Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Matthew Witkin April 3, 2019

Ḥaketía: An Ecological Perspective

By

Matthew Witkin

Hazel Gold, PhD
Donald N. Tuten, PhD
Advisors

Department of Spanish and Portuguese

Hazel Gold, PhD
Advisor

Donald Tuten, PhD
Advisor

Pazit Kahlon-Shelnutt, MA
Committee Member

2019

Ḥaketía: An Ecological Perspective

By

Matthew Witkin

Hazel Gold, PhD
Donald N. Tuten, PhD
Advisors

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of Spanish and Portuguese

2019

Abstract

Ḥaketía: An Ecological Perspective

By Matthew Witkin

Ḥaketía is an Ibero-Romance language traditionally used by Sephardic communities in northern and coastal Morocco (particularly the cities of Tetouan, Tangier, Larache, Asilah, El Ksar el-Kebir, Essaouira, Fez, and Casablanca) and Oran, Algeria, in greatest regular use from 1492 to 1956 (albeit with evident decline from at least as early as 1860). It shares many features with historical and modern Peninsular Spanish as well as eastern Mediterranean varieties of Judeo-Spanish, but it has retained or acquired features that distinguish it from both of these. Over the centuries, Ḥaketía was used in these communities alongside numerous other language varieties that were used by other Moroccan communities: Moroccan Arabic, Classical Arabic, Moroccan Judeo-Arabic, Berber languages, Judeo-Berber, French, and peninsular Castilian. However, thanks to ongoing contact via trade and religious dialogue, it was not the only variety of Judeo-Spanish used by the Moroccan Sephardic communities, for in published written texts (for example, the communal edicts known as the *takkanot* or the rabbinic work *Vayomer Yiẓḥak*) they more often made use of an elite, pan-Sephardic literary register of Judeo-Spanish (referred to as Ladino in this study) that was shared with, and predominantly influenced by, other Sephardic communities in the Mediterranean. As a result, and unlike varieties of Judeo-Spanish spoken in the eastern Mediterranean such as those used in Salonika and Constantinople, Ḥaketía was relegated almost exclusively to the status of community vernacular that was rarely used in written texts. As such, its speakers imagined it as one, local variety of relatively low prestige on a broader continuum of Sephardic language varieties. Even so, the close-knit social networks of the Moroccan Sephardic communities favored its retention and its "covert" positive evaluation as a marker of community solidarity and belonging.

The ecological approach of this study contributes to ongoing re-evaluation of the use and status, as well as the reasons for retention, of Ḥaketía and Judeo-Spanish more generally. It emphasizes that Judeo-Spanish and Ḥaketía in particular are not merely the results of isolation of these communities from the changing norms of Peninsular Spanish. It also emphasizes that the differences between western (Moroccan) and eastern varieties of Judeo-Spanish are not only or principally the result of isolation from each other. Rather, in the sociohistorical contexts in which they lived, users of these varieties actively interacted with their unique language environments, changing their language to better adapt to the contexts in which they lived, prayed, and conducted business.

Keywords: Judeo-Spanish, Ḥaketía, Haketia, Ladino, Sephardic, Sephardim, Jews of North Africa, Morocco, Ecology of Language, Koineization

Ḥaketía: An Ecological Perspective

By

Matthew Witkin

Hazel Gold, PhD

Donald N. Tuten, PhD

Advisors

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of Spanish and Portuguese

2019

Acknowledgements

A million and one thanks to my advisors, Professor Tuten and Professor Gold, for staying with me during the entire thesis writing process, and for their constant encouragement and guidance. Their knowledge and insight know no bounds, and I am incredibly honored, humbled, and proud to have had the chance to work and study under them. Thank you to Professor Kahlon-Shelnutt for her willingness to help and for her insights into my contribution to this field. To my Mom, Dad, and brother Brandon, I could not have done this without you and the love that we have for each other as a family that spans the thousands of miles in between us. This work is in dedication to my grandparents and to all the generations that struggled long before me to carry our traditions forward and pass them on to us: Grandma Bobby, Grandpa Al, Grandpa Steve, Grandma Merrilee, and Grandpa Bob. May I continue to make all of you proud.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction……..1

Chapter 2: Features and Formation of Ḥaketía…….9

Chapter 3: An Ecological Approach to Ḥaketía……39

Chapter 4: The Decline of Ḥaketía……54

Chapter 5: Conclusion……...69

References……73

Ḥaketía: An Ecological Perspective

1. Introduction

Other than Hebrew, the biblical language that was resurrected in the 20th century when the state of Israel was founded (1948), only Yiddish has achieved near-universal popular recognition as a uniquely Jewish language. The exclusive focus on Yiddish, spoken by Ashkenazim (Jews from Northern and Eastern Europe), fails to take into account the diversity of global Jewish culture and languages. Sephardim, the second-largest Jewish ethnic group, trace their origins to the Iberian peninsula. Although expelled from Spain in 1492, and subsequently from Portugal in 1497, they did not abandon the Romance language they spoke. This language, Judeo-Spanish, was maintained in pockets across the Mediterranean for centuries after the expulsion, serving as a language of community, prayer, song, and literature. This language, Judeo-Spanish, was maintained in pockets across the Mediterranean for centuries after the expulsion, serving as a language of community, prayer, song, and literature. Even those who are aware of the language's existence generally are only familiar with the eastern variety of Judeo-Spanish, referred to in my study as Judezmo. Judezmo has been relatively well studied and has produced a wealth of literature and theater over the centuries, attracting the attention of many scholars and amateur enthusiasts as well. However, the western variety of Judeo-Spanish, formerly spoken in Morocco, never produced such a substantial literary tradition, and therefore has been in large part overlooked in comparison to the eastern variety Judezmo. Ḥaketía, the endonym given to the Judeo-Ibero-Romance language spoken primarily in the cities and towns of northern and coastal Morocco from 1492 to as late as 1956, was the main language spoken by Jews particularly in Tangier, Tetouan, Larache, Asilah, El Ksar el-Kebir, Ceuta, and Melilla. It was also the main Jewish language in Oran, Algeria, and was an important minority language in

Essaouira (sometimes in the West called Mogador), Fez, Marrakesh, Casablanca, Rabat, and Salé. The language was born from the expulsion of Iberia's Jews during the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions and reared to maturity at the edges of the Mediterranean. The persistence and evolution of the language over the more than five centuries since the 1492 expulsion is a unique testament to the linguistic and cultural tenacity of the Sephardic Jews of the Maghreb.

The purpose of this thesis is to examine why and how Ḥaketía survived for such an extended period of time, and to better understand the relevance of the language to those who spoke it and to the society in which those speakers lived. My study also seeks to clarify the ever-changing social contexts in which Ḥaketía was used as a communal variety in relation to the multitude of other languages within Morocco during Ḥaketía's period of greatest usage, 1492 to 1956. To accomplish this, I will analyze Ḥaketía and Morocco more generally through the lens of the ecology of language model. This model was developed by the sociolinguist Einar Haugen, who defines the ecology of language as the system of changing relationships between various languages and their speakers within a society (Haugen-1972: 325). More explicitly, this theory sets up the metaphor of languages as species, surviving and competing in one or more ecosystems, the various human societies of the world. The model is useful for the purposes of this thesis, as it provides an excellent framework to examine the changing social status and functions of languages within a society.

The period of critical study in this thesis is defined as the years between 1492, the date of the forced expulsion of Jews from the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon, and 1956, the year Morocco gained its independence from its French and Spanish colonizers. The period of study must be wide due to a severe dearth of written records in Ḥaketíaand the vast range of social "niches" the language and its speakers have occupied; however, the broad period in question

truly showcases the tumultuous ecosystem in which the language survived, and even thrived[1]. Colloquial and liturgical use of the language marked the identity of its speakers, distinguishing them religiously and ethnically from other Jewish communities of North Africa to the point that Ḥaketía speakers referred to native Moroccan Jewish communities as *forasteros*, the Ḥaketía word for 'outsiders.' What I will assert in this thesis, however, is that Ḥaketía was never a cause or result of isolation, but rather an instrument used to connect with a much larger community and a vehicle for the economic and political development of Sephardic Jews in Morocco.

A. History of the Jews of Morocco:

In order to better understand the language ecosystem in which Ḥaketía was spoken, this section of my study will establish the geographical, historical, and social contexts into which the language was to arrive and flourish. First, it is important to understand that the Sephardim were not by any means the first or only group of Jews to arrive in Morocco. Jews have been an integral part of Morocco since long before Ḥaketía and its speakers arrived. Legend says that Jews have resided in Morocco as far back as the period of the First Temple of Jerusalem, in the fifth to third centuries B.C.E. (Zafrani 2005: 1). The Carthaginian Empire's gold markets, at the time situated in what is now northern Morocco, attracted travelers and traders from around the Mediterranean, and the legend holds that the first Jews of Morocco were in fact Israelite merchants looking to purchase gold (www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org). While it is unclear whether this legend holds historical merit, what is certain is that the earliest surviving written evidence of Jewish communities in Morocco dates from at least the second century C.E. This written record appears in the Roman ruins of Volubilis, in the form of Hebrew inscribed on tombstones of a

[1] Through the ecology of language model, I will also explore the reasons for the lack of written records, reasons which also led to the decline of Ḥaketía.

