

CHAPTER THREE

THE JUDEO-PORTUGUESE CORPUS

In this chapter I introduce the corpus of Old Portuguese in Hebrew script that forms the basis of this study. I discuss various ways in which the texts may be approached as linguistic artifacts, and some problems raised by each of these approaches. I then provide a detailed description of the Judeo-Portuguese writing system, followed by a description of the Romanization system I employ in the critical editions of chapters 4-6.

1. JUDEO-PORTUGUESE IN CONTEXT

The corpus of Hebraicized Portuguese examined in chapters 4-6 comprises five manuscripts, which are briefly described below along with a sample from each one:¹

- **Chapter 4.** Biblioteca Palatina (Parma, Italy), ms. 1959 (formerly ms. De Rossi 945): או ליברו די קומו שי פ'אזין אש קוריש *O libro de komo se fazen as kores*, a treatise on the techniques of manuscript illumination and recipes for inks and dyes, composed at the earliest in 1262 (Sed-Rajna 1971). First published by Blondheim (1929-30) based on a photograph of the manuscript, his edition provided a Hebrew-letter transcription, Romanization, and English translation (though no philological commentary). The edition I offer in this study updates and expands on newly-edited excerpts first published in Strolovitch (2000c),

¹ A facsimile from each of the manuscripts is presented in the appendix section.

and presents the entire text in critical edition (though without a full Hebrew-letter transcription). The following excerpt presents a list of the ten "principal colors":

- (1) f.15r.
 שאבי קי דיץ שאאו אש קוריש פרינשיפאיש אזול אורפימינטו אי וירמיליין וירדי
 קרמין סופיי קאטאשול אסאפראאו אזרקון אלווילדי בראשיל
 Sabe ke deş sao as kores prinsipais azul oripimento e vermelyon verde
 k^armin sufi katasol açafrao az^arkon alv^ay^alde brasil
 'Know that the principal colors are ten: blue, oripiment and red, green,
 carmine, sufi, sunflower, saffron, zircon, white-lead, brazil-wood'.

• **Chapter 5.** Bodleian Library (Oxford, England), ms. Laud Or. 282: או ליברו או מאניקא *O libro de maḡika*, an early-fifteenth century² copy of an astrological treatise attributed by the scribe to בורגוש גיל די גואן *guan ḡil de burgos*. At 800 pages (each containing between 29 and 31 lines), this manuscript constitutes on its own more than half of the known Judeo-Portuguese corpus. Nevertheless, a single transliterated folio is all that has been published previously (Gonzalez Llubera 1953). In the excerpt below the twelve names of the Zodiac are introduced:

- (2) f.5v.
 אי נומיארון אשי אירש טאאורו גימיני קאנסיר ליאון וירגו ליברא אישקורפיאון
 שאגייטריאו קפיקורניאו אקאירו פיסיש
 e nomearon asi ayr^as tauro ḡemeni kançer leon virgo libra eskorpion
 sageyt^ario akayro piçes
 'And [the sages] named them thus: Aries, Taurus, Gemini, Cancer, Leo, Virgo,
 Libra, Scorpio, Sagittarius, Aquarius, Pisces'.

² Although no date appears in the manuscript itself, the copyist was probably the same as that of Bodleian ms. Laud Or. 310, who gives the date of completion for that text as a late-summer Friday in the year [51]71, i.e. 1411 (Levi 1995).

• **Chapter 6.** Three shorter texts:

(a) Bodleian Library (Oxford, England), ms. Can. Or. 109: Rubrics for the Passover *seder* (ritual meal) in a Hebrew *maḥzor* (prayer book) dating from 1485. Facsimiles and Roman-letter normalization of the text were first published by Salomon (1980); a critical edition first appeared in Strolovitch (2000b) and is further elaborated in this study. The excerpt below describes the ritual of כּוּרֵךְ *koreḥ*, the eating of "Hillel's sandwich":

(3) f.240v.

אֵי טוֹמְרָא דָּא אוּיִטְרָא מְצָה שְׂאֵאָה אֵי דָּא אֶלְפֶסָה אֵי מוֹלֵיִרָא אֵינּוּ חֲרוּסֵת אֵי נוֹן
 דִּינָא בְרַכָּה

e tom^ara da oytra *maṣa* saah e da alf^aç^ah e moly^ara eno *ḥaroseṭ* e non
 diga *beraḥa*

'And take from the other unbroken *matza* and from the lettuce and dip [them]
 in the *haroseṭ* and do not say a blessing'.

(b) Brotherton Library (Leeds, England), Roth ms. 71: Passover rubrics from a Hebrew *maḥzor*, dated by Jewish historian (and former owner of the manuscript) Cecil Roth to the late fourteenth century (Metzger 1977). Also first published in Strolovitch (2000b), but since that edition omitted all *niqqud*, which was not discernable in the facsimiles of Salomon (1980), it is reproduced and elaborated in this study. The excerpt below explains the size of the portion of *matza* to be eaten:

- (4) f.5v.
 אי קומיראאו טוד־וש די אילא קונטיאָה די אונאָה אַזיטונא לא פֿחות לא יוֹתֶר אַי
 אַינְגִיראאוֹ אוש בא וַאשׁוּש די וַינִיִּי
 e komerao todos de ela kon^otiah de uah azey^otona lo pahot lo yoter e
 engerao os ba vasos de vin^oyo
 'And everyone [is to] eat from it the amount of an olive – no less, no more –
 and fill the ku- cups with wine'.

(c) Cambridge University Library (Cambridge, England) ms. Add.639.5: a single ten-line medical prescription on the last page of a manuscript containing gnomic verse in Judeo-Spanish (see Gutwirth 1992), which is edited and published here for the first time. In the Cambridge University Library catalogue of Hebrew manuscripts (Reif 1997) the Portuguese text is misidentified as Spanish. The excerpt below is the final instruction in the prescription:

- (5) f.20r.
 אי טיראר און פיראסו אי מיטיר אַוטרו פֿין קי נון אביאה מאיש פילי אי טאנבין און
 שאנגרו לִוְגוֹ דוֹ בראסו
 e tirar un pedaço e meter otro fin ke non abiah mais pele e tanben o
 sangro logo do braço
 'And [I] remove one piece and place another until there is no more skin, and I
 also I bleed it over the coals'.

Before I turn to at the characteristics of the corpus as a whole, there are several distinctions to note among the five manuscripts. The passage from *O livro de komo se fazen as kores* (henceforth *As kores*) illustrates the quasi-technical vocabulary (often borrowed from Arabic) that occurs in that text, which amidst other features gives it the most varied linguistic profile in the corpus. Among my editions, *O livro de maḡika* is the only one limited to a fraction of

the manuscript (the first fourteen of its 400 folios are presented). The Passover material in chapter 6 is distinctive for its non-contiguity, in that it comprises individual sentences interspersed among Hebrew blessings. It is also the only material that has been systematically vocalized with diacritics (although each of the two larger texts contain isolated forms with *niqqud*), and the only texts to feature words of Hebrew origin, usually in relation to the Passover rituals.³ In addition, the Brotherton Passover text is the only one in the corpus not written in the cursive *Rashi* script, but rather in square characters. These distinctions aside, the texts form a coherent corpus based on date (thirteenth to fifteenth century) and on region of production (Portugal), as well as on the similarities of their linguistic form, both genealogical (Western Ibero-Romance) and graphical (Hebrew). The immediate question, then, is what might one hope to gain from a linguistic study of this corpus.

1.2. Approaches to Old Portuguese in Hebrew script

These Portuguese-language texts can be approached first and foremost as synchronic and perhaps diachronic windows onto the history of the Portuguese language – and indeed this is the primary focus of the critical editions in chapters 4-6 and the summary in chapter 7. Because many distinctive features of modern Portuguese began their progress in the medieval period, the orthographic strategies of these late medieval writers might reveal synchronic information on the spread of nasalization, palatalization, and other phonological phenomena that may be less detectable in the more conventionalized, tradition-laden, Roman-letter writing system.

