africa, where they abandoned
Ibero-Romance and were reabsorbed linguistically into the greater Arabic
speech community. The present paper offers a preliminary comparative
examination of the seminal features of medieval Ibero-Romance as used
by the Jews and Arabs of medieval Spain, and of the distinct fates which
befell their Ibero-Romance religiolects after the fifteenth century. As such
it may be seen as a contribution to what might be called religiolinguistics,
or the comparative study of religiolects.²

1. Linguistic transitions of the Jews and Arabs
of medieval Spain

When the Arabs swept through much of Iberia from 711, Arabic
became the major language of administration, and of significant intellectual
endeavor and artistic creativity, throughout the Iberian regions they came to dominate. Responding to this new reality, the Jews who found themselves in Muslim-controlled Iberia appear to have adopted varieties of Arabic as their primary everyday vernacular and, alongside Hebrew, as their preferred literary language. Arabicized Christians living in Muslim Spain, who came to be known as Mozárabes, spoke varieties of Ibero-Romance which were heavily influenced by Arabic and were written in the Arabic alphabet.

Part of the evidence that Jews, and of course Muslims, in Islamic Spain used Arabic as a literary language is the body of poetic literature cultivated by both groups, from the eleventh through fourteenth centuries, in the genre known as the muwāššah (or strophic verse). Although Jews wrote some of their strophic compositions in Hebrew, Jews as well as Arabs built up a rich corpus of verses in varieties of Arabic. And yet, in the compositions of both groups, one of the most distinctive features of this poetic genre was the xargā (or refrain) in Ibero-Romance added at the end of the poem, as a kind of summary of its message. Generally these refrains were adaptations of a verse from a popular Ibero-Romance song. Often placed in the mouths of women, and playing a pivotal role in the muwāššahāt, these xargas illustrate the fact that, even before the Christian reconquest of Spain, at least some Jews and Arabs in Muslim Iberia were familiar with Ibero-Romance, as well as Arabic.

Rabbi Abraham Ibn Ezra (c. 1089 -1164) of al-Andalus—or Spain under Islam, as it was called by its Arabs and Arabicized Jews—also alluded to the local Jewish familiarity with Ibero-Romance, as well as Arabic, when he suggested, at the beginning of his commentary on the first chapter of Genesis, that Hebrew Elohim, a plurale tantum form for 'God,' was an honorific:

"'Elohim—After we found [formally singular] Eloah we knew that [formally plural] Elohim was plural, and the root of this is in the manner of the language, because each language has a manner of demonstrating honor. And honor in the La'az [i.e., Ibero-Romance] language is indicated by an inferior speaking to a superior in the plural form [cf. OSp. vosotros/vuestra merced]. And in the language of Yišma'el [i.e., Arabic] the way of [demonstrating] honor is for a superior to speak like the king, in the [majestic] plural [cf. Ar. nahμna]. And in the Language of Holiness [i.e.,
Hebrew] the way of indicating honor is to speak of a superior in the plural, such as 'adonim and bê'alin [sirs and masters]..."

In his medical discourses, Maimonides (b. Córdoba 1135, d. Egypt 1204) provided glosses of medical terminology in Ibero-Romance as well as Ibero-Arabic, Berber, Greek, Persian and Syriac. Mordêxay ben Yishaq Kimhi (Provence, end 13th century) noted that in his time and place, “because of our sins, most of our sons and daughters speak Romance and Arabic and Greek and the languages of other nations, and even the majority do not know how to speak the Jewish/Judean language [i.e., Hebrew].” However, despite whatever level of familiarity with Ibero-Romance they might have commanded in Islamic Spain, the primary language of its Jewish and Muslim authors, as well as that of their audiences, was evidently a variety of Arabic, rather than of Ibero-Romance.

With the success of the armed struggle known among Christians as the Reconquista, or al-'Istirdād ([Christian] Recapturing), as it was referred to by Spanish Arabs, formerly Muslim-subjugated Iberian lands returned to Christian rule. With this transfer of power, Ibero-Romance languages and cultures regained their former preeminence throughout re-Christianized Iberia. This was certainly true among the Christians living in formerly Muslim Spain. The Jews and Muslims of the region also accommodated the triumph of Christendom by making a gradual linguistic transition from the varieties of Arabic they had been speaking and writing in Muslim Spain to varieties of Ibero-Romance. The linguistic shift occurred among Arabs and Jews in the same places, at the same times. Among the Jews, it affected whole communities, which basically remained intact geographically but underwent extreme linguistic and cultural transformation. Among the Muslims, it affected those individuals who remained in place rather than fleeing southward, and ultimately across the Mediterranean to North Africa, to escape the Christian onslaught.

Especially in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, pressure was brought to bear on both the Jews and Muslims in re-Christianized Spain to convert to Catholicism. Among both groups, many resisted conversion; but many also succumbed—whether sincerely or not—, becoming known among Christians as Marranos if the converts had formerly been Jews, and Moriscos, if formerly Muslim. To all appearances, the converted Jews abandoned any distinctive linguistic features connected with their former Judaism and used Spanish as spoken and written by their Old Christian counterparts. With the expulsions of the late fifteenth century, all openly practicing Jews who would not convert had to leave the country. Many Muslims also had to flee; but some, especially those engaging in critical
vocations, such as agriculture, were allowed to remain. Known as Mudéjares, intense pressure was brought to bear on these Spanish Muslims in the sixteenth century to effect their conversion to Catholicism. According to the available evidence, those of them who remained faithful to Islam preserved some distinctive linguistic features connected with their ancestral religion in their Ibero-Romance.

Thus, from the time of the Reconquista until the end of the Mudéjar presence in Spain in the early seventeenth century, somewhat distinctive Ibero-Romance religiolects were used by the openly practicing Hispanized Jews and Muslims of re-Christianized medieval Iberia (through 1492), and later by the Mudéjares. Despite the general Hispanization of both Jews and Muslims, however, the linguistic and sociolinguistic specifics of the Hispanization took somewhat different forms among the Jews, on the one hand, and the Muslims and Mudéjares, on the other.

1.1. Divergent pace of language shift

1.1.1. Rapid shift of the Jews in Christian Spain to Ibero-Romance

For pragmatic reasons—to ensure their physical and economic survival—among the Jews the shift to Ibero-Romance probably began to occur from the earliest stage of the re-conquest, in the eighth century, with formerly Arabicized Jews in each of the regions re-taken by Christian combatants willingly accommodating linguistically and culturally to their new, Ibero-Romance-speaking Christian rulers. The Jewish linguistic switch is perhaps better understood as a linguistic reorientation, since, as was pointed out, Jews probably had at least some familiarity with Ibero-Romance even under Muslim domination, so that in newly-Christianized Spain, Ibero-Romance gradually became the principal language, and Ibero-Arabic, the secondary. Ultimately, the active use by Jews of Ibero-Romance is demonstrated by Ibero-Romance texts in the Hebrew alphabet from various regions of Iberia which had formerly been under Arab domination. However, documentation of texts of this sort seems to begin only around the 12th century; before this time, Jewish Ibero-Arabic may have continued to play a significant role in the Jewish communities, alongside Ibero-Romance. Neither in their Hebrew nor their Ibero-Romance writings do the Jews of re-Christianized Spain appear to have expressed sorrow over their making the transition from Ibero-Arabic to Ibero-Romance.

As is well known, for some of the Christian royalty and clergy, the linguistic and cultural assimilation of the Jews was not sufficient; they
eventually demanded that the Jews convert to Catholicism. Toward the end of the fourteenth century, waves of violence against the Jews brought some to convert. In 1478 the Tribunal of the Holy Office of the Inquisition was founded by the Catholic Monarchs, Ferdinand II of Aragon and Isabella of Castile, primarily in order to ensure the Catholic orthodoxy of converted Jews and Muslims. In order to make the appearance of being true Christians, the Jews who converted—either sincerely or simply as a ruse, secretly remaining faithful to their ancestral religious beliefs, or at least to their Jewish ethno-religious identity—eventually came to speak and write Ibero-Romance as the Christians did. The use by crypto-Jews of a word or linguistic form considered by Christians to be typical of Jewish speech could reveal their secret attachment to Judaism, which could in turn lead to investigation by the Inquisition and ultimately even to a death sentence. Thus, it is unlikely that Spanish crypto-Jews used varieties of Ibero-Romance diverging from those of their Old Christian counterparts, at least in print and in public places. But, as will be elaborated upon later, those Jews who did not convert but continued to profess their Judaism openly until their expulsion from Iberia at the end of the fifteenth century did in fact diverge somewhat from the Christians in their spoken and written Ibero-Romance.

1.1.2. Gradual shift of the Iberian Arabs to Ibero-Romance

Before the fifteenth century, an Arab in Iberia fluent in Ibero-Romance spoken without a foreign accent seems to have been a relative rarity. Of such an Arab, Christian Spaniards said that he was a *moro ladino*; the latter word eventually came to mean “astute, sagacious.” Among the Arabs in the peninsula as a group, especially those in Aragon and Castile, linguistic Hispanization occurred primarily from the fifteenth century. This was especially true after 1492, among those who remained in Andalucía following the Christian capture of Granada, the last Muslim stronghold in Spain. From that time, the Mudéjares who wished to remain in the country were pressured to become Christians. Like the Jews, some genuinely converted, while many others pretended to. The Christianization of the Iberian Arabs, actual or feigned, included their adoption of local Ibero-Romance. Like the Ibero-Romance of the faithfully-practicing Spanish Jews who had probably become linguistically and culturally Hispanized before them, the Ibero-Romance of those Hispanized Arabs, or *Moriscos*, whose conversion to Catholicism was insincere also diverged in significant ways from that of the Christian Spaniards, as well as from that of the Hispanized Jews.
The present brief and highly tentative examination of how the documented varieties of Ibero-Romance used by the Jews and Moriscos of Spain differed from the varieties used by Spanish Christians is based on the extant written corpuses of both groups. It should be kept in mind, of course, that the documented varieties of Ibero-Romance used by Jews and Moriscos probably constitute but a few of their diverse written and spoken varieties. The manifold varieties of Jewish and Arab Ibero-Romance may well have evolved in different ways over time, and in the diverse regions and social settings in which they existed. Among the Jews of medieval Spain, such diversity is exemplified by the distinctively ‘Jewish’ character of texts intended for a specifically Jewish readership, such as the rabbinical ordinances governing the Jewish community, set down in Valladolid in 1432,16 and other communal and personal documents which have survived.17 These stand in opposition to the de-judaized language of writings commissioned of Jews by Christian patrons, including Bible translations such as the so-called Biblia de la Casa de Alba (completed in 1430),18 and works dedicated by Jews to Christians, who were obviously expected to be able to read and understand them, such as the Proverbios morales of Šem Ťob ben Yisḥaq Ibn Arduiel or Santob de Carrión (c. 1355)19—not to mention Hebrew-letter transcriptions of texts composed by Christian Spaniards, such as the 14th-century Danza general de la muerte,20 which Jews familiar with the Roman alphabet rendered in the Hebrew alphabet more customarily employed by Jews in order to enable co-religionists to read them.

The remaining discussion will focus on divergences between the Hispanized Jews and Arabs of medieval Iberia with regard to attitudes toward Ibero-Romance; the linguistic antecedents of Jewish and Arab Ibero-Romance; their non-Latin writing systems; the impact of the sacred languages and earlier linguistic traditions of Judaism and Islam on Jewish and Arab Ibero-Romance; the special linguistic varieties used in the translation of sacred texts; reflections of historical, regional, and social-level variation in the Ibero-Romance of Jews and Arabs; and Jewish and Arab Ibero-Romance in exile.

1.2. Divergent attitudes toward Ibero-Romance

1.2.1. Negative attitude of Muslim spiritual leaders toward Spanish

It is common among linguists to describe the linguistic state of the Arab world as being one of diglossia (to use the term coined by Charles Ferguson in 1959), in which local colloquial varieties of Arabic are used
for everyday, informal communication, while high-prestige varieties, closer to Quranic Arabic, are used in formal contexts such as the spheres of religion and ‘high culture’. Such was the linguistic state of the Arabic-speaking Muslims in Spain before the Reconquista. Although there would have been numerous divergences between their everyday and formal literary varieties, the Spanish Arabs undoubtedly perceived the varieties of ancestral language they used on a daily basis, as well as in their cultural and religious life, as parts of the same language—Arabic, which, when they made the transition to Spanish, they called ‘árabi (cf. A. ‘arabī) or arávigo.

As knowledge of Arabic fell into serious decline among the Arabs in newly re-Christianized areas such as Aragon and Castile, its replacement by Ibero-Romance as the primary spoken and written language of the Arabs remaining there became a fact. For the Muslim spiritual leaders, the loss of Arabic was nothing less than a shameful degeneration. For them it meant the replacement, by a ‘foreign tongue,’ of a language with which they had fully identified ethnically and religiously—the divine language in which the Quran had been revealed to the prophet Muhammad.

In the Quran itself, the fact that its language is Arabic is presented merely as a pragmatic necessity, since Arabic was the language understood by the earliest potential Muslims:

“Verily, We have sent it down as an Arabic Qur’an in order that you may understand” (12:2);

“A Book whereof the Verses are explained in detail; A Qur’an in Arabic for people who know” (41:3);

“And if We had sent this as a Qur’an in a foreign language other than Arabic, they would have said: ‘Why are not its Verses explained in detail [in our language]? What! [A Book] not in Arabic and [the Messenger] an Arab?’ ” (41:44);

“We verily, have made it a Qur’an in Arabic, that you may be able to understand [its meanings and its admonitions]” (43:3).

However, later Islamic tradition and law emphasized the sanctity of Arabic, the obligation of a Muslim to study it and speak it, and the distastefulness of speaking or writing another language. In the words of Shaykh ul-Islām Taqi ad-Dīn Ahmad ibn Taymiyyah (1263-1328):

“As for becoming accustomed to talking to one another in a language other than Arabic, which is the symbol of Islām and the language of the Qur’ān,
so that this becomes a habit in the land, with one’s family and household
members, with one’s friends, in the marketplace, when addressing
government representatives or authority figures or when speaking to
people of knowledge, undoubtedly this is makrīh (disliked), because it
involves being like the non-Arabs, which is makrīh…. Moreover, the
Arabic language itself is part of Islām, and knowing Arabic is an
obligatory duty.” 23

The anthropologist Raphael Patai (1977: 110) suggested the following
comparison of the status of Arabic in Islam with Hebrew in Judaism:

“Compared to [the] veneration of and attachment to Arabic in the Muslim
world, the Jewish position was always a much more flexible one. While the
Jews considered Hebrew their Holy Tongue and referred to it as lshon
haqodesh (lit. ‘language of holiness’), they never clung to it with anything
comparable to the fervent, almost sensual, attachment the Arabs had for
Arabic.” 24

In the case of the Muslim spiritual leadership in Spain, the degradation
experienced by the Arabs in being forced to speak Ibero-Romance was
compounded by the fact that Arabic was being substituted by the language
of an ‘accursed’ people who refused to accept Islam and managed to
retake lands previously won from them for Islām.25 Hence it is not
surprising that the Arabs in Spain called Spanish ‘ajami26 or al-‘ajamiyya,
from Arabic al-a’jamiyya ‘non-Arabic, foreign language,’ itself from
‘ajami ‘foreign, non-Arabic; specifically, Persian’;27 e.g., “Esta es un
addu’a […] tornado de arabi en ‘ajamía” ‘This is a prayer […] turned
from Arabic into Spanish.’28 Among Christians, the word became aljamía,
realized as [alʤa’mia] in Old Spanish, later yielding [alxa’mia]), 29 which
signified ‘Spanish spoken or written by Moriscos, especially when written
in the Arabic alphabet.’30 From that base derives alfamiado ‘Arabic (or
Hebrew) writing system used to transcribe Morisco (or Jewish) Ibero-
Romance.’31 Another Morisco term for Spanish was romanse (Kontzi
1974, vol. 1, 324; cf. S. romance < L. romanice), which was also used into
the sixteenth century (but hardly beyond) by those Jews who wrote in a
minimally judaized (or rather, de-judaized) variety of Jewish Ibero-
Romance, written in the Hebrew alphabet but apparently modeled after
Christian literary Spanish.32

Arab intellectuals in medieval Spain expressed repugnance toward
Spanish, and in the sixteenth century the Spanish Arabs occasionally rose
up in rebellion against the Christian legislation that ultimately demanded
that they abandon their ancestral language and cultural traditions in favor
of the language and culture of Christian Spaniards. For example, in 1567
Felipe II forced Moriscos to abandon their Islamic names in favor of Christian ones, give up their traditional dress, cease speaking and writing Arabic, and have their children educated by Catholic priests. The use of Arabic was henceforth to be considered a crime. The Arabs were given three years to master Spanish, after which they were to destroy all Arabic material in their possession. This led to the Rebellion of Alpujarras (1568-1571). In the end the law was not strictly enforced and Arabs succeeded in maintaining ties to Islam and Islamic traditions, partly through the rise of a crypto-Islam practiced among ostensible Arab converts to Christianity. In general, the Arabs who chose to remain in areas under Christian control were suspected by the Christians of being disloyal to the Spanish monarchy, and of supporting the Muslim Ottoman Turks in their wars against Christian Europe.

1.2.2. Neutral attitude of Jews toward Spanish

In contrast to the state of diglossia which existed among the Arabs in Iberia, the linguistic condition of the Jews of Muslim Spain might be captured by Joshua Fishman’s (1967) term, extended diglossia: the Jews there had used judaized varieties of Arabic for daily speech and for certain types of scholarly and poetic writing, but entirely different languages—Hebrew, and to a lesser extent, Aramaic—for their liturgy, as well as for most high-level religious literature.

Paralleling the Spanish Arabs’ identification with their ancestral Arabic, on ethnic and religious grounds the Jews could identify solely with Hebrew, the language of ancient Israel and of their most sacred texts. As Patai noted in his exaggeratedly lukewarm characterization of the Jewish attachment to Hebrew, from Mishnaic times on, Hebrew was traditionally referred to by Jews, both in the language itself as well as in the distinctive Jewish Diaspora languages which developed among Jewish groups in the diverse regions of their dispersion, as the “language or holiness” or “holy tongue” (H. lĕšon ha-qodeš). For example, in translating Bahye Ibn Paquda’s moralistic work Ḥovat ha-lĕvavot into ‘Ladino’ in post-expulsion Salonika, Ṣaddiq Formón (c1568: [1]a) justified his choice of translation-language on purely pragmatic grounds, expressing regret over the reality it reflected: “Treslaðé este livro de lašón hakóđeš en laðino porke esta lengwa es la mas kolsaða entre nozotros baavonoθ” “I translated this book from the language of holiness into laðino because this language is the most common among us, for our sins.” In the final analysis, for the rabbis, all languages other than Hebrew—including Jewish varieties of Arabic and Romance—were “foreign”.
According to various *midrašim* or “homiletical commentaries”, Hebrew was the language used by God at the creation of the world. Homiletical sources sought to demonstrate the primordial nature of Hebrew by comparing the relationship between the Biblical words אִישׁ “man” and אִישָׁה “woman”: just as woman was created from man (Genesis 1:21-23), it is only in Hebrew, according to the midrash, that the word for “woman” derived from that for “man”. According to rabbinical sources, in addition to its use by the Divinity, Hebrew was the language of the First Man, as well as of the rest of mankind, until linguistic diversity was sown among mankind as a divine punishment for the attempted Tower of Babel (Genesis 11:1-9). After the Flood, only Ever and his descendants are said to have retained Hebrew, but, the rabbis argued, all languages continued to incorporate some Hebrew words. Rabbinical tradition maintains that Hebrew is the language used in heaven by the ministering angels. According to Leviticus Rabba (sec. 32.6), one of the reasons the biblical Israelites were deemed worthy of redemption from slavery in Egypt was because they did not abandon their Hebrew names and language. During the Israelites’ sojourn in the desert, God spoke to them in Hebrew, and gave them the Torah in that language.

In the Hebrew Bible and other Jewish sacred texts, peoplehood and language are equated, and God is said to have chosen and sanctified the Jewish people and its (Hebrew) language above others: a variation on the phrase “u-vanu ṣarta mī-kol ‘ām wē-lašon” (and us did You choose above every nation and language), in Deuteronomy 10:15, is contained in the sanctification (qidduš) text pronounced over wine at the beginning of festival meals. It is traditionally inferred from the phrase in Deuteronomy 11:19, “wē-sinantim lē-vaḥarta wē-dibbara bām” (And ye shall teach them to your children, to speak of them), that fathers should speak to their children in Hebrew and teach them the language, as well as study it themselves, especially during the festivals. Speaking the Holy Tongue is said to be one of the attributes of a person worthy of life in the World To Come. At the end of days, according to legend, all of mankind will again speak Hebrew. From the Middle Ages into the modern era, the attachment of the Jews to Hebrew is demonstrated by their continuous use of the language for liturgical and literary/scholarly purposes, as well as the deep incorporation of Hebraisms into the Jewish languages of the Diaspora.

With the Muslim conquest of much of Spain, those Jews finding themselves under Arab domination had readily adopted Arabic, albeit in variants of their own, written in the Hebrew alphabet and containing elements of Hebrew origin. Nevertheless, they, or at least their rabbinical
scholars—and it is their words which have been preserved in writing into our times—did not identify the language as their own. We already saw that in certain contexts Avraham Ibn ‘Ezra referred to Arabic as lešon Yišma’el “the language of Ishmael”, a personage enjoying no great prestige in Jewish sources; while Ibn ‘Ezra sanctified Hebrew as lešon ha-qodeš “the language of holiness”. In other contexts, Ibn ‘Ezra drew contrasts between what he called lešonenu “our language”, meaning Hebrew, and lešonam, “their language”, meaning the language of the Arabs, in a variety of which language he himself spoke and sometimes wrote, but—reminiscent of Derridas’s attitude toward French—with which he could not identify as his own language (Derridas 1998:1). For example, in a discussion of the Hebrew word na ‘raw (flesh),’ occurring in Exodus 2:19, Ibn ‘Ezra observed:


[Most of the Arabic language resembles Hebrew. And live flesh they call in the Arabic language nay’[כ”ג] [cf. A. ] and the letters ‘alef, he, waw, yod interchange with one another in their language as in our language] [emphasis mine].