Jewish cemetery (Zafrani 2005: 1-2). Other Jewish tombstones from the same period, this time written in Ancient Greek, exist near Salé, denoting the existence of ancient Moroccan Jewish communities (jewishvirtuallibrary.org).

Second, the Jewish peoples of the ancient Maghreb region were by no means a homogeneous community. Other communities existed beyond Volubilis and Salé: some Jews apparently moved beyond the Roman sphere of influence, settling among the native Berber tribes of the interior (jewishvirtuallibrary.org). Some Jewish missionaries are said to have focused on converting the Berbers, to varying degrees of success, while other Jews may have integrated themselves within Berber communities over the centuries, cyclically fleeing from various outbreaks of religious persecution by the Romans and even subsequent Arab dynasties (Gilbert 2010: 4). Historians disagree over the dates when these Berber tribes were converted; what is certain is that the Jewish descendants of those Roman settlers and Jewish Berber tribes still existed at the time of the Arab invasions, and were documented by Muslim historians at the time (Pennel 2003: 14; Zafrani 2005: 2-3). Many cultural artifacts of these heterogeneous Jewish communities from this period exist to this day, including small communities of speakers of several Judeo-Berber languages (Zafrani 2005: 2-3). As will soon become evident in this thesis, cultural heterogeneity and the Judaization of local vernaculars are fundamentally defining themes in the history of the Jews in Morocco.

Two further watershed moments define the historical and linguistic background of this thesis: the Arab conquest of Morocco and the expulsion of the Iberian peninsula's large Romance-speaking Jewish population. The Arab conquest of the Maghreb and what is today Morocco began in the end of the 7th century and culminated with the establishment of the Idrisid dynasty in the first decade of the 8th century (Pennel 2003: 24-25). The Arab military leader

Uqba bin Nafi led an assault on the Byzantine rulers of North Africa beginning in 662 CE, sweeping through much of the southern Mediterranean's coastline and finally reaching the Atlantic Ocean in 682 (Pennel 2003: 24-25). However, in what would become the first occurrence of a recurring theme in the history of Morocco, Berber tribes rose up against the Arab conquerors in 686 from the Atlas Mountains, forcing out the conquering Muslim army and successfully keeping them out of all land from Morocco to modern Tunisia (Pennel 2003: 24-26). It would take until 710 for Muslim conquerors to subdue these provinces, when Arab armies even reached as far south as the Sous valley, where modern-day Agadir is located (Pennel 2003: 26).

In Morocco as in numerous other territories, the conquering Arab armies found many Jews and Christians who, being Peoples of the Book, were given protected status and were not required to convert to Islam (Zafrani 2005: 3-4). However, while they were protected and generally tolerated, this came with the legal status of *dhimmi* (Zafrani 2005: 3-4). The *dhimmis* held a sort of second-class citizenship, which in exchange for freedom of religion required them to pay the *jizya,* a sort of poll tax for non-Muslims, and the *kharaj*, a land tax from which Muslims were exempted (Laskier 1983: 10-11). *Dhimmis* were required to wear special clothing to mark them as infidels, were not allowed to ride a horse or possess weapons, and frequently were not permitted build new synagogues or churches even though some were at times forcibly converted into mosques (Laskier 1983: 10-11). Before the law, *dhimmis* were far from equal: a *dhimmi* man could not marry a Muslim woman, though a Muslim man could marry a *dhimmi* woman. A *dhimmi's* testimony or evidence in court could not be held against a Muslim's. If a Muslim murdered a *dhimmi*, the Muslim would not be given the normal punishment for killing a Muslim, the death penalty (Laskier 1983: 10-11). While this status and treatment were far better

for Jews than those in almost any other territory at the time, particularly better than the situation of many non-Christians in Europe, it is important for the purposes of this thesis to understand the marginal status of non-Muslims, which will become another critical theme in the history of both Morocco and Ḥaketía (Zafrani 2005: 4).

The status of non-Muslims would in fact become immediately relevant to the people of Iberia, many of whom would eventually become Ḥaketía's speakers. The many non-Jewish Berber tribes of North Africa were not Peoples of the Book, and could therefore be forced to convert to Islam or face an impossible choice: be shipped back to the eastern Muslim lands and sold into slavery, or be pressed into military service (Pennel 2003: 26-27). In 711, with their armies now bolstered by a large number of Berbers, Arab forces invaded the Iberian peninsula, crossing the Strait of Gibraltar and establishing the first of the Muslim kingdoms that would rule greater or lesser regions of the peninsula, along with its many Jews, for the better part of seven hundred years (Pennel 2003: 27).

Although it would remain a relatively unimportant western outpost of Islam, Morocco would undergo a process of Arabization over the following centuries. The Arabic language's influence would begin to transform the linguistic landscape of the Maghreb, dividing the land and the peoples between the Arabic-speaking cities and coastal plains and the Berber-speaking mountains and interior. By the time the Sephardim arrived in Morocco, the majority of Jews primarily spoke Judeo-Moroccan Arabic, changing the linguistic makeup of the Jewish community there dramatically. Therefore, the Arab conquest of Morocco marks the first cultural turning point in the history of Jewish Morocco.

B. Arrival of the Sephardim

In order to better understand the second critical moment in Judeo-Moroccan history, it is important to discuss the existence of many internal distinctions within the Jewish people, such as religious practice, language, and ethnicity. For most of its history, Judaism has been a geographically and ethnically dispersed religion. The Jewish world has been geographically dispersed since at least the time of the Babylonian Empire, when Jews were first deported to Babylon around the year 600 BCE (Levenson 2012: 156). Since the destruction of the Second Temple by the Roman Empire in 70 CE, the Jewish faith has also been religiously decentralized, with each community being led by its own rabbi, or spiritual leader (Levenson 2012: 102). While rabbis very regularly communicated with one another across great distances in order to discuss religious interpretations and the specifics of practice (Levenson 2012: 183), the geographically and religiously decentralized faith has understandably developed numerous, robust internal divisions along geographic, ethnic, linguistic, cultural, and doctrinal lines (Levenson 2012: 550-551). While there are many other groups, among the largest of these Jewish ethnic divisions are the Ashkenazim (Hebrew: Germans) of northern and eastern Europe, the Sephardim (Hebrew: Spaniards) originally of the Iberian Peninsula, and the Mizrahim (Hebrew: Easterners) of North Africa and the greater Middle East (Levenson 2012: 550-551). The most important distinction in this thesis is that between the Sephardim, the traditionally Judeo-Spanish-speaking descendants of those exiled from the Iberian Peninsula during the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions, and the Mizrahim, a heterogeneous group of Jews native to Arab or Muslim lands who traditionally spoke dialects of Judeo-Arabic or local varieties such as Judeo-Berber dialects.

The Sephardim originated on the Iberian peninsula, existing there in large numbers at least since the time of the Romans (www.jewishencyclopedia.com). Under Muslim rule in Iberia,

the community particularly flourished; Jews wrote beautiful poetry, held some positions in government, and translated important works into Arabic (www.jewishencyclopedia.com). For centuries, they lived under some of the most tolerant and prosperous regimes in Europe, the Islamic kingdoms of Al-Andalus, the Arabic name for the Iberian peninsula that is today Spain and Portugal. However, this was not to last: the encroaching Christian kingdoms slowly chipped away at the Islamic territories from the north in a process they called the Reconquista ('Reconquest'), and to combat them the Islamic kingdoms in the eleventh century called upon the Almoravids, a fanatical Muslim Berber warrior tribe. The Almoravids fought off the advancing Christian armies, but then seized Al-Andalus for themselves. They were true zealots, and persecuted the non-Muslims of their kingdom (www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org). This period under the Almoravids and their successors, the Almohads, caused many Christians and Jews to flee northwards to Christian lands.

Significant Jewish flight from the Iberian peninsula to the North African region of the Maghreb occurred during the later period of the Spanish Reconquista. Conditions for Jews in the Iberian Peninsula began to worsen from the 11th century onwards as they became trapped between the Christian kingdoms that were slowly pushing further south over the centuries, and the increasingly zealous and intolerant Islamic dynasties such as the Almoravid and Almohad dynasties ruling both Morocco and Al-Andalus. In the year 1391, Christian incitement of anti-Semitic sentiments erupted in a large anti-Jewish pogrom in the Christian kingdoms of Iberian Peninsula, beginning a tenuous century for the Jews during which increasing numbers would flee Spain.