³ The Cambridge medical text also contains one Hebrew word, *בהמה* *behema* 'animal', though the context there is decidedly non-religious.

Despite my warning against treating Hebraicized texts as phonetic transcriptions in chapter 1, there is little doubt that having been undertaken later in history than the Roman-letter adaptation, the Judeo-Portuguese writing system captures the language, in whatever indirect fashion, at a more recent stage in its history.

This approach comes, of course, with the usual caveats of historical linguistics, principally against assuming that what a writer has written was motivated by his or her peers' spoken language (specifically his own production or perception of it). Writing systems whose corresponding vernaculars are in the throes of phonological change that is not "officially" reflected in the orthography are ripe for so-called inverse spellings. The orthographic confusion of and <V> in imperial and early medieval Latin, for example, may be taken as evidence for a phonological merger⁴ – not as evidence that a given writer intended to (incorrectly) spell [b] in some cases and [v] or [w] in others.

Even when the variants differ in subtler ways, it is always problematic to use the silent artifact of a small set of writers as evidence for the speech habits of a larger community. For example, Dutch Jews writing Roman-letter Portuguese in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries frequently (and inconsistently) confused the spelling of a variety sibilants, e.g. *suseção* for *sucessão* 'succession', *grassa* for *graça* 'grace', *felizidad* for *felicidad* 'happiness', *resar* for *rezar* 'pray', and so forth (see Teensma 1991 for many further

⁴ For example, among the over 225 entries in the *Appendix Probi* (ca. 300 CE), which correct some of the lexical, phonological, and orthographic lapses in the Latin of the day, are the following that attest to the merger of /b/ and /w/: BACULUS NON VACLUS 'staff', ALVEUM NON ALBEUS 'trough', PLEBES NON PLEVIS 'plebeians', TABES NON TAVIS 'decay', VAPULO NON BAPLO 'be beaten'

examples). Yet it would be hasty to deduce a process of phonological merger among the phonemes represented by these graphies from the writers' apparent uncertainty about how to spell them. Since the use of the Portuguese was on the decline in those centuries, the wide variation is more likely due to a waning knowledge of orthography – not to mention interference from the writers' tenuous familiarity with Spanish and French orthography – than evidence for variant pronunciations from a given writer or the community at large.

The corpus of Hebrew-letter Portuguese contains comparable cases where conclusions about orthography-as-transcription may be too hastily drawn from the written artifact. For instance, Metzger (1977) points out that when the fifteenth-century Bodleian Passover manuscript was catalogued by Neubauer (1886), he believed it to be of Spanish origin, with its rubrics written in a form of Castilian. The source of his mistake was no doubt the frequency with which the scribe had used the letter ן *n* on determiners, pronouns, and third-person plural verbs, which he took to indicate that the word-final nasal consonant was still "present" as in Spanish (as opposed to only the nasalized vowels present in Portuguese). This is illustrated in the following excerpt from folio 241r.:

- (6) כִּיּוֹאֵן קִדָּא אֵין
 bevan k^ada un
 'each one drink'

And yet this feature is all the more curious given that the ostensibly earlier Brotherton manuscript contains no visible nasal consonant in its determiners

and verb endings. Instead it features spellings with vowel-letters only, as illustrated by the corresponding phrase from folio 5r.:

- (7) בֵּיבִירְאֹוּ קְדָאָאוּ
 beberao k^adau
 'each one (will) drink'

A spelling such as this more clearly suggests that scribe meant to indicate nasalized word-final vowels. Adding ambiguity to the situation is the Parma colours text, in which pairs such as אַזְרְקוֹן/אַזְרְקָאוּ *azarkon/azarkao* 'zircon' alternate throughout, showing both an innovated and conservative spelling (see chapter 7 § 1.1). And the Roman-letter transcriptions of Hebrew names cited by Garbell (1954: 658) also show inconsistencies in the conventions of usage for <m> and <n> in similar environments.

That this orthographic alternation attests to some form of phonological variability in the community is beyond doubt, given the known development of word-final nasals from Latin to Portuguese. Yet it does not follow that the written variants themselves correspond to real utterances manifesting this variability. It is difficult to decide whether the presence of final ך *n* in the Bodleian Passover text is an archaizing spelling, reflecting the traditional written form of the word irrespective of its phonological form, or else a diacritic spelling, where the final letter simply signals that the preceding vowel is nasalized in speech. Indeed, both of these characterizations could apply to the <-m> in the modern Roman-letter orthography of the Passover phrase above (ModPg. *bevam*⁵ *cada um*), since it is in fact a restored spelling

⁵ Although this verb is one of several imperative forms that occur in the text, most of the verbs in fact appear as future-tense forms, which curiously enough is the one conjugation in the

that nonetheless signals the nasalized ending produced in spoken Portuguese. The most that can be definitively ascertained from the intra-textual variability of final-nasal spelling is that both orthographic variants were available to the scribe; the conditions that led him to write one or the other in a given instance may be lost to the modern reader.

1.3. The "Real" Judeo-Portuguese

In addition to the relatively straightforward historical-linguistic approach, one might delve into this corpus for the insight it might yield into a particular sociolinguistic situation, that of the Jewish population in Portugal. Vernacular documents from this group are especially scarce, as are studies of them: a book-length study of the Portuguese Jewish community by Tavares (1992), for example, makes only passing reference to one of the texts discussed here (*As kores*) as part of the community's "cultural production" (the remainder consisting of Hebrew-language material). In the adaptation-of-scripts context of this study, one might hope to show that the processes of adaptation that yielded these texts constitute the beginnings of the tradition of Hebraicized Ibero-Romance that flourished in the centuries following the Spanish and Portuguese expulsions (cf. chapter 2 § 3.2). Even more tempting might be an analysis of the texts that yielded evidence for a distinct variety of Judeo-Ibero-Romance, a forebear of the attested Portuguese dialect spoken by some descendants of the lusophone émigrés in the centuries after the 1496-97 Portuguese expulsion and forced conversion.

modern writing system whose third-person plural /ãw/ is not spelled with <am> but rather <ão>.

It is this last, perhaps most enticing prospect that leads to the least conclusive areas of research. No modern-day lusophone population has descended from the Portuguese-speaking Jewish community, which shifted to co-territorial languages such as Spanish, Dutch, and English by the nineteenth century. In fact many of the émigrés from Portugal were Spanish speakers expelled from Castille-Aragon a few years prior to the Portuguese edicts of 1496-97. The Portuguese speakers who left the peninsula to settle in Italy, the Balkans, and Turkey assimilated to the Spanish-speaking majority, thus beginning the long-term language shift that eliminated Portuguese from the Sephardic repertoire. With a relative shortage of material there have consequently been very few linguistic studies of Jewish Portuguese, apart from those focused on written records from specific cities where Jews settled, such as Amsterdam (Teensma 1991) and Livorno (Tavani 1988).⁶

Judeo-Spanish, the only Judeo-Ibero-Romance language still spoken today, certainly boasts a richer documentary history from both the Iberian Peninsula and the resettled communities of the Ottoman Empire and North Africa. Yet its existence prior to the expulsions remains a vexed question (cf. Marcus 1962, Wexler 1982). The question of a distinct Judeo-Portuguese may at first blush seem less "vexed" simply because, given the small extant corpus and absence of a modern speech community, the field is less ploughed. Moreover, the prospects for discovering the expression of a distinct (spoken) dialect amidst the short ritual prescriptions and non-Judaic scientific discourse in the Hebraicized Portuguese corpus may well be discouraging. The corpus

⁶ The only book-length study of Jewish Portuguese in general appears to be a Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Lisbon by da Silva Germano (1968), which I have been unable to access.

is above all a written artifact, and the use of Hebrew script is simply not a sufficient condition for presuming it to represent the early rumblings of the elusive pre-expulsion Judeo-Portuguese dialect.