So, too, in Jewish sources, the Arabic alphabet is associated with the “Ishmaelites” (cf. H. kētivat/kētav ha-Yišma’el “writing of the Ishmaelites”) and “their language” (H. lešonam), and for that reason its use among Jews was not widespread before the modern era. If the Spanish Jews’ emotional attachment to and ethnic identification with Hebrew resembled that of the Spanish Arabs to Arabic, their reaction to the necessity of transferring from Ibero-Arabic to Ibero-Romance as their language of daily intercourse and certain types of writing in newly re-Christianized Spain did not. For the Jews, the shift merely signalled yet another victory of one group of foreign hosts over another, the result of which, of necessity, was simply one more in a long series of pragmatic linguistic transitions the Jews had had to make following the decline in the use of Hebrew as their everyday spoken language, in consequence of conquest and exile. In each such instance, one essentially “foreign” language—be it Aramaic, Persian, Greek, Latin, or some other language of non-Jewish origin, albeit in a Jewish variant—was replaced by another for everyday communication and some writing, while Hebrew was always maintained as the primary language of the sacred sources, liturgy and, usually, high-level religious discourse.
As among other peoples (e.g., ancient Greeks, Romans, Chinese and, as we have seen, the Arabs), the Jews of the biblical period employed a generic exonym—the Hebrew root ד"ע (l.'z)—to designate “foreigners speaking a language other than Hebrew” and “the speaking of a foreign/non-Hebrew language”. In the Bible, l.'z. is used in connection with the language spoken by the Ancient Egyptians; in the Mishnah, it designated the language of the Greek conquerors of the Land of Israel. Later on, in medieval Europe, Jews referred to local Romance languages, including the varieties used by Jews, as lēšon lo’ez, or la’az (foreign language) in their Hebrew writings. For Jewish French, this use of the term is best illustrated in the lē’azim, or glosses of “difficult Biblical words”, incorporated in the sacred-text commentaries of Rashi (Šelomo Yishaiqi, 1040-1105).

In Iberia too, the rabbis referred to Ibero-Romance in Hebrew primarily as la’az. This might have seemed particularly appropriate to them because, phonologically, the word resembled the Ibero-Romance lexeme ladino (from Latin latīnus), which they seem to have preferred over other Hispanic-origin names (e.g., romance, español) to denote Ibero-Romance itself when writing in that language. Such ‘phono-semantic matching’ (to borrow Ghil’ad Zuckermann’s term) of lexemes across the components of Jewish languages was a significant criterion for the selection of lexical correspondences generally in this community. Similarly, speakers of Ibero-Romance, and translators of sacred texts into Ibero-Romance, were called lo’ázim “speakers of a foreign language.”

But despite their formal categorization of Ibero-Romance as ‘foreign,’ the Jews in Spain appear not to have rebelled against its adoption following the Reconquista. Rather, they demonstrated the same pragmatic openness to Ibero-Romance which they had shown toward Arabic while living under Muslim domination, as well as a facility for acquiring its sound system and, at least among some Iberian Jews, a familiarity with its Latin-letter orthography—subjects to which we shall return in due course.

It should be noted, nevertheless, that following the expulsion, and perhaps partly in response to it, the introductions to rabbinical works composed in Judezmo—the principal variety of Ibero-Romance that developed among the Sephardic exiles in the Ottoman Empire—often included the complaint that, to quote Rabbi Moše Almosnino of sixteenth-century Salonika, “because of our sins, all of our conversations are in a language foreign to us” (“por nwestros pekaðos son toðas nwestras plátikas en lengwa ažena a nos”). In his Hebrew introduction Almosnino remarked that he acceded to the request of a relative, who did not know Hebrew, and wrote the book in La’az, adding at the end a list of difficult
words and their explanations “lĕ-ma’an yaruṣ ha-qore bĕ-la’az la-lo’āzot” (so that the reader should read it quickly in La’az for La’az speakers). In the Hebrew introduction, Almosnino waxed poetic in describing the spiritual torture he endured in writing the book in Ibero-Romance (albeit in the Hebrew alphabet) rather than in Hebrew, in acquiescence to his relative, who:


[begged of me … that my words be in the La’az language, to study and to teach the art of the sermon … And in the eyes of Moše [Almosnino, the author], bad is the deed [cf. Nos. 11:10], and there is no comforter [cf. Eccl. 4:1], for stronger than death is the love [cf. Song 8:6] of my first husband [i.e., Hebrew (cf. Hos. 2:9)], the language which is usual on the door of my lips [as a rabbi and scholar (cf. Ps. 141:2)], it shall be called holy [cf. Is. 4:3] … and in it are called my name and the names of my forefathers.]

It is perhaps worthy of note that speakers of Ḥaketía, the variety of Jewish Ibero-Romance employed by the descendants of the Jews of medieval Spain in North Africa, employ ‘ažmía, bearing a close resemblance to the North-African colloquial Arabic form of classical Arabic al-a’jamiyya, to denote “(non-Jewish) Spanish”. The use of ‘azmiya by speakers of Moroccan Judeo-Arabic to denote a Ḥaketía-speaking woman of Iberian origin, corresponding to the use by North African Sephardim of kasteyana (descendant of Spanish Jewry), may be seen in the following passage from a responsum of Rabbi Ša’ul Yĕšua ben Yiṣḥaq Abitbol (1747–1821) from Sefrou, 1785, referring to an older text, perhaps from Spain:


[In the matter of marriages … that is how it is written on the marriage certificates … and also at the time of the contract claimed from the bridegroom regarding the marriage certificate we saw that they used to say at the end of the contract and the certificate [with reference to the bride, if she was from a family of Iberian origin] “Azmiya,” and the Ibero-Romance-speaking Jews say “Kasteyana,” and we do the same after them.]
We shall return to this topic toward the end of our discussion.

2. Impact of the sacred languages and linguistic traditions

2.1. Jewish and Arab Ibero-Romance writing systems

2.1.1. Mutual rejection of the Roman alphabet

From earliest times into the modern era, writing and religion have been intimately connected. Especially before the modern era, people learned to read and write mostly within the framework of religious studies, in order to gain access to their body of sacred sources. Thus, if one knew only a single alphabet, it would be that used in the sacred texts of his or her religion. The Jews and Muslims identified the Hebrew and Arabic alphabets, respectively, with their religions and peoples, since their most sacred texts were written in those alphabets. Among the Jews, Hebrew letters were often referred to as “Jewish letters”. Among the descendants of Spanish Jewry in the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian empires, such designations included 'otiyyot dē-Yišra’el ‘letters of Israel,’ 66 letra ġuđeka,67 and letras ġudezmas (e.g., in an issue of the Viennese Judezmo periodical Gwerta de estorya from 1865).68 The rabbis of various Jewish subcultures also referred to the Hebrew alphabet by expressions such as ‘our holy letters,’69 ‘the letters of holiness,’70 and ‘our holy script.’71 Especially in Jewish mysticism as exemplified in the Zohar, Sefer yēṣira and Sefer ha-tēmuna, the letters of the Hebrew alphabet were believed to be imbued with sanctity, as well as creative force.72 The mystical work Sefer yēṣira offers a version of Creation accomplished by harnessing the supernatural powers of the Hebrew letters.73 Jewish homiletic literature assigns the Hebrew letters anthropomorphic shapes and depicts them as speaking with the Divinity, while discussions in the Talmud allude to their indestructibility.74 An extensive religious literature in Hebrew is devoted to the formulation of rules governing the correct forming of the Hebrew letters.75

Among Muslims, the Quranic verse “Thy Lord is the Most Bounteous, who teacheth by the pen, teacheth man that which he knew not” (Surah al-Alaq, 96:3-5) has served as the inspiration for viewing the Quran in its Arabic alphabet, and therefore the Arabic script in general, as mankind’s perceptual glimpse of the Divine.76

Thus, although there were individual Jews and Arabs in medieval Spain who had a familiarity with the Latin alphabet, and even utilized such
knowledge professionally (for example, as translators), en bloc the two groups identified the Latin alphabet with the Catholic Church and its Latin religious literature and liturgy. Among the Jews of Iberia, Latin letters were denoted by terms such as kēav̱kētv̱a nosrit(t) “Christian script”,77 The descendants of the Spanish Jews who found refuge in the lands of Islam following the expulsion continued to identify the Roman alphabet with Christianity, as illustrated in expressions such as: letra de goyim,78 ‘otiyyot ha-goyyim or ‘otiyyot šel goyyim “letters of the Gentiles”,79 ‘otiyyot dē-goy “Gentile letters”.80

Similarly, Arabs in Spain who were forced to write in the Roman alphabet referred to it as letra de krishτanoš “Christian letters”, and they described Muslims skilled in reading it as those who saben leer el krishτano “know how to read Christian”.81 For Muslims, the Latin alphabet stood in opposition to ārabi or arábigo, or la letra de los muçlimes “the letters of the Muslims”.83 Both Muslims and Jews in Iberia were most comfortable writing whatever languages they used, sacred or profane, “their own” or “foreign”, in their own religion-based group alphabets. The Iberian Muslims put off writing in romanization so long as they could withstand the pressure to do so on the part of the Catholic rulers; but they eventually acceded to the Christians’ demands, especially the Moriscos who remained in Spain after the expulsion.

2.1.2. Characteristics of the Hebrew and Arabic orthographies used to transcribe Jewish and Arab Ibero-Romance through the seventeenth century

2.1.2.1. Jewish Ibero-Romance in the Hebrew alphabet

Even before the Middle Ages, the Jews had had a long history of writing languages adopted from their neighbors in the Hebrew or “Jewish” alphabet. The earliest examples are the Aramaic passages in Ezra, Daniel, and other parts of the Bible, as well as the occasional borrowings from Egyptian, Persian, Akkadian, and other regional languages in the Hebrew portions of the Bible.

The Hebrew-letter orthography devised by the Jews of Spain to transcribe Ibero-Romance existed in two distinct variants, the first used in Islamic Spain, the second in Christian Spain. Both variants incorporated features from earlier Jewish writing systems. The variant used in Islamic Spain, especially in the xarg̱as mentioned earlier in this article, was governed primarily by the characteristically Semitic consonant-denoting orthographic principles that governed the writing of Hebrew in its ancient through medieval variants, as well as the writing of Jewish Aramaic—
which, vis à vis Hebrew, included some graphemic innovations (e.g., the use of double yod <\textsuperscript{yy}> for the diphthong ay)—and Jewish Ibero-Arabic.

With their transition from Jewish Ibero-Arabic to Jewish Ibero-Romance, the Jews of re-Christianized Spain used a revised Hebrew-letter orthography for transcribing diverse texts, from those connected with prayers, sacred study and religious ritual, through various other types of literary texts, and personal notes, commercial correspondence and communal records, to Hebrew-letter transcriptions of non-Jewish literary texts for the enjoyment of those Jews who could not read the Latin alphabet. The Jewish Ibero-Romance orthography of Christian Spain incorporated various graphemic innovations which had arisen among the Jews of Muslim Spain in their accommodation of the Hebrew alphabet to the sound system of Arabic. Some of the innovations were shared by the Arabic-letter orthography used to transcribe Ibero-Romance among the Moriscos. But what distinguished the Jewish Ibero-Romance orthographic system from that used by the Moriscos was, perhaps more than any other features, its manifestation of influence by the Latin-letter orthographic system used by Christians to transcribe their Ibero-Romance, and its reflection of the Hispanic-influenced phonological realization of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet as accepted among the Jews of Christian Spain rather than those of Muslim Spain.

Some of the principles of the Hebrew-letter transcription of Ibero-Romance which came to characterize Jewish vernacular writing in regions of Spain under Christian domination are already to be seen in the thirteenth century, for example, in the xarğas serving as the concluding verses of muwāşšahāt composed by Todros Abolafia of thirteenth-fourteenth-century Toledo. The major principles exemplified in the orthography of Todros Abolafia, who maintained contacts with the Christian Spanish court, continued to survive in later Jewish Ibero-Romance texts written in Christian Spain, and after the expulsion, in Ottoman Judezmo and Moroccan Ḥaketía orthography into the twentieth century. These principles include features illustrating the three major sources of Jewish Ibero-Romance orthography in Christian Spain:

(a) Hebrew-Aramaic. Norms of Hebrew and Aramaic orthography, in some instances in their medieval variants, are reflected in several features of Hebrew-letter Ibero-Romance orthography. These include:

Consonantal spelling of lexemes of Hebrew-Aramaic origin: The Semitic principle of consonant representation (with vowels often receiving zero representation) was preserved in Jewish Ibero-Arabic orthography in the spelling of lexemes of Hebrew and Aramaic origin; the analogous
spelling of such lexemes also became the norm in Jewish Ibero-Romance spelling; e.g., ṭקָה "tekaná 'ordinance.'

**Silent 'alef:** Post-Biblical Hebrew-Aramaic norms require that a 'silent' (according to the Whole Hebrew-Aramaic reading tradition of medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance speakers,\(^8^5\) from the original Ancient Hebrew glottal-stop denoting) 'alef (ן) must precede a word-initial front or back vowel (e.g., יוֹן <yw'yn> ʼyor 'to see,' קִיאָר <qy'yry> ʻyer/kierə 'wants').

**Silent 'alef:** Post-Biblical Hebrew-Aramaic norms require that a 'silent' (according to the Whole Hebrew-Aramaic reading tradition of medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance speakers; \(^8^5\) from the original Ancient Hebrew glottal-stop denoting) 'alef (א) must precede a word-initial front or back vowel (e.g., אוֹר <wrw> ʻor 'gold'), and it often separates vowels in hiatus or glide + vowel (e.g., וּיאָר <wy'yr> ʻeer 'to see,' קִיאָר <qy'yry> ʻyer/kierə 'wants').

**Rejection of doubled letters to denote a single phoneme:** Also reflecting Hebrew-Aramaic norms is the use of doubled yod for the glide y (cf. Aramaic ḥeyyaytahu ʻTorah', Ibero-Romance ḥə <yy> ʻthere is/are'), but the absence of doubled consonants if such use is not normative in Hebrew or Aramaic proper. Thus, there is no use of doubled lamed, nun, or reš to denote single phonemes, which would have produced Jewish orthographic parallels to the Christian denotations of the phones [l]—orthographically denoted in Christian Spanish romanization by <ll>, [ɲ]—denoted by <nn> (alternating with <ñ>), and trilled [r]—denoted by <rr> (alternating with <R>). Instead, these phonemes were represented in Old (i.e., pre-expulsion) Judezmo by lamed+yod(+yod) (לך, e.g., קָוָלִים <qwlyy'r> ʻkol ʻset of hooks and eyes'), nun+yod(+yod) (ני, e.g., פָנָיו <p'nyw> ʻpāno 'cloth,' cf. OS. <panno/paño>), and single reš (ר, e.g., תייר <ṭyyrh> tyerra 'land,' cf. OS. <tierra/tieRa>), respectively.

**Representation of /b/ and /v/:** In addition, Hebrew influence is responsible for the preference in Old Jewish Ibero-Romance orthography for an occasional two to one grapheme to phoneme correspondence, the choice of the grapheme conditioned by position in the word. For example, the Hebrew-Aramaic letter bet (ב) has two variants: pointed (בּ), denoting /b/ in Hebrew and Aramaic, and unpointed (ב), denoting /v/. According to post-Biblical Hebrew-Aramaic norms, in word-initial position bet must be pointed, but in word-medial position it may be pointed or unpointed, depending on the phoneme it denotes. Consonantal waw (ו), on the other hand, always denotes /v/ (according to the Hebrew-Aramaic tradition of Jewish Ibero-Romance speakers). Thus, under the influence of the normative constraints of post-Biblical Hebrew-Aramaic orthography, bet was chosen to represent Jewish Ibero-Romance /b/ word-initially (e.g., בְּרַגְדִּישׁ <brw'gdwrh> brocadura 'set of hooks and eyes'), and often word-medially (e.g., אָלָבָה <lgwb> alvbah 'roses'). Waw was preferred for /v/ word-initially (e.g., רָבָן וָאֵל <wystnymy'yn> vestimientas 'clothes'); while there was vacillation between unpointed bet, bet with a superscript diacritic(ב'), and waw for /v/ in word-medial
position, e.g., דיבריא "should", שאליו "except". In the case of the last two examples, the use of bet and waw correspond to the use of <b>/<u> and <v> in Old Spanish Roman orthography,87 themselves reflecting <b> as opposed to <v> in Latin. It should be noted that, in post-expulsion Ottoman Judezmo orthography, the post-Biblical Hebrew-Aramaic norm ceased to be a significant factor, and /b/ ultimately came to be denoted by bet, and /v/ by pointed vet, in all positions (e.g.,VESTIMYENTAS, DEVRIA, SALVO).

Preference for monovalent over bivalent letters: Comparing the graphemics of Jewish Ibero-Romance in Muslim and Christian Spain, we find several consonantal shifts. Jewish Ibero-Arabic speakers had probably realized pointed kaf (כ) as k, unpointed xaf (כְ) as x, and qof (ק) as q; and thus in the Ibero-Romance xarğas appearing at the end of Jewish muwāšahāt, k was denoted by kaf (e.g., קנד kwando "when").88 Similarly, in Muslim Spain, pointed taw (ת) was realized as t, unpointed gaw (ג) perhaps as θ, and tet (ת) probably as f; and thus in the xarğas, Ibero-Romance t was represented by taw (e.g., תנט tanto 'so').89

However, with the transition to Ibero-Romance, and under its phonological influence, the Jews of Christian Spain lost the pharyngealized sounds q and f which they had employed in the Ibero-Arabic and Hebrew-Aramaic of Muslim Spain, and thus they no longer distinguished between kaf and qof, on the one hand, and pointed taw, syllable-initial unpointed gaw, and tet, on the other. They now realized the first pair as simple k, while they realized syllable-final unpointed taw as θ or δ and the rest of the members of the second group as simple t. These phonological shifts led to a new denotation of Ibero-Romance k by qof rather than kaf (e.g., קואנדו qw'ndw kwando "when"), and of t by tet rather than taw (e.g., טאנטו ṭnṭw "so"), prompted by the fact that kaf and taw were both bivalent, representing k and t, respectively, if pointed, but x and (in syllable-final position) θ/δ if unpointed; whereas qof and tet were unambiguously univalent, always being read k and t, respectively. Thus, in Christian Spain, the Jewish Ibero-Romance denotation of k and t came into line with the designation of those phones in the other Jewish languages of Indo-European stock used in medieval Christian Europe (e.g., Yiddish, Jewish Italian).90

Diacritic denoting lenition: In the writing of Hebrew and Aramaic in the Middle Ages, a diacritic (usually a short bar or dot) was often added above a letter to indicate the fricative realization of Hebrew letters having two values—one, occlusive, the other, fricative; e.g., רפף <rp̄> rafé. The lenition marker was also adopted for use with the same letters in the Jewish Ibero-Arabic orthography of Muslim Spain (see also below), and
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Later, in Christian Spain, it was adopted in medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance orthography, for example, to distinguish between occlusive \( p \), denoted orthographically by unmarked \( p e \) (e.g., הדר
\(< rwph > \) rophe “garment”), and fricative \( f \), denoted by diacritic-bearing \( fe \) (e.g., והדר
\(< p\wymw\'> wimos “we were”), in words of Romance origin.” To a more limited extent, the lenition marker was also placed over \( b \), as opposed to unmarked \( \text{\unpt} b \) (e.g., זז
\(< \text{\unpt} vez > \) vez/ (alternating with \( \text{\dlen} y \) “time”, מראבידיש
\(< \text{\dlen} wim\'y > \) wimyš “we were”), in words of Romance origin.”91 To a more limited extent, the lenition marker was also placed over \( \text{\dlen} b \), as opposed to unpointed \( \text{\unpt} b \) representing \( b \) (e.g., ביז
\(< \text{\unpt} vez > \) vez/ (alternating with \( \text{\dlen} ו\) “time”, מראבידיש
\(< \text{\dlen} wim\'y > \) wimyš “we were”), in words of Romance origin.”92 and over \( \text{\dlen} d \), to depict \( \theta \) (and word-finally, perhaps \( \Theta \), as opposed to unpointed \( \text{\unpt} d \) representing \( d \) (e.g., טודו
\(< \text{\unpt} to\'> \) todo/, standing in opposition to simple \( \text{\unpt} d \), representing occlusive \( /d/ \), e.g., the first \( \text{\unpt} d \) in פריאלד
\(< \text{\unpt} frialda\'> frialda “cold”).93

In Arabisms in Jewish Ibero-Romance, the diacritic was used over \( \text{\dlen} x \) (5) to denote \( x \), as opposed to unmarked \( \text{\unpt} k \) (e.g., in the Valladolid communal regulations of 1432, the \( \text{\dlen} x \) + diacritic grapheme
\(< \text{\dlen} \text{\unpt} x > \) appears in the word אלכמיהש, probably realized /a lxami(h)as/ “kind of Moorish garment,” with the grapheme reflecting Arabic /\( x /\) (cf. Ar. al-xām) as /xl/.94

\( \text{b) Jewish Ibero-Arabic.} \) Elements of Jewish Ibero-Arabic orthography are also preserved in its Jewish Ibero-Romance heir. Innovatively, in Jewish Ibero-Arabic, the lenition marker was also used above the letter \( \text{\dlen} g \) to denote the Arabic phone \( \text{\g} \), absent from the medieval Iberian Hebrew-Aramaic phonological inventory.95 In Christian Spain, this innovation was then adopted to depict two Ibero-Romance phonemes which had no equivalent in medieval Iberian Hebrew-Aramaic: \( \text{\g} \) (having the positional variants [\( g \) and [\( \text{\g} \)], e.g., שָבָא
\(< \text{\gwb}' s > \) algubas “robes”, בָּרֵם
\(< \text{\g} w > \) bermežo “vermilion”), and \( \text{\g} \) (e.g., דָּבָר
\(< \text{\g} w > \) dico “said”). For the first phoneme, \( \text{\g} \), Old Castilian romanization used two distinct environmentally-conditioned allophones (thus being less economical than the Jewish Ibero-Romance analogue): \( \text{\g} \) before \( \text{\a,\o,u} \), \( \text{\g} \) before \( \text{\e,i} \) (e.g., \( \text{\g} \) ube
\(< \text{\g} w > \) robe”, \( \text{\g} \) uge
\(< \text{\g} w > \) “woman”). For \( \text{\g} \), Old Castilian employed a digraph, \( \text{\g} \) (e.g., \( \text{\g} \) “said”).

\( \text{c) Latin-letter Christian Old Spanish orthography.} \) The designers of the Jewish Ibero-Romance orthography were clearly familiar with, and influenced by, the contemporaneous roman orthography used by Christian Spaniards.96

**Full graphemic representation of vowels:** This familiarity and influence is evidenced first and foremost in the systematic, overt graphemic representation of the vowels \( a, e, i, o, u \), and the glides \( w \) and \( y \), in lexemes of Romance, and often also Arabic, origin. In Christian
Spanish orthography, the vowels were denoted by <a>, <e>, <i>, <o>, <u>, and the glides by <u> and <i> or <y>, respectively. In Jewish Ibero-Romance, their analogues were denoted almost systematically by the matres lectionis:

- 'alef (א), in word-initial and word-medial positions, and often he (ה), alternating with 'alef, in word-final position, to denote a (e.g., י"ע 'š'yyh> saya “tunic”);
- waw (ו) for o (e.g., י"ר <šw> su ‘its’), and w-glide (e.g., י"ש <qw’tw> kwatro “four”);
- yod (י) for e (e.g., י"ט <dy> de ‘of’), i (e.g., י"ט <sy> si ‘if’) [always preceded word-initially by “silent” 'alef, e.g., יא <y> i ‘and’], and, sometimes accompanied by a second yod, for the y-glide (e.g., יי"ב <yy'/yyh> ya ‘already’).