However, the most significant moment in Sephardic history came when the Jews of Castile and Aragon, the precursor kingdoms to the modern Spanish nation-state, were expelled

by the Edict of Alhambra in the year 1492. Some 200,000 people were suddenly forced from their homeland by the threat of torture, forced conversion, or death (jewishvirtuallibrary.com).[2] From 1492 through the sixteenth century, the wave of 'exiles,' or *megorashim* in Hebrew, swelled the Jewish population of Morocco, and initially came into intense conflict with native Moroccan Jews, whom they called *toshavim*, 'foreigners' in Hebrew (Levenson 2012: 223-224). In the north, in communities like Tetouan and Tangier, the *toshavim* were swallowed up by the waves of *megorashim*, and after only a few generations were completely assimilated. Even the descendants of *toshavim* came to call the non-Ḥaketía speakers of the interior *forasteros*, outsiders or aliens. However, in the southern interior many of the newcomers linguistically assimilated to the Judeo-Moroccan Arabic-speaking environment, even though they separated themselves socially and religiously from the native Jews for centuries by creating the "*takkanot* of the exiles of Castile" (Sisso Raz 2015: 115). These *takkanot*, or religious and communal edicts issued by Moroccan Sephardic rabbis to govern community practices such as marriage and inheritance, were based heavily on Spanish laws and customs and provide a wealth of information about the communities in which the Moroccan Sephardim lived (Sisso Raz 2015: 115).

2. Features and Formation of Ḥaketía

Comprehensively defining and understanding the linguistic organization of Judeo-Spanish is an exercise in complexity. The language has never had a true regulatory body, the backing of a state-sponsored educational system, a consistent standard orthography[3] or lexicon,

[2] There is considerable debate – and little consensus – about the number of Jews who actually went into exile. Joseph Pérez (2007) states the number to be between 40,000 and 100,000, while Jewish Virtual Library states that the number is around 200,000.

[3] Across the centuries it has been written in Hebrew Rashi and Solitreo scripts, various Latin scripts, Arabic scripts, Cyrillic, and even in the Greek alphabet, and never had truly standardized orthography.

nor even a fixed geographic territory in which it predominated (Lleal 1992: 17-45, Minervini 1997-8). Linguistic organization of the language is further complicated by the broad range of endonyms and exonyms employed to describe both the "language" as a whole or various varieties of the language. Among them are Ladino, Judeo-Spanish, Ḥaketía or Hakitia, Judezmo, Jidyó, and Espanyolito.[4] For the sake of clarity, this thesis will adopt and elaborate upon the usage found in Bunis (2008), and will utilize four terms to distinguish distinct varieties of the Judeo-Spanish language. Slightly elaborating on Bunis's aforementioned usage, in this thesis all varieties of the Judeo-Ibero-Romance language spoken by the Sephardim will be referred to as Judeo-Spanish. The spoken varieties of Judeo-Spanish in the eastern Mediterranean, including such communities as Salonika, Constantinople, and Jerusalem, will be referred to as Judezmo, while the spoken varieties of northern Morocco and western Algeria will be referred to as Ḥaketía. Finally, the literary register of the language will be referred to as Ladino. This thesis seeks to demonstrate that Ḥaketía is its own distinct entity, united sufficiently by unique structural features to distinguish it from peninsular Spanish as well as Judezmo and Ladino.

The etymology of the endonym Ḥaketía is disputed. The first scholar to study the language, philologist José Benoliel, suggested two possible origins. The first theory states that Ḥaketía derives from "Haquito," referring to "Ishaquito," or a diminutive of the name of the Jewish patriarch Isaac (Benoliel 1977: 210). However, Benoliel notably prefers the second theory, which is also more widely accepted amongst those studying Ḥaketía. This second theory states that the word is a derivative of the Arabic verb *ḥaká*, 'to chat' or 'to tell,' which corresponds well with its use as a communal vernacular (Benoliel 1977: 213). The word *ḥaká* is pronounced with the voiceless pharyngeal fricative /ħ/, which in this paper will be represented

[4] "Judeo-Spanish" was not a historical term, but has been increasingly adopted in popular usage and by linguists. The rest of these terms are historical names used by its speakers for their language.

with “ḥ”, which is also found in the initial position of the word “Ḥaketía.” In the sections below, standard Peninsular Spanish first will be compared to Judeo-Spanish as a whole, and then the Judezmo variety of Judeo-Spanish will be compared with the Ḥaketía variety to demonstrate the various features that define each.

A. Linguistic Features of Ḥaketía:

I. Phonology

Judeo-Spanish is frequently described by linguists studying the evolution of Spanish as having a somewhat conservative phonology (Lapesa 1980: 526). However, Judeo-Spanish is, as with any language, conservative in some areas and quite innovative in others (Penny 2000: 174-194). For instance, the first area in which it differs from Spanish is in its phonology, which is conservative in some respects and quite innovative in others. For comparison between the two language varieties, below is a chart following International Phonetic Alphabet conventions that lists the inventory of sounds found in most modern varieties of Peninsular Spanish, contrasted with a chart for Ḥaketía, which is arguably more innovative than Judezmo.

Table 1: *Modern Peninsular Spanish language phonological inventory chart* (Martínez Celdrán, Fernández Planas & Carrera Sabaté, 2003: 255)

CONSONANTS	Bilabial		Labiodental		Dental		Alveolar		Postalveolar		Palatal		Velar	
Plosive	p	b			t̪	d̪							k	g
Nasal		m						n				ɲ		ŋ
Trill								r						
Tap or Flap								ɾ						
Fricative		(β)	f		(θ)	(ð)	s		(ʃ)				x	(ɣ)
Approximant												j		
Lateral approximant								l				(ʎ)		
Affricate									tʃ					

VOWELS	Front	Back
Close	i	u
Close-mid	e	o
Open	a	

Table 2: *IPA Chart of Ḥaketía constructed from UCLA Phonetics Lab Archive,* The Language of the Sephardim: A Historical Overview *by David M. Bunis* (1992: 114)*, and analysis of* Dialecto Judeo-Hispano-Marroquí o Ḥakitía *by José Benoliel.*

CONSONANTS	Bilabial		Labiodental		Dental		Alveolar		Postalveolar		Palatal		Velar		Uvular		Pharyngeal		Glottal	
Plosive	p	b			t̪	d̪							k	g	q					
Nasal		m						n				ɲ		ŋ					ʔ	
Trill								r												
Tap or Flap								ɾ												
Fricative		(β)	f	v		(ð)	s	z	ʃ	ʒ			x	(ɣ)			ħ	ʕ		
Approximant												j							h	
Lateral approximant								l												
Affricate									tʃ	dʒ										

VOWELS	Front	Back
Close	i	u
Close-mid	e	o
Open	a	

One reason that Judeo-Spanish is often described as conservative is because most varieties of the language preserve five phonemes from medieval Spanish, most of which no longer exist in most varieties of modern Spanish: the voiced and voiceless post-alveolar

fricatives /ʒ/ and /ʃ/ (cf. respectively the *s* sound in "pleasure" and the *sh* sound in "fish"), the voiced post-alveolar affricate /d͡ʒ/[5] (cf. the *j* sound in "joke"), the voiced labiodental fricative /v/ (cf. *v* in "voice"), and a voiced alveolar fricative /z̲/ (similar to the *z* in "zero") (Penny 2000). No other Ibero-Romance language variety today besides Mirandese preserves all six of the medieval central Ibero-Romance sibilants: /ʒ/, /ʃ/, /d͡ʒ/, / t͡ʃ/, /s̲/, and /z̲/, so it is exceptional that many varieties of Judeo-Spanish have preserved six of them, or even five in the case of Ḥaketía, which likely merged /d͡ʒ/ and /ʒ/ (Bunis 1992: 420; Tuten, Schwarzwald, and Pato 2015: 389).[6]

Several other phonological features of Judeo-Spanish, however, are also notable for their innovative natures. For example, take the merger of /ɲ/ with /nj/ in some varieties of Judeo-Spanish, losing the phoneme /ɲ/ with the result that *español*, [e.spa.ɲól] 'Spanish,' becomes *espaniol* [e.span.jól] (Penny 2000: 180-185). This is by no means the only phonological innovation in Judeo-Spanish: another example is the independent merger of /lj/ with the voiced palatal lateral approximant /ʎ/ (cf. *caliente*, 'hot' [ka.ljén.te] becomes [ka.ʎén.te]) *before* the advent of yeísmo, or the merger of the /ʎ/ phoneme with /j/, which now also predominates in almost all modern varieties of Spanish (Penny 2000: 180-185). Penny compares this innovation with what occurred in peninsular Spanish (Penny 2000: 180-185), stating that in standard varieties of Spanish, as well as in Judeo-Spanish, a verb like *llenar* was originally pronounced [ʎe.nár], but became [je.nár], written as *yenar* in Latin script Judeo-Spanish. However, due to the merger of /lj/ with /ʎ/ in Judeo-Spanish before the advent of yeísmo, words with /lj/ such as *familia* [fa.mí.lja] ('family') would have become [fa.mí.ʎa], and *then* underwent yeísmo. This

[5] Bunis (1992: 420) states that /d͡ʒ/ merged with /ʒ/ in North Africa.