The seemingly trivial issue of what to call the language can aggravate this issue, particularly when there is no longer a community of native speakers. Frakes (1989), for example, talks about the form and variety of names devised – largely by non-natives – for the language of what he calls the "Old Yiddish corpus" as an exercise in identifying the object of research in order to (de)legitimize it: Germano-Judaic, Hebrew-German, Jewish German, *Jüdisch-deutsche*, *judéo-allemande*, etc. As he explains, these ostensibly descriptive statements about the language are decidedly prescriptive and ideological in their view of linguistic history. And yet it is not only in the absence of native speakers that glottonymics can prove troublesome. Judeo-Spanish speakers⁷ (and researchers) have their own array of names for that language: *Ladino*, *Judezmo*, *Jídiyo*, *Spanyolít*, *Sefardí*, etc.

For the present purposes I have somewhat grudgingly adopted the term *Judeo-Portuguese*. A more accurate, or at least less constraining term might be *Hebreo-Portuguese*, since it does less to suggest distinctive features of the language beyond the only one apparent, namely its writing system. Short of a direct declaration, of course, there is no way to know what the native glottonym was. And although neither of these terms is a viable candidate, this study is targeted at an audience for whom the term *Judeo-Portuguese* will be

⁷ Prominent native speakers with upwardly-mobile aspirations may be particularly unhelpful. Baruch/Benedictus Spinoza, a Sephardic Jew born in Amsterdam, referred to his native language simply as "Spanish," while Moses Mendelssohn, the principal figure of the eighteenth-century European Jewish Enlightenment, spoke of his native Yiddish as the "Jewish-German" dialect (Gilman 1986: 105).

eminently conventional and meaningful. As a starting point to probing the nature of this corpus, then, I turn to the mechanics of the adaptation of Hebrew script that constitutes written Judeo-Portuguese.

2. THE WRITING SYSTEM

Having surveyed in the previous chapter the orthographic patterns that occur in various adaptations of Hebrew script, I now offer a more detailed description of these patterns as they occur in the Judeo-Portuguese corpus. As a model for an orthography-oriented study of Jewish language, this work has been strongly informed by Freedman (1972), a study of Italian texts in Hebrew characters that focuses on the writing system. I have also drawn on the diachronic studies of Judeo-Spanish writing by Minervini (1992) and Recuero (1988), which examine the pre- and post-1492 corpora respectively, as well as from Dominovich (1948), one of the few English-language surveys of (Roman-letter) medieval Portuguese orthography available to me. The corpus of Hebrew-letter Portuguese does not have the breadth to allow one to trace a chronology comparable to those just cited. I do believe, however, that the description below offers some novel approaches for the study of a Hebraicized writing system, by focusing on features broader than the patterns of usage for individual letters. As will be argued below, these features constitute the fusion of conventions that firmly positions Hebrew-letter Portuguese in the annals of Hebraicization, while at the same time distinguishing it in the adaptation-of-scripts framework.

2.1. Independence from the mother script

The following orthographic strategies, while not unique to Portuguese in the Hebraicization canon, do represent the particular responses by Jewish Portuguese writers to the interface of Hebrew script and the Portuguese language that confronted them. More importantly, perhaps, they set the spirit and attitude of the writing system apart from both contemporary Roman-letter and Hebrew-language writing.

2.1.1. Vowel letters

Above all, the Judeo-Portuguese texts represent a mature adaptation of Hebrew script in their extensive and systematic use of the *matres lectionis* as straightforward vowel letters. This simply could not have been an orthographic strategy were the writers of these texts still bound to the basic conventions of canonical Hebrew orthography,⁸ where the majority of vowels are imputed by the reader. Nevertheless, unlike the progressive trend that Minervini (1999) discerns in pre-expulsion Judeo-Spanish texts, it is difficult to perceive in the small corpus any developmental history of vowels tending to be spelled with letters rather than diacritics (or with no vocalization at all); in all the extant texts Judeo-Portuguese writing is a fully alphabetic system.

Although the *matres lectionis* are in this function analogous to the vowels of Roman script, they are not deployed as one-for-one substitutions – nor could they be, since the four *matres* are no better a match for Portuguese

⁸ In the broader context of vocalization in adaptations of Hebrew script, the only true innovators are Germanic-language writers, who, as noted in the previous chapter, use the non-mater v^c for /e/. This letter is never used to spell native words in Judeo-Romance writing beyond isolated glosses, and its use in Judeo-Arabic, Judeo-Persian, and Hebrew-letter Turkish is usually calqued on the behavior of the cognate Arabic consonant ayn^c .

vowel phonology than the five Roman letters. In an unpointed text, two of the *matres* (א and ה) only indicate the vocalic distinctions "non-low front," and "non-low back" while א⁹ and final vocalic ה may stand for /a/, /e/, or /o/ (see § 2.2.1 below). Yet the full system of *niqqud* is ultimately superfluous for Portuguese vowel orthography because, if the diacritics are taken for their historical Hebrew-specific values, it indicates phonological distinctions that are redundant in Portuguese. When *niqqud* is fully deployed, as in the Passover texts, it tends to be induced simply by other Hebrew-language material in the neighborhood. Even in such cases, however, it is usually redundant¹⁰ (and occasionally mis-deployed), as illustrated by the following examples from vernacular passages in the Passover texts:

(8)	אַלְפֶּאסָא	alfaça(a)	'lettuce'
	בִּינִירָאן	bevera(a)n	'(will) drink'
	קוֹמִינְסָאָרִן	komença(a)r ^a n	'(will) begin'

The <a> in parentheses in the Romanizations of each of these words is indicated by a *qames*, the T-shaped diacritic for /a/ that appears beneath א⁹ (itself the letter that indicates /a/ in this writing system). In addition to the *qames* under the consonant preceding א (which is ipso facto redundant), the

⁹ Minervini (1999: 420) claims that in the earliest period of Judeo-Romance, the vernacular was written "in accordance with Hebrew graphic norms" and that א could represent any vowel, e.g. בֵּאן *ben* 'come', דֹּלֵר *doler* 'pain', אִשְׁבִּילִיה *Isbilia* 'Isabella'. She attributes this to its "incomplete acceptance as a *mater lectionis* for /a/ in Hebrew orthography and its nature as a tendentially graphic element, disconnected from pronunciation." Although she cites only Judeo-Italian as another graphical tradition attesting to the "weakness" of א, it is certainly the case in Judeo-Portuguese that no other vowel letter may be omitted as readily as א.

¹⁰ Note that while Modern Hebrew orthography may make use of both *niqqud* and the *matres lectionis*, the two strategies usually overlap only in the spelling of initial vowels (which require a diacritic and *niqqud*-bearing א) and word-final /a/ (see § 2.2.1 below).

segol and *şere* that indicate /e/ in *beveran* and *komençaran* respectively each underlies a consonant that is followed by ם *y*, the letter that serves the same role.

The redundant *niqqud* is most likely due to the delegation of lettering and vowel-pointing to separate individuals in the production of Hebrew manuscripts. The *naqdan* 'pointer' may have been less familiar with the vowel-letter conventions of Hebraicized Portuguese than of Hebrew itself. As a result it is not surprising to see that the diacritics, while not fundamentally wrong – the *naqdan* was quite likely, after all, a Portuguese speaker – do not play a crucial role in the writing system.