The use of the matres lectionis made for more fluid reading of the Romance-origin lexemes without the need for vocalization points above or below the Hebrew graphemes, as ordinarily used in vocalized Hebrew itself (e.g., י"ע <qof+qame mem+qame he> k[a]ma “she rises” vs. Ibero-Romance י"ע <q'mh> ka'ma “bed” [cf. S. camaj]). This solution diverged from the older, Semitic-principled, primarily consonant-indicating orthography used, for example, in earlier Hebrew-letter Ibero-Romance xarjas as written by speakers of Jewish Arabic in Muslim Spain, in which vowels, especially when unstressed, lacked overt graphemic representation (e.g., כנד <knd> in Muslim Spain, but קואנדו <kw'ndw> [cf. Sp. cuando] in Christian Spain).

Monovalent graphemic representation of phonemes having multiple allophonic variants: Probably reflecting influence from Old Castilian Romanization as well, and perhaps an intuitive understanding of the principles of phonemic transcription, in lexemes of Romance origin medieval Jewish Iber-Romance orthography overwhelmingly used the unpointed grapheme gimal (ג) to denote both [g] and [?] allophonic variants of the /g/ phoneme (e.g., [g] in לטינח <ṭyngh> tenga 'should have’, [?] in י"ע <lgwn> algin ‘some’), and the unpointed grapheme dalet (ד) to depict both [d] and [ð] allophonic variants of the /d/ phoneme (e.g., [d] in אלקאנדוראש <lq'ndwr'š> alkandoras ‘white tunics’, [ð] in קאדה <q'dh> kada ‘each’). This usage is comparable to the use in Christian Ibero-Romance of <g> and <d>, respectively, representing the same pairs of allophones. The medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance orthography also sometimes employed unpointed tav (ת) for word-final θ/ð, comparable to
Old Spanish <th> (e.g., דיבירשידאת dybyršyd’t> diversidad/-θ, OSp. <diversidad/-th/-t> ‘diversity’).

2.1.2.2. Arab Ibero-Romance in the Arabic alphabet compared with the Hebrew-letter system

The spoken use of Arabic persisted longer in Valencia and Andalucía than in Aragon and Castile; but by the sixteenth century most Moriscos had made the transition to Ibero-Romance. Nevertheless, their literati, especially the religious leaders, at first preferred, whenever possible, to write this Ibero-Romance in the Arabic alphabet. This was especially so in Valencia and Andalucía. Morisco texts in Arabic-letter aljamiado are known from the fifteenth century, with most from the sixteenth century. From the sixteenth century, Moriscos were banned from writing in the Arabic language proper, and by then most in fact lacked sufficient knowledge to be able to do so. Like the crypto-Jews and, of course, the truly Christianized former Jews of Spain, in Aragón and Castile the Moriscos eventually adopted the Roman alphabet. But there are sufficient Ibero-Romance texts in the Arabic alphabet to enable us to deduce the main features of Arabic-letter Ibero-Romance spelling. As we shall see, in some ways it offered parallels to the orthography used by the Jews; but in significant ways it also diverged from the Hebrew-letter orthography. In addition to the structural parallels and divergences, it would seem, to judge from the cursive script employed by the Arabs and Jews in their Ibero-Romance transcriptions, that the two groups shared a certain esthetic sense, characterized by a tendency toward rounding out the letters, and using ligatures to join them.

The Arabic-letter Ibero-Romance texts preserved from this period include translations of the Quran, writings concerned with Islam and its practice, and adaptations of Christian Spanish literary works. Particularly illustrative of the Arabic-letter orthography used in such works is Suma de los principales mandamientos y devedamientos de nuestra santa ley y sunna, a compilation from 1462 by the mufti of Segovia. Perhaps reflecting their lack of familiarity with, or conscious resistance to, the Romanized orthography used by Christian Spaniards, those Arab Ibero-Romance speakers who persisted in writing their Hispanic vernacular in Arabic letters modeled their orthographic system after the Semitic-principled, essentially consonant-denoting writing system used to write Arabic proper. Unlike the medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance orthography, with its diverse external influences, there were apparently few external influences on the Arabic Ibero-Romance orthography. In this, the Ibero-Romance-speaking Arabs resembled the Mozárabes, or Arabized
Christians, as well as the Jews of Muslim Spain in their Semitic-featured Hebrew-letter xarqa transcriptions. Thus the Arabic-letter aljamiado orthographies of both Mozárabes and Moriscos differed significantly from the Hebrew-letter Ibero-Romance orthography used by the Jews of Christian Spain. For example, in the Morisco orthography, as in Arabic, vowels were indicated primarily by means of vocalization points above or below the consonants (e.g., تَكُونْ <d̂k̂tirina> “doctrine”), rather than through the systematic use of matres lectionis (cf. corresponding Hebrew-letter נַקְטוֹן <dwqryn>). Even when the Moriscos used matres lectionis, they sometimes differed from the corresponding Hebrew letters employed in Jewish Ibero-Romance. Compare, for example, the occasional Arab use of (fatḥa+alif+ya (ڥ)) to denote ʾay (e.g., لاَيْ <ley> “law”), and (fatḥa + alif (ڥ)) to denote e (e.g., ِ<d̂> de “of”), as opposed to the Hebrew-letter representation of the same sounds by double yod (י, e.g., ליי <ley> “law”) and simple yod (י, e.g., ַ<dy> de “of”), respectively.

Some divergences in the Ibero-Romance orthographies of Iberian Jews and Arabs reflected the phonologically Europeanized pronunciation of Hebrew which, under Hispanic influence, had become established among the Jewish Ibero-Romance speakers of Christian Spain. This de-Semitized phonology stood in opposition to the more conservatively Semitic phonology apparently preserved in some elements of Arabic origin employed in the speech of the Iberian Arabs, or at least among the writers of the aljamiado texts, some of whom knew Arabic proper. For example, a distinction between the pharyngealized realization of qaf (ق) [q] and ṭa (ط) [t], as opposed to the nonpharyngealized realization of kaf (ك) [k] and ta (ت) [t] in Arabic, led the Arabs to denote Hispanic [k] and [t] by kaf and ta, respectively (e.g., کَانْتَرَاشْ <kantareš> “songs”).

Perhaps indicating a measure of their writers’ familiarity with Latin-letter Castilian orthography, in some Morisco texts one finds the use of lam + tashdīd (��) to denote palatalized Ibero-Romance [ʎ], constituting a parallel to Romanized Old Spanish <ll>. Similarly, palatalized [ɲ], denoted in Old
Spanish romanization by <nn/ñ>, is represented as nūn + tašdīd (٢). In transcribing Jewish medieval Ibero-Romance, the parallel Hebrew gemination marker, the dageš (ד), was generally not used with any letters to denote consonant doubling, and even in Hebrew proper, its use with the letter reš (ץ) was rare.

Some Arab aljamía writers recognized that, in lexemes of Hispanic origin, the pairs of phones d and ð, and g and γ, were what would later be recognized by linguists as allophones or positional variants of /d/ and /g/ phonemes; and thus, paralleling the medieval Christian and Jewish orthographies, they denoted these pairs of allophones by the single graphemes dal (ذ) for occlusive [d] vs. ðal (ذ) for fricative [ð]; and innovative ghayn + tašdīd (غّ) for occlusive [g] vs. ghayn (غ) for fricative [γ]. The voiced velar fricative which tends to appear in Spanish before word-initial wV- is sometimes reflected in Morisco texts as دَقَّة (e.g., ّغَوْيَة) “army”, ّغَوْيَة [cf. Sp. huerta] “garden”, ّغَوْيَة [cf. Sp. huerto] “egg”). Arab Ibero-Romance texts also display alternate forms with the loss of historical γ before w: e.g., تَغَرْنِدا (Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 342; St.S. guardamiento). Although, in written Judezmo, γ is generally preserved in the corresponding forms, some varieties of spoken Judezmo (e.g., that of Salonika) offer some wγ > w parallels to the latter variants (e.g., awa, frawar, wardami(y)ento).

On the other hand, the medieval phonemic opposition between Old Christian Ibero-Romance (occlusive) /b/ and (fricative) /v/, often distinguished orthographically in Old Spanish by the Latin graphemes <b> vs. <v>, and in Jewish Ibero-Romance (at least in initial position) by beq (ב) vs. waw (ו), was not reflected graphemically in Arab aljamiado. The Arab correspondent of both Christian Spanish phonemes was ba (ב), e.g., بُواَنَ (Sp. buena) “good” (Sp. buena), بَادَرْ (Sp. bedar) “to prohibit” (Sp. vedar). Perhaps this resulted from the absence in Arabic of a grapheme denoting the phone corresponding to Old Spanish /v/; but possibly Arab Ibero-Romance speakers actually did not distinguish
the two sounds, reflecting both as \(b\). It should be noted that during the sixteenth century, the Spanish /b/ and /v/ phonemes would collapse as /b/, having the positional variants [b] and [β]. This could also have been a factor in the transcription in this text, but probably not in those from the fifteenth century exhibiting the same feature. The Jewish Ibero-Romance speakers who left Spain with the expulsion had already left the peninsula before this collapse occurred, and thus it did not affect their speech or orthography.\(^{105}\)

Classical Arabic orthography lacks a grapheme representing the sound \(p\), which was absent in Arabic but present, with phonemic status, in the medieval Ibero-Romance of Christians and Jews, standing in opposition to phonemes such as \(b\) and \(f\). As was noted, Arab aljamiado used \(ba\) (waż) to denote Ibero-Romance \(b\). In some texts, the sound corresponding to \(p\) in Christian and Jewish Spanish was reflected graphemically as \(ba+tašdīd\) (장), e.g., \(<b y\> por “for”\(^{106}\), but in other texts no graphemic distinction was made to indicate two different sounds, and \(ba\) corresponded to Christian and Jewish \(p\) as well as \(b\). This might suggest that some speakers of Arab Ibero-Romance had difficulty articulating \(p\), and instead used \(b\).

Although the earliest shapers of the Hebrew-letter Ibero-Romance orthography were probably Judeo-Arabic-speaking bilinguals, and the Arabic component in their Judeo-Arabic lacked a /p/ phoneme, they were used to articulating the sound \(p\) in the context of Hebrew, and used the grapheme \(pe\) (פ) to denote it. Thus, when the transition was made from Jewish Ibero-Arabic to Ibero-Romance, the letter \(pe\) served to accurately reflect Ibero-Romance \(p\) in their new writing system.

There are numerous parallels in the Arab and Jewish transcription of the Ibero-Romance sibilant series, suggesting a similar perception and articulation of the sounds, and perhaps some mutual influence in arriving at solutions to their Semitic-letter transcription. For example, the Arabs appear to have perceived Castilian /s/—perhaps articulated as the retroflex, apicodorsal sibilant usual in Castile today—as a sound closest to the Arabic phoneme /š/, and thus they transcribed it by \(šīn\) (ש), e.g., \(<š n>\) los “(m.pl.) the”.\(^{107}\) The Jews generally used unpointed \(š\) (which could have represented \(šīn\) or \(šīn\)) to denote the sound corresponding to Christian /s/, e.g., \(<š n>\) los “(m.pl.) the”. In all of the post-expulsion varieties of Judezmo spoken in the regions of the former Ottoman Empire, and of Hakettia spoken in North Africa, the /s/ phoneme is not retroflex as in Castile, but an alveolar fricative, as in Andalucía and Latin America. Thus it is likely that the /s/ phoneme was articulated in that fashion by the Jews of medieval Spain as well, and that the unpointed medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance grapheme \(š\) in fact denoted \(s\)-indicating
$\text{sin}$. In post-expulsion Judezmo, that grapheme was eventually replaced by $s$-indicating samek.

Perhaps reflecting influence by Christian Spanish romanization, both Arabs and Jews sometimes employed the parallel grapheme $\text{š}(\text{šin/šin})$ between vowels to denote voiced $/z/$ when it corresponded to Christian Ibero-Romance $/z/$, denoted graphemically in Old Spanish by $<$VsV$>$, e.g., Arab $<$اعز$>$ $\text{uzar}$ “to use”, Jewish $\text{kwšh}$ $\text{koza}$ “thing” (cf. OSp. $\text{usar}$ $\text{uzar}$, $\text{cosa}$ $\text{koza}$). In later Spanish this developed into voiceless $/s/$; but the earlier $/z/$ sound continued to be preserved in Judezmo into the modern era. Similarly, Arabs employed $\text{zayn}$ ($\text{ظ}$), and Jews parallel $\text{zayin}$ ($\text{ז}$), to represent the voiced sibilant denoted in Christian Ibero-Romance orthography by $<$z$>$ (a reflex of earlier $\text{dz}$), e.g., $\text{haza'n}$ $\text{hazen}$ “they do”, $\text{fazer}$ “to do”. In Andalucía, this later developed into voiceless $s$, and in most other parts of Spain, into voiceless $\theta$; but Judezmo continues to reflect the medieval sound as voiced $z$.

To distinguish the sound denoted by Christian Castilian $<\text{x}>$ (i.e., $\text{s}$) from that denoted by $<$s$>$ (probably apico-dorsal $s$), some Arab Ibero-Romance texts represented the former by $\text{š}$ $\text{tard}$ $\text{id}$ ($\text{شّ}$). For example, in a text from around the sixteenth century by the writer known as the “mancebo de Arévalo”, we find: $\text{deš':amoš}$ “we leave”. The Jews, too, usually represented the $\text{s}$ sound by $\text{š}$ with diacritic ($\text{ש֗}$), e.g., $\text{dešar}$ “to leave,” and continued to preserve this sound into the modern era, whereas in Spanish it became the voiceless velar fricative $[x]$ in the sixteenth century.

The Arabs used $\text{sin}$ ($\text{ס}$), denoting $s$ in Arabic, and the Jews, $\text{samek}$ ($\text{ס}$) or, less commonly, $\text{sad}$ ($\text{צ}$)—both probably corresponding to an $s$ sound in Christian Spain—to represent the voiceless sibilant denoted in Christian Spanish by initial and medial $<$c/c$>$ (before a front vowel) or $<$s$>$ (before a back vowel), and final $<$c$>$, e.g., $\text{konosko}$ “[I] know”, $\text{qwnwsq'n}$ “that they know”, Sp. $\text{conozco, -zcan}$. The corresponding Christian Spanish sound, derived from earlier $\text{dz}$, became $\theta$ in most parts of Spain, but developed into $s$ in Andalucía, and $s$ continues to be the reflection of its analogue in Judezmo as well.

For their sounds corresponding to the Christian Ibero-Romance voiced palatal phoneme $\acute{\text{j}}$, which probably had the positional variants $\acute{\text{g}}$ (word-initially, after a resonant, and in certain other environments) and $\acute{\text{j}}$ (intervocically), as well as for the phoneme $\acute{\text{j}}$, the Arabs employed $\text{gim}$ $\text{tard}$ ($\text{ג֗}$), e.g., $\text{aženōš}$ “(m.pl.) foreign”, and the Jews, as was noted above, analogous $\text{gimal}$-diacritic ($\text{ג}$), e.g., $\text{aljwp}'r$ $\text{algofar}$ “pearl,” $\text{g'mylwy}$ $\text{camelote}$ “camlet.”
Wishing to preserve the etymological spellings of the Arabisms incorporated into their Ibero-Romance, the Arabs reserved the use of graphemes denoting Arabic sounds absent from Romance such as ta (ت), ba (ب), xa (خ), sad (ص), dad (ض), ta (ط), za (ظ), 'ayn (ع), and qaf (ق) for that purpose. Analogously, the Jews, while generally transcribing the Arabisms in their Ibero-Romance according to the same phonemic principles (including the use of matres lectionis) governing the spelling of Hispanisms, tended to limit the letters het (ח), xaf (כ), 'ayin (ע), sadi (צ), as well as taw (ת) in non-final position to words of Hebrew-Aramaic origin. It should be noted that, in transcribing the distinctive Semitic-origin lexemes they used in their Ibero-Romance, both Arabs and Jews granted certain consonants the privilege of occurrence ordinarily denied their correspondents in Christian Spanish; e.g., f, g, ġ, k, m, p, t could occur in such words in word-final position.

From the surviving transcriptions of Ibero-Romance in Hebrew and Arabic letters, as well as in the light of comments by contemporaneous Christian writers, it would appear that the Jews were generally more successful in adopting the phonology of Ibero-Romance as used by Christians than were the Arabs. This was perhaps the result of the Jews': (a) longer and more profound group-level interaction with Christian Spanish speakers in their own language than the Arabs had entertained; (b) their being accustomed to reading and articulating Spanish sounds also present in Hebrew but absent in Arabic (e.g., p and v, which Arabs found difficult to articulate); and possibly (c) a greater motivation to speak Ibero-Romance as did the Christians in an attempt to enjoy a higher, less “foreign” status among them and avoid ridicule—e.g., pronouncing Old Spanish /s/ as s, rather than š. Thus they expressed “to pass” as pasar (cf. OSp. <passar>), and “to prevent” as vedar (cf. OSp. <vedar>), rather than bašar and bedar, as was evidently common among the Arabs. The Jews also seem to have realized consonant clusters consisting of an occlusive + r without inserting an epenthetic front vowel: the latter tendency is illustrated in Arab alfamiado texts in a lexeme such as كرِيْشْتِيْنُوش <kirištiyanuš> kiristiyanos, as opposed to Jewish <qryšṭy'nwš> “Christians”.

As was noted, the Iberian Jews seem also to have been much more influenced by the orthographic principles of Christian Old Spanish than were the Iberian Arabs. This influence included the full graphemic depiction of vowels; as well as the use of word boundaries identical with those of Old Spanish romanization, as opposed to the Arab tendency to write as a single word lexemes written separately as two or more individual words in the Roman and Hebrew alphabets, e.g., Arab إِفْلَانْ
"i-kon-loš" vs. Jewish לוש קון י "and with (m.pl) the", corresponding to Spanish "y con los".

2.2. Hebrew-Aramaic and Arabic as donor languages

The sacred status enjoyed by Hebrew among the Jews and Arabic among the Muslims was already alluded to in section 2 above. In the Ibero-Romance of Jews and Arabs, each group’s sacred language was a source of borrowings. Most, although not all of these borrowings were lexical, and referred to the religio-cultural traditions of each group.

For both Jews and Arabs, the structure of Ibero-Romance, with its tendency toward analytic syntactic structures, its free-standing lexemes lacking case endings, and its wealth of discrete derivational affixes, coupled with orthographic systems employing the alphabets in which the groups’ sacred texts were written, greatly facilitated the incorporation of Hebrew-Aramaic and Arabic material in the Ibero-Romance variants of both Jews and Arabs.

2.2.1. Hebrew-Aramaic component in medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance

In several Hebrew-letter texts surviving from the Jewish communities of medieval Iberia, Hebrew and Ibero-Romance co-occur in varying proportions. Some texts, such as the fifteenth-century communal ordinances of Valladolid (1432), demonstrate the kind of Hebrew/Ibero-Romance codeswitching practiced among the Iberian rabbis, and later, among their post-expulsion heirs in the Ottoman Empire and North Africa. Typically, in such texts, most of a paragraph might be formulated in Hebrew proper, but then, sometimes in mid-sentence, the text switches to Ibero-Romance, and at some point switches back to Hebrew, with similar codeswitching continued throughout the text. The technique seems to have imbued such texts with greater halakhic validity and authority than one written entirely in the vernacular, especially since it could easily accommodate exact citations and legal formulations from halakhic classics in Hebrew or Aramaic, while at the same time rendering a significant portion of its contents comprehensible to the average member of the community unlearned in the Holy Tongue. In other, less formal documents, of no particular halakhic significance, such as personal correspondence, scientific treatises and creative literary compositions, Jewish Ibero-Romance provided the basic framework, with little or no switches to Hebrew proper.
In the Ibero-Romance portions of the Valladolid ordinances, as well as in the other Hebrew-letter Ibero-Romance documents surviving from the Middle Ages—except those constituting mere transcriptions of Christian texts, meant for the reading convenience of Jews unfamiliar with the Latin alphabet—elements of Hebrew and sometimes Aramaic origin played some role. In certain of the texts, such as personal notes, the Hebraisms might be limited to proper nouns, terms for basic Jewish religious concepts, Hebrew dates, and the like. But in others, such as the Valladolid ordinances, the Hebrew-Aramaic-origin elements are of such significance that the main thrust of the discourse is often incomprehensible without knowledge of their meanings. The phenomenon is illustrated in the following phrase from the Valladolid ordinances:


[Each [Jewish] congregation, may its Rock and Savior protect it, of ten householders is obligated to maintain a decent teacher of children to teach their sons the [weekly Torah] chapter.]\(^{111}\)

In the medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance texts the elements of Hebrew-origin include:


(b) analytic verbs, e.g., SER + gozer gezeroθ (גזרות גוזר) “promulgate decrees”, maskim (מסכים) “approve, agree”, kovea ( gerektiğini) “establish”, metakén (מקכן) “establish a regulation”, mekabel (מקבל) “receive, accept”, mexuyav (מחויב) “be obligated”, metparnes (מחצרים) “earn a living”; FAZER + nedavá (נדבה) “make a charitable donation”, xupá (חופה) “make a wedding”, as well as other verbal constructions, e.g., tener [h]aspaká (Tôiסקה) “receive a (scholar’s) stipend”;

(c) adjectives, e.g., kašer (כשר) “suitable for Jewish use (e.g., wine, meat)”;
(d) adverbs and adverbial constructions, e.g. *bexóax* (בְּכֹחַ) “by dint of”, *baavono* (בעוונות) “for [our] sins”, *kol zemán* (כל הזמָן) “so long as”, *vexadomé* (וכדומֶה) “and so on”.