[6] It is also posited by Penny (2008) that a sixth, separate phoneme /d͡z/ exists, distinct from /d͡ʒ/, and used for words such as *dizir* ('to say'). However, Schwarzwald (2015: 389) disputes this, stating that /d͡z/ merged with /z̲/ or in a few cases /d͡ʒ/, which seems far more likely than Penny's model given that, except in loanwords, the devoiced counterpart of /d͡z/, /ts/, has been entirely absorbed into the sibilant /s̲/ (Tuten, Schwarzwald, and Pato 2015: 389).

leads to a very innovative form of yeísmo, where *familia* became the modern Judeo-Spanish form *famía* or *famiya* [fa.míja], and the aforementioned *caliente* would become *kayente/kayenti* [ka.jéɲ.t̪e] or [ka.jéɲ.t̪i]. Furthermore, another innovation that appears in some varieties of Judeo-Spanish but is suppressed in standard peninsular Spanish is the strengthening and analogical extension of the initial diphthong /we/ to /ɣwe/ or even /gwe/. For example, the third person present tense of the Spanish verb *oler*, 'to smell', *huele* [wé.le], became strengthened to [ɣwé.le] and then [gwé.le]. Then, by a process known as analogical extension, the /g/ phoneme was extended to other conjugations of the same verb, such that *oler* became "*goler*", conjugated in the third person present tense as *gole* in some varieties of Judeo-Spanish such as Ḥaketía (Benoliel 1977: 355; Tuten, Schwarzwald, and Pato 2015: 391). As can be seen in the previous examples, Judeo-Spanish is not merely phonologically conservative, but actually quite innovative in some aspects of its phonology.

There are also significant differences between different varieties of Judeo-Spanish, particularly between the Ḥaketía and Judezmo varieties. Ḥaketía as a language variety has been understudied in comparison to its eastern counterpart Judezmo, and it can be challenging if not impossible to craft a definitive phonological inventory for the variety of Judeo-Spanish, largely owing to differences between individual speakers and to various Arabic or Hebrew lexical borrowings. That being said, several unique phonological features have developed in this variety that do not appear in other varieties of Judeo-Spanish, in modern Spanish, or even in many other Romance languages. Ḥaketía is phonologically distinguished from other varieties largely due to its ongoing contact with the range of languages present in Morocco. It absorbed several phonemes directly from Moroccan Arabic. For example, the very name of the language variety, "Ḥaketía," includes one of the most striking phonological features, the voiceless pharyngeal

fricative phoneme /ħ/ (Arabic: hah ح), a sound borrowed from Arabic (Lillich, n.d.:15). In loan words from Hebrew and Arabic, it has also been attested that a voiceless glottal stop /ʔ/, as in the word *ʻajuba* (an expression of astonishment) (Sisso Raz 2010:), and a voiced pharyngeal fricative /ʕ/, as in the Arabic loanword *ʕayyán* ('tired') (Bunis 1992: 418), were adopted to maintain the original pronunciations of borrowings. It is also attested that a voiceless uvular plosive /q/ native to Arabic, sometimes represented by the Arabic letter qaf ق or the Latin letter "q", existed in loanwords due to contact with Judeo-Moroccan Arabic (Benoliel 1977: 214; Bunis 2008: 187).

The high degree of lexical borrowings and borrowing of sounds from Moroccan Arabic needed to reproduce loanwords lend themselves to the development of a more complicated phonological inventory than those of either modern Spanish or Judezmo, and distinguishes Ḥaketía from these related varieties. However, its proximity to and frequent contact with the Iberian Peninsula, which became far more frequent in the middle of the nineteenth century during and after the Spanish invasion of Morocco, have also caused the variety to converge phonologically in some ways with the Spanish language of Spain. For example, as contact increased and the Spanish began to administer northern Morocco from 1860 onwards, the phonemes /ʒ/ and /ʃ/ were sometimes replaced by /h/ in an attempt by Ḥaketía speakers to "modernize" the language (Penny, 2000: 192). For example, the word *dexar*, originally pronounced /d̪e.ʃáɾ/ and meaning 'to leave,' would become /d̪e.háɾ/, and *ojo*, pronounced /ó.ʒo/ and meaning 'eye,' would become /ó.ho/.

II. Grammar

A second reason Judeo-Spanish as a whole is sometimes described by linguists as conservative is its retention of several grammatical features from medieval Ibero-Romance

languages. For example, it maintains its pronouns from Spanish, and importantly maintains a deferential *tú/vos* distinction, with *tú* used informally and *vos* for polite situations, which was a distinction practiced heavily in North Africa (Penny 2000: 184). *Él* and *eya* are also used in the eastern dialects as another form of polite address, although it is unclear whether that distinction developed in North Africa (Penny 2000: 184). Likewise, in the east, *eyos/eyas* are used where most Spanish varieties would use *ustedes* to show deference to a plural audience, although according to Benoliel (1977: 140) in Ḥaketía the *vosotros* or *vozotros* form was acceptable for crowds (Penny 2000: 184). The *usted* and *ustedes* pronouns, used commonly in most varieties of modern Spanish to refer with deference to a singular and plural audience, is noticeably missing, having appeared much later in the evolution of Spanish as a contraction of *vuestra merced* (Penny, 2000: 152). However, the language as a whole also innovates in a number of ways that can be seen in Tables 3 and 4 below. For instance, the Spanish first-person singular present conjugation, *-o*, often becomes *-oy* in Judeo-Spanish (particularly in North Africa), and the first-person plural pronouns *mozotros* and *mozotras* are markedly different from the Spanish *nosotros* and *nosotras*. In the preterite tense, something even more innovative occurs: the first-person singular and first-person plural preterite conjugation of verbs ending in *-ar* both end in *-í*, whereas in Spanish they would be *-é* and *-amos* respectively (Benoliel 1977: 351).

Table 3: *Present Tense Judeo-Spanish pronouns and normal conjugations (Benoliel 1977: 351;*

	-ar verbs tomar	-er verbs komer	-ir verbs vivir
yo (1SG)	**-oy** tom**oy**	**-oy** kom**oy**	**-oy** viv**oy**
tú (2SG-Informal)	**-as** tom**as**	**-es** kom**es**	**-es** viv**es**
el/eya (3SG-Formal)	**-a** tom**a**	**-e** kom**e**	**-e** viv**e**
mozotros/mozotras (1PL)	**-amos** tom**amos**	**-emos** kom**emos**	**-imos** viv**imos**
vos (2SG-Formal) /vozotros/vozotras (2PL-Informal)	**-ais** tom**ais**	**-ís** kom**ís**	**-ís** viv**ís**
eyos/eyas (2PL-Formal/3PL)	**-an** tom**an**	**-en** kom**en**	**-en** viv**en**

Table 4: *Preterite Tense Judeo-Spanish pronouns and normal conjugations*

	-ar verbs tomar	-er verbs komer	-ir verbs vivir
yo	**-í** tom**í**	**-í** kom**í**	**-í** viv**í**
tú	**-átes** tom**ates**	**-ítes** kom**ites**	**-ítes** viv**ites**
el/eya	**-ó** tom**ó**	**-ió** kom**ió**	**-ió** viv**ió**
mozotros/mozotras	**-imos** tom**imos**	**-imos** kom**imos**	**-imos** viv**imos**
vos/vozotros/vozotras	**-átis** tom**átis**	**-ítis** komítis	**-ítis** viv**ítis**
eyos/eyas	**-aron** tom**aron**	**-ieron** kom**ieron**	**-ieron** viv**ieron**

One of the most distinguishing features of Judeo-Spanish is its heavy adoption of Hebrew and Aramaic words, and the extension of Hebrew syntax and morphology into the language. For example, while the normal plural morpheme in Judeo-Spanish is *-s*, masculine-gendered Hebrew loan words such as the name for Jews of Iberian origin discussed above, *sefardí*, use the Hebrew masculine plural morpheme *-im* to pluralize, in this case to *sefardím* (Batzarov, Z. (n.d.). http://www.orbilat.com). Other examples include *haham* > *hahamím* (wise man > wise men), or *malah* > *malahím* (angel > angels). The feminine plural *-ot* also appears for some words ending with *-á*, such as *keilá* > *keilot* (synagogue > synagogues), although the Romance pluralizing morpheme *-s* is also acceptable for many of these same words: *keilá* can be pluralized to *keilás*.

An interesting development is the occasional extension of the Hebrew masculine plural morpheme *-ím* to a few common words of Romance origin, such as *ermano* (brother). *Ermano* can be pluralized as either *ermanos*, as it would be in modern Spanish system, or *ermaním*.

Ladrón (thief) also uses this form, and can pluralize to either *ladrones* or *ladroním* (http://www.orbilat.com/).