In a very few instances, however, *niqqud* is used in an unpointed text with words that a given scribe may have considered "learned" or related to a technical context perhaps unfamiliar to the reader. The words in (7) below all occur in *As kores*, which is otherwise completely unpointed:

(9)	אִיִּשׁ ¹¹	ides	'that is'
	אַלְפִיר	alfer	'bishop'
	פּוֹשֵׁטִי	fuste	'(wooden) stick'
	אַזְרְקוֹאֲנֹבּוֹלִי	azarkoanboli	'zircon'

2.1.2. Merged segments

Another trend that appears to have matured in the Portuguese corpus is the tendency in Hebraicized writing to disfavor one of each pair of letters whose phonetic values in the community's traditional pronunciation of

¹¹ The three dots that appear above the ך are used elsewhere in this text, most often at clause boundaries, in the same horizontal space as the letters. This is probably the *segolta* of Tiberian pointing, one of the stronger disjunctive accents indicating a pause (G. Rendsburg, p.c.). As a symbol above a given letter, however, it appears to carry no orthographic meaning.

Hebrew are identical (usually because one of the historical values does not exist in the vernacular phonology). In the case of Romance languages this generally applies to three pairs of letters: ק/כ [k], ט/ת [t], and ו/ב [v]. In the case of the first two sounds, it is the first member of each letter pair, the historically emphatic (pharyngealized) Hebrew consonant, that is used almost exclusively to spell the relevant sound in Hebraicized Portuguese;¹² in the case of [v] a semi-systematic division of orthographic labour is put into effect (see § 2.3.1 below). For each pair, the member that is disfavored for the writing of native vocabulary is always preserved in the spelling of words of Hebrew or Aramaic origin, whose historical spellings are uniformly maintained.¹³ An exception of sorts is the pair ם s and ש š, whose distinction in most Romance-language pronunciations of Hebrew is maintained but which are often used interchangeably for sibilant phonemes (see § 2.3.2 below).

2.2. Reliance on the mother script

There is no doubt that the writers of Hebraicized Portuguese were literate readers and writers of Hebrew itself, and that their audience was more or less similarly versed in Hebrew writing (though perhaps less familiar with

¹² Minervini (1999) notes that the same choice is made in both Hebrew and Arabic *aljamía* (Hebraicized and Arabicized Spanish). With regard to Judeo-Spanish writing, she suggests that the fricative pronunciation of the non-emphatic stops in weak position, i.e. the reflex of Hebrew spirantization, may be the motivating factor. Recall, however, that in Yiddish, where speakers have merged ם x and ן h in their pronunciation of Hebrew, the writing system opts for the non-emphatic "spirantized" first member in the spelling of non-Hebraic vocabulary (neither ם nor ן is used to spell non-Hebrew vocabulary items in medieval Judeo-Romance, though Modern Spanish /x/ is, as expected, rendered by ם in modern Yiddish orthography).

¹³ As noted in the previous chapter, Yiddish in early Soviet Russia represents the only concerted effort to re-spell the Semitic component "phonetically" in a Hebraicized writing system, part of a state-sponsored strategy to purge the language of any religious character or association (see Estraikh 1999).

Roman-letter writing). Thus it is inevitable that the writers would draw on conventions of Hebrew-language writing that could maximize the reading comfort-level of their audience. Again, while these strategies are not unique to Hebraicized Portuguese, they do illustrate the unique fusion of conventions in the writing system insofar as they do not have direct counterparts in Roman-letter writing.

2.2.1. Final /a/ allography

In modern written Hebrew the letter ה represents the voiceless glottal fricative /h/ in syllable onsets, but is "silent" in word-final position, where it normally spells /a/ (and sometimes /e/).¹⁴ Although Hebrew medial /a/ is generally either not spelled explicitly or else rendered by א ׁ, the final -a of feminine singular nouns and third-person feminine singular inflection on past-tense verbs are both spelled overtly and uniquely with final ה h, as illustrated below:

- (10) a. נהגה nahaga 'drove' (fem.)
 התנהגה hitnahaga 'behaved' (fem.)
- b. מנהיגה manhiga 'leader' (fem.)

¹⁴ Though some nouns do contain final /e/ in the lexicon, e.g. שדה /sade/ 'field', in unpointed script final ה may be grammatically ambiguous in adjectives and verbs, e.g. both the masculine and feminine forms of 'lovely', /jafe/ and /jafa/, are spelled יפה, while רוצה 'want' spells both the masc. sg. /rotse/ and fem. sg. /rotsa/ of the present tense. Final ה also appears in ancient inscriptions and vestigially in the Bible as a spelling for the 3rd masculine singular possessive enclitic -o < *-ahu (replaced in later orthography by וֹ). It remains, however, the normal spelling for the fem. sg. possessive enclitic -a.

In direction imitation – and, significantly, with no precedent in Roman-letter writing – Judeo-Romance writing makes a nearly-systematic use of the alternation between א^h and ה^h for the spelling of the word-final /a/ that occurs in grammatical contexts analogous to those in Hebrew, namely feminine singular nouns and third-person singular verb inflections:

Table 3-1. Final /a/ allography

אואה	uah	דואש	duas	'one/two'
שאָאָה	saah	שאָאָש	saas	'whole'
אונסָה	onç ^a h	¹⁵ אונסָאָס	onçaç	'ounce(s)'
דישטָה	dest ^a h	דיסטָאָש	deçtas	'of this/these'
טיגילָה	tiğel ^a h	טיגילָאָש	tiğelas	'bowl(s)'
שיגָה	seğ ^a h	שיגָאָן	seğan	'be' (pres. subj.)

This allography is not merely a luxury of the script:¹⁶ since in Hebrew the "silent" vocalic ה does not occur anywhere except in word-final position, the plural markers ש^h *š* and ך^h *n* can *only* be preceded by the א^h allograph of /a/. This variation has no phonological basis in Portuguese, nor does it have an analogue in the Roman-letter orthography of Portuguese nor any other Romance language with similar morphology. Moreover, it is sufficiently characteristic of the orthography that the feminine singular definite article, a single <a> in Roman script, is spelled אָה (plural אָש); only where the article is

¹⁵ On the final א see § 2.3.2.

¹⁶ In the cursive script used by medieval Sephardic writers, ה is actually the only grapheme with its own final-position allograph beyond the canonical five (cf. chapter 2 § 2.1). In fact the character presented in table 2-9 is the non-final form ה, which, though it does resemble the standard square ה, occurs extremely rarely in the Judeo-Portuguese corpus (almost exclusively in Hebrew words). The far more frequent allograph that occurs in final position more closely resembles an inverted Greek σ (which is, curiously enough, the final-position form of sigma).

graphically attached to the noun – itself probably in imitation of the practice for the Hebrew definite article -ה *ha* – is the single א used:

- (11) אה מצה אה מייא *a maša ah meia* 'the half matza'
 אמייא מצה *am^eya maša* 'the half matza'

2.2.2. א^o as a diacritic

Although /a/ may be represented by several sub-linear diacritics (cf. chapter 2 § 2.4.1), this Portuguese vowel is most often spelled by the letter א, which in the grapheme-to-phoneme correspondence of the script uniquely represents the low vowel. This choice is motivated by both Semitic and Romance tradition: as the first letter in the Hebrew alphabet, א is a perfect analogue to – and related to the ultimate source of – the Roman letter <A>. Moreover, as noted in chapter 2, in late antiquity this original glottal stop had already come to be used occasionally in Hebrew to fill the same orthographic function as would its descendent in Roman script.