Pre-expulsion texts in the Latin alphabet, including Inquisitorial documents and texts for crypto-Jews adapted from Hebrew-letter Jewish Ibero-Romance texts or incorporating distinctive material from Jewish speech, document the fusion in single lexemes of Hispanic- and Hebrew-Aramaic morphological material. Such fusion formations include innovative blends such as substantives, adjectives and verbs constructed of Hebrew-origin bases and Hispanic-origin inflectional or derivational morphemes: e.g., the plural nouns *<escamas>* “rabbinical approbations” (cf. H. *haskama* הַסָּכָה + S. -s), *<samases>* “synagogue beadles” (H. *šammas* שַמָּס + S. -es), *<hazans>* “cantors” (H. *ḥazzan* חָזָן), *<midrases>* “study halls” (H. *midraš* מדרשׁ), *<quiñanes>* “bills of sale” (H. *qinyan* קנין); and the verbs *<enheremar>* “to excommunicate” (S. *en-* + H. *ḥerem* חָרֵם “excommunication”), *<malsinar>* “to inform against the Jewish community” (malsin ‘informer’ < H. *malšin* מַלְשִּׁין “informs” + S. -ar), *<malvisar>* “to clothe (e.g., poor children)” (< malbiš מַלְבִּישׁ ‘clothes’), *<badcar>* “to ritually search, examine” (< ב-ד-ק), *<darsar>* “to sermonize, lecture” (< ד-ר-ש). Sixteenth-century Hebrew-letter Judezmo texts published in the Ottoman Empire by the first few generations of Sephardim born there following the expulsions from Iberia, and Latin-letter texts published by former *conversos* who returned to the open practice of Judaism in Italy, present an even richer array of such creations, including fusion verbs derived from verbal roots such as *kafrar* “to deny (Judaism), disbelieve (in God)” (< כ-פ-ר), and verbs derived from adjectival and nominal stems such as *kaserar* “to prepare utensils for Jewish use (by ritual immersion, etc.)” (< *kaser* כָּסֶר “fit”), *asoxadear* “to bribe” (< ṣóxaḥ, H. *šoḥad* שֹׁחֶד “bribe”), *tebilar* “to ritually immerse” (cf. *tebilara* < ṭeḇíla, H. *טֶבִּילה* “immersion”), and the fusion adjective *gaavento* “haughty” (< gaavá, H. *ga’avá* גָּאוָה). It is very likely that these fusions had already arisen in Spain but were simply not documented in the few texts surviving from the peninsula. The same is perhaps true of thousands of other Merged Hebrew-Aramaisms documented for Judezmo and Ḥaketía, especially in their rabbinical registers, in the sixteenth through twentieth centuries.

Because of their conservative, etymological spellings (corresponding to those in Hebrew proper), the Hebrew-letter spellings of most of the Hebrew-Aramaisms found in medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance texts tend to mask the phonological realizations they received in everyday speech. However, contemporaneous Christian and Jewish texts in the Latin
alphabet prove that, in medieval Spain, many features of Whole and Merged Hebrew, as characteristic of Judezmo speakers in the Ottoman Empire, were already known among the Jews of Iberia, and many Merged Hebrew elements had already undergone phonological modification under Ibero-Romance influence. Among the characteristic realizations of Hebrew consonants one finds the realization of:

- word-final ‘ayin as [x] (e.g., <zerah> <זרא zerā’; Lazar 1990: 91);
- word-initial ר reš as trilled rr (e.g., <rebi> <רבי re-/ribbi ‘rabbī’; Lazar 1990:159);
- שׁ šin as well as ס samek, ס sadi, and צ ṣadei, as denoted by <ç> or <š>, e.g., <çofar/sofar> <שׁופר šofar “ram’s horn”, <çuca> <סוכה sukka “Sukkoth tabernacle”, <çiçid> <שׂיץ šiṣit “ritual fringes”; Lazar 1990: 115, 118, 168);
- word-final unpointed ת taw as <д> (i.e., δ or θ; e.g., <berid> <ברית bĕ́rit “circumcision”; Lazar 1990: 114).

Phonological modifications in the realization of Merged Hebraisms included:

- the raising of a > e when preceding s + consonant (e.g., <escamas> “rabbinical approbations” <הסכמה haskama; Garbell 1954:662);
- the lowering of e > a when preceding r (as in the masculine anthroponym <Zarahya> <זריה Zĕraḥya; Cátedra 1994:338);
- e-syncope between a stop and a resonant (e.g., <trefa> “unfit for Jewish use” <טרפה ṭĕrefa; Garbell 1954:692);
- neutralization of the quality of unstressed vowels (e.g., o > a ~ e, as in the masculine anthroponymic variants <Janto> ~ <Jentob> <Yom Ṭov; Garbell 1954:658; Tilander 1958:10; or i > i ~ e as in <tequn> “correction” <תיקון tiqqun; Lazar 1990:144);
- vowel reduction (e.g., eu > u, as in the masculine anthroponym <Ruben> <ראובן Rĕu‘ven; Garbell 1954:652; or ea > a, as in <senadarim> “(leap year with) two Adars” <שנים שני אדרים šĕne ṣĕne‘adarim; Lazar 1990:144);
- consonant epenthesis (e.g., -sr- > -str-, as in the masculine anthroponym <Istrael> <ישראל Yiśra‘ēl; Garbell 1954:684);
- word-medial assimilation of voice (e.g., <mizna> “Mishnah” <משנה mišna; Garbell 1954:667);
- consonant apocope (e.g., -f > zero in the masculine anthroponym <Juče> < يوسف Yosef; Tilander 1958: 10);
neutralization of the word-final resonants -m and -n (evidenced in alternate forms such as <heren> ~ <herem> “excommunication” < herem; MacDonald 1994: f. 30v) and -l and -r (e.g., <mançel> ~ <mancer> “bastard” < mamzer; Elia 2002: 133);

- word-final consonant devoicing (e.g., -v > -f in <tisabaf> “Ninth of Av” < tis’a bē ’av; Garbell 1954:652); and others.\(^{126}\)

It should be noted that, since many elements of Hispanic and Arabic origin were known both to Moriscos and Christian Spaniards, but most members of both groups lacked a knowledge of Hebrew, elements from the latter language might well have served among the Iberian Jews to create a secret code, comprehensible only to Jews, which could have been used in the presence of non-Jews. Such a Hebrew-derived code would have been the predecessor of the secret language used among the Sephardim of the Ottoman Empire in the presence of non-Jews who were suspected of knowing everyday, less-Hebraized Judezmo.\(^{127}\) It is interesting to note that the Hebrew-origin word goyim (cf. גוים “Gentile”) appears in a Morisco Ibero-Romance text in the sense of “non-believer, Christian”.\(^{128}\) So, too, do Hebrew-origin malšín “informer” and derivative malšinaðor “informer”, malšinami(y)ento “informing”, as well as the apparently metathesized forms lešminde, desmindar, dešmindera,\(^{129}\) the latter forms absent from Jewish Ibero-Romance and its post-expulsion heirs.

2.2.2. Arabic component in Morisco Ibero-Romance in comparison with the Hebrew-Aramaic component of Jewish Ibero-Romance

In the surviving texts, actual code-switching between Ibero-Romance and Arabic proper in original passages composed by Moriscos, i.e., not direct textual quotations or fixed formulaic expressions, are extremely rare. Even in the Morisco adaptation of the Quran, direct quotations wholly in Arabic, and in Arabic script, are scarce.\(^{130}\) Perhaps, by the time of their writing, few Ibero-Romance-speaking Arabs had managed to retain a sufficiently active knowledge of Arabic to permit original composition in the language, and the potential readership of passages in Arabic proper would have been limited. Instead, original material was written in Arab Ibero-Romance, and Arabic works were translated into it, at first in the Arabic alphabet and later, when this became impossible (especially in the sixteenth century), in romanization. Such texts incorporated citations of pre-existing Arabic-language passages, such as quotations from the Quran, as well as Arabic-origin fixed phrases, and
standard laudatory and exhortative expressions. Such expressions were added, for example, after the Name of God (‘Allāh), e.g., azza wa jalla “the mighty and the exalted one”; after the name of Muhammad, e.g., dixo el annabi Muhammad ūlla Allāhu ‘alayhi wa-sallam “said the Prophet Muhammad, may Allah pray for him and give him peace”; and after names of prophets other than Muhammad, e.g., ‘alayhi s-salām “peace upon him”. Such expressions are reminiscent of set phrases in Jewish Ibero-Romance texts such as barux hu (הו ברוך “blessed be He”, added after el Dyo (God); alav ašalom (השלום עליו “peace upon him”, added after the name of biblical personalities such as Moše Rabenu (רבנו משה) “Moses our Master” as well as deceased Jews; and yaγén alav Elohim (יגן אלוהים “may God protect him”, added after the names of living Jews.

It was noted above that the ancestors of Spain’s Jewish Ibero-Romance speakers had spoken earlier Jewish languages, among them, Jewish Arabic in Muslim Spain, which had already incorporated Hebrew material. With respect to Spanish Jewry, we will return to this subject later on. The only “pre-language” used among the Muslim conquerors of Iberia—and then, only amongst some of them, in fact being spoken alongside Arabic—was Berber. Since varieties of Berber incorporated Arabic material, they could have provided a model for the integration of Arabisms within Arab Ibero-Romance (e.g., the borrowing of substantives along with their definite article, al-, common in Berber, but also in Christian and Jewish Ibero-Romance). In their Ibero-Romance texts, the Moriscos incorporated numerous Arabisms, some of them paralleling the types of elements of Hebrew origin encountered in medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance. In the texts analyzed by Kontzi (1974), over 175 Arabic-origin substantives occurred in ready-made, morphologically wholly-Arabic form; additional texts analyzed in subsequent research publications document further borrowings. More Morisco texts seem to be known from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries than Jewish Ibero-Romance texts, and thus the Morisco texts probably furnish a more detailed picture of the language of the Hispanized Arabs than we have of the Hispanized Iberian Jews.

Most of the Arabisms in the Morisco Ibero-Romance texts consisted of single words, while some others were composed of phrases combining several words. Most, although not all, of the Arabisms in the Morisco texts were connected with Islamic beliefs, rituals, and lifestyle, whereas the semantic references of the Hebraisms in the Jewish texts often extended beyond the specific realm of Jewish religion. Many of the Morisco Arabisms had Hebrew-origin Jewish Ibero-Romance parallels linked to Jewish culture and civilization. Some of the Semitisms in the Arab and Jewish texts denoted similar concepts. For example, Arabic provided the
Moriscos with their preferred name for God, *Allāh*, also referred to as Arabic-origin *Xāliq* “Creator”, as well as the term by which they referred to themselves, *muṣlimes* (f.pl. *muṣlimas*)<sup>135</sup> <*A. muslim*). In *their* Ibero-Romance, the Jews, too, drew upon their sacred language of religion and liturgy for several of the names by which they referred to the Divinity. The most widespread name used by Iberian Jews was of Hispanic origin, but in a form distinguishing it from that generally used by Christian Spaniards: *el Dyo*, as opposed to Spanish *Dios*. However, some Jewish Ibero-Romance names for God derived wholly from Hebrew as well: e.g., (*el*) *Šem yitbarax* (יהוה יברך “the Name Blessed be He”), (*el*) *Boré* (ברא “the Creator”), (*el*) *Ha(k)adoš Barux U* (היה וברух ברוך) “(the) Holy One Blessed be He.” Others were loan translations of such names, e.g., *el Santo Bendičo El*, a calque of the last term. Some of the names by which the Jews denoted themselves also derived from Hebrew, e.g., *yehuðim* (יהודים) “Jews”, *Yisrael* (ישראל) “Israel”. The peoplehood of Muslims/Arabs was expressed through Arabic-origin *al-'umma* “people, nation”, while that of the Jews was denoted by (*la*) *umá (yisreeliθ)* (*אומה ישראלית*) “(Israelite) people” or its calque, *la nasyón* (*גוציה*).

Many other Semitisms in the two non-Christian variants of medieval Ibero-Romance belonged to parallel semantic spheres as well. For example, Moriscos used Arabic-origin *ad-dīn* to express “religion”, and Jews used *emuná* (אמונה) to denote their “faith”. The field of prayer was denoted in Arab Ibero-Romance by *ad-du’ā* and in Jewish Ibero-Romance by *tefilá* (תפילה) “prayer”. Semitisms provided the names of specific prayers or prayer types, e.g., Arabic-origin *attasbiḥ* “the ‘God be Praised’ prayer”, and the derived verb *attasbiḥar* “to recite that prayer”, Hebrew-origin *bakašá* (בקשה) “prayer of supplication”, and the derived verb *bakašear* “recite supplications” (documented after the expulsion among Judezmo speakers in the Ottoman regions but very likely known among their medieval ancestors as well).

Various religious rituals, often specific to Islam or Judaism, were also denoted by Semitisms. Among the Moriscos these included Arabic-origin *al-waḍū* “ablution”, *as-salām* “inclination in prayer”, *ar-rak’a* “bowing while praying” and derived *arraka’ar* “to bow during prayer”, *sagda* “ritual prostration during prayer”, and derived *asaqdar(s)ē* “to prostrate oneself during prayer”, *šaum* “fasting (especially during Ramadan)”. In Jewish Ibero-Romance texts of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries one finds Hebrew-origin lexemes such as *netilá* (נטילה) “ablution”, *keriā* (יעהכר) and *hištaxavayá* (השתחוויה) “bending the knee” and “bowing” during prayers, *taamiθ* (תאום) “fasting”, *bediká* (בדיקה) “ritual inspection
(e.g., of a house, in search of leavened food before Passover)" and derived baðkar “to ritually inspect”.


Numerous other Arabisms in the Morisco texts also bore some connection to Islamic institutions, traditions, and beliefs, e.g., al-γār “cave”, al-qibla “south (direction of the Kaaba in Mecca, for prayer)”, ad-dunya “(this) world”, ʿṣadaqa “charity”, al-baraka “blessing”, al-kitāb “book”, aš-šayṭān “the Devil”, al-bēlē (from al-balē) “evil, torment, troubles”, and the fusion formation jarikança “worshippers of more than one god” (cf. A. širk ‘idolatry’ + OS. -ança). Hebrew analogues in Jewish Ibero-Romance texts from Iberia and the sixteenth-century Ottoman Empire, each bearing connotations tied to Jewish beliefs and traditions, included mearā (מערה) “cave”, tevā (תיבה) “reader’s platform in the synagogue”, mizrax (מזרח) “east (direction of prayer, toward the Temple Mount in Jerusalem)”, (este) olam (עולם) “(this) world”, sebākā (שברך) “charity”, beraxā (ברכה) “blessing”, besorā (בשורה) “good) tidings”, séfer (ספר) “book, scroll (generally, the Torah scroll)”, satān (שטן) “the Devil”, saroθ (צרות) “evil”, yisurín (יסורים) “suffering”, avoθ sara (עבודה זרה) “idolatry” and akum (עכו) “worshippers of stars and constellations”). In the Morisco Ibero-Romance texts, terms connected with the splendiferous architecture and luxurious lifestyle of the Muslim elite, as well as terms referring to nature, were also imported from Arabic, e.g., al-asās “foundations”, al-kursi “chair, throne”, al-bahar “sea”, al-marjal “meadow” (< al-marj + Sp. area-denoting -al), al-ʿaqrab “scorpion”, al-fil “elephant”.
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It should be noted that some Arabisms were adopted by Christian and/or Jewish speakers of Ibero-Romance as well, sometimes with changes in form or meaning. For example, compare: Arab al-minbar “pulpit in the mosque” with synonymous Spanish almimbar and Judezmo almemor “synagogue lectern,” Arab al-biṣra “good news” (ṣ al-biṣara) and derived albriçiador “admonisher”, alb(i)risadura “good tidings”, Spanish albricias “reward for good news”, albrićiador “to give good news”, and Judezmo albrisyas/albrisyas “reward for good news; thanks” albrisyar “to thank for bringing good news; to bring good news,” Ladino (=Judezmo religious-text calque translation language) albrisyaðor “bearer of good news”; Arab al-qaṣar “palace” with Spanish alcázar “castle, fortress”; Arab al-jōfar (< Per. jewher) “precious stone” with Spanish aljófar “misshapen pearl” and Jewish Ibero-Romance algōfar; Arab al-yaquta “ruby” with Ladino anyakuta/-ota.

As was also true of the Hebraisms in Jewish Ibero-Romance, the Arabisms in Morisco Ibero-Romance were not limited to substantives; there are also examples of exclamations, e.g., ya/ye “(vocative) oh”; particles, e.g., fa (introducing a sentence); adjectives, e.g., zarqō “blue-eyed”; and adverbs, e.g., dakiya “until”.

Very characteristic of the Arabisms in the Morisco texts was their tendency to be fully integrated morphemically and syntactically within the overall Ibero-Romance framework—in certain ways, more so than the Hebraisms in the pre-expulsion Jewish texts. To a much greater degree than those Hebraisms, Arabic substantives and adjectives in the Morisco Ibero-Romance texts attracted Hispanic-origin plural suffixes; for example, sg. šala “prayer” (< šala), pl. šalaš; sg. alhasana “good deed”, pl. alhašanas; alhaqiq “major Muslim pilgrimage”, pl. alhaqiqes; sg. sāhid “witness”; pl. sāhīdeš. Tautological plurals, consisting of the Arabic broken plural to which was added the Hispanic pluralizer -es, were also known, but were rare, e.g., alxawātīmīs < xātim “seal, stamp”. In the Hebrew-letter Ibero-Romance texts surviving from Iberia, on the other hand, the plurals of Hebrew-origin nouns generally exhibited Hebrew-origin plural markers, as illustrated in lexemes appearing in the Valladolid ordinances such as peratim (פרתים) “details” (cf. sg. perat פרת + pl. -im פרתים), kehiloth (קהילות) “Jewish congregations, communities” (cf. sg. kehilā קהילא + pl. -oth קהילות). Hebrew-origin substantives bearing Hispanic-origin plural markers were the exception, and are generally recorded in Latin-letter adaptations of Hebrew or Hebrew-letter Jewish Ibero-Romance texts, e.g., <samases> “synagogue beadles” < šamāš (שمام) (see section 2.2.1 above).
Morisco Ibero-Romance texts in the Arabic alphabet reveal dozens of synthetic verbs created with Arabic-origin bases and the Hispanic-origin verbalizer -ar. Some were created by attaching Hispanic-origin derivational morphemes to Arabic substantives; e.g., ḥurar “to free” (< ḥurr + S. a- -ar), alhadisar “to recount” (< al-hadīq), alhadiyar “to give a gift” (< al-hadiya), alkhol(a)lar “to make up one’s eyes” (< al-kuḥl), asunnar “to be a Sunni” (< as-sunna), azakear “to give to charity” (< az-zakā), āḏhār “to forbid” (< āḏrām), āḏhābar “to punish” (< āḏāb), and the verbs attāshiḥar, arrāka’, and asajdar(se), already mentioned. Other such verbs derive from Arabic verbal stems with Hispanic verbalizers; e.g., xalqar “to create (the world)” (< xalaqa), xatenar “to circumcise” (< xatana), amahar “to wipe; to forgive” (< maḥā), masḥar “to stroke, wipe with one’s hand” (< masaḥa), talqar “to divorce (a woman)” (< ṭalaqa), al(t)ḥaharar “to purify” (< ṭahara, ṭahhara).

The texts also reveal numerous derived substantives and adjectives created through the affixing of Hispanic-origin derivational morphemes to Arabic-origin stems, e.g., with -dor: xalaqador “Creator”, talqador “one who divorces his wife”, ḥafṣador “one who knows the Qur’an by heart” (< ḥāfṣ), amahador “one who eradicates or forgives sin”, with -ero (f. -era): ashhrero ‘sorcerer’ (f. asḥrera; < sihr), with -ante: (al)ḥiǧante/xiγante, alṭiγante “(Muslim) pilgrim” (< al-ḥaǧg), with -ado: xaleqado “created; creature”, alḥiǧante/-xiγante “(Muslim) pilgrim”, alkoḥolado “with eyes made up” (< al-kuḥl), with -mi(y)ento: xal(l)ekami(y)ento “Creation”, ṭaharami(y)ento “purification”, asuγdamiento “prostration (in Muslim prayer)” (< as-suγūd), arrak’amiento “bowing (in Muslim prayer)”.

Especially because of the semantic connection of most of these verbs and their derivatives to Islamic beliefs and practices, very few of them entered Old Judezmo, and those that did underwent a semantic shift: e.g., amaxar, used in Judezmo in the sense of “to calm, to alleviate”. Although, as was mentioned, pre-expulsion Latin-letter texts apparently reflecting Jewish usage also exhibited some Hebrew-origin synthetic verbs of this kind (e.g., malsinar, enxeremar, malvisar, discussed above), the Hebrew-letter texts written by and for a Jewish readership featured many more analytic verbs constructed of an auxiliary verb, such as ser “to be”, and a Hebrew-origin verbal participle (e.g., ser metaher [מְטָהֵר] “to purify”, and others mentioned in section 2.2.1 above). In such constructions, the Hebrew-origin participle attracted no Hispanic-origin morphemes, agreeing in number and gender with the subject through the use of Hebrew
bound morphemes, as in Hebrew proper, e.g., 3sg. es (m./f.) metahér/-etθ תֵּפָּה “purifies”, 3pl. son (m./f.) metaharim/-oθ מְתָּהֵרִים “purify”. Morisco writers preferred the use of verbs constructed of Arabic-origin stems and the Hispanic derivational morpheme -ar.

As was common in Arabisms in the Iber-Romance of Christians as well as Jews, the Morisco Arabic-origin substantives were often lexicalized with the Arabic definite article al-, and for actual definition would be preceded tautologically by the Hispanic definite article, e.g., el alislām “Islam”, el annabi “the Prophet”, el aluma “the (Muslim) people” (cf. S. el ‘the’ + A. al- ‘the’). Such constructions, too, suggest a certain lack of sensitivity to and familiarity with the structure of Arabic among the Moriscos, as compared with a greater knowledge of Hebrew proper among the Iberian Jews, or at least among those who wrote the surviving Hebrew-letter Ibero-Romance texts. Semantic shifts in the use of certain terms of Arabic origin—e.g., el-ḥadīth employed in the sense of “story” or “narration”, rather than “prophetic tradition”—strengthen the impression that the Moriscos were losing a keen knowledge of Arabic semantics and their use of Arabisms was no longer tied to the senses their etyma expressed in the language of origin.

On the other hand, Arabic sometimes affected the semantic sense of elements of Hispanic origin, e.g., aberdadeser “to concede, to confirm”, under the influence of muṣaddiq(an), aberdadeser a + person “to believe”, under the influence of ʿamanā bi. While among Christians, pascua ordinarily denotes ‘Easter,’ in Morisco texts pašku(w)a is used in the sense of a Muslim holiday, e.g., pašku(w)a de aramaðan “holiday at the end of the month of Ramadan.” In Jewish texts, paška(s) ordinarily denotes Passover, but in sacred-text translations in the Ladino calque variety it can denote a Jewish holiday in general, corresponding to biblical ḥag (חָג) ‘holiday,’ e.g., paškwa de las kavanyas “holiday of booths”, translating ḥag ha-sukkot in Leviticus 23:34. As denominal verbs, Morisco pašku(w)ar / Jewish paskwar respectively signify “to celebrate a Muslim/Jewish holiday.”

Thus, in comparison with the Hebraisms in the pre-expulsion Jewish Ibero-Romance texts, the elements of Arabic origin in Morisco Ibero-Romance tended not to maintain their morphological or, at times, semantic integrity. Nor, evidently, were the Arabisms in Morisco Ibero-Romance able to completely preserve their original phonological quality. Reminiscent of the Jews’ accommodation of their Hebraisms to the surrounding Ibero-Romance phonology, texts in the Arabic and especially the Latin alphabet document the Moriscos’ phonological adaptation of the Arabisms to Ibero-Romance as well. In the Arabisms in texts written in
Arabic letters, the characteristic Semitic sounds of Arabic often make the appearance of being better preserved than in those in Latin letters, since the original, at times distinctively Arabic, consonants tended to be maintained—just as the etymological spellings of Hebraisms were generally well preserved in Hebrew-letter Jewish Ibero-Romance texts, whereas texts in Roman letters frequently disclose historical changes in the form of Hebraisms (e.g., Roman-letter <escama> as opposed to Hebrew-letter הסכמה, making the appearance of haskama, but perhaps in fact realized as eskamá). Thus, the etymological spellings of Arabisms in Arabic-letter Morisco texts do not necessarily guarantee that their writers or readers realized the words exactly as in Arabic proper.