Ḥaketía is somewhat distinct from other Judeo-Spanish varieties in its morphology, mainly due to its extensive contact with Moroccan Arabic, although some Romance-based differences existed. For example, to form the diminutive it preferred the suffix *-eto* or *-ito* while Judezmo preferred *-eco* or *-ito* (Penny 2000: 185). However, Arabic borrowings are more numerous and unique to Ḥaketía. Bunis (2008: 193-197) mentions two types of morphological borrowings from Arabic: fusional borrowings and prefabricated or ready-made borrowings. The other type of morphemic borrowing from Arabic, fusional morphemic borrowing, parallels the previously mentioned extension of Romance plural morphemes to words of Hebrew origin, such as in the word *keilás*. However, with Arabic borrowings this morphological adoption extends even past pluralization: Bunis (2008: 195-197) notes that some nominal, adjectival, or verbal bases are borrowed from Arabic, and then modified with Romance morphemes to create Romance-style nouns, adjectives, and verbs. For example, the Arabic root *xaml-* ('to clean') is paired with a Romance infinitive morpheme *-ear*, allowing it to be conjugated in a Romance style. The root can be elaborated upon further, for example, to create an agent: *xaml- + ea + -dor* creates *xamleador*, 'cleaner of latrines.'

More interestingly from a linguistic point of view, Bunis (2008) finds approximately forty Ḥaketía nouns listed in Benoliel's work that follow the prefabricated borrowing method, words composed entirely of Arabic morphemes. Generally, Ḥaketía speakers borrowed a root word or noun from Arabic, and then attached an Arabic morpheme when they needed to modify the word in some way, such as to pluralize, to gender, to form an adjective, or even to describe an action's agent (the role of the *-ist* suffix in English). Bunis provides several examples, such as

pluralization of the word *ḥaddad*, 'ironsmith,' (*ḥaddad* + m.pl. *-a* > *ḥaddada*), or the addition of the Arabic agent marker *-awi* to *hadrá*, or 'conversation,' forming *hadrawi* ('conversation' > 'conversationalist'). In this method, Ḥaketía employs Arabic morphemes to modify a small number of Arabic loanwords in the same way that all Judeo-Spanish varieties were previously shown to employ Hebrew morphemes to modify certain Hebrew loanwords. In this way, Ḥaketía morphology distinguishes itself from any other variety of Spanish or Judeo-Spanish.

III. Lexicon

The lexicon of Ḥaketía is certainly what most distinguishes it from its eastern relative Judezmo, as well as from its progenitor language, Spanish. It should come as no surprise that the foundation for and the majority of the lexicon of Judeo-Spanish comes primarily from medieval Spanish (Benoliel 1977: 213). Frequently, however, the Sephardim would replace or change certain words in their speech that may have seemed too Christian or pagan. The most famous example would likely be the Judeo-Spanish word for 'god'. In peninsular Spanish, the word for 'God' is *Dios*, which is singular – but in Judeo-Spanish, the word is *el Dió*. While the origin is uncertain, folk etymology says this change may have derived from Sephardi aversion to the Spanish form's final *-s*, seemingly making the word plural and therefore antithetical to the central monotheistic doctrine of the Jewish faith (www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/the-ladino-language). Further changes occurred after the expulsion: due to five centuries of geographic separation, North African Sephardim differed from their Ottoman cousins in their usage of some important words retained from Spanish. Take the example of the verb *meldar*, a retention from medieval Spanish well-known among scholars of Judeo-Spanish meaning 'to read' in Judezmo[7]. While in the east it may have meant 'to read' in general, in North Africa it explicitly meant 'to

[7] *Meldar* also exists in Ladino, the high-register written form of Judeo-Spanish.

study or cite religious text (only)' (Bunis 1992: 420). Even the word *Judezmo* carried a different connotation between east and west: in the Judezmo variety itself, the word meant both 'Judaism' and 'the Sephardi Ibero-Romance vernacular', while in Ḥaketía it referred strictly to 'Judaism' (Bunis 1992: 420).

As is the case with many Jewish languages, a distinguishing lexical feature of Judeo-Spanish as a whole is its heavy borrowing from Hebrew and Aramaic, for both liturgical and non-liturgical purposes (Bunis 1992: 417-418). The borrowings are largely to describe religious subjects, such as *nés* (miracle), *keilá* (synagogue), or *pésah* (Passover), but also describe certain folk concepts found in Hebrew texts that would have been relevant to the daily lives of Ḥaketía speakers, such as *melaj* (king), *hatán* (boyfriend or groom), *sefer* (book), or *sején* (neighbor) (Benoliel 1977: 513). Essentially, if a concept would appear in a religious or Sephardic communal context, speakers of Ḥaketía would very likely have borrowed a Hebrew or Aramaic term for that concept.

Ḥaketía is most distinctively marked as its own entity by its heavy borrowings from what Bunis (1992) calls co-territorial Arabic, particularly the Judeo-Moroccan variety spoken by the Mizrahi Jews native to Morocco (Benoliel 1977: 214). We know that the Romance varieties Jews in Iberia spoke before the expulsion in 1492 likely had adopted Arabic vocabulary from the former Muslim rulers of Iberia thanks to various lexical similarities that appear in both Ḥaketía and Judezmo, but not in any attested form of Spanish (Bunis 2008: 179-180). Given that the majority of Judezmo's speakers lived in modern-day Turkey, the Balkans, and Greece, further borrowings from dialects of Arabic would have logically been less frequent than in Ḥaketía, so the existence of certain Arabic forms in all varieties of Judeo-Spanish suggests that these terms were adopted while the Sephardim were still living on the Iberian Peninsula. This is the case of

the Judeo-Spanish word for Sunday: *alḥad* in Ḥaketía, and *alxad* in Judezmo. Jewish Ibero-Romance speakers are said to have rejected the Christian Romance word, *domingo*, for its religious connotations of Jesus as *Dominicus*, or 'Lord' in Latin (Bunis 2008: 180).

In the years 1494 to 1495, the traveler Hieronymus Münzer recorded that there had been approximately 20,000 Jews inhabiting Muslim-ruled Granada in 1492 prior to the edict of expulsion (Münzer 1951: 44), and it is well established that many Jews had extensive knowledge of the dominant Arabic language (Bunis 2008: 180) and could have assisted their fellow exiles in navigating their new Arabic-speaking environment in Morocco, bringing Judeo-Spanish and Judeo-Arabic into immediate, close contact. Bunis (1992: 418) notes that many words taken from Arabic relate to concepts that would have been unfamiliar or formerly irrelevant to the recently arrived Sephardim, such as names for local flora or fauna (*ḥalluf* 'pig'), local occupations (*xaddam* 'laborer'), government and institutions (*ḥkam* 'authority'), local culture and arts (*žillabia* 'a long garment'), and words for general surroundings (*ḥara* 'street' or 'quarter'). Bunis (1992: 418) also finds adjectives (*ʕayyán* 'tired'), abstractions (*fal* 'luck'), and Hispanicized verbs with Arabic roots (*qar* + *-ear* > *qarear*, 'to read' or 'to pray') that were borrowed extensively to enrich their speech.

Unfortunately, it is difficult if not impossible to know exactly how much of Ḥaketía's lexicon is of Arabic origin, as Ḥaketía as it was spoken developed no substantial literary culture (Bunis 1992: 405). What writings were produced in Judeo-Spanish in Morocco, such as the *takkanot* or a rabbinical text known as *Vayomer Yiẓḥak*, were generally in the highly formal register, Ladino, achieved by excising many of the Arabic elements (Schwarzwald 2008: 223). Even many Hebrew and Aramaic elements were translated into Romance forms (Schwarzwald 2008: 223). We will see that this longstanding preference for Romance may have contributed to

the decline of Ḥaketía in the 19th century, as young speakers in colonial Spanish Morocco began to prefer modern Castilian over their mother tongue. Written examples in Passover *haggadot* published in locally during the Spanish colonial administration reveal that in some areas, such as Tangier, Ḥaketía's lexicon had shifted almost completely towards peninsular Castilian, in a process referred to as Re-Hispanicization (Schwarzwald 2008: 224).

B. Ladino:

Speakers of many languages with rich literary traditions, English speakers included, are well aware of the fact that the spoken language does not always match the written language. Russian, for example, maintains a marked distinction between its formal, standardized literary language, which absorbed significant influence from the Old Church Slavonic language, and the informal spoken registers heard throughout Russian-speaking regions today (Unbegaun 1973). Judeo-Spanish is another such language with a significant distinction between its spoken varieties. Ladino is the name commonly given to the written varieties of Judeo-Spanish, frequently renderings of the Old Testament that preserve Hebrew syntax but use Spanish morphemes (Penny 2000). The first and most important scholar in the history of studying Ḥaketía, José Benoliel, wrote that Ladino was strictly a literary language, reserved for the Bible, liturgy, and literature (Benoliel 1977: 213). Here, Benoliel asserts that the term "Ladino" specifically refers to a highly formal and somewhat archaic calque register of writing, which was reserved specifically for translating the Tanakh and Judaism's other holy works. A calque language is a system of borrowing words or even entire phrases from another language where the borrowings are translated literally, word for word. However, Ladino was used in many more ways than just as an archaic calque language reserved for holy texts. Rather, it also served as a sort of literary koine or common written language across disparate Sephardic communities, and

served as an important vehicle for Sephardic unification. The existence of Ladino publications widely used in Morocco that were produced in other parts of the Mediterranean (Schwarzwald 2008: 223) demonstrates that Ḥaketía speakers and the Jews of Morocco were not in fact isolated and shut off from the world as is commonly perceived (see Penny 2000: 178). Sephardim were linguistically united by this seemingly out-of-place literary register of Ladino, connecting the speakers of North Africa with other Sephardim across the Mediterranean.