Since absolute-initial vowels do not historically occur in Hebrew, a single א^o or א^u in word-initial position is read as a consonant in written Hebrew unless it is preceded by an unpointed א, which indicates that the following א^o or א^u is vocalic.¹⁷ With rare exceptions this convention is strictly

¹⁷ C. Rosen (p.c.) points out that some instances of initial <au> in Gascon orthography reflect an etymological unstressed /o/, e.g. *auherir* 'offer' < OFFERIRE, *augan* 'this year' < HOC ANNO. Alba Salas (2000: 122) notes a similar case in thirteenth-century Catalan *auciea* 'kills' < OCCIDET, and calls the <au> "a clear case of hypercorrection." Yet it is not clear how fully the diphthong represented by historical <au> had been levelled at this stage in (Gallo-)Romance, and thus how conventional <au> could be construed as a spelling for /o/. Moreover, the putative sound change involving initial unstressed /o/ > /aw/ is not well motivated. This raises the possibility that Catalan and Gascon writers have imitated the convention adopted by Judeo-Romance writers (whether or not as a direct influence), using <a> as a diacritic to indicate "vocalic <u>." Thus the modern Gascon reading of these instances of <au> as a diphthong would reflect a "spelling pronunciation" rather than historical sound change.

preserved in Judeo-Portuguese writing (indeed in Judeo-Romance more generally as well):

(12)	אואטבא	out ^a ba	'eighth'
	טודו אין אואו	todo en uo	'all at once'
	אי שי ויריש קי שי אינגי	e si veres ke se inḡe	'and if you see that it fills'

This convention in fact applies more broadly in Hebraicized Portuguese to syllable-initial vowels other than /a/ as well as to a vocalic ם or ם that occurs in hiatus. In these instances the letter is usually preceded by a diacritic ם to indicate the vocalic reading:

Table 3-2. Non-initial vocalic ם and ם preceded by ם

ויראאוש	veraos	'summers'
אאוטנוש	autonos	'autumns'
לינסואואוש	lenḡouos	'bedsheets'
נון איי קואושא	non ay kouša	'there is no thing'
מאאיש סירקאאה	mais ḡerkaah	'closer'
אקומיסיאי די קונפואיר	akomeḡei de konpoer	'I began to compose'

In fact, so conventionalized is the digraph that a second ם is necessary to indicate the diphthong in *autonos* above, even though the ם-ם sequence is the letter-for-letter equivalent of <ao>. In the case of the third-person plural verb inflection and the other /aw/ diphthongs (usually from deleted /n/ or /l/) that pervade Portuguese, all of the texts in this study feature an alternation between forms with one or two *alephs*, since the letter does not conventionally serve its silent diacritic role following consonants (cf. *veraos* above). The same is true of the /aj/ diphthong in some words, as in מא(א)יש *ma(a)is* 'more' above.

Additionally, there are some contexts in which the **⚡** could almost be viewed purely as a device to avoid a sequence of three identical letters (cf. the Yiddish strategy for avoiding three ם in ch.2 § 3.9.1):

- (13) טרוטאריי trotarey 'I will deal with'
 איאן נון פֿאלייא eu non falei 'I did not find'

The final sequence in *trotarey* is especially interesting, given that ם preceded by **⚡** more often serves to indicate the /aj/ (as opposed to /ej/) reading, e.g. קונטראירן *kontrayro*.

In yet other instances, while the diacritic function of **⚡** is not strictly necessary for a correct reading of some *matres* sequences, there is a "visual" convention (probably based on Hebrew writing as well) that compels the Judeo-Portuguese writer to include it:

- (14) אוןוביאן סאיו o nobio çeo 'the ninth heaven'
 אישטרולוגיאה estrologiah 'astrology'

In such cases the **⚡** serves as a kind of "syllabifier," not unlike its hiatus-breaking role above (and similar to the dieresis in French and older English orthography), indicating that the vowel letters belong to different syllables rather than a diphthong.

2.3. Reliance on the dominant script: Latin

Although there was no self-conscious *reconquista* undertaken in Portugal, the country was fully under Christian rule by the end of the thirteenth century (when its borders also essentially took their current shape).

Thus unlike Jews in some regions of what would become Spain, the Jews in Portugal lived amidst a firmly Latin culture. But the Roman script was not merely the "dominant" script of the literary milieu; it was a form of writing that Jewish Portuguese writers were at the very least acquainted with, and at best willing and able to exploit in adapting Hebrew script to write Portuguese. Beyond the categorical adoption of vowel letters (cf. § 2.1.1), the clearest way in which their adaptation was informed by Roman-letter writing is the use of Hebrew letters to preserve distinctions, usually etymological but often phonological, in Romance vocabulary items that were not necessarily maintained in speech nor, curiously enough, in the contemporary Roman-letter spelling of Portuguese.

2.3.1. /v/

As discussed in § 2.1.2, when the phonetic realizations of two letters have merged in the local pronunciation of Hebrew, normally only one of these is used in the Hebraicized spelling of native vocabulary. However, in Judeo-Portuguese (and to some degree in other Judeo-Romance as well), such pairs may be deployed to spell similar sounds that have distinct etymologies and, in some cases, distinct spellings in non-vernacular writing.

The spelling of Portuguese /v/ is quite variable across the corpus, being represented by ם, double-ם, as well as by plain and augmented ן (i.e. ן and ן׃). This Portuguese phoneme is the product of the merger of Latin /w/ and /b/,¹⁸ attested from an early date by orthographic confusion of orthographic <v> and . This confusion is also attested in the excerpt of the

¹⁸ Some instances of Latin /p/ also yield ModPg. /v/ e.g. *povo* < POPULU; a form based on this word appears in *O livro de maḡika* as פּױבאָױ *pobao* < *POPOLANU.

Brotherton Passover text presented in § 1, where *vaso* 'cup' occurs first spelled **באשו** *baso* and later in the text as **וואשו** *vaso*. In fact, at one point on folio 5v. the writer appears to have begun the word with **בא** *ba-*, but stopped to begin anew with **ווא** *va-*, leaving his hesitation unemended:

(15) **אוש בא וואשוש** os ba *vasos* 'the ku- cups'

Thus **ב**, the historical Hebrew *b*, and **ו**, itself a historical Semitic *w*, seem to behave as analogues to Roman and <v> respectively. The spelling of /v/ elsewhere in the corpus also suggests that the writers were sensitive to its etymology, and perhaps to the orthography of the Latin etyma. Unlike contemporary Roman-letter Portuguese writers, they frequently spelled it accordingly: where its source is Latin *b* (or *p*) it is spelled with **ב**, while Pg. *v* < Latin *w* is spelled with **ו** (either doubled or as a singleton). The effect of this "ב = B / ו = v" equivalence appears to be independent of the precise sound ostensibly being indicated:

Table 3-3. **ב** < *Lat.* /b/

לאב'ראר	laḇrar < LABORARE	'work'
דיאב'לו	diāblo < DIABOLU	'devil'
אינבי'דו	enbebido < IN-BIBITU	'drunk' (past part.)
אישטוב'יר	estober ¹⁹	'be' (pres. subj.)
ביב'ראאו	beberao < BIBERE HABENT	'(will) drink'
איסקריב'אאו	eskriḇao < *SCRIBANU	'writer'

¹⁹ The stem of this third-person singular future subjunctive was formed analogically from the preterite of *haber*, and as such does not in fact reflect any etymological *b* in the verb STARE (Penny 1991: 185).