There are various sorts of evidence of the adaptation of the Moriscos’ Arabisms to Ibero-Romance phonology. For example, a paragogic vowel was often added to word-final consonants or consonant clusters which did not ordinarily occur in final position in Spanish or were absent from Spanish, e.g., šarke-i, (Quran) translation” < šark, al-miske
An alternative solution was for word-final voiced occlusives to become devoiced, e.g., as-sot < as-sūd “wall”.

As in the case of the realization of Whole Hebrew, or Hebrew proper, among the Jews of medieval Christian Spain—and certainly of the Merged Hebraisms within Jewish Ibero-Romance—there is evidence in the Morisco texts of significant supplanting of the characteristically Semitic phones of Arabic by their closest Ibero-Romance correspondents: e.g., q by k, in ar-ričke < ar-rizq “sustenance”; s by in asāf < as-saff “row (in a mosque)”, ʿayn by zero in alarše < al-ʿarš “throne”.

Various other sound changes endured by Hispanic phonological tendencies are documented as well: e.g., -r > -l, as in alwazīl < wazīr “minister”; -m > -n, as in ḥaran < ḥarām “impure; forbidden”. The word for a ‘Muslim judge’ was sometimes spelled with ka and ṭa (i.e., al-kaṭṭi), instead of etymologically anticipated qaf and dal (al-qadī), probably hinting at the pronunciation alkādi, closer consonantally to the Spanish reflex, alcalde, than to the Arabic etymon. As in the case of Latin-letter representations of the Hebraisms appearing in Jewish speech, Morisco texts in the Latin alphabet probably offer a better indication of how their Arabisms were actually realized phonologically by their users than those in the Arabic alphabet.

When comparing the Arabisms in the Morisco texts with the Hebraisms in the texts written by Iberian Jews, it should be remembered that, for the Jews of Iberia and their sixteenth-century descendants removed from Iberia, Hebrew was primarily a language of sacred text,
liturgy and high-level rabbinical writing, rather than a spoken language; whereas for the Muslims, before their intensive Hispanization—imposed in good measure by the Christians—Arabic had been their spoken as well as written language. Thus one might have expected to find that, in some Arab Ibero-Romance texts, the Arabic component would be even more extensive than the Hebrew component in Jewish Ibero-Romance texts.

However, to judge from the available documentation, during the fifteenth through sixteenth centuries, the Ibero-Romance of the Jews of Spain and their descendants in the Ottoman Empire was in fact just as rich, if not richer in Hebraisms than that of the Moriscos in Arabisms. This undoubtedly reflects the fact that the Jews of Spain and, later, of the Ottoman Empire, were able openly to practice their Judaism, and cultivate its language of liturgy and sacred study, even if it was not used as a language of daily speech, up until their expulsion from the peninsula; whereas the Moriscos who remained in Spain after the official expulsion of the country’s Arabs were eventually forbidden from practicing their ancestral religion or using their ethnic and religious language. It should be remembered that, among the crypto-Jews who remained in Spain after the expulsion and later returned to Judaism outside of Iberia—i.e., among the Spaniards of Jewish descent who were the true parallels of Spain’s Hispanized and (even if only ostensibly) Christianized Moriscos—the level of Hebrew knowledge and use of Hebrew-origin material in their written, and probably their spoken language, seems to have been close to nil. Thus, in comparison, the continued use of any elements of Arabic origin among the Moriscos, despite the Spanish prohibitions on such use, was an outstanding act of identification with their ancestral language and religious traditions.

---

2.3. Languages of sacred-text translation

2.3.1. The Jewish Ibero-Romance sacred-text translation tradition: literal translation (*ladino*) and rabbinical explication (*perush*)

2.3.1.1. Role and general nature of the sacred-text translation language vis-à-vis the Hebrew text

According to Jewish religious law, as first alluded to in Deuteronomy (e.g., 5:11, 6:7, 11:19), Jewish males are enjoined to study the Torah, especially the Pentateuch, on a regular basis, and to teach it to their sons. During the period in which most Jews spoke Aramaic and no longer were conversant in Hebrew, the Talmud stipulated that, in order to ensure comprehension of the Holy Writ, the weekly Pentateuch portion was to be
studied ‘twice in Hebrew and once in Aramaic’ ("שבעה שתיים ופעם אחת"). From the very phrasing of the injunction it is clear that the reading of the original Hebrew text, even if not fully understood, was of primary importance; the Aramaic translation was secondary, and meant as a pedagogical aid to the study of the Hebrew text.

Over the centuries, as Jews in various places made the transition from one language to another as their daily tongue, the role of Aramaic as the everyday Jewish vernacular used orally in Torah-focused studies was supplanted by other Jewish languages. In Muslim Spain, the sacred writ must have been translated into Judeo-Arabic—though no examples seem to have survived. Probably around the time the Iberian Jews made the transition from Jewish Arabic to Ibero-Romance, the inability of the less learned sectors of Iberian Jewry to fully understand texts in Hebrew or Aramaic led to the practice of translating the Pentateuch into varieties of Ibero-Romance. At first such Torah translations were probably oral, ad hoc, on-the-spot renditions, produced extemporaneously in the class room and study hall; but more formal, written versions were probably created as well. Pre-expulsion Hebrew-letter vernacular translations of the Biblical texts, prepared by Jews and meant for Jewish readers, seem not to have survived, although the existence of some (e.g., the Scroll of Esther, read in translation for women in some Iberian congregations) is alluded to in the Iberian rabbinical responsa. In the end, a system of Jewish Ibero-Romance sacred-text translation evolved, which was the basis for the system later employed by the descendants of Spanish Jewry in the Ottoman Empire and North Africa. Thus, in Sefer ha-yir'a, one of the standard Jewish ethical works of the Middle Ages, which most scholars attribute to Rabbi Yona Gerondi (Gerona, Catalonia, d. 1263), the author could suggest that ‘if one does not have the Aramaic translation, he should read [the weekly Pentateuch portion] twice in Hebrew and once in La'az’ (i.e., "שבעה שתיים ופעם אחת" in Jewish Romance). The phrasing of this sentence suggests that, just as a written Aramaic translation of the Pentateuch was available to be read and studied at the time, so too was a written translation in La’az. Judging from the discussion in the Iberian responsa, the variety of La’az in question was probably Jewish Castilian.

The problematic nature of sacred-text translation was raised among the rabbis of Iberia in connection with their discussion of the issue in the Palestinian Talmud (Megilla 82, law 1). In particular, the 14th-century Catalonian rabbi Nissim ben Re’uven Gerondi (b. Barcelona 1310?, d. 1375?), his student Yišiḥaq Bar Sheshet, and other Iberian rabbis of the period debated whether or not hearing (or, in the words of the benediction, ‘reading’) the Scroll of Esther in La’az rather than Hebrew fulfilled the
commandment to hear (‘read’) it during Purim. Despite various rabbinical objections, the Iberian Jews and their descendants continued to use Ibero-Romance translations of the sacred writ, especially for the sake of women listeners, into the modern era.

A hint that an inclusion of the original Hebrew text had been a sine qua non in the pre-expulsion Iberian Jewish study of the Bible by males, and that the vernacular translation was merely an aid to its comprehension, may be seen in the structure of almost all of the post-expulsion Biblical texts published in the Ottoman Empire with vernacular translations meant for the Sephardim. In such editions, which appeared from the mid-sixteenth through twentieth centuries, the original Hebrew text was almost always present, printed in bold, vocalized Square type. At first, in the sixteenth century, the archaizing, highly literal Ladino translations which accompanied the Hebrew text, in order to render its words, grammatical structures and very word order comprehensible to the less learned, were at first printed in the same vocalized Square letters as the Hebrew text itself. But from the late sixteenth century, the Ladino translations in Bible glossaries of ‘difficult words,’ such as Sefer haqesh Šelomo (Venice 1588), and in the full text translations produced subsequently in the Ottoman Empire, were generally printed in the less sanctified and unimposing, unvocalized, so-called ‘Rashi’ type font, founded on the basis of the cursive script which had been used among the Iberian Jews. In Bibles published in Italy for the Sephardim, the Ladino text was often limited to small-print marginal glosses of problematic words and expressions. Among the descendants of the Iberian Jews in North Africa, the literal, archaizing Ladino Bible translation tradition also flourished into the modern era, but its transmission there was essentially oral. There, no printed editions were published locally; but Hebrew texts with marginal Ladino glosses printed in Italy (e.g., Livorno) were imported for local use.

The Jews in Iberia who had ostensibly converted to Catholicism under Christian pressure appear to have completely relinquished the use of the Hebrew and Aramaic languages, and made little if any use of words originating in those languages which had formed a part of their ancestral vernacular, in order to maintain their Catholic façade. Among those who returned to Judaism outside Iberia—in Italy, Holland, England, France—translation texts in Romanization, rather than in Hebrew letters, played a central role in education and religious study. Such texts were printed independently of the Hebrew text, which the first generation of ‘returned’ Jews could not read. Later, Sephardic rabbis from the Ottoman Empire and North Africa began to serve as rabbis and teachers in the ‘Western’ or ‘Spanish-Portuguese’ communities of western Europe, and they instructed
the children in Hebrew, at which time the Hebrew texts were returned to their former, primary role in Torah study, and translation texts, or glosses, again received their secondary role as mere educational tools. Thus it may be said that, at the ideological level, the use of the vernacular in the context of traditional Jewish scholarship was traditionally perceived by the Spanish rabbis and their post-expulsion heirs as little more than a practical necessity.

2.3.1.2. Structural characteristics of the sacred-text translation language

Syntax

In all of the traditional Jewish Ladino Bible translations, the sacred, pivotal status of the original Hebrew text was underscored by means of various calque techniques employed to mirror-image the source text. To a considerable extent, the translations attempted to reflect the syntax, phraseology, lexicon, semantics, and wherever possible, even something of the phonology of the Hebrew sources. This was accomplished by using literal translations of Hebrew idioms and sentence structures, as well as glosses characterized by what Zuckermann (2003: 41) called “phonosemantic matching” (i.e., two words from distinct languages, sometimes used as glosses of one another, bearing a certain phonological as well as semantic resemblance). The following verses from the story of Joseph in Genesis illustrate some of the features characteristic of the Jewish Ibero-Romance Bible-translation language (the Jewish translation texts considered are: Constantinople 1547; the adaptation by 'Avraham 'Asa, 1739; the Christian translations with which they are compared are the 1569 Casiodoro de Reina Spanish translation, and its 1995 revision):

“[37:4] Wa-yir'u 'ɛḥā w kī-ōtō 'āhab 'abhem mi-kol 'ɛḥā w yiśnē'u 'ōtō wē-lō yāxēlū dabbērō lē-sālōm (And [when] his brethren saw that him loved their father of all his brothers and they hated him and could not speak with him for peace) [And when his brethren saw that their father loved him more than all his brethren, they hated him, and could not speak peaceably unto him]:

“(1547) I vyeron sus ermanos ke a el amava su paðre mas ke todos sus ermanos i aboresyeron a el i no pudieron avlar kon el por pas.”

In the translation, the original word order is retained throughout. The verb phrase wa-yir'u 'ɛḥāw (And [when] his brethren saw), although functioning as an adverbial phrase, is translated literally as I vyeron sus
eranos (“And saw his brethren”). The personal a, obligatory according to Hispanic syntax, is absent before the definite, human complement mas ke todos sus ermanos (more than all his brethren) since it lacks a counterpart in the Hebrew phrase, mi-kol 'ěḥāw. The verb phrase wa-yišnē ‘u 'ōtī (and they hated him) is translated analytically with aboreser + a: i aboresyeron a el, the object phrase a el constituting an analogue to the Hebrew direct object marker 'et + 3sg. pronominal morpheme > ‘ot. The idiom dabhērō lē-sālōm (speak peaceably unto him) is translated literally as avlar kon el por pas (speak with him for peace). This may be compared with the freer translation appearing in the Casiodoro de Reina translation (the so-called Biblia del oso), published in Basel in 1569, in which more anticipated Hispanic structures are employed: “Y viendo sus hermanos que su padre lo amaua mas que á todos sus hermanos, aborrecíanlo, y no le podían hablar pacificamente.”

Typifying the systematic translation of various Hebrew particles and function words by elements of Hispanic origin perceived by the founders of the translation tradition to be their semantic equivalents, Biblical na (נא), corresponding in English to something akin to ‘pray, I pray you,’ was uniformly translated in this as in other Ladino texts as ayora. The Constantinople 1547 Ladino text artificially replicated the Hebrew post-positioning of the demonstrative (here, ze, i.e., ha-ḥālōm ha-ze) after the substantive it modified (el swenyo este), despite the fact that Hispanic syntax requires it to precede the substantive (S. este sueño). In the edition published in Constantinople, 1739, by 'Avraham 'Asa, this is modified to Oid aymora el swenyo el este ke sonyé, bringing the translation still closer to the Hebrew by mirroring the repetition of the definite article ha- (ה). Here, as in other verses, when a particular verbal root also appeared in the substantive form which functioned as its complement, the Ladino translation reflected this duplication (here illustrated by el swenyo fel este ke sonyé/sonyí, translating ha-ḥālōm ha-ze ‘āser hālamātī (this dream which I have dreamed”), even though in Spanish the same verb might ordinarily take another complement, bearing no relation to the verb stem. Also as in other verses, the single-lexeme verb forms of Hebrew were translated by means of simplex (e.g., preterite, imperfect) rather than com pound (e.g., present perfect) verb forms, as
illustrated in *sonyé/sonyi*, translating *ḥālamāḥ* (*חלמתי*).
The contrast between these features and the analogues more natural to Spanish syntax are illustrated in the 1569 Casiodoro de Reina Spanish translation: “Oíd ahora esto sueño que he soñado,” and in the revised version published in 1995, containing a further lexical alteration: “Oíd ahora este sueño que he tenido.”

[37:9] “Wē-hinne ha-šrmē wē-ha-yārēah wē-‘āhād ʿāśār kōkāḥām mīstahāwīm li (הנה השמש והירח ושבע עשרכוכבים השתחווים לי) (“And, behold, the sun and the moon and eleven stars bowed down [literally: bow down] to me”):
(1547) “I ek el sol i la luna i onze estrelas enkorvantes a mi.”

Here, as in other verses, the particle *hinne* (*הנה*) ‘behold’ is systematically translated as archaic *ek*, from Aragonese (*<* Lat. ECCUM), and the verb denoting ‘to bow down’ is rendered by *enkorvar* (*S. encorvar*), here occurring in the plural present participle form *enkorvantes* in reflection of the Hebrew masculine plural present participle *mištaḥāwīm* (*משתחווים*). This may be compared with the more usual, contemporaneous Spanish lexemes *he* and *inclinarse* (in the imperfect indicative form *se inclinauan*) in Reina 1569: “[Y he aquí] que el Sol y la Luna, y onze estrellas se inclinauan à mi,” the verb phrase being introduced by the relative, *que*.

[37:20] “Wē-‘attā lēkū wē-nahargehū (*והנהו לכו עתה*)”
[Literal: And now [2pl.] go and let us kill him]
[“Come now therefore, and let us slay him”]:
(1547) “I ayora andað i matemoslo”.

This cohortative expression is translated literally, with the adverbial phrase *wē-‘attā* (*והנה* “and now”) rendered *i ayora*, the second person imperative *lēkū* (*לכו* ‘go’) translated *andað*, and the following cohortative verb form *wē-nahargehū* (*והנהו* “and let us slay him”) translated as *matemoslo*. In rendering the phrase as “Aora pues venid, y matemoslo,” Reina (1569), as usual, takes greater liberty in translation. He leaves the initial conjunction *wē-* (*ו* “and”) untranslated. He uses the more modern form *aora* (cf. M.S. *ahora*) to translate ‘*attā*, inserting the exclamational filler *pues*, having no explicit correspondent in the Hebrew text, and, in terms of Spanish and Judezmo. Here, the cohortation employs the verb *venir* ‘to come’ rather than *ir* ‘to go’, in disagreement with the Hebrew formulation.
Here, as in all Jewish Ladino Bible translation texts, the copula (‘be’) is omitted since a form of the verb ḥāyā (‘be’) does not appear in the Hebrew text: thus, Yo Yosef (literally, ‘I Joseph’), translating ‘Anī Yūsēp (‘אַתָּא יַעֲשֶׂה, ‘I am Joseph’). This stands in opposition to the presence of an overt copula, as obligatory in Spanish, in the 1569 Reina Spanish translation, “Yo soy José vuestro hermano.”

Lexicon: Phono-semantic matching and lexical innovation

In Jewish Ibero-Romance Bible translation texts of the sixteenth and subsequent centuries, we find a preference for translations phonologically resembling the Hebrew source words. For example, tam (תָּם) ‘to complete, finish’ was sometimes translated by atemar, from Arabic tamm, as when wa-tittām ha-šānā ha-hi (וַיִּתְמַן הַשָּׁנָה הָיָה = And when that year was ended) in Genesis 47:18 was rendered by (1547) i atemóse el anyo ese (‘Asa 1739 ... el anyo el este). There are also neologisms which had been created by the Jewish Bible translations using concatenations of morphemes which also existed in Spanish but had not been combined in precisely those sequences in Spanish, to parallel Hebrew lexemes with certain stems where no such parallels (e.g., no substantive exhibiting a certain stem) had existed in Christian Ibero-Romance, e.g., novy eðað translating ḥāṭunā (חתונה ‘wedding,’ derived from novy ‘groom’ = ḥāṭnā כַּחַנ).

Incorporation of elements of Hebrew origin

Hebrew elements occurring in the Biblical verses and apparently having reflexes in everyday medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance (or at least appearing in the writings of its speakers) were rarely incorporated in the sacred-text translation language. The few such Hebraisms which did appear in the translations consisted mostly of proper nouns, such as Yosef (יוסף) “Joseph”, and gentilics, such as Miḏyanī (מדיני) “Midianite”. Several Biblical Hebrew religious terms lacking single-word Hispanic equivalents were replaced by post-Biblical equivalents commonly used in everyday speech. For example, post-Biblical teflîn (תֵּפְלִין) was employed to translate Biblical ṭūṭôfáthim (תתוּופִּים) “phylacteries”. Hebraisms were also used to convey concepts having deep emotional connotations in Judaism, e.g., malsinar < מַלְשָּׁנָה “to inform, to slander”, kafrar < כַּפְר “to blaspheme”, asoxaðear < אָסְוָאָד “to bribe”. Where Hebrew-origin synthetic verbs existed for such concepts in everyday Jewish Ibero-Romance, they were sometimes
employed to translate the same verbal root in a Biblical verse, even if the verb conveyed a different sense in the Biblical context. For instance, ke enxeremare (]< enixeremar < הֵרֶם herem “excommunication”), which in medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance would ordinarily express “that he excommunicate”, was employed in translating the phrase appearing in Leviticus 27:28 (kol-ha’rem ’āšer) yahārim [’is la-’ādīnāy] (“no devoted thing that a man shall devote (to the Lord)”, in Sefer hešeq Šēlomo (Venice 1588) as well as in ‘Aṣa’s 1739 translation of the Pentateuch.186 The verb yahārim was instead translated as santificare “devote, sanctify” in Reina 1569.

Reflections of traditional exegesis

According to Jewish tradition, the Oral Law, explicating the written Torah text, was received together with the Written Law. Reflections of it, as developed over the centuries by Judaism’s major exegetes and translators, are sometimes evident in the traditional Ladino Bible translations. For example, in the Constantinople 1547 Pentateuch the anthropomorphic phrase appearing in Deuteronomy 4:34, (bē-ḥād ḥazāqā (חזקה ידו[2])), literally, with the Lord’s “strong hand”, was rendered as (kon) poder fwerte, literally, “(with) strong power”.

Oral use of sacred-text translation structures

The characteristic techniques of Jewish Ibero-Romance (en)labinar—translation of Hebrew and Aramaic sacred texts into the special, archaizing calque variety of the vernacular—were not limited to written translation texts. In fact, such techniques were first and foremost components in the impromptu oral translations of sacred texts formulated by boys studying in the traditional religious schools. As documented for the Sephardic communities of the Ottoman Empire, after the expulsion, at the most elementary level the target verse was translated literally, word by word, e.g., wa-yōmer (אמרו) “I dišo”. Later, whole phrases and sentences were translated, e.g., wa-yōmer ’Adōnāy ‘el Mōše lemōr (אמרו אל משה למר) “I dišo Amonay a Mošé por dezir’.187

Language of exegetical interpretation of sacred texts

Along with the literal translation of the sacred Hebrew texts, the school boys were taught their rabbinical interpretations (peruš ספירוש), traditionally believed to constitute a part of the oral law. The most extensive Jewish
Ibero-Romance written compilation of rabbinical commentaries on the Bible is the Judezmo Me-‘am lo’ez series, initiated by Rabbi Ya’aqov Khuli in Constantinople in 1730 and continued by various Ottoman rabbis into the twentieth century. In the oral and written peruš or explication of a Biblical text, the rabbis allowed themselves greater liberties in rendering the Hebrew text into the vernacular than in the highly literal and archaic language characteristic of the traditional Ladino translations themselves. The text adaptations in the peruš often employed constructions more closely resembling everyday speech, using lexemes more usual in the spoken language. Thus, for example, in translating the above-cited phrase (וָלֶלֹא בִּשְׂלָם) “and they could not speak peaceably unto him” (Gen. 37:4), Ya’aqov Khuli (1730: 182b) rendered the latter expression as (יָאִים לְוַעְלָו) rather than the more literal (נָאִים לְוַעְלָו) used in the 1547 Constantinople Pentateuch and later literal Ladino Bible editions. In translating the phrase (שָׁמַעְתַּם הַמַּעֲמֶר הַנָּא) “Hear, I pray you, this dream” (Gen. 37:6) as (שָׁמַעְתַּם הָאֲמָר הָנָא) Khuli (1730: 182b) employed the everyday verb sentir, rather than oír, to express “to hear”, and this verb appeared in the popular, apocopated second-person plural imperative form sentí, without the final -ð usually found in the more conservative printed Ladino Bible translations. Although the verb form (חָלַם) ‘I have dreamed’ is a qal or simple verb in Hebrew, Khuli expressed it by means of the reflexive form sonyí, as usual in spoken Judezmo, rather than as non-reflexive sonyé/sonyí, occurring in the literal translations.