When a matter of importance, often of religious significance, needed to be communicated across the Sephardic world, Judeo-Spanish speakers, and Ḥaketía speakers in particular (Bentolila 2008: 164), turned to written Ladino and perceived higher registers of speech and writing. In Ḥaketía, as in Judezmo, the higher registers of communication were achieved by excising or replacing loan words from the local "lexifier" languages – Arabic, in the case of Ḥaketía, and Turkish and Greek in Judezmo – with Romance vocabulary until the remnants were principally Romance and Hebrew, at which point it became Ladino (Bentolila 2008: 159). In fact, Bunis (2008: 405) notes that the most difficult challenge in studying Ḥaketía as a language variety is that Moroccan Sephardim produced relatively little in the way of *informal* written documents, written records showing how the language was spoken on a day-to-day basis. In Bentolila's (2008: 164) aforementioned argument, he lists sermons, translations of the Old Testament, rabbinic treatises, and even simple letters as examples of Ladino, commonly written in the Soletreo Hebrew scripts and adhering to strict written norms (see Schwarzwald 2008: 223). Sermons (*derushím*) are of particular interest, since they were meant for the public's consumption, typically at family gatherings (Bentolila 2008: 203-219). Bentolila's (1992) analysis of these sermons shows that writers took great care to purge any semblance of Arabisms from their vocabulary. This purging process, the time and effort required to grammatically and

lexically construct Ladino texts, the dearth of written Ḥaketía samples, and the precision with which writers excised Arabicisms all suggest that Ḥaketía-speakers held a shared language ideology that evaluated and ranked all the languages in their ecosystem, including Ḥaketía. In this ranking system, the aforementioned excision process suggests that Arabic[8] and the Ḥaketía vernacular (which borrowed heavily from Arabic) were at the bottom, not seen as fit for use in formal communal settings. The more heavily Romance-influenced Ladino literary register would have been the next level up, used in formal settings such as *derushim* and in writing. Hebrew (and Aramaic to some extent) occupied the top rung of this linguistic hierarchy, being religious languages employed in the most formal liturgical settings. The heavy use of the calque form of Ladino (with Hebrew translated word for word into Romance-based Ladino, but with Hebrew word order) constitutes clear evidence for a strong ideology of language hierarchy that permeated Sephardic life in North Africa.

Schwarzwald (2008: 223) states that there were strict norms employed across the Mediterranean when writing Ladino, particularly when it came to translating Hebrew phrases; she uses various Passover prayer books, or *haggadot*, to demonstrate a remarkable similarity in these literary norms. To translate Hebrew phrases, Ladino writers from Tangier to Salonika would attempt to closely preserve the original syntax of Hebrew. It is critical to understand that the Hebrew language in Judaism, called *lashon hakodesh* or 'the holy tongue', is often regarded as the sacred language used by God in the book of Genesis to speak the world into existence, and is traditionally seen as both the language of angels and the original language of humanity (www.myjewishlearning.com). Schwarzwald (2008: 227) provides an example of the common

[8] Speculating on one reason for this, it is possible that from a Peninsular perspective, the Sephardim's views of Arabic may have been shaped by Peninsular Christian language ideology. Arabic may have still been seen as "foreign" by the new arrivals, in what could be seen as an interesting and paradoxical maintenance of a peninsular Christian language ideology for centuries after the Reconquista.

Hebrew phrase employed on Passover: "*ma nishtana **ha-layla ha-ze** mi-kol ha-lelot? She-be-khol ha-lelot 'en **'anu metablin 'afilu pa'am 'ahat**. Ha-layla ha-ze shete pe'amim*" (Schwarzwald translates this as "Why is **this night** different from all other nights? On all other nights **we do not dip [vegetables] even once**; and on this night [we do so] twice."). The *haggadah* from Tetouan translates this as: "Cuanto diferente **la noche la ésta** más que todas las noches, que en todas las noches **no nos entinientes tampoco vez una** y en la noche la ésta dos veces."

This translation is syntactically striking. "La noche la ésta," for example, would read to a Spanish speaker something like 'the night that is this one,' a truly atypical phrasing for a Romance language. However, it copies the perfectly normal Hebrew syntax of the phrase "ha-layla ha-ze" word for word. Similarly odd is the phrase "no nos entinientes tampoco vez una," a bizarre, archaic-sounding translation into Romance that attempts to copy the original Hebrew verbatim. Schwarzwald (2008) demonstrates that this is not a standalone case either. An Istanbul *haggadah* is surprisingly similar in its norms: "Kuanto fue demudada **la noçe la esta** mas ke todas las noçes, Ke en todas las noçes **non nos entinyentes afilu vez una**, i la noçe la esta dos vezes," It is arguably even stranger, substituting the Hebrew *afilu*[9] in place of *tampoco* and employing the irregular phrasing *afilu vez una*.

Unsurprisingly, these translations of religious texts represent the highest register of Judeo-Spanish, the "calque language" that Benoliel (1977: 213) describes. Ladino liturgical texts follow the norms of Ladino printing established in Sephardic European printing centers in Italy (notably Livorno) as early as the 1500s (Schwarzwald 2008: 223), where arguably the most important Ladino work, the so-called Ferrara Bible, was translated and published in 1533. The original title of the book leaves no uncertainty about the norms that its translations would follow:

[9] *Afilu* in Hebrew means 'even,' but Schwartzwald notes that in eastern Ladino it is translated as *tampoco*, which is 'neither' in standard Spanish.

Biblia en Lengua Española Traducida Palabra por Palabra de la Verdad Hebrayca por Muy Excelentes Letrados, Vista y Examinada por el Oficio de la Inquisicion. Con Privilegio del Ylustrissimo Señor Duque de Ferrara ("Bible in the Spanish Language, Translated Word for Word from the True Hebrew Language by Very Excellent Literate Persons, Viewed and Examined by the Office of the Inquisition. With the License of the most Illustrious Lord Duke of Ferrara"). Schwarzwald (2008: 223) states that these printing centers produced most of the liturgical material circulated in Morocco, as well as for the Judezmo-speaking eastern Mediterranean. Critically, this is the closest Ladino and the Judeo-Spanish language came to being standardized; these printing centers united Sephardic communities with a formal language that shows clear preferences for common/shared Romance-based vocabulary and for new syntactical styles that would come to define Sephardic literary tradition.

However, contrary to what many scholars suggest (see Díaz-Mas 1997; Benoliel 1977: 213), Ladino had other registers besides the religious calque variety, and was used for more than just translational purposes. It also served as a vehicle for other forms of communication and culture across Morocco and the Mediterranean, in a register that Bentolila (2008) terms the koine register of Ladino. In this register, the syntax was Romance, and the authors incorporated Hebrew words while excising borrowings from other lexifiers like Arabic. For example, Bentolila (2008: 167) provides the following example of a preface to a Ladino book on the religious duties of Jewish women written in Morocco around 1840:

"1. Haqdama la-lo'azot[10]
2. Señoras hiǰas de Israel abríd los ojos
3. del entendimiento y poní[11] mientes
4. en este mundo y su reǰo y su vida y su muerte
5. y verís bien claramente que no vinimos aeste mundo

[10] 'Introduction for those who do not understand Hebrew'
[11] *Poní* is the present tense *vos* conjugation of *poner*, but *vos* conjugations are also sometimes used, as it is here, as the conjugation for *vozotras*.

6. para comer y beber y pasar tiempo, que si
7. fuera por eso esten seguras que no se creara
8. mundo. Si no ciertamente que lo que venimos aeste
9. mundo es para haźer gusto del *Sh[em] Yi[tbara?]*[12] y aesto
10. debe la presona bushcar[13] y preguntar por loque le
11. falta del judeźmo[14] para haźerlo..."

This passage reveals some characteristic features of Ladino writing. First, the passage is entirely and purposefully free of Arabic loanwords. Second, and perhaps more importantly with regards to the fate of Ḥaketía, we can clearly see here a tendency towards a more standard Spanish: note, for example, *beber* in place of the traditional *bever.*[15]. However, a new question arises if we assume that the communities they were addressing spoke a register of Judeo-Spanish that was divergent in its lexicon and even grammar from the norms of Ladino, a composite of formal Ibero-Romance and sometimes literal word-for-word translations of Hebrew scripture. Why would religious scholars and leaders work towards producing works in this more formal style of the Judeo-Spanish language, when the markedly different conversational language being used daily would have sufficed? The distinction these religious writers made between the informal usage of Ḥaketía in daily speech and the formal usage of Ladino registers in writing (and possibly reading aloud?) makes clear that Judeo-Spanish publications exist in Ladino not for the purpose of producing esoteric works to be read or heard only by the same *mellah* or community of speakers in which it was produced, but rather as an expression of pan-Sephardic religious practice and identity.