Table 3-4. ן < Lat. /w/

וירמיליִיא	vermelya < VERMICULA	'red'
וידרו	vidro < VITRU	'glass'
ויניו	vinyo < VINU	'wine'
וינגרי	vinagre < VINU ACER	'vinegar'
וּוּשׁוֹ	vaso < *VASU < VAS	'cup'
דיוורשאש	deversas < DIVERSAS	'various'

This division of orthographic labour is not, however, perfectly consistent. For instance, it is curiously difficult to find a medial Pg. *v* < Lat. *w* spelled with ן, as shown in the following words where it is spelled with ב:

Table 3-5. ב < Lat. /w/

אובױ	oḅo < OVU	'egg'
ויבױ	viḅo < VIVU	'live' (adj.)
ארזינטי ביבױ	biḅo < VIVU	'quicksilver'
נובױא	noḅa < NOVA	'new'
קאבידארטאש	caḅidartas < *CAVITARE...	'be wary'
לאבראאו	labrao < LAVARE...	'work'

There are also several cases in which ן is used to spell a /v/ that derives from an etymological or borrowed *b*:

Table 3-6. ן < Lat./Ar. /b/

אלווא	alva < ALBA	'white'
בִּיבֶרֶאָן	beveran < BIBERE HABENT	'drink'
²⁰ אדיידיא	adivida < *(AD-)DEBITARE	'preside'
אישקרייר	escrever < SCRIBERE	'write'
אלואייאלדי	alvaialde < Ar. al-bayād	'white lead'

These exceptions, particularly those in table 3.5, could be explained as an orthographic strategy for avoiding an internal ן that stands for /v/ near a non-low back vowel (i.e. /o/ or /u/), since the same letter is used to spell those vowels. In fact, a form like אױבױבױב *oḥo* may be seen as using a strategy to avoid spelling the word with three identical letters in succession, i.e. אױױױ*.²¹

Double-ױ, for its part, is used almost invariably as a digraph for /v/, and in the texts of chapters 4-6 it is never used to indicate a VC sequence [uv] or [ov]. There are, however, rare occurrences in those texts in which it does represent the CV sequence [vo] or [vu] (where Pg. /v/ may derive from Latin /b/ or /w/), as in the following words:

(16)	אלוו	alvo < ALBU	'white'
	סירוו	çervo < CERVU	'stag'
	²² ױונטאדי	vontade < VOLUNTATE	'volition'

²⁰ This word, though it is the most recurrent verb in *O libro de maḡika*, is most often spelled with ן (see chapter 5 § 2.1 for a fuller discussion).

²¹ Though C. Rosen (p.c.) informs me of Romanian forms that do end in <-iii>, triple-letter spellings are rare and avoided in both Roman- and Hebrew-letter orthographies (and probably in other writing systems). As noted in the previous chapter, near-instances in Yiddish require either *niqqud* or an intervening ך, e.g. ױאױ/ױױ *vu* 'where'.

²² The first two words (from *As kores*) each occur only once, yet this spelling alternates in *O libro de maḡika* with בױונטאדי *bountade*, which features both an initial ב *b* and a more expanded spelling of the hiatus left by deleted /l/.

Similarly, though **אױ** may stand ambiguously for either a diphthong [oa]/[ua] or the CV sequence [va], the reverse digraph **אױ** nearly always represents a fully-vocalic [u] or [o] (with diacritic **אױ**; see § 2.2.2 above), or else word-final [ãw]. In the twenty folios of *As kores*, for example, there is only a single form in which the digraph does in fact represent a VC sequence [av]:

(17) **אראיקא** aravika < ARABICA 'arabic (gum)'

The following example from the same text is even more striking, since it combines these two breaches of convention²³ – the initial **אױ** is not strictly vocalic and double-**אױ** is not uniquely consonantal:

(18) **אױנדאר** avondar < AD-FUNDARE 'dip'

Based on the exceptional character of these double-**אױ** forms, we can maintain that the unmarked reading of a single non-initial **אױ** is vocalic, while in initial position it is consonantal unless preceded by **אױ**. In this orthography, then, non-initial /v/ is almost invariably spelled with **ב** (with or without a diacritic), while a distinct spelling for /v/ < Lat. /w/ is indeed "preserved" in initial position.

²³ Although the form in (18) represents the only occurrence of this phenomenon in the texts presented in the following chapters, it occurs on at least one occasion in the smaller Bodleian astrological text, *O libro enos g̃uizos das estrelas*, in the verb **אױריראן** *avoreceran* 'will abandon' < ABHORRESCERE.

2.3.2. *Sibilants*

Overall, Judeo-Portuguese orthography favours ש *š* as the "default" sibilant letter, i.e. for Portuguese /s/ that derives directly from Latin /s/, while using ס *s* for sibilants that, though they occur as [s] in the modern language, derive from another source (and were probably pronounced [ts] in the earliest attested Portuguese). This is illustrated in the orthographic near-minimal pair in (19a) as well as the words in (19b), where ס spells the sibilant produced by the palatalization of Latin /k/:

- (19) a. שאַרײַן sairen < SALIRE 'leave' (fut. subj.)
 סײַארײַן çearen < CENARE 'dine' (fut. subj.)
- b. אינסימה ençima < IN CYMA 'above'
 שי פּאַסאַ se façã < SE FACIAT 'make' (subj.)
 אַקױנטײַסיר aconteçer < AD+CONTIGESCERE 'happen'

ס also serves to spell the Portuguese sibilant that occurs in a nativized loanword, even when its source is not strictly a sibilant-type sound:

- (20) אַלפּאַסאַ alfaça < Ar. *al-ḥass* 'lettuce'
 איר וואַנסױש er vanços < Gk. □□□□□□□□ 'chick peas'
 אַשײַדריס ašedreç < Ar. *šātranğ* 'chess (pieces)'

Thus unlike ש, which appears to straightforwardly represent the unvoiced apicoveolar segment described in 1536 by Fernão de Oliveira in the first Portuguese grammar, ס probably did not have as unambiguous a reading. In the corpus ס does on occasion infect the spelling of one extremely frequent sibilant derived from plain Latin /s/, namely the plural marker, on nouns that already contain this letter, e.g. אונסאַס *onçaç* 'ounces', קאַביסאַס *kabeçaç* 'heads'

(the plural morpheme is otherwise consistently spelled with שׁ on both nouns and verbs). In addition, some words spelled in the texts with ס do have <s> in modern Portuguese orthography, e.g. סומו < Ar. zūm, ModPg. *sumo* 'juice'. Nevertheless, the use of ס corresponds quite robustly to the distribution of <c> (<ç> before a non-front vowel) in the Roman-letter orthography of Portuguese, while שׁ represents only those sibilants that were spelled by a single <s> in Latin orthography.

The spelling of sibilants in the Arabicized Portuguese also generally conforms to the Judeo-Portuguese practice. In addition to the small corpus of early-sixteenth century letters from North Africa (see Lopes 1940), Galmes de Fuentes (1962: 103) mentions a twelfth-century Arab geographer whose transliterations of Portuguese toponyms make systematic use of שׁ *šin* to reproduce Romance *s*, while reserving שׁ *šin* and שׁ *šād* to reproduce *ç*. Whether "Romance *s*" means [s] the sound or <s> the letter – in other words, whether this geographer was transcribing or transliterating the Portuguese names – is not made clear.²⁴ The Judeo-Portuguese usage does seem to distance ס from its unmarked Hebrew value (both historical and modern) as the letter indicating a plain /s/. In fact, much of early Judeo-Romance writing favours שׁ as the spelling for the reflex of simple Latin /s/,²⁵ although the non-

²⁴ Galmes de Fuentes does point out more explicitly that a single medial <s> is often rendered by שׁ *šim* in the sixteenth-century corpus. His transcription of this letter with <z> (superscribed by a diacritic) recalls the only parallel case I have found in the Judeo-Portuguese corpus, where some instances of the verb *kerer* 'want' in *As kores* occur with כׁ *g* as the stem-final consonant in subjunctive forms, i.e. קיגרישׁ *kiğeres* < QUAESIVERIS (see chapter 4 § 2.1)

²⁵ Although the spelling of sibilants in early Judeo-Spanish also conforms to the Judeo-Portuguese pattern, in later Judeo-Spanish writing ס was generalized as the default spelling for /s/ regardless of source.