In his rendition of Genesis 37:9, Khuli (1730: 183a) did not translate the phrase (וַיִּקְרָא הַהַלַּוֹם הָעַלָּו) (I ek (el sol i la luna)) literally, as (וַיִּקְרָא הַהַלַּוֹם הָעַלָּו) (I ek (el sol i la luna)) “And [the fact] is that the sun and the moon”. Khuli also used more ordinary, spoken Judezmo constructions in translating the phrase (וַיָּתְאוּ לָכֶם וַיָּמָשׁוּ לִהְוָה) (I aíora andað i mátemoslo) “Come now therefore, and let us slay him” (Gen. 37:20) as I aíora andemos i lo mataremos. That is, the first verb, lêkû (literally, “go”), although a second-person imperative in the Hebrew text, was rendered as the first-person plural cohortative using the subjunctive mode, andemos. The second verb, wê-nahargehû (“and let us slay him”), was expressed as a first-person plural in the future indicative tense, with the direct object pronoun preceding the finite verb, i lo mataremos, again, as usual in spoken Judezmo. These verb forms stand in opposition to the more literal and literary constructions employed in the word-for-word Ladino translations, I aíora andað i matemoslo. In his explication of Genesis 45:4, Khuli did not translate the entire dramatic
phrase ‘Anî Yōsēp ḥahîxm (I am Joseph your brother), but only ‘Anî Yōsēp, which he translated into ordinary Judezmo, including the copula obligatory in ordinary, non-translation-language: Yo so Yosef, as opposed to the literal translation, Yo Yosef, used in the Ladino Bibles.

2.3.2. The Morisco šarḥō and tafsir (Ibero-Romance translation and interpretation) of Muslim sacred texts

As was noted in section 2.1 above, for Muslims, the Quran is an object of the greatest veneration, intentionally revealed by God in the Arabic language and script, which are believed by Muslims to be His divine gifts to them. Like the Bible among the Jews, the Quran is traditionally the major focus of Muslim elementary education. Among Muslims, the Quran is believed to have a miraculous nature (i’ǧāz al-Qur’ān), which cannot be translated absolutely or perfectly; “at best, only a translation of its understood meaning (tmq [=translated meaning of the Qur’an]) can be offered.” In fact, Islam traditionally objects to translating the Quran into foreign languages and alphabets. Thus, by preference, the medieval Mudéjares recited the Quran and Muslim prayers in Arabic. However, with the decreasing knowledge of Arabic among the Muslims of Christian Spain, especially those of Castile and Aragon, some Muslim scholars in Iberia came to believe that only an Ibero-Romance adaptation could ensure the continued viability of Islam in Spain. This belief eventually led to the rendition of the Quranic verses, as well as the Muslim prayers, into Ibero-Romance. They were eventually recited in that language from Arabic-letter transcriptions prepared for the purpose.

Written translations, at first in the Arabic alphabet, began to appear from the fifteenth century. Perhaps the most important of them was that produced by ‘Īsâ ibn Jābir or ‘Īsâ Gidelli of Segovia in 1456. Ultimately, versions appeared in the Latin alphabet as well, prefaced by apologies for the fact.

Since Islam stresses that the Quran cannot be translated exactly, and because many of the Ibero-Romance renditions were apparently meant to be studied as independent units, without concomitant reference to the original Arabic source text, the Morisco Ibero-Romance adaptations of the Quran are less literal than the traditional Jewish Ibero-Romance translations of the Bible. Also, to a much greater extent than in the literal Jewish Ibero-Romance (Ladino) translation of the Bible, which for the most part is kept distinct textually from the related exegetic commentary (perush), Quranic exegesis is incorporated within the Morisco Ibero-Romance adaptation itself. Perhaps this was because qualified Quran
instructors, comparable to the plentiful Jewish Bible teachers, were growing rare in Christian Spain, and it was felt that an accompanying written commentary was crucial so that any reader of the translation could derive maximum benefit from it without a teacher. While some Quran adaptations presented the text in bilingual, interlinear Arabic and Ibero-Romance form, others limited their focus to the Ibero-Romance translation itself. The monolingual Morisco Ibero-Romance Quran texts, especially those in the Latin alphabet, differed from the Ibero-Romance Bible translations and glosses printed for the Sephardim of the Ottoman Empire and Italy, who were expected to use the Romance material as a tool for studying the original sacred text in Hebrew. The monolingual Morisco texts were more akin to the Hispanic Bible translations in the Latin alphabet, unaccompanied by the Biblical Hebrew text, published for conversos of Jewish origin returning to Judaism in Western Europe, who, at least at first, were completely ignorant of Hebrew proper and even of the Hebrew alphabet. Like them, many if not most users of the Morisco Ibero-Romance Quran adaptations would have been completely unequipped to understand the Arabic original or even to make out their Arabic letters.

2.3.2.1. Some structural features of the Morisco Quran translation cum interpretation

The following extracts of an adaptation of sūra 12 (from Toledo B.P. 235, f. 128v), some of them resembling Biblical verses recounting the story of Joseph and his brothers referred to above, exemplify certain of the features characterizing the Morisco Ibero-Romance Quran translations cum commentaries.\(^{195}\) (Only the Ibero-Romance text appears in the manuscript):


Joseph said to his father, “O my father, I saw eleven planets, and the sun, and the moon; I saw them prostrating before me.”]

\[\text{Morisco adaptation: “Dixo Yúçuf a su padre: ‘Ye padre, yo e visto en mi sueño doze estrellas y el sol y la luna a mí açaxdados.’”}

[Modern Spanish: Cuando Yusuf dijo a su padre: ¡Padre mío! He visto once estrellas, al sol y a la luna; y los he postrados ante mí.]\(^{196}\)

The adaptation of this verse, which resembles a Biblical verse, begins with a literal translation of the Quran text, incorporating the Arabic-origin
vocative element ye, but adds the explanatory phrase en mi sueño “in my dream”, absent in the source, and renders Arabic ʻahada ʻašara (kawkaban) “eleven (stars)” as doze (estrellas) “twelve (stars)” (perhaps through scribal error). The single-element verb form raaytu “I saw” is translated by the compound verb form e visto (literally, “I have seen”), unlike the Jewish translations, in which such verb forms are ordinarily rendered by means of a simplex verb. The repetition of the verb, raaytuhum “I saw them”, is left untranslated. The final verbal expression, the present participle șājidīna “prostrating”, is expressed by means of a past participle form functioning as an adjective, açaxdados, the base of which derives from the Arabic root s-j-d in the source text (as opposed to Hispanic-origin enkorvantes in the Jewish translation). Although the Morisco adaptation is closer to the original Arabic than its modern Muslim Spanish counterpart, it nevertheless incorporates certain free adaptations of the text; adaptations of this type are foreign to the more literal, stylistically fixed Jewish Ladino translation tradition.

**Quran 12:5:** “Qāla yā bunayya lā taqsgu ru’yāka ‘alā ixwatika fayakidā laka kaydan inna aš-šayātīna li-l-insāni ‘aduwwun mubīnun”

[He said, “My son, do not tell your brothers about your dream, lest they plot and scheme against you. Surely, the devil is man’s worst enemy]

**Morisco adaptation:** “Dixo: ‘Ye hijo, no recuentes tu sueño sobre tus hermanos, que ymbidiaran a ti con ymbidia. Que el axeyttán es a la persona enemigo claro.’

[Modern Spanish: Dijo: ¡Hijo mío! No cuentes tu visión a tus hermanos porque si lo haces tramarán algo contra ti, verdaderamente el Shaytán es un claro enemigo para el hombre.]

Here the translation is rather literal. In the phrase lā taqsgu ru’yāka ‘alā ixwatika (“do not tell your brothers about your dream”), the preposition ‘alā, which sometimes means “over”, is translated by sobre rather than a (“to”), as in the modern Spanish translation: no recuentes tu sueño sobre tus hermanos. The expression fayakidā laka kaydan “(literally) they will envy you with envy”, i.e., “they will envy you”, is expressed by the calque que ymbidiaran a ti con ymbidia, and ‘aduwwun mubīnun “(literally) clear enemy”, i.e., “worst enemy”, by the calque enemigo claro. Calques in which the verb and its object exhibit the same stem are common in Jewish Ladino as well; e.g., H. Wa-yevk Ḥizkiyyāhū bēxi gadol (And Hezekiah wept sore) = I yoró Hizkiyau yoro grande (Is. 38:3), as opposed to freer modern Spanish adaptations such as “Y Ezequías lloró amargamente” (And Hezekiah wept bitterly). The Arabic word for “the Devil”, ʻaš-šaytān, is retained in the Morisco Ibero-Romance
adaptation, although the Hispanic and Arabic definite articles al- and el render the construction el axeyttán characteristically redundant. Again shying away from the use of Hebraisms, the Jewish Ladino tradition instead “translates” Hebrew šāṭan “Devil, accuser” (e.g., in Job 1:7) as atorsedor “twister (fig. accuser)”.

Quran 12:6: “Wa-kathālika yajtabika wa-yu'allimuka min ta’wīli al-aḥāđīthi wa-yutimmu ni'mahā 'āli ya'qūba kamā atammahā ‘ālā abawayka min qablu ibrāhīma wa-ishāqa inna rabbaka ‘allmūn hakīmūn” [Your Lord has thus blessed you, and has given you good news through your dream. He has perfected His blessings upon you and upon the family of Jacob, as He did for your ancestors Abraham and Isaac before that. Your Lord is Omniscient, Most Wise.”]

Morisco adaptation: “Y así te eslitará para el annubúa tu Señor, y te hará a saber de la declaraçión de los sueños. Y cumplirá de su graçia sobre ti y sobre los de Ya@acob, así como la cumplió sobre tus padres de antes, Ybrahim y Yçhac. Que tu Señor es sabidor, çiente.” [Modern Spanish: Así es como tu Señor te ha escogido y te enseñará parte de la interpretación de los relatos, completando Su bendición sobre ti y sobre la familia de Yaqub, como ya hizo anteriormente con tus abuelos Ibrahim e Ishaq. Es cierto que tu Señor es Conocedor y Sabio.]

The adaptation of this verse is rather literal as well. The introductory phrase, Wa-kathālika “and thus”, is rendered by “y así”. The phrase wa-yu'allimuka min ta’willi al-aḥāđīthi “and will cause you to know of the explanation of dreams” is translated literally as y te hará a saber de la declaración de los sueños. However, there are also departures from the literal translation of the text; e.g., ‘ali Ya’qūba is translated as sobre los de Ya@acob; and the translation of kamā (atammahā ‘ālā abawayka) incorporates the addition y así (como la cumplió sobre tus padres).

Illustrating the influence of Aragonese characteristic of many of the Morisco texts, the phrase yajtabika rabbuka “will choose you” is expressed by the Aragonism te eslitara (vs. te ha escogido in the modern Castilian translation). The explanatory phrase, para el annubúa “for prophecy”, incorporating the Arabism for “prophecy”, is inserted between the phrases. The Ḥešeq Šełomo Ladino Bible glossary offers an interesting analogue. Exodus 14:31 contains the phrase “(Wa-ya’āminī b-Adōnāy) u-v-Mōšē ’avdō” (the people ... believed in the Lord,) and in His servant Moses.” In the 1547 Ladino Pentateuch the reference to Moses is translated simply as i en Mošé su syervo; but Ḥešeq Šełomo alters this to nevuá de Mošē “the prophecy of Moses” (supported by binvi’ut Moše
‘avde in the Aramaic adaptation by Onqelos), thus seeming to emphasize Moses’ divine gift of prophecy, and not the man himself. As in the case of the Quran verse, in introducing this exegetic phrase, the Hebrew Bible translator incorporated the Hebraism nevuá (נְוָעָ), widely documented in Judezmo.\(^{198}\)

The Arabic forms of the personal names Ya@acob, Ybrahim and Yçhac, rather than their Hispanic equivalents, are preserved in the translation as well. The incorporation of Hebrew proper names is characteristic of the Jewish Ladino translation texts as well.\(^{199}\) The qualities of the Divinity, stated as appositional ‘alîmîn hakîmûn, are translated sabidor çiente; the latter an archaic form (later replaced by esciente). Although an overt copular verb is absent in the Arabic phrase rabbaka ‘alîmîn hakîmu “Your Lord [is] Omniscient, Most Wise”, as characteristic of Arabic, the copula es is added in the translation, tu Señor es sabidor çiente—another example of the freer adaptation of the Quranic text in Morisco Ibero-Romance as opposed to the more strictly literal translation of the Biblical text in the Jewish Ladino tradition.

Using devices often resembling those employed by the Sephardim in their Ladino Bible translations, the Morisco translators of the Quran into Ibero-Romance sought to preserve as much as possible of the original Arabic structure of the text, through considerable literality and loan translations of Arabic idioms, as was illustrated in the passages above. In common with the Jewish Ladino texts, the Morisco documents exemplify lexical innovation (e.g., lexemes evidently rare in or undocumented for Christian Spanish or Judezmo such as bendezimî(y)ento “blessing”, enemiyansa “enmity”,\(^{200}\) amüçecer “to increase”, abibeçer “to revive”\(^{201}\); cf. St.S. bendición, enemistad, multiplicar [O.S. muchiguar], vivificar), and semantic transference (e.g., in translations of Arabic texts such as the Quran, verbs such as derrocar “tear down” and descargar “descend” used causatively can serve as calques of inzûl “revelation”).\(^{202}\) The languages of Moriscos and Jews share some instances of semantic shift or specialization; e.g., cf. Morisco faðaš / fadañento “naming ceremony (among Sephardim: for a girl)”, fadar/fadak Morisco “to give good luck”/Judezmo “to name a baby girl”.\(^{203}\) Nevertheless, as we have seen, there are some significant differences. The Jewish Ladino Bible translations tend to be even more literal than the Morisco Quran translations, and to tolerate fewer exegetical insertions not reflecting actual material in the original Hebrew text. Hebraisms are less readily incorporated into the Jewish translations than Arabisms in the Morisco adaptations.
With the exodus of the Muslims from Spain and their physical and cultural integration within Islamic communities elsewhere, they and their descendants returned to the recitation of the Quran and its interpretation, as well as of the Islamic prayers, in Arabic. And thus, whereas Ladino translations of the Bible and prayers continued to play a role in the Sephardic communities of the Ottoman Empire, and to a certain extent in North Africa, into the modern era, the need for Morisco Ibero-Romance translations of Muslim texts came to an end in the seventeenth century.

3. Reflections of pre-languages

3.1 Jews of Spain

As often happens in the historical development of peoples unable to maintain their political independence, the linguistic transitions undergone by the ancestors of the Spanish Jews in their shifts from varieties of Greek and Latin and its derivations to varieties of Arabic and, ultimately, back to medieval Ibero-Romance, did not come to pass without leaving a trace of the pre-language, including its Hebrew and Aramaic component, in each succeeding Jewish language. Such preservations generally denoted actions, concepts or objects directly connected to Jewish beliefs and practices. For example, the Jewish Greek-Latin substratum is exemplified by the verb *meldar* (cf. G. *meletáō* “contemplate” > Jewish Latin *mel[e]tare*), used in the sense of ‘read or study a Jewish text’ in pre-expulsion Jewish Ibero-Romance, as well as in the evolved forms of it spoken into the modern era in regions of the former Ottoman Empire and in parts of North Africa. The verb stood in opposition to Hispanic-origin *leer* (cf. L. *legere*), used to denote “reading” in general.

It should be noted that some of the Arabisms employed in the Morisco texts, while apparently undocumented for Christian Spanish, occur in Jewish Ibero-Romance texts pre-dating or following the expulsion. That is, paralleling the Arabic component of Morisco Ibero-Romance, the language of the Spanish Jews had a Hebrew substratum richly reflecting their group language of liturgy and high-level religious study; but they also had an Arabic component probably reflecting their earlier use of Jewish Arabic as a primary language of daily communication in Muslim Spain. This component diverged from the Arabic component of contemporaneous Christian Spaniards in that, phonologically, it often more closely resembled the Arabic sources, since, over generations, the Jews evidently retained a facility for articulating some of the distinctive phones...
of Arabic which the Christians lacked, and it included some Arabisms apparently absent from the Arabic component of Christian Spaniards.

The Jewish Arabic substratum of Jewish Ibero-Romance is illustrated by Judezmo (or Ottoman Jewish Ibero-Romance) \(\text{alxá(ð)}\) / Haketía (or Moroccan Jewish Ibero-Romance) \(\text{alḥad}\)\(^{206}\), ultimately reflecting the medieval Jewish Ibero-Arabic word \(\text{al-ḥad}\) “Sunday”, preserved during the transition to medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance, in rejection of Spanish \(\text{domingo}\), with its allusion to Jesus as “Lord” (cf. Latin \(\text{dies dominicus}\)). Echoes of the Jewish use of spoken Arabic in Muslim Spain are also heard in modern lexemes such as Haketía \(\text{adafina}\) “Sabbath lunch dish, cooked on Friday and kept warm overnight” (cf. A. \(\text{ad-daf}\)īna “hidden treasure” < \(\text{dafana}\) “hide; bury”);\(^{207}\) Judezmo \(\text{karaya}\) “Sabbath lamp” (cf. A. \(\text{q.r.'}\) “read”);\(^{208}\) Haketia and Judezmo \(\text{zi(y)ara}\) “pilgrimage to a holy site sacred to Jews, such as Jerusalem, or to the grave of a sainted Jew” (cf. A. \(\text{ziāra}\) ‘visit’),\(^{209}\) and numerous others,\(^{210}\) used to this day among the descendants of the Jews of Spain in their modern-day versions of Ibero-Romance.

As has frequently been noted, the Arabisms used in the Ibero-Romance spoken by the Jews of Spain, and the reflexes preserved among their descendants following the expulsion, were often closer in phonological form and semantic sense to their Arabic etyma than the corresponding reflexes used in the Spanish of Christians. This apparently reflects the Jews’ formerly deeper acquaintance with, and actual daily use of Arabic, than their Christian contemporaries. For example, Modern Judezmo \(\text{alxavaka}\) “hyacinth” (cf. A. \(\text{al-ḥabaqa}\)) and \(\text{alxašú}\) ‘kind of filled cake’ (cf. Ibero-Arabic \(\text{al-ḥašú}\), Cl.A. \(\text{al-ḥašw}\) ‘filled’) reflect the older pharyngeal fricative \(\text{ḥ}\) as velar \(\text{x}\),\(^{211}\) as opposed to their modern Christian Spanish cognates, \(\text{albahaca}\) [alβa'aka] and \(\text{alajú}\) [ala'xu],\(^{212}\) reflecting earlier \(\text{ḥ}\) or phonological zero.

### 3.2 Arabs of Spain

Although some of the North African Muslims who participated in the conquest of Spain from 711 were Berber speakers, they apparently also spoke and read Arabic, using both languages concurrently. Thus the linguistic situation among the Spanish Muslims was not truly parallel to that of the Spanish Jews, since at the time of their arrival in Spain they were speaking and reading varieties of their sacred language, whereas for the Jews, Hebrew was a language of religious study and liturgical service but not of speech. As was noted, this distinction was reflected in the survival in Jewish Ibero-Romance of lexical relics from their former Jewish Greek, Latin and Arabic, often corresponding to analogous
lexemes which the Spanish Arabs incorporated from Romance. For example, in their Ibero-Romance, the Arabs of Spain apparently used the same word as the Christians to express ‘reading,’ whether religious or secular: leer (e.g., the Toledo Quran in Romanized Ibero-Romance was described as intended “más a vista de los musulmes que saben leer el cristiano y no la letra de los musulmes” (“more for the Muslims who know how to read the Roman alphabet better than the Arabic alphabet”);213 the readers of such a text were referred to as “los leedores [...] de tu onrrado al koran” (“the readers [...] of your honored Quran”).214 But like the Jews, the Iberian Muslims and crypto-Muslims rejected some Hispanic words on religious grounds, instead employing Arabisms. In some instances this led them to employ the same Arabisms in their Ibero-Romance as did the Jews, e.g., alḥad rather than domingo for “Sunday” (e.g., “And he who shall pray on Saturday night, saying two salaams [...]”).215 Certain other Arabisms, apparently undocumented for Christian Spanish speech, were shared by Spanish Arabs and Jews as well; e.g., amahar “to calm, ease, etc.”216

4. Reflections of historical, regional, and social-level variation

The varieties of language used in the sacred-text translations and other religious writings produced by the Jews and Muslims of Iberia teach us not only about how these two groups expressed their unique religious and ethnic affiliations through the incorporation in their vernaculars of lexemes and syntactic structures derived from their languages of religion. These literary varieties, and others, used in additional stylistic genres they cultivated, also inform us about the nature of the Romance components which constituted the bulk of their vernaculars.

As was already noted, transference from Hebrew and Arabic led to the creation of neologisms, albeit constructed from bases and derivational affixes already existing in Ibero-Romance. On the other hand, both Jewish and Arab literary varieties of Ibero-Romance show a measure of conservatism and archaism when compared with contemporaneous texts in Christian Ibero-Romance (e.g., in the use of the apocopated present participle of the type illustrated by Jewish singular (l)yahmán instead of (l)yahmante or (l)yahmando (S. llamante, llamando) for “calls/-ing”, as the Ladino calque translation of the Hebrew msg. present participle qôre in Psalms 42: 8; and in Morisco texts by a form such as obadećeyén “obeying” [Nykl 1929: 202]). We are left with the impression that Jews and Muslims did not “keep pace” with changes occurring in the language
of their Christian neighbors. This might have been due either to lack of familiarity with the changes (perhaps implying communal isolation), or a conscious resistance to the changes, perhaps simply through linguistic conservatism, or possibly as a kind of assertion of ethnic independence and a desire to be linguistically distinct from their neighbors of other religions, particularly since all three groups seem to have been speaking varieties of essentially the same language.\textsuperscript{217} It must be remembered, of course, that our impressions of linguistic conservatism are based solely on the analysis of written texts, most of a literary nature, and such texts—especially sacred-text translations—generally tend to be conservative among all groups.

Some of the texts also have a strong regional character, apparently revealing the regional provenance or place of residence of their writers. For example, there are some pre-expulsion Jewish texts whose Ibero-Romance components clearly mark them as having been written in Portugal, Catalunya, or Aragon. But the pre-expulsion Jewish Ibero-Romance texts, and also the Arab Ibero-Romance texts of the fifteenth through seventeenth centuries, often display predominantly Castilian features, with occasional lexical or grammatical forms pointing in the direction of non-Castilian varieties, often co-occurring as variants alongside their more usual Castilian analogues. Some of these variant features—e.g., preservation of Latin word-initial $f$- rather than the evolved forms with word-initial $h$- or zero, occurring both in Jewish and Arab texts, as in fazer rather than hazer or azer “to do”—were also known as variants in Castilian. Others—e.g., vowel breaking, as in ti(y)engo rather than tengo “I have”, found in Arab Ibero-Romance texts—tend to be limited to individual regions, such as Aragon. The primarily Castilian-featured texts displaying occasional regional features would seem to indicate their writers’ sensitivity to the high status of Castilian during this period and their desire to accommodate to Castilian tendencies, but their only partial ability to do so without lapsing from time to time into their more natural regional varieties.