Another fascinating example of non-calque Ladino koine is the pan-Sephardic folk song *Kuando el rey Nimrod*, a Ladino folk song originating not in the Iberian peninsula, but rather in the Sephardic diaspora long after expulsion (Hassán & Izquierdo Benito 2008: 558). Hassán &

[12] 'The Blessed Name,' referring to God
[13] "sh" here denotes the voiceless post-alveolar fricative phoneme /ʃ/
[14] Meaning 'Judaism,' not the language variety. The "ź" denotes the voiced alveolar fricative sibilant /ʒ/
[15] Written in Hebrew script, the letter would be "hay" ה /h/ in place of "shin" ש /ʃ/

Izquierdo Benito (2008) assert that the *piyyut*, or Jewish liturgical poem, upon which the song is based, *La vocación de Abraham*, actually dates from around the 18th century, and that a preliminary version of the song developed and spread throughout Jewish communities in the Mediterranean. The version of the lyrics and melody that are most common in Sephardic communities today, however, was written in the Ladino koine register in Tangier by an unknown Moroccan Sephardi around 1890, and does not use any local Arabisms. The following text is the first three verses of the Tangier version of *Kuando el rey Nimrod*[16]:

> Kuando el rey Nimrod al campo salia
> mirava en el cielo y en la estrelleria
> vido una luz santa en la juderia
> que havia de naser Avraham Avinu.
> (chorus):[17]
> (Avraham Avinu, Padre querido
> Padre bendicho, luz de Yisrael) (x2).
> [Verse 2]:
> Luego a las comadres encomendava
> que toda mujer que prenyada quedara
> si paria un hijo, al punto la matara
> que havia de naser Avraham Avinu.
> (chorus)
> [Verse 3]:
> La mujer de Terach quedó prenyada
> y de dia en dia él le preguntava (or demandava)
> "¿De qué teneix la cara tan demudada?"
> Ella ya savia el bien que tenia.

[16] *English Translation:*
When King Nimrod went out to the countryside
He was looking at heaven and at the stars
He saw a holy light in the Jewish quarter
[A sign] that Abraham, our father, was about to be born.

[17] *English Translation:*
Then he told the midwives
That every woman who became pregnant
If she gave birth to a male child at once he will be killed
because Abraham our father was about to be born.
Terach's wife became pregnant
and each day he would ask her
"Why do you look so pale?"
She already knew the blessing that she had.

In this text, the Ladino koine register is almost entirely Romance-based beyond a few biblical Hebrew terms such as *avinu*, 'our father,' or *Yisrael*, 'Israel,' and is not clearly of one particular regional variety of Judeo-Spanish. The lyrics are also remarkably close to Spanish in their syntax and even vocabulary, although it is clearly marked as Judeo-Spanish by the presence of archaisms such as *vido* and *bendicho*, the use of "v" to mark [v] pronunciation, verb endings such as *-eix* (cf. Spanish: *-eis*) or specific words such as *savia* or *prenyada* (cf. Spanish: *sabia* and *embarazada*). Ladino and its literary norms served as an important literary and cultural vehicle for communicating Sephardic religious messages and for uniting the disparate Judeo-Spanish-speaking communities scattered throughout the Mediterranean. However, as we will see, Ḥaketía speakers' affinity for Romance in the form of Ladino may have made speakers view their own spoken language variety as something of very low prestige, and in this way may have set the stage for an eventual abandonment of their ancestral language altogether, once they entered into closer contact with French and Spanish culture and institutions.

C. Linguistic Formation of Ḥaketía

Ḥaketía's evolution and survival in northern Morocco and not in southern Morocco presents a quandary to those studying the variety: why did Judeo-Spanish survive where it did? Why did it survive and thrive for hundreds of years, only to decline when European powers began to exert influence over Morocco? The survival of Ḥaketía in the north can be attributed to a plethora of linguistic micro and macro-processes that will be further explored in this section. The variety evolved as it did due to contact and mixing among different varieties of Ibero-Romance, and because of contact with other co-territorial languages such as Arabic and Hebrew. Furthermore, the variety survived as long as it did due to constant reinforcement from the tightknit social networks of its speakers and communities of practice dedicated to its

preservation. The occurrence of these processes helps to explain the reasons for the survival and eventual decline of Ḥaketía in Morocco.

I. Koineization and Standardization

When discussing how Ḥaketía coalesced from medieval Romance to become and thrive as the language variety that it did, the obvious starting point might be to discuss the language varieties spoken by those who were exiled. However, the answer is not as clear cut as it first appears. As within any language, there is variation from speaker to speaker, and particularly from region to region. English speakers are well aware that differences exist between speakers of different geographic regions, such as (varieties of) American English versus (varieties of) British or English English, and between speakers of different social groups, such as Cockney English versus Received Pronunciation (Kretzschmar 2011: 187-202; Baugh 2011: 17-27). Iberia's Jewish population did not come from a single region within the peninsula, and this is evident in the vocabulary and phonology of Ḥaketía (Penny 2000: 187-190). Penny demonstrates that numerous words show evidence of features derived from multiple Ibero-Romance dialects. For example, in medieval Iberia three geographical variants (/f/, /h/, and /Ø/) vied to replace the original "weak" voiceless bilabial fricative /Φ/ found in Romance words such as *forno* [Φór.no] 'oven' Many Castilian dialects tended to prefer /h/ or /Ø/ (as in [hor.no] or [or.no]), while others such as Portuguese, Catalan, Leonese, and Galician preferred /f/ (as in [for.no] or [Φór.no]). Judeo-Spanish by and large tended to adopt a labiodental articulation of /f/, as in the verb *favlar*, 'to speak,' (cf. *hablar* in modern Spanish) or the word *fijo* 'son,' (cf. *hijo* [í.xo]). Upon their exile and flight to Morocco and other parts of the Mediterranean, the Sephardim would have had to immediately communicate with a mix of speakers from diverse regions of Iberia, and form new communities with them. Yet, scholars such as José Benoliel (1977) and Yaakov Bentolila

(2008) record that Ḥaketía-speaking communities had relatively stable, accepted forms employed throughout their community where one might expect extensive dialectal variation. The immediate question is, then: How did speakers of Ḥaketía, and more broadly Judeo-Spanish, form a relatively stable, distinct common language variety from numerous variants of Ibero-Romance?

The process that likely occurred is known as koineization. The process of koineization is defined here as a leveling of the differences in the speech patterns of various speakers, in the case of Judeo-Spanish speakers from different regions, thereby producing a *koine*, a Greek term meaning 'common language variety' (Tuten 2003: 9). Koineization happens for a number of reasons: it may be due to a pressure or desire to fit into a community, or due to a need to communicate with many communities or individuals with differing linguistic norms, or simply to a quasi-automatic tendency of human communicators to converge on common norms and forms. Tuten (2003: 9-10) provides the example of the formation of an ancient Greek koine, sometimes referred to as *Great Attic*, in the emerging Athenian empire as a dialectal leveling that first occurred as speakers of the prestigious Attic dialect of Athens settled in Ionic-speaking regions of the Athenian empire, and vice versa. Later this process was continued and strengthened with the expansion of Alexander the Great's empire. As speakers of various different dialects interacted with one another, new spoken and written norms were established to facilitate communication (Tuten 2003: 10).

According to Penny (2000: 177-178), a similar process of koineization likely occurred in all Sephardic communities that maintained use of Ibero-Romance, including Ḥaketía-speaking communities, as each developed their own established communal norms of speech. For the purposes of my thesis, the theoretical model of koineization that best breaks down the process

that Penny (2000: 177-178) states occurred in North African Judeo-Spanish is Tuten's (2003: 48) elaboration of the process-based model developed by Peter Trudgill (1986). In Trudgill's model, speakers of many different and relatively stable dialects or language varieties come into prolonged contact with one another and eventually form a new, stable variety of language, which they accomplish by consciously or unconsciously getting rid of distinctions in their own speech and conforming to the speech patterns of those around them (Tuten 2003: 48). This is accomplished by simplifying some of the speakers' more complicated or irregular grammar and language to technically simpler forms, and leveling distinctions in their own speech to create shared language norms (Tuten 2003: 28). In this model, interactive micro-linguistic processes that occur in day-to-day life and interactions, such as adult dialectal accommodation[18] and childhood language acquisition, build over time and lead to the aforementioned linguistic macro-processes of language simplification (often a simplification of grammar) and dialectal leveling. Trudgill tested his own process model by studying forms of colonial English, namely Australian and New Zealand varieties of English, and determined that a linguist could in fact isolate the aforementioned linguistic processes occurring in koineization as they likely occurred in North Africa. Importantly for the ecological perspective of my thesis (the changing social statuses of languages and speakers), Tuten (2003: 48) elaborates on Trudgill's process by suggesting that linguists take note of the social dynamics of the society in which the speakers reside. Since the language attitudes, social structures, and social contexts of a society also help to shape the manner in which people speak, it is critical to examine the role of self-separation of Sephardim

[18] Accommodation will be defined here as Tuten (2003: 32) defines it, the usage found in Kerswill (1994: 154): an interactive process where speakers of minority or foreign varieties will adopt the more mainstream pronunciation around them if there is phonological contrast, great phonetic difference that impedes understanding, or if the switch appears more natural or requires less effort.

from both Mizrahim and Muslims, which likely forced their varieties of Romance into prolonged contact that allowed koineization to occur.

