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This dissertation explores the process undertaken by medieval writers to produce Portuguese-language texts using the letters of the Hebrew alphabet. Through detailed philological analyses of five Judeo-Portuguese texts, I examine the strategies by which Hebrew script is adapted to represent medieval Portuguese in the context of other Roman-letter and Hebrew-language writing. I focus on the writing system in order to challenge the conception of such texts as marked or marginal, a view that misleadingly equates language and script. I argue that the adaptation of Hebrew script for medieval Portuguese is neither derivative of Roman-letter writing nor entirely dependent upon the conventions of written Hebrew. Nor is it an adaptation performed anew by each writer and influenced primarily by spoken language. The perspective I adopt thereby rejects the premise that the patterns manifested in this unconventional orthography are ad hoc creations by its writers, that it requires extra effort from its readers, or that it is less "native" than the dominant, more conventionalized, Roman-based adaptation that normally bears the title "written Portuguese."

In the first chapter I introduce the phenomenon of adaptation of scripts in the context of linguistic borrowing and conventionality in writing, and the uniqueness of Hebrew script in this field. In chapter 2, I present a survey of adaptations of Hebrew script for languages other than Hebrew, from biblical Aramaic to late-nineteenth-century English, leading to a more detailed
analysis of the Judeo-Portuguese writing system in chapter 3. In chapter 4 I present a new critical edition of a handbook for manuscript illumination. Chapter 5 presents a 27-page excerpt of a previously-unpublished 800-page astrological treatise. Chapter 6 presents editions of three shorter texts, vernacular rubrics from two Hebrew prayer books and a short medical prescription. Chapter 7 summarizes the archaic and vernacular features attested by the texts in chapters 4-6. In the final chapter, I offer a proposal for a Judeo-Portuguese "alphabet," along with a sketch of some further problems of adaptation and interpretation that arise from the process of editing Hebraicized texts and of transforming them from manuscript to computer screen.
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While living in France several years ago, I suffered an identity crisis of sorts. After repeated attempts to introduce myself to French people by pronouncing my given name au naturel, it became clear that very few people, peers and bureaucrats alike, could correctly make out this less-than-common name, and I often found myself identified as an all-too-common David or Kevin. In order to be sure my name would be written down correctly, I had to pronounce the second syllable in such a way that I became known as [devən], [døvón], or, worse yet, [døvõ]. The net effect was to remind me of a tenth-grade French teacher who, with similar difficulty pronouncing my name à l’anglaise, could only refer to me as [møsyø divã], and as such unintentionally coined my nickname for that year: 'Mr. Sofa’.

In the end I resigned myself to this fate of misidentity, which I was able to attribute to the average francophone’s inability to associate the unaccented vowel and weak word-final n in the second syllable of [dévvin] with a conventional way to spell that syllable in their writing system. And yet this was not the first time that writing my name had posed an orthographic problem. My second-grade class was once visited by a sofer stam, a Jewish scribe trained in the calligraphic art of the sacred text. As a personalized sample of his work, he wrote each student's name in the script of a typical Torah scroll. My name materialized as יבויולזר, or dbn strwlbys in letter-by-letter transliteration. To my eyes, however, something was amiss. Why had the five letters of my first name been reduced to three? And why had the final <tch> of my surname been fused into a single sade, a letter that I had been taught to read as [ts]?
Clearly there were French and Hebrew writers who had trouble producing a written form of my name that preserved its visual identity for me. In the case of the final consonant of my surname, the sofer did the best he could, since the Hebrew script had no letter that normally represented [ʃ] – nor, lest we forget, does the English-language use of Roman script, as the <tch> trigraph makes clear. Looking back, in fact, I should have been flattered that in spite of (or perhaps thanks to) scribal tradition, the sofer was more willing and/or able to adapt a letter of his script to this foreign sound than had been the officials at the port of Montreal who, upon hearing something that sounded like [ˈsrɔylɔvitʃ] from my Romanian-Jewish relatives, proceeded to insert the t that anglicized the s-r cluster. From a strictly linguistic point view, it seems impossible to say which script – and whose use of that script in particular – was better suited to spell my hybrid name. And yet both writers adapted the conventions of their respective writing systems to accommodate the written identifier of this North American anglophone. This is the issue that I take up in the pages that follow: the convivência that emerges when languages and scripts that are normally foreign to one another, in particular medieval Portuguese and the Hebrew alphabet, are made to cohabitate.