Furthermore, the texts may very well reflect linguistic varieties related to the social stratification existing in the Jewish and Arab communities of pre-expulsion Spain, and, in the case of the Jews, also in their post-expulsion lands of immigration. Among the Iberian Jews and their Ottoman descendants, the distinction recognized by the rabbis between learned people and the more popular strata, and very possibly linguistic distinctions between them, are reflected in Hebrew terms such as ha-hamon (חָהָהָם) or hamone ha-'am (חָהָהָם הַעַמָּה) “common people” and corresponding léšon ha-'am (לֵשֶׁון הַעַמָּה) “language of the common people”,

Iešon bene adom (עברית בן אדם) “language of [ordinary] people”, and, in Ottoman Jewish texts from the sixteenth century, Judezmo el vulgo “the common people”. For example, in various statements in his Sefer hanhagat ha-hayyim ... Režimyento dela vida (Salonika 1564), Rabbi Moše Almosnino (c. 1515-c. 1580) of Salonika alluded to distinctions between his use of the vernacular—which he called romance (f. 13a), a name often used among contemporaneous Christian speakers of Ibero-Romance—and that of “el vulgo.” Whereas Almosnino referred to a ‘violent, angry, depraved’ person as airado (S. airado), “el vulgo,” he stated, commonly called such a person kruel (S. cruel ‘cruel’).

The surviving literary texts from pre-expulsion Spain were written by members of the most educated strata of Spain’s Jews and Arabs, who, among the members of their communities, probably would have been the most familiar with the “higher” registers of Christian Spanish, and perhaps to have been influenced by those registers. Thus, their texts may well represent varieties of language significantly different from those used among members of the communities’ more popular sectors, who naturally constituted the majority—among the Jews, both before the expulsion and afterwards. That post-expulsion Judezmo developed primarily from a much more popular variety of pre-expulsion language than that represented by texts such as the ordinances of Valladolid would seem to be indicated by much of the documentation from the Ottoman regions from the sixteenth century on.


Like Judezmo (and certain regional varieties of Ibero-Romance, such as Aragonese), Morisco texts show a tendency to create the **diminutive with -iko** (cf. regional S. -ico, preferred -ito): e.g., *asíniko* “small donkey” (Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 233), *papeliko* “little paper” (Kontzi 1974, vol. 1,
307), yotiga “little drop” (Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 274), polliko [po’λiko] “chick” (Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 313). Nevertheless, unlike Judezmo, this suffix is also used after stem-final k (+ vowel): e.g., bodokiço “small ball of potter’s clay” (Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 244), ţiqiço [ţikiko] “very small” (Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 277).223

The varieties of Ibero-Romance documented for Moriscos and Spanish Jews also differ in several other significant ways. As was noted, the Morisco texts incorporate features clearly reminiscent of Aragonese: e.g., Latin consonant clusters ending in t yielding -yt- in Morisco texts versus typically Castilian -č- in Jewish texts: cf. Morisco eškučador vs. Judezmo eskučador “hearer” (Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 264; cf. Nehama 1977: 191 eskučar), Feyto vs. (f)eco “fact” (Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 269; Nehama 1977: 207), leyo vs. lečo “bed” (Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 295; Nehama 1977: 325), muyto/muncho vs. mu(ñ)čo (only) “much” (Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 303; e.g., Nehama 1977: 373 mučo). The Morisco texts also contain other forms suggesting Aragonese influence, e.g., clamor (López-Morillas 1994:159) vs. Judezmo (l)yamar > yamar “to call” (Nehama 1977: 599 y-). Morisco Ibero-Romance, spoken by Hispanized Arabs residing in Spain during the major phonological shifts which occurred during the sixteenth century—after the Jews had left with the expulsion—reflects some stages of those shifts; e.g., the devoicing of old voiced palatal sibilants, such as ź > š alluded to in mušer “woman”, ošo “eye” (López-Morillas 1994:171-172), for which post-expulsion Judezmo preserves the more archaic correlate, ź, into the modern era (cf. Nehama 1977: 375, 397).

5. Jewish and Arab Ibero-Romance in exile

With the Christian Reconquest of Spain, its Jews and Muslims were pressured to accommodate to the Christian majority in language, culture, and, in the end, religion. At various times, in different communities, Jews and Muslims adopted varieties of Ibero-Romance, as well as certain patterns of culture—clothing, culinary arts, genres of oral literature, and so on—originating among the Christians. Nevertheless, both groups, in strikingly similar if not entirely identical ways, exerted their communal independence and ethnic distinctiveness by erecting diverse sorts of linguistic and cultural boundaries between themselves, the Christians, and one another. The boundaries were greatest between the Christians, on the one hand, and the openly practicing Jews, the faithful Muslims, and those Muslims whose conversion to Catholicism was a mere sham; linguistically, the boundaries between Christians and crypto-Jews appear to have been minimal or non-existent.
With the expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492 and the expulsion of the last of the Arabs in Spain in the early seventeenth century, the distinctive varieties of Ibero-Romance which had been cultivated by Spain’s Jews and Arabs met entirely different fates. Into the modern era, in the linguistically heterogeneous Ottoman Empire and North Africa—where they were hosted, as had been the Jews of Spain, by non-Jewish rulers—the descendants of those Jews who had left Spain as openly professing members of their faith persisted in speaking and writing constantly evolving varieties of “Jewish Spanish.” Despite the objections of their rabbis, who argued that the only really “Jewish” language was Hebrew, the Ottoman Sephardim and their non-Jewish neighbors came to perceive this distinctive Jewish Ibero-Romance as a “Jewish language.” And in fact, the group language of the Ottoman Sephardim displayed many of the features of an independent language: a distinctive alphabet, orthographic rules, grammatical system and lexicon; a unique regional dialectology and social stratification; and a literature focusing for most of its history on traditional Jewish themes, of particular interest to members of the speech group and to them alone.

For the majority of Arabs forced to leave Spain, exile resulted in reincorporation in predominantly Muslim societies in North Africa and the Ottoman Empire, and assimilation to the local languages and cultures of Islam. Despite their retention of a certain nostalgia for the Muslim Spain of the Middle Ages and an identification with other descendants of Arabs who had been exiled from Spain—apparently concretized in the transmission of Hispanic surnames, and, in North Africa, in the use of more elements of Hispanic origin than found among other speakers of local Arabic—the descendants of the Arabs of Spain apparently abandoned their distinctive medieval Ibero-Romance shortly after their expulsion. Thus, throughout its existence, Arab Ibero-Romance was never perceived by its speakers as anything other than a “foreign” language, an ‘ajamiyya, and thus it never attained the status among its speakers as that enjoyed by Jewish Ibero-Romance, among whose speakers the “Jewish language” and “Judaism” itself were denoted by one and the same word—Ǧuđezmo.
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Notes

*The seeds of this paper were planted during my participation in the conference “El español de las tres religiones,” a collaboration between scholars of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and scholars from several European universities, convened at the University of Oviedo in December 2008. I take advantage of the opportunity to thank my hosts at the University of Oviedo for their gracious hospitality.

1 In Jewish comparative linguistics, the term ‘religiolect’ seems first to have been suggested by Benjamin H. Hary (1992: xviii n. 1). In 1993 Helma Pasch used ‘Religiolect’ extensively in connection with languages of religion in Africa (Pasch 1994). In 2009 Hary used religiolect to denote “a language variety with its own history and development, which is used by a religious community” (Hary 2009: 12); that is the sense in which the term is used in the present article.

2 See Hary and Wein 2013.

3 Ray 2006.

4 See for example Sola-Solé 1973; Galmés de Fuentes 1983.

5 The importance of the Ibero-Romance xarğas was first brought to the attention of scholars by S. M. Stern in 1948. Following the publication of his pioneering article in Al-Andalus (Stern 1948), an extensive and controversial literature on the subject has developed (see Hitchcock 1977; Hitchcock & López-Morillas 1996). For some recent remarks, see Armistead 2003.

6 The toponym (Al-)Andalus appears, for example, in the responsa of: Maimonides (1138-1204; e.g., “‘eṣlenu bĕ-xol ‘arṣot Andalus”’ among us in all the lands of Andalus’ [no. 218]), “‘iš ‘eḥad mĕforsam me-baxme Alandalus”’ a renowned man
among the [Jewish] scholars of Al-Andalus’ [no. 257]); Šêlomo ben Šim’on Durán (c. 1400-1467; e.g., ‘‘iḏ ębd bê-Andalus še-haya lo gannot u-xramim’’ ‘a man in Andalus who had gardens and vineyards’ [no. 412]); and Šim’on ben Semah Durán (d. 1444; cf. vol. 1, no. 72). These, and numerous other Hebrew citations adduced in the present article, were found with the help of the Bar-Ilan Responsa Project.  
7 Meyerhof 1940. However, in his explication of the Mishnah (e.g., Massexet kêla‘im, chapter one), Maimonides’ glosses for various problematic terms were in Ibero-Arabic only.

8 “Ba-zêman ha-ze še-ba-‘ăwonotenu rov banenu u-vnotenu mědabbērim ’edomī wê-‘aravī wê-yēwani u-vi-lšon ’am wa-‘am, wê-‘afi[l]u rov ha-‘anašim ’enam mevinim lê-dabber yēhudīt” (Kimhi, Têšuvot hašme Provinciya, no. 7).

9 On the use of Arabic as the primary spoken as well as a major written language of the Jews in Muslim Spain see Dan 1992: 115; Decter 2007a, 2007b.

10 See for example the documents assembled, romanized and analyzed linguistically by Minervini (1992).

11 For example, references to the use of Ibero-Romance translations of the Scroll of Esther are found in the rabbinical responsa of Nahmanides (1194-1270) and other Iberian rabbis (Bunis 2004: 126-135).

12 This argument was advanced recently in Assis 2012.

13 On contemporaneous Jewish attitudes towards Arab culture see Alfonso 2008.

14 That there were such words, usually of Hebrew origin, which some conversos dared to use is alluded to in Christian testimony in documents from the Holy Inquisition attesting to their use by conversos accused of secret judaizing. For some of the distinctive words the use of which was attributed in Inquisition testimony to conversos secretly faithful to Judaism, see among others Beinart 1981; Marín Padilla 1988: 123-125; Shepard 1982; Gitlitz 1992: 3; Bunis, 2013c. Furthermore, in the Libro llamado el Alboraique, it is said of those who are referred to by the term alboraique (denoting a false convert to Catholicism) that they are known to “meldar como judíos” ‘pray/study like Jews’ (l. 393) and call their God “Adonay” (e.g., Gitlitz 1992: 11). It is also stated that, when encountering a convert, Spanish Jews asked him if he was an anūs [an apostate by force] or a mesumad [convert by choice]: “Y si alguno deste linage llega algún lugar a donde hay aquesta generación, pregúntanle: ¿eres anūs, y dest christianos, o mesumad, christianos por la voluntad: Y si responde, christianos soy, anūs soy, danle dádivas y hónrranle, y si dice mesumad, no le hablan más” (Gitlitz 1992: 4; cf. Heb. ‘anūs, mēšumad).

15 The expression is first documented in the thirteenth-century Crónica General: “un moro tan ladino que semejava christiano” (a Moor so Hispanized that he appeared to be a Christian), cf. Corominas 1984: vol. III, 554.

16 A romanization was attempted by Fernández y González (1885-86). For a more successful romanization and some linguistic analysis, see Minervini 1992; for a photographic reproduction, see Moreno Koch 1978.

17 Many are presented in Minervini 1992.

18 For some analysis see López-Morillas 1990.

19 See González Llubera 1947.
See Morrás & Hamilton 2000.


23 Iqti’â as-Sirât al-Mustaqqîm (2/207)

http://islamicweb.com/resources/arabic_status.htm (last access 20 December 2013).

24 Cited by Suleiman 2004: 156.

25 The ‘accursedness’ of the Christians, as well as the Jews, is stated in the Qur’an: e.g., “Wasqâlati alyahûdu ‘uzayrun ibnu Allâhi wasqâlati annâgarâl almasedûg ibnu Allâhi thâlika qawluhum bi-afwâhîhîm yu’dhi-qawla allâhi kalfürî min qablu qînâlahummu Allâhu annâ yûfâkînu” (And the Jews say: ‘Uzair (Ezra) is the son of Allah, and the Christians say: Messiah is the son of Allah. That is a saying from their mouths. They imitate the saying of the disbelievers of old. Allah’s Curse be on them, how they are deluded away from the truth!) (Quran 9:30; see also 2:65 and 5:60).


27 Conversely, among Spanish Christians the popular attitude toward Arabic was generally negative as well. Spanish algarabía (from Arabic al-’arabîyya “Arabism”), in addition to denoting “Arabic”, colloquially means “gibberish; gabble, din, hullabaloo, etc.; poorly pronounced language” (Smith c. 1971: 24; DRAE, s. algarabía [accessed 22 December 2013]). Spanish alâr(a)be (from Arabic al-’arab “Arab”), “Arabic”, is used figuratively in the sense of “an uneducated, unmannerly or brutal man” (DRAE, s. alarbe [accessed 22 December 2013]), as in the idiom portarse como un alarbe “to behave badly”, while the Romance derivative arâbigo (cf. L. arabîcum), “Arabic”, figuratively denotes “gibberish” or “something difficult to understand” in expressions such as estar una cosa en arábigo or hablar en arábigo (Smith c. 1971: 44; DRAE, s. arâbigo [last access 22 December 2013]).


Aljamiá is first documented in a Spanish text in Poema de Alfonso XI, from around 1350 (Corominas, DCHEH, vol. 1, p. 177).

Later, incongruously, in Spanish the term also came to denote Jewish Ibero-Romance as written in the Hebrew alphabet (DRAE, s. aljamiá [last access 22 December 2013]).

DRAE, s. aljamiado (last access 22 December 2013).

Note the following abbreviations of language names: A. = Arabic, G. = Greek, H. = Hebrew, Hisp.-A. = Hispano-Arabic, L. = Latin, M.S. = Modern Spanish, S. = Spanish, OS. = Old Spanish, St.S. = Standard Modern Spanish.


For example, of the practical necessity he felt to translate a part of Yosef Karo’s Sûlûh ‘arux into ‘Ladino,’ Me’ir [Benveniste] (Me’ir 1568: f. 2a) wrote: “Haya yoter tov ‘im hayut ha-kol yode’im ha-lašon lešonenu ha-qadosh ... še-lo hayinu

Hebrew as a revered, holy language see Halkin 1963, esp. 324–325.
ṣĕrixim lĕhoši ha-tora bê-lašon zar” (It would be better if everyone knew our language, the Holy Tongue, ... so that we would not need to publish the Torah in a foreign language).

37 Genesis Rabba, in Bialik & Ravnitzky 1995: 374. The fact that, etymologically, the two words derived from two different roots was perhaps unknown to, or at least disregarded by, the commentators—as was the historical connection between the words *man* and *woman* in English.
38 Cf. Tanhumah, Noah, sec. 22, in Bialik & Ravnitzky 1995: 376; Talmud Yerushalmi, Megilla, chap. 1, halacha 9, f. 10a; Rashi on Genesis 11:1.
40 Talmud Bavli, Hagiga, 16a.
42 Talmud Bavli, Berachot, 13a, Sanhedrin, 21b.
45 Talmud Yerushalmi, Shabbat, chap. 1, halacha 3, f. 9a.
47 On the Hebraisms in Jewish languages see, for example, Morag 1992.
48 Abraham Ibn ‘Ezra, long commentary on Exodus 2:19. Similar contrasts were made by other rabbis of Spain, such as Isaac Abravanel (1437-1508), who, for example, compared poetry written *bi-lšonenu ha-mêquddâs* “in our sanctified language” with that written by *ha-yêšmê’elim bi-lšonam* “the Ishmaelites [i.e., Arabs] in their language” (commentary on Exodus, chapter 15).
49 For example, the Ottoman rabbi Eliyyahu ben Ḥayyim (c. 1530-1610) wrote with regard to the masculine personal name Bayram, of Ottoman Turkish origin, adopted by the Jews of the Ottoman Empire: “Ḥa-šem ha-ze ‘ešlenu kinnuy bê-‘alma laqâḏ mi-lêšon Yišmâ’el u-l-fi ze ... yîxtêvu kê-fi kêtivat ha-Yîšmê’elim wê-im nîxtav bi-lšonam bihi ‘alef raûy lê-xotvo” (This name is among us simply a name taken from the language of Ishmael [here, Turkish] and as such ... they should write it according to [its spelling in] the writing of the Ishmaelites, and if it is written in their language without an ‘alef [after the bet, as it sometimes is in Ottoman Turkish, i.e., ṣılm], it should be written [that way, i.e., נלע, in our script]) (Eliyyahu ben Ḥayyim [=Ra’anah, c. 1530-1610], Responsa, no. 35). The passage was later reproduced and discussed in numerous responsa collections by Sephardic rabbis of the Ottoman Empire (e.g., Ha-Levi 1697, *Even ha-‘ezer*, no. 45). In the same context, Azulay (1886, part 1, no. 38) used the term *kêtav Yišmê’elim*.
50 As illustrated in a rabbinical work by a rabbi from Baghdad at the turn of the twentieth century, even in the modern era, Jews in Arab lands recognized an opposition between *kêtiva šelanu* “our writing” (i.e., Hebrew letters) and *kêtiva sel Yišmâ’el* “writing of the Ishmaelites” (i.e., the Arabic alphabet) (cf. Ḥayyim 1901, part 2, *Orah Ḥayyim*, no. 22).
On the decline of Hebrew as the everyday language of the Jews see, for example, Kutscher 1982; Sáenz-Badillos 1996.

On the use of exonyms in various cultures see Matisoff 1986; Jordan et al. 2007.


E.g., Megilla 18a.

The use of the phrase lĕšon lo’ez is illustrated in Ibn ‘Ezra’s discussion of linguistic expressions of honor, cited above.

For an inventory, see Catane 1988.

E.g., “wĕ-šibbolet šu’al, še-hu avena bĕ-lə’az” and [H.] šibbolet šu’al [‘oats’], which is avena in La’az [cf. S. avena] (David ben Yosef ben David Abudarham of Sevilla [Flourished c. 1340], Sefer ‘Abudarham, s. seder ha-haggada u-ferušah); “karkom niqra bi-lion ‘Arav za’farán” “turmeric is called in the language of Arabia za’farán and in La’az safrán [cf. S. azafrán]’ (David ben Yosef ben David Abudarham of Sevilla [flourished c. 1340], Sefer ‘Abudarham, s. seder ha-haggada u-ferušah).

The use of the phrase lĕšon lo’ez is illustrated in Ibn ‘Ezra’s discussion of linguistic expressions of honor, cited above.


E.g., Megilla 18a.

The use of the phrase lĕšon lo’ez is illustrated in Ibn ‘Ezra’s discussion of linguistic expressions of honor, cited above.

For an inventory, see Catane 1988.
that our holy letters are not arbitrarily agreed upon like the letters of the Gentiles, which are ad hoc signs, but are independently sacred, created from on high” (Horowitz, Masseket pēšaḥim [=a section of Horowitz 1649], maṣṣa ‘āśira, sermon 3 [1]).

70 E.g., “Wē-rauy lē-hizzaher harhe bē-xol ‘otiyot ha-qodeš še-lo yavo’u li-yde bizzayon … wē-‘a[yyen] Rema bē-Yore de’a si[man]’ 284 … u-va-Bet Yosef si[man]’ 283 bē-šēm ha-Rambam bi-Tšuva u-va-Radbaz ḥe[leq] da[let] si[man]” 45 še-yeš bi-xtav ‘āšurit qēduša” “And it is worth taking great care with all the letters of holiness that they not be disgraced… and see Rema [=Moses Isserles], Yore de’a, section 284 … and [Yosef Karo (b. Toledo 1488)], Bet Yosef [Venice, 1550-59], section 283, citing Maimonides [b. Cordoba 1135], Laws of Repentance, and [David] Ibn Zimra [b. Spain c. 1479], [Responsa], vol. 4, no. 45, [stating] that there is sanctity to the Square Hebrew letters” (Tanenboim, vol. 2, no. 83);

71 E.g., “Wĕ-hu lĕ-hade ba-Roqea ḥa[s]man’ 296, še-mošivin ha-tinoqot li-lmod bĕ-šavu’ot wĕ-xu[le]ʾ še-m[eh]an xin ‘oto lĕ-‘otiyyot ha-qodeš wĕ-xu[le]ʾ wĕ-ḥa[śa][x] ’meviʾin beša mēvuššelet u-qlufa ha-qĕlippa mi-menna wĕ-xatuv ‘aleha … u-ma’axilin la-naʾar ha-ṭov li-ftiḥat ha-lev…” “And it is stated in Ha-roqea [by Elʿazar of Worms, Fano 1505], section 296, that they sit the children down to study [Torah] on Shavuot, etc., during which they instruct him in the letters of holiness, etc., and afterwards they bring a hardboiled egg from which the shell has been removed and it is written on it [in Hebrew letters] … and they feed the boy the cake and the egg because it is good for the opening of the heart [to study]” (Halberstam 1996-2004, ’Oraḥ ḥayyim, no. 227).

72 For midrashim involving the letters of the Hebrew alphabet see Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Pesah 87b, Avodah Zarah 18a; and recent treatments of the Hebrew alphabet from a mystical perspective such as Munk 1983; Kushner 1990; Harrington 2001, esp. pp. 133-134.