While the spoken varieties of Judeo-Spanish underwent leveling more or less unconsciously over time as new generations acquired these leveled speech varieties, the regularization of Ladino norms across the Mediterranean by contrast represents something completely different: a conscious attempt at creating a written koine. Effectively, the creation of written norms of Ladino occurred via a process of quasi-standardization, where the convergence leading to common forms were consciously sought and ideologically shaped in a way that is not typical, or at least not dominant, in koineization (Tuten 2003: 18). There are similar movements toward convergence in koineization, but the process of koineization is generally informal and unplanned (Tuten 2003: 18), while the norms of Ladino were very clearly consciously created. As in other examples of standardization, writers of Ladino consciously selected certain features such as Romance and Hebrew forms and excluded others, specifically, Arabic borrowings. The previously mentioned Italian printing centers (Schwarzwald 2008: 223), particularly Livorno, were one such place that helped to regularize Ladino and its norms, stabilize the written language over the centuries, and disseminate those norms to communities across the Mediterranean. Therefore, while the spoken Judeo-Spanish language as a whole was never officially standardized, the norms of Ladino can be said to have developed into a kind of "standardized" literary language.

II. Formation: Language Contact

I have shown in this study that Judeo-Spanish has phonetically and lexically diverged from Peninsular Spanish, and that Judezmo and Ḥaketía are distinct varieties with their own ranges of features, including unique lexicons. The driving factor for the divergence of Spanish

and Judeo-Spanish, as well as the divergence of the various varieties of Judeo-Spanish, is in large part due to language contact. Previously, as indicated above, no state has ever employed Judeo-Spanish in an official or officially standardized capacity[19], nor was it the majority language even in the cities and regions in which it was spoken. Surrounded by and in close interaction with users of other languages, it was perhaps inevitable that Judeo-Spanish speakers would learn and borrow from other languages.[20]

While Ibero-Romance languages all have numerous borrowings from Arabic, the once-hegemonic language, a unique feature of Judeo-Spanish that may have distinguished it from other speech even before the expulsion is the tendency to borrow not only more Arabic words, but also to adopt those Arabic words with greater phonetic accuracy than their Christian neighbors (Bunis 1992: 402-403). For example, Bunis (1992) states that the Arabic word for 'surname,' *al-kunya*, was borrowed into all varieties of Judeo-Spanish as *alkunya*, versus the Spanish borrowing *alcornia*. An even more interesting phenomenon occurs in Ḥaketía, when speakers encountered words with sounds that did not previously exist in the phonetic inventory of Judeo-Spanish. Ḥaketía speakers appear to have attempted to closely preserve the original sounds of the words they borrowed (this phenomenon is relevant to the following discussion of multilingualism and the societal roles of Ḥaketía). Evidence for this phenomenon is widespread. Whereas Judezmo borrowed the Arabic word for 'Sunday' (*al-ḥad*) as *alxad*, Ḥaketía borrowed the more phonetically accurate *alḥad* (Bunis 1992: 403); whereas the Arabic word for 'sad' (Classical Arabic: *ḥazīn*) is borrowed into Judezmo as *xazino* 'ill', in Ḥaketía it becomes *ḥzen*

[19] With regard to Ladino, printers played a lead role in a sort of quasi-standardization – which can be conceived of as inventing a kind of prestige, written "koine."

[20] Quinto-Pozos and Adam (2013: 379), for example, explore the borrowing and code switching that occurs in Deaf communities, in which most members are multilingual and must communicate in not only their country's sign language or languages but also must understand the local languages as well, often adopting structures from those languages and elaborating upon them in the process.

'sorrow' (Bunis 2008: 181-182). The accuracy of Ḥaketía's phonological borrowings and its frequent usage of Arabic and Hebrew loanwords can be seen in the following translation of a passage of Moliere's *Harpagon* into vernacular Ḥaketía by Solly Levy, which appears in one of the few books translated into Ḥaketía: *Ya ḥasrá* (Bentolila 2008: 160-161). Arabic borrowings[21] are bolded and Hebrew borrowings are italicized:

¡**Wo** por mí! ¡So yo mismo! ¡Ya me estoy volviendo **ḥamaqa**! Mammá, ya no sepoy ni ánde me hallo ni quién soy ni lo qué hagoy. ¡Mis chavitos! ¡Mis perrítaz endiamantadas, me vaya *korbán* por bozotras! ¡Ay mi dinerito güeno me separaron de ti, se los separe el meollo amén! Ya me quedí solo, mi consuelo, mi alegria... Todo se **qadeó** para mi y ya no me queda que hazer en este **mel'oq** de este mundo. Mi dinerito que te **alḥoti** con tanto y tanto cariño, sin ti ya no cuedoy **qemear**... ¡Me muero, llamay a la *ḥebrá*, ansí me enterrís! ¿No habrá quién me fukkeare devolviéndome mis chavitos, o diziéndome quién fue el matador que me los quitó? ¿A? ¿Qué dizís?... No, nadie.
Sea quien fuere el que me lo **jafteó**, ¡con qué **taḥramia** habrá **'esseado** pa **kemlear** la **fdiḥa**! Justo cuando estaba yo **hadreando** con el trapo de mi hijo. ¿**Wa** sabís lo que hay? Vámonos de aquí. Voy a traer a los pulicías que den garrote a toda la **ḥinta**: criados, criadas, mi hijo, mi hija... y a mi tambien.

In this passage, an array of lexical and phonological borrowings demonstrates the surprising extent to which Ḥaketía was in contact with and borrowed from the languages in its ecosystem, but also demonstrates an important point: the amount of borrowings and accuracy of phonetic borrowing indicate that the speakers of Ḥaketía were highly fluent in Moroccan Arabic. This communal adoption of Arabic by the Sephardim is well-attested in other sources (Michaux-Bellaire and Salmón 1905: 35); this fact suggests that Sephardim had no communicative need to develop or maintain Ḥaketía, and of course obliges us to seek an explanation for these phenomena.

III. Maintenance: Social network theory and Community of Practice

The fact that immigrant languages frequently die out after only a few generations is well-attested in modern sociolinguistics (see Potowski 2013: 322). While the adults arriving as

[21]IPA pronunciations of phonological borrowings: "q" = /q/, " ʿ " = /ʔ/, "ḥ" = /ħ/, "h" = /h/, "k" = /k/.

immigrants are generally native speakers of a home language, the children of immigrants often become bilingual in both the home language and the societally dominant language, and eventually the grandchildren frequently become essentially monolingual in the societally dominant language (Potowski 2013: 322).Given the high levels of exposure to Moroccan Arabic, and the societal prestige that Arabic (or at least Classical Arabic) enjoyed, it may appear surprising that Ḥaketía developed during the first generations and survived in later ones. Indeed, some scholars suggest that some Moroccan communities of Sephardic immigrants quickly assimilated into the Judeo-Moroccan Arabic communities (Sisso Raz 2015: 115). The continued existence and indeed prosperity of Ḥaketía in northern Morocco over nearly five centuries of use raises the question: How did Ḥaketía continue to survive and thrive for such a length of time in the multilingual contexts in which it was used?

Two sociolinguistic models provide some insight on the maintenance and evolution of Ḥaketía in Morocco: Social Network Theory and the Community of Practice model. The first, Social Network Theory, highlights the importance of social networks in enforcing sociolinguistic (and other social) norms, that is, ensuring that individual members of a network or community comply with expectations of language use. A social network can be defined as the aggregate of relationships contracted by an individual with others (Llamas & Milroy 2013: 407). If those relationships are dense (everyone knows everyone else) and multiplex (each relationship is based on multiple ties of family, shared neighborhood, school, synagogue, etc.), then the social network will be maximally strong and capable of enforcing community norms of language use. This model has allowed researchers to address the question of how some social groups maintain nonstandard dialects or minority languages, often over centuries, despite pressures (of the kind

described by Lippi-Green 1997) to adopt publicly legitimized national or dominant languages or varieties (Milroy & Llamas 2013: 407).

Social network theory explains the persistence of Ḥaketía particularly well because members of Ḥaketía-speaking communities had such close-knit (dense and multiplex) social networks. Essentially, following this theory the language survived and thrived because the social networks of speakers of Ḥaketía were