Iberian languages tend to prefer ש ם for other sibilants.²⁶ The fact that Judeo-Portuguese avoids this letter in native vocabulary (with sporadic exceptions in *As kores*) suggests that the deaffrication of Portuguese sibilants, which Galmes de Fuentes (1962: 103-113) considers to have begun as early as the thirteenth century, was well underway.

Given the other sibilant-related changes occurring in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Portuguese, it is difficult – and indeed perhaps misleading – to try to determine the precise phonetic character of the sounds "intended" by a particular writer's use of ס or שׁ. The permutations of <s> and <c>, despite their frequent confusion, probably accomplish the task of spelling the four medieval Portuguese sibilants in a phonetically more transparent way. What the distribution of the two Hebrew letters more accurately captures is etymology, as if in imitation of Latin rather than vernacular Roman-letter spelling, and in the manner of many a modern standardized (and hence conservative) orthography. Whether this is the premise upon which Judeo-Portuguese writers made their orthographic choices – that is, whether they consciously drew on Latin *qua* Latin writing – as opposed to simply capturing two classes of pronunciation within the confines of their writing system (which usually coincided with a prior convention) may not be answerable.²⁷

²⁶ Steiner (1982: 37) maintains that "if anything is known about the Hebrew sibilants in Christian Spain and Portugal, it is that ש and ס were not distinguished."

²⁷ In reference to the opposite process, i.e. the rendering of Hebrew ש, ס, and שׁ in Roman-letter Old Spanish, Steiner (1982: 39) claims that their distribution reflects "identities rather than mere approximation" – that is, transliteration rather than transcription.

2.3.3. *Classicizing spelling*

O libro de maḡika contains occurrences of some proper names and astrological terms that alternate between what appears to be an innovated vernacular form and a conservative etymological spelling:

- (21) a. אריסטוטיליס ariṣtoteleṣ 'Aristotle'
 אריסוטיל ereṣotel
 b. אקאריאו akario 'Aquarius'
 אקאירו akayro²⁸

In a very few instances, this phenomenon appears to occur with words outside the obvious sphere of classical influence. The first form in (20) might be better considered a "pseudo-classicizing" form, since its cluster consonants reflect only the unassimilated voicelessness of the etymon's segments:

- (22) אמיסטאדי amiṣtade ModPg. *amizade* < AMICITATE 'friendship'
 אינימיזאדי enemizdade ModPg. *inimizade* < INIMICITATE 'enmity'

In either case, these alternations attest to another level on which the Judeo-Portuguese writer exploits his biliteracy. It is certainly possible that the alternation also reflects a variation in the speech or perception of the scribe. However, rather than a variation truly based in vernacular phonology, this phenomenon is probably more akin to the variant pronunciations that a (more or less) bilingual in a minority group would have for local terms (especially geographical names) in the majority language.²⁹

²⁸ This particular nativization is addressed in chapter 7 § 2.3).

²⁹ A Montreal anglophone, for instance, may refer to the vibrant *Rue Saint-Denis* in a "classicizing" fashion as [sæ̃ndəni] or as a "nativized" [seyndéni] (though, oddly enough,

2.4. Reliance on another dominant script: Arabic

As Jewish writers in a Latin-literate culture it was inevitable that the biliterate writers of Hebraicized Portuguese would draw on some Roman-letter conventions in their writing system. Yet they also borrowed conventions from Semitic writing beyond Hebrew that enable both etymological and quasi-etymological spellings not captured (or even capturable) by the conventional Roman-letter orthographies.

2.4.1. Cognate letters

The Hebrew alphabet allows the Judeo-Portuguese writers to maintain etymological distinctions between Arabic phonemes that have merged in their borrowed Portuguese form, e.g. Ar. *z/ṣ* → Pg. *z*:

(23)	אלמופאריץ	almofariṣ	ModPg. <i>almofariz</i> < al-miḥraṣ	'mortar'
	אזוני	azoge	ModPg. <i>azogue</i> < az-zā ³ uq	'mercury'

Using different letters could, as always, suggest nothing more than the mere fact of distinct pronunciations intended or perceived by the Jewish writer, who may be more apt to do so with these Semitic loanwords than a non-Jew. What should be noted above all, however, is that the transfer of spelling convention is made especially feasible and perhaps even expected because the Hebrew letters ז and צ are in a real and practical sense cognate with and historically related to the Arabic letters ز *zāy* and س *ṣād*.

never [...denis], as though this fully-nativized "spelling pronunciation" would obscure the word's identity in this case as the name of the street). Note, of course, that this alternation is never reflected in the spelling, which simply follows the dominant orthography.

2.4.2. *Quasi-etymological spelling*

As noted elsewhere, the occurrence of vowel letters in Hebraicized Portuguese writing is not entirely consistent. The most salient variation occurs in Arabic loanwords, which are especially prevalent in the technical lingo of *As kores*. There they show an interesting clash of conventions, especially with respect to /a/. Although the orthography of the text is overwhelmingly alphabetic, variants such as the following pairs occur in close proximity to one another in the text:

(24)	קרמין	קאמריין	k(a)rmin	'carmine'
	אספראאו	אסאפראאו	aç(a)frao	'saffron'
	אלוויילדי	אלוואייאלדי	alv(a)y ^a lde	'white lead'

Unpointed and vowel-less spellings in such loanwords could be construed as a form of "un-nativized" or quasi-etymological spelling if the short vowels in the Arabic etyma were not represented in their Arabic-script orthography either. The practice of reproducing the Arabic vowel-spelling is well-attested in the "Arabicized orthography" of Judeo-Arabic (Hary 1996). In that tradition, the letters א, ו and י often serve exactly the same orthographic function as do their graphemic cognates in classical Arabic spelling, namely to represent the long vowels /ā/, /ū/, and /ī/. For example, in the fifteenth-century Arabic-Spanish glossary discussed in chapter 2, these letters appear as vowels only when they are long (or as part of the definite article) and would thus be spelled in Arabic script. The pattern is illustrated below with ו /ū/:

(25)	אלִּטְפֵר	al-zufr	'fingernail'
	אלִּפְלֵפֵל	al-fulful	'pepper'
	אלִּפּוֹל	al-fūl	'(fava) bean'
	אלִּפְצוּץ	al-fuṣūṣ	'stone'
	אלִּחּוּמֵץ	al-ḥūmmuṣ	'chick pea'

Judeo-Arabic forms in this tradition are very much orthographic calques, produced by substituting each Arabic letter with a phonetically-similar or historically-related Hebrew one, often augmented by diacritics similar to those used on the Arabic letters, e.g. *z* (IPA [ð^ʕ]) as זִ, which like the cognate letter in Arabic script ط represents /t/ when unadorned by a diacritic.

The collision of Romance-language context and adapted Hebrew tradition is most strikingly illustrated on folio 240v. of the Bodleian Passover text, in the following variants of another Portuguese loanword from Arabic:

(26)	אַלְפֵאַסָא	alfaça	'lettuce'
	אַלְפֵאַסָה	alf ^a ç ^a h	

The Hebrew cognate of the Arabic source *al-ḥass* is חֶסֶה *ḥas:ā* (the *dagesh* indicates the historical gemination of the middle radical /s/ in this form of the root). In both Portuguese variants, the phonological adaptation of Semitic *ḥ* to *f* is spelled as such – even in the second instance, where the word lacks any vowel letters (apart from the initial article, in imitation of the spelling of the Arabic definite article), as if based on a typical (though etymologically inaccurate) trilateral Semitic root .ה.ס.פּ *f.s.h.* or even .ה.ס.פּ *p.s.h.*

Although alternants such as these are relatively rare in the parts of the corpus I have examined, the vowel-less forms may still be considered a visual sign of etymological or "learned" spelling. They are in practice akin to the use

of <ph> or <ae> in English, which do not represent any sort of un-nativized pronunciation but are simply a vestige of the word's Greek source. Although the blend of components in the English lexicon might discourage nativization in the orthography³⁰ and also desensitize readers to the variation and competition among these conventions, this is not the case in many other standard orthographies.³¹ Because of its mixture of components (Hebrew and Arabic in particular), however, the Hebraicized Portuguese orthography tolerates un-nativized spellings such as those above, which arise from the contrasting conventions of alphabetic writing and Semitic-language borrowing.

2.5. Imported/innovated characters

The only symbols from outside the canonical Hebrew tradition used by Judeo-Portuguese to further refine their orthography are the apostrophe³² and the occasional hacek. Similarly, there has been no innovation in the basic inventory of letter graphs, nothing akin to the "Roman" letters <j> or <u>, which evolved from allographs of <i> and <v> to independent letters in most Roman-letter orthographies. An exception to this rule in Hebraicized writing more generally may exist in modern Yiddish, where the Yiddish Scientific

³⁰ This may be particularly true for words of Greek or Latin origin, where knowledge of the correct – that is, unadapted – spelling is often given (unduly) strong weight as a marker of erudition and educatedness.

³¹ To wit: at the National Library of Wales in Aberystwyth, English *Aeneas* appears next to Welsh *Eneas* on the display case of a medieval manuscript of Virgil's poem.

³² The apostrophe continues to serve in Modern Hebrew writing to indicate phonemes not found in the native inventory, e.g. צ׳׳ינייה <ʃ'yʃ'nyh> *Chechnya*, ג׳ורג׳ וושינגטון <g'wrg'> *George Washington*. It is possible that the use of these diacritics in Hebrew writing itself was modeled on the practice in Hebraicized vernacular writing, though the other modern tradition, Yiddish, avoids such augmentations in favour of multigraphs, e.g. טשעטשניא <ʦʰʦʰnyʰ> *Chechnya*, דזשארדזש וואשינגטאָן <dzʂʰrdzʂ> *George Washington*.

Institute (YIVO) recommends that *tsvey-vovn* (double-ו) be joined at the base, forming what looks like a Roman <V> (Fishman 1977). In my own experience I have encountered this phenomenon only in the handwritten "blackboard" Yiddish of a few language teachers.

3. BETWEEN TRANSLITERATION AND TRANSCRIPTION

Having described the major orthographic features of Judeo-Portuguese writing, I propose to show how these characteristics have informed my own Romanization scheme.³³ While avoiding outright normalization (see chapter 8 § 2.4), my overarching goal has been to employ a system that preserves the distribution of graphemes in the original texts (thus making it possible to reconstruct the original Hebrew-letter spelling) but that clashes as little as possible with the expectations of a modern Roman-literate (and largely English-speaking) audience. Thus I have largely avoided the letter-borne diacritics and graphotactically-unfamiliar strings that may be found in some Romanizations of Semitic-script texts (cf. chapter 8 § 2.3.1), since the clutter they impose on the orthographic field often outweighs the importance of the information they provide in the Portuguese context. Individual strategies are discussed below – not strictly from the point of view of each Hebrew letter, however, as is normally the case, but from the perspective of the writing system more holistically.

³³ Although the following only applies in a strict sense to the Romanizations in this chapter and in the critical editions of the succeeding chapters, the transliterations of non-Portuguese Hebraicized material in the previous chapter largely conform to this system as well. I have on occasion followed a mixed set of conventions; while these are too multifarious and tangential to enumerate, they nonetheless serve the same goal described here, namely to provide a maximally-informative but minimally-disruptive text to an anglo-literate audience.

3.1. Vowels

Wherever the Portuguese Jewish writer has made use of a *mater lectionis* to serve as a vowel-letter, I have reproduced it in the transliterated form, including "silent" final ם as <-h>. When two ם occur in succession (e.g. in hiatus from a deleted consonant), I normally transliterate both unless the second serves as the diacritic for a following vocalic ם or ם (cf. § 2.2.2). The Romanization of ם and ם themselves usually involves a choice between <o>/<u> and <e>/<i> respectively, which I have based on a combination of etymological and phonological considerations.

When a vowel is not explicitly spelled, I have transliterated it as a superscript, even if it is indicated by *niqqud*. I base this decision on the fact that Hebraicized Portuguese writing is emphatically alphabetic – that is, vowel letters are the norm and the *niqqud* that is used rarely if ever disambiguates forms that would otherwise be homographic. Thus all deviations from this norm are indicated by the most suitable analogy in transliteration, i.e. superscribed Roman vowel letters.

3.2. Semivowels

A single ם is rendered as <v> where it has a consonantal value, and as <o> or <u> (depending on etymological and phonological considerations) where it serves to represent a vowel (double-ם, which is almost exclusively consonantal, is transliterated as an italicized <v>³⁴). The same applies to ם, which is rendered as <y> when it serves as a consonant, and as <e> or <i> (again based on etymology) when it represents a vowel; double-ם is rendered

³⁴ The Roman letter that could be seen as most faithfully rendering the graphemic form of double-ם, namely <w>, produces the wrong effect for anglophone readers.

as <y> when it follows ם or ץ to indicate palatalization (or else indicating the semivowel), but as <ei> when it indicates a vocalic diphthong.

3.3. בגד־כפת *begad-kefat* (Stops/Spirants)

פ is rendered as <p> or <f> depending on the presence or absence of a diacritic to indicate the stop (unaugmented or with *dagesh*) or spirant (*rafeh*, *hacek*, or *apostrophe*) value, though no diacritic is added to either of the Roman letters. By contrast, ם and ץ are rendered as <g>/<ḡ>/<ḡ̄> and /<ḅ> respectively depending on the use of a diacritic on the Hebrew letter.³⁵ However, all three letters (ץ/ף/צ) are rendered in italics, i.e. <*b*>/<*g*>/<*f*>, when a spirant is expected (usually based on considerations of Portuguese phonology) but no diacritic is present in the Hebrew-letter original.

3.4. Sibilants

As noted in § 2.3.2, ש ם is the default sibilant letter in Judeo-Portuguese writing. For this reason, despite its historical and modern Hebrew value as /š/, as well as the widespread occurrence of this sound in (modern) Portuguese, this letter is rendered simply as <s> in my Romanization (except in Hebrew words themselves, or in the few instances in *As kores* where it is augmented by an apostrophe). Similarly, since ם s represents sibilants that almost exclusively derive from sources other than simple Latin /s/, it is transcribed as <ç> here, giving it approximately the same distribution as <ç> (and <c> before <e> and <i>) in modern Portuguese orthography. Thus I do

³⁵ For typographic reasons I avoid the apostrophe in transliteration, using a *hacek* instead. Only a macron, however, is used with , also for typographic reasons.

not exploit the convention of "soft-c" in Roman-letter Portuguese (where the cedilla is not required before <e> and <i>) and avoid the unadorned <c> altogether in my Romanization.

3.5. Velar stop

ק is always rendered as <k>, despite the fact that this convention follows neither the Semitic philological tradition (where it is transliterated as <q>) nor traditional Portuguese orthography, where [k] is written as either <c> or the digraph <qu>, and the letter <k> is generally avoided.³⁶ Using this character is the most efficient way to indicate the appropriate phoneme, while preserving the single-grapheme choice of the Judeo-Portuguese writer.

3.6. Final forms

Because they are used only and always in final position in this corpus, no distinction is made in Roman script to indicate the final forms. This is normal practice in most if not all Romanizations of most if not all Hebraicized texts.

³⁶ Although not a factor per se in my rationale, it is striking that most systems of modern (Romanized) Judeo-Spanish use <k> where modern Spanish orthography has <c> or <qu>, probably for the very reason that it may be the only feature to distinguish some forms in written Judeo-Spanish from those written as standard Castilian.