73 See also Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Berachot 55c; Zohar 1:3-2:152. 

74 E.g., Mēšnat sofērīm, constituting section 36 of Kagan 1884.

75 See for example Welch 1979; Welch & Welch 1982.

76 E.g., “Ha-ʾišṣa šaxēra šalāḥ goy ʾēḥad … wē-natēna kētav nosrī bē-yado šeyēviʾen le-yad ʾiṣḥah mē-hēmmad” “The [Jewish] woman hired a non-Jewish agent … and gave him a document written in Christian script, for him to bring to her apostate husband’ (Naḥmanides, Responsa, no. 3); “Wē-ha-kētav bi-xtav nosrī wē-ha-lašon lēon portugez” “And the script [in the document] was Christian script, and the language, the Portuguese language’ (Ibn Zimra, Responsa, vol. 6, no. 2,228 [no. 2,228]). The term continued to be used after the expulsion by descendants of the Spanish Jews in Muslim lands: e.g., “Wē-nimṣa katuv bi-šṭar nēduña nosrī a[l] y[de] sofer públiko…” ‘Āniʾ omer ki ha-kotev bi-xtav nosrī u-vi-lšono ʾeno mēxawwen li-xtov ʾela kē-fi nimusehem ha-nahug bē-xol šiře ha-
kētubbot šel ha-yēhudim ha-nīxtavot ‘al yadon” “And it was found written in a
Christian dowry contract by a [Christian] public scribe… I say that one who writes
in the Christian script and in its language does not mean to write anything except
according to the custom observed in all the Jewish marriage certificates written by
them” (Karo, Responsa Bet Yosef, Dine kētubbot, section 10; see also Moše ben
Yosef Mitrani, Responsa, vol. 1, no. 309); “Wē-halax lē-[rka’ot] še[ll] g[oyim]”
wē-hoṣi kētavam wē-’amar še-hem kētav yad ha-’arelim … wē-hevi šēne yēhudim
ha-yodē’im l-qrot kētav noṣrī wē-her’u ha-kētavim li-īne ha-šofeṭ wē-he-’idu ‘al
lāḥimat yad ha-’arelim makkirim lāḥimatam” “And he [the litigant] went to the
non-Jewish court and took out their written document and said they were the
handwriting of the non-Jews … and he brought two Jews who know how to read
the Christian script and they showed the writing to the judge and testified to the
signatures of the non-Jews, because they know their signatures” (Ha-Levi 1697,
Ḥošen mišpāṭ, no. 8); “Wē-hoṣi … kētav … wē-hu kētav noṣrī wē-lašon
talyano u-v-xen šalahu bē’ad soḥārim yēhudim lo’āzim bē’im ba-kētav u-v-lašon
li-hyot niqra kētav ze lē-fanenu” “And he took out … a written document …
and it was written in Christian script in the Italian language and therefore we sent
for Jewish merchants [from Romance-speaking Western Europe] who are familiar
with the script and language in order for them to read the writing in front of us”
(Ha-Levi 1697, Ḥošen mišpāṭ, no. 45). Dani’e1 Ha-Kohen Perahya (1568: 1a)
described his having adapted into the Ibero-Jewish vernacular a work on the
calendar originally written in Spanish as its being a transformation “mi-kētiva
noṣrīt lē-’ivrit, bē-lašon sēfaradi” “from Christian writing into Hebrew, in the
Sephardic/Spanish language”. 78 For instance, in the preface to his Hebrew-letter Judezmo adaption of Yosef
Karo’s halakhic compendium Šulḥan ‘arux, Me’ir [Benveniste] warned the readers
of his Šulḥan ha-panim (1568: 1b): “ke no aya alguno ke lo treslaðe en letra de
goyim” “let there be no one who translates it into the letters of Gentiles”.
79 E.g., “Otiyyot šel goyim ‘en niqno[t]’ bi-xtiva” “The letters of Gentiles are
not acceptable [in Jewish legal documents]” (Ha-Levi 1716-17: Ḥošen mišpāṭ, rule
5, sec. 16).
80 E.g., “En lē-halleq ben ’otiyyot dē-Yisra’el lē-’otiyyot dē-goy” “One should not
distinguish between the letters of Israel and the letters of Gentiles [when
considering legal documents having a bearing on Jews]” (Ha-Levi 1716-17: Ḥošen
mišpāṭ, rule 5, sec. 16).
84 On the history of Judezmo orthography in its historical development see Bunis
85 For an attempted reconstruction of the Whole Hebrew-Aramaic phonological
tradition of Jewish Ibero-Romance speakers in medieval Spain, see Bunis 2013a.
86 The Jewish Ibero-Romance examples in this section are taken from the
rabbinical ordinances of Valladolid, 1432 as presented in Koch 1978; Minervini
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E.g., Old Spanish <deuer> in Alfonso X, General Estoria, segunda parte, c. 1275 (Sánchez-Prieto Borja 2003: 83v), alternating with more common <deber> and <dever>, <salvo> alternating with <salbo> (for examples see CORDE).

Stern 1949: 312-313.


On the Jewish languages of medieval Europe see Bunis: forthcoming a.

In post-expulsion Judezmo, the Hebrew-origin diacritic also came to be used more regularly, throughout the Judezmo speech region, with the letters bet (ב), dalet (ד), zayin (ז) to denote v, ð, and z, respectively, and, to a more limited extent geographically and with respect to certain printing houses, with kaf (כ), qof (ף), shin (ש) and taw (ת), to denote x, palatalized k’, š, and ð, respectively. For further details and examples see Bunis 2005, passim.

Baer 1936: 287, 288. This would seem to indicate the Jewish pronunciation rather than being a mere imitation of Christian Roman-letter orthography since, in the latter, one also finds the variant spellings bez (from 1100; cf. St.S. vez) and marabedi (from 1226; cf. St.S. maravedí) (CORDE).


Jews, who were outstanding in Spain as translators into Spanish of texts composed in diverse languages, were probably more familiar with foreign alphabets, including Latin, Arabic, and Greek, than the Iberian Arab Muslims, among whom a familiarity with the Hebrew alphabet, at any rate, and to a considerable extent also the Latin and Greek alphabets, must have been rare or non-existent. A reflection of the familiarity of some Jews in pre-expulsion Iberia with Spanish romanization is seen in the surviving Hebrew-letter transcriptions of texts originally composed in Spanish, such as Danza general de la muerte (Morrás & Hamilton 2000; Hamilton, forthcoming). As noted, following 1492, the linguistically Hispanized Moriscos became increasingly familiar with Spanish Romanized orthography, at the expense of their knowledge of the Arabic alphabet and spelling.

Nevertheless, because of the incorporation into medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance of lexemes from Hebrew-Aramaic as well as Arabic, in which g as well as ð, and d as well as ð could occur intervocally, without predictability based on phonological environment, these must in fact be considered four separate phonemes in Old Judezmo, as in Modern Judezmo. But, as was true among Judezmo speakers into the modern era, the writers of Old Jewish Ibero-Romance distinguished between the Hebrew-Aramaic (and to an extent, the Arabic) components in their language, which generally received only consonantal representation orthographically, and the Romance component, both the consonants and vowels of which received full graphemic representation in the orthography.

Among the descendants of the Jews who left Spain with the expulsion, the group adoption of romanization for transcribing Ibero-Romance did not occur until the late nineteenth century, when Jewish children in the Ottoman Empire and North
Africa began to be educated in western European languages and became more familiar with the Roman alphabet than with Hebrew letters.

99 The Morisco examples offered here are from a text by the ‘mancebo de Árêvalo,’ from around the 16th century http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Aljamiado.png, last access 26 December 2013.

100 Galmês de Fuentes 1970: 160.


103 Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 238 (no Arabic-letter spelling is provided there).

104 Cf. also báziar “to empty” (Nykl 1929: 189; St.S. vaciar), benino “poison” (Nykl 1929: 189; St.S. venino).

105 Speakers of Haketía in northern Morocco, on the other hand, became influenced by the phonology of modern Spanish from at least the late 18th century, and under that influence their language exhibits a similar collapse between older /b/ and /v/, denoted as <egen>, as opposed to modern Ottoman Judezmo <egen> for /b/ vs. <egen> for /v/. On the reintroduction of the /b/ vs. /v/ opposition in a Jerusalem Judezmo adaptation of an early 19th-century Haketía work published in Livorno, see Bunis 2012.


107 Cf. also aientarse “sit down” (Nykl 1929: 188; St.S. sentarse).


109 Cf. also Arab Ibero-Romance forms such as kereer and kereser, corresponding to Christian Spanish creer “to believe” and crecer “to grow” (Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 290-291).


111 Cf. Koch 1978; Minervini 1992: 193. It is unclear whether the Hebrew letter he (?) was realized as h or received zero realization among the Jewish Iber-Romance speakers of medieval Spain. Following the expulsion, the phonological value of he among the Sephardim of the Ottoman Empire was zero. In the present article it is transcribed as h, but this may not be an accurate reflection of its true pre-expulsion value.

112 The examples derive from the Valladolid taqkanot of 1432 (Minervini 1992). Many of the Hebrew-Aramaic elements documented for medieval Jewish Ibero-Romance had prototypes in earlier Jewish Aramaic and Arabic texts (on Hebrew elements in medieval Jewish Arabic see Blau 1999:133-166) and perhaps may be best understood as preservations from these pre-languages.

113 Garbell 1954: 662.

114 The Hebrew-origin verb malsinar, and its derivatives malsinación, malsinería and malsindh, also appear in the Ibero-Romance of Muslims, as well as Christians. For an illustration of the use of malsinar in the language of the Moriscos, see Fuerch 1995: 113.

The Roman-letter lexemes <samases>, <hazans>, <midrases>, <malsinar>, <enheremar> appear in a Roman-letter legal document from 1413 originating in the Jewish community of Tudela, Navarre (cf. Yanguas 1843: 166-173; Kayserling 1861: 206-208; Fernández y González 1886:15-21). The original text published by Yanguas was housed at the time in the Archivo de Comptos, P. S. leg. 2, carp. 7. Based on the appearance of these Jewish lexemes, Fernández y González conjectured that the Roman-letter text was a translation of a Hebrew text, or a transcription of a Hebrew-letter Jewish Ibero-Romance text. The lexeme <quiñán>, and plural <quiñanes>, appear in a Roman-letter text from Navarre (Kayserling 1861:211, after Zuaznavar 1829, vol. 3, 1, 342ff.). The variant forms appearing in the research literature illustrate the errors which often creep in during copying and re-publication: for example, Fernández y González offers erroneous plural “samates,” “midrasas.”

Lazar 1990: 141 (in a Latin-letter text estimated to be from the mid-fifteenth century); Me’ir 1568: 65a (in a Hebrew-letter text).

In Roman letters: Lazar 1990: xviii (perhaps mid-fifteenth century); Lazar 1995a: fol. II, 130r (from 1552); in Hebrew letters: Formón c.1568: 23b.

Hešeq Šelomo 1588: 41b.

Me’ir 1568: 95a.

Hešeq Šelomo 1588: 64b, 98a.

Lazar 1995a: f. II, 64v (from 1552).

Formón c.1568: 88a.


For recent discussion of Max Weinreich’s terms, Whole and Merged Hebrew, see Bunis 2013b.

For discussion relating to the phonological features of the Hebrew-Aramaic component in Jewish Ibero-Romance before and after the expulsion see Crews 1935; Garbell 1954; Bunis 1981; Bunis 1997; Dodi 2002.

For examples, all of them direct quotations, see López-Morillas 2011: 229, 332, 441, 557—and these, out of some 415 pages of Ibero-Romance text.


On medieval Berber orthography in the Arabic alphabet, see Van den Boogert 2001, esp. 9-12, 15, 19-20 (with references to the incorporation of Arabisms in pharmacological texts written mostly in Muslim Spain). For a study of Berber-
Arabic language contacts in the Sahara and Arabic borrowings in modern Berber, see Souag 2010.


Interestingly, Rabbi Yom Ṭov Ṣahalon of seventeenth-century Eretz Yisrael objected to the term el Dyo, popularly used among the Jews of Spain and their descendants to denote "God". Although it is distinct from Castilian Dios, which was perhaps one of the motivations for its rise and popularity among the Sephardim, Ṣahalon seems to have been unaware of the form used among Christians, naively suggesting that the Christians used el Dyo, composed of two words, as an allusion to what he perceived as their belief in a dual Godhead. He argued that punctilious Jews did not use el Dyo but el Šem yiðbarax (cf. H. šem yitbarax 'the Name Blessed be He') (Ṣahalon, New responsa, no. 92):

ולומ שמלת אל דין חוה טבס בלשון תועים וויאס במזכירים אינן לעולם והמדקדקים לומש אלום מכיכים אל דין שמס חוה לא יש יברך.


136 Nehama 1977:24, 32; Schauffler 1855:52, s. b̄-ś̄-r.

140 Cf. Schauffler 1855:52 albrisyahor, s. bēšora.

141 As in the case of certain other Arabisms of medieval origin in Jewish Ibero-Romance, this Perso-Arabism again entered the language of the Sephardim in the Ottoman Empire, as a borrowing from its Turkish reflex (cf. Tk. cevher, cevahir), taking forms such as ǧevaer, gevaer and gaever; e.g., “El mansevo el xaxam ... asemēz a un ǧevaer grande i presiaõo” “The wise young man ... resembles a large and precious jewel” (Ben ‘Avraham 1765: 34a).


143 Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 72.

144 Alternate plurals of Hebraisms with Hispanic plural markers (e.g., beraxā > pl. beraxās “blessings”) and tautological plurals exhibiting plural morphemes both of Hebrew and Hispanic origin (e.g., beraxodes ‘blessings’, cf. H. -əb š- + S. -es) became much more common in post-expulsion Judezmo texts in the Hebrew alphabet (Bunis 1985).

145 In this respect the Arab Ibero-Romance texts bear a closer resemblance to Latin-letter texts in somewhat judaized Spanish and Portuguese composed by former conversos who had returned to Judaism after linguistic assimilation to their Christian surroundings. Such texts generally display more plural forms of Hebraisms with Hispanic-origin -(e)s; for examples, see Wexler 1982.

146 Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 75; cf. also; Nykl 1929:195.
Kontzi 1974, vol. 1, 75. Such Arab Ibero-Romance fusion verbs derived from
Arabic verbal stems of the type C(C)aC- and the Hispanic verbalizing suffix -ar
parallel Jewish Ibero-Romance verbs of the type baškar “to inspect” (cf. H. b-d-q
š-š-š) and darsar “to lecture” (cf. H. d-r-š š-š-š), and Christian Ibero-Romance
verbs of the type aškar “to blame” (cf. A. tašakka ‘to complain, blame’), zafar
“to free” (cf. A. azāhā “to remove”) and sajelar ‘remove impurities from pottery
material’ (cf. Hisp.-A. sahhāl “to purify” < A. sahhalā ‘to facilitate’). The
analogous forms in the three varieties of Ibero-Romance would seem to argue
against Aslanov’s theory (Aslanov 2010:32) that the Jewish verbs derive from an
infinitive construct stem (e.g., bodq-), irregularly realized with a rather than o (i.e.,
bodq-), unique to Judezmo.

159 Kontzi 1974: vol. 1, 280.
160 Kontzi 1974: vol. 1, 80.
163 E.g., Nehama 1977: 33.
165 Chejne 1983: 188.
166 Kontzi 1974: vol. 1, 188.
169 Kontzi 1974: vol. 1, 310; Nehama 1977: 415, and paskwar translating la-hog in
Zachariah 14:18. In sixteenth-century Hispanized or “elitist”, dejudaized Judezmo,
paskwar could also denote a Muslim holiday, e.g., “La paskwa de los turkos, ke
lyaman bairam, ... es delyos muy sublima do” “The holiday of the Turks/Muslims,
which they call bayram, ... is among them sublime” (Romeu Ferré 1998:107).
170 Kontzi 1974: vol. 1, 331.
171 Kontzi 1974: vol. 1, 76.
173 Nykl 1929: 184.
175 Kontzi 1974: vol. 1, 76-81.
177 Kontzi 1974: vol. 1, 279.
178 Nykl 1929:186.
Jewish and Arab Medieval Ibero-Romance

179 Talmud Bavli, Massekhet Berakhot 8b.
180 I wish to thank Ofra Tirosh-Becker for informing me of this.
181 For further details see Bunis 2004.
182 לע איןואם, התרגום ואחד מקרא שנים בשבט שנות מקרא אוד ובראש סדר קלאי הוא. Sefer ha-yir’a was first published as an appendix to Sefer halakhot ‘olam, by Yeshu’a ben Yosef Ha-Lewi (1490; Steinschneider 1852-60: no. 5859). In the edition published in Amsterdam by Menasseh Ben Israel in 1627, the quoted citation appears on f. 47a. See the relevant entry in the Bibliography of the Hebrew Book for bibliographical details and references to the research literature dealing with the parts of the work and their possible authors.
183 The argument against the la’az text focused on possible inaccuracies of translation (for discussion, see Bunis 2004).
184 For a summary of the features characterizing the Ladino Bible translation language, see Bunis 1996: 347-352 and accompanying bibliography.
185 Cf. Sachs 1936.
186 For references to the use of these Hebraisms in Jewish Ladino Bible-translation texts, see Bunis 1999.
187 On the oral sacred-text translation tradition among Judezmo speakers see Bunis 1996.
188 For discussion of the editions see, among others, Romero 1992.
189 The term šārḥ (שָׁרֵח) was widely used among speakers of Judeo-Arabic to denote the literal Judeo-Arabic translation of Jewish sacred texts, often transmitted orally. The term was also known, especially with reference to the Judeo-Arabic Bible translation of Sa’adya Ga’on (b. Egypt 882/892, d. Baghdad 942), among Judezmo speakers residing in lands under Arab domination. For example, the term appears in the responsa of rabbis Yom Tov Ṣahalon (Safed, 1559-c. 1620; 1980: no. 206) and Ḥayyim Yosef David Azulay (Jerusalem, 1724-1806; 1792, vol. 1, no. 38; 1814, Yore de’a, no. 199).
190 Tufal 1993: 5. On problems of Qur’an translation and interpretation according to Islamic authorities, see for example Tibawi 1962; Fatani 2006; Wilson 2009. For Quran interpretations in diverse languages, see http://www.altafsir.com.
192 The intermediate linguistic role played among the Sephardim by Aramaic as an earlier Diaspora language which continued to survive as a minor liturgical language (e.g., in the recitation of the qaddiš or memorial prayer), as well as the language of major canonical works such as the Babylonian Talmud and the kabbalistic Zohar, had no parallel among the Spanish Arabs.
195 Al-Hujailan, Yāsīfsūra, 191-201; López-Morillas 2011: 285-294 (for linguistic notes on the manuscript: 83-100). It is interesting to note that the Mancebo de Arévalo reveals some familiarity with “el tafsir ebraico” (López-Morillas 1982: 47).
The text used is the Muslim Spanish translation offered in http://www.quran4theworld.com/translations/Spanish/12.HTM

It is interesting to note that, although the Hebrew verb hištaḥawa 'to prostrate oneself' occurs in the Biblical text, and is also used to denote the prostration performed to this day in part of the high holiday prayer service, neither a synthetic verbal form of the Hebrew root, nor its deverbal noun, hišṭahavaya—which is documented in modern Judezmo as an independent noun and also as a component in the analytic verbs *(f)azer and ečarse (išta[xa])vayá ‘to prostrate oneself* (Bunis 1993, no. 1227)—was incorporated into the Ladino translation text. This again testifies to the translators’ hesitation to use Hebraisms in the traditional Ladino translation texts.

Bunis 1993, no. 2789.


Harvey 1984: 345.


While apparently used into the modern era in Ḥaketía, *leer* was supplanted by *meldar* ‘read (in all senses)’ in the Ottoman regions in the 18th century. For examples of other preservations from Jewish Greek-Latin in Ibero-Romance see Blondheim 1925; Wexler 1988.

For an example of pre-expulsion use, see Lazar 1995b: 208; for post-expulsion survival see Nehama 1977: 128 for Ottoman Judezmo; Benoliel 1977:171 for North African Ḥaketía.

Fray Luis, an apostate from Judaism, was accused by the Inquisition “de comer los sábados carne degollada y guisada por judíos en la tarde del viernes, de facer su adofaina, como la hacían los judíos” (Amador de los Ríos 1875-76: 842). *Adofina* continued to survive in Moroccan Ḥaketía, just as a cognate term is used among North African speakers of Judeo-Arabic. On the use of the verb *d.f.n* in the sense of ‘to bury’ in Rabbi Rĕfa’el Berdugo’s *šarḥ* or traditional calque translation of the Bible, see Bar-Asher 2001, vol. 3, 314. For a folk etymology of *adofina* see Benoliel 1977:187. In the Ottoman Empire, the same concept was denoted instead by *xamín*, documented for example in the Judezmo adaptation of the *Šulḥan ‘arux* by Me’ir [Benveniste], entitled *Šulḥan ha-panim* (Salonika 1568: 48b; cf. Mishnaic Hebrew/Aramaic חמין [ḥammīn] ‘warm [water, etc.’).

E.g., “Mošiko … arrivó detrás de todos, kon una karraya en la mano i una mortaža debašo el laðo” ‘Mošiko … arrived after everyone, with a lamp in his hand and a shroud under his arm’ (*El Kirbač* 3:41 [Salonika 1912], 2); “Ke veas a Sará la Xaxa azendo mečas para las karayas del ketóret asamim” ‘You should see Clumsy Sará making wicks for the lamps in the synagogue’ (*El Rizón* 2:49 [Salonika 1928], 2). Benvenisti (1984:106) mentions the karaya del tamid ‘eternal lamp (before the Torah ark in the synagogue’. Also derived from Arabic *q.r.*, the Ḥaketía verb *qarear* denotes ‘to read, pray’ (Benoliel 1977: 241). Note <खर्जुङ्गः> in the sense of ‘(sacred) study’ in Berdugo, Job 30:4 (Bar-Asher 2001, vol. 3, 508).
For Ḥaketía, see Benoliel 1977: 263; for Judezmo, Nehama 1977: 608. With respect to pilgrimages to sacred grave sites in Erets Yisrael, the word ziara appears in Hebrew contexts in the responsa of Sephardic rabbis in the Ottoman Empire such as Moshe Mitrani (Hamabbiṭ, 1500-1580), 2:2, no. 220, from 1579: ‘בהיותו ‘חייפה של ’הזיארמן וחזר, (Yaaqov Berav (c. 1474-1546), 1663, no. 22: ‘באני הייתי ’לירושלם לזיארה לבדי ’באנדרנופה שהיא ’מביתי), and numerous others. It is also widely documented in Judezmo sources; e.g., ‘’ǧente de Estanbol ke vinyeron para zyara a Sefaθ’ ‘people from Istanbul who came on pilgrimage to Safed’ (Šivhe ha-’Ari, Constantinople 1766, 9b).


211 Alxavaka (spelled א’ אלחבק) appears in Yosef Karo’s Bet Yosef, ‘Orah hayim, hilxot birkat ha-perot, sec. 225; see also Nehama 1977: 28; Benoliel 171 (alhavaka). The baked good rosquilas de alxašú (‘pockets filled with honey and almonds,’ cf. S. rosquillas de alajú) are mentioned in Yosef Karo’s Hebrew-language Bet Yosef, ‘Orah hayim, hilxot bēṣi’at ha-pat, sē’uda u-virkat ha-mazon, sec. 168), and in the Hebrew-language responsa of Yosef Mitrani (vol. 2, Yore de’a, no. 18), as well as in numerous Judezmo works; see also Nehama 1977: 28.

212 For further discussion of Arabisms in this context see Bunis 1996.


214 Anonymous text, transcribed from the Arabic alphabet in Fuerch 1995: 151v.


216 Nehama 1977: 33; on this and related words in the language of Jews and Moriscos see Harvey 1960.

217 For examples of apparently conscious Jewish Arabic linguistic conservatism in Baghdad in the face of linguistic transitions among the Muslims of the city under the influence of Bedouin immigrants, see Blanc 1964.

218 E.g., Karo, Bet Yosef, Yore de’a, no. 217.

219 For references, see Bunis 2004.

220 “El vulgo ... komummente lyaman kruel a el muy airado” (ibid., f. 88b).

221 On Aragonisms in Morisco Ibero-Romance see Galmés de Fuentes 1991: 84-88; on Judezmo elements having parallels in Aragonese and Portuguese see Quintana 2009.

222 On archaisms in Morisco texts see Galmés de Fuentes 1991: 80-84.

223 On diminuitive formation in Judezmo see Bunis 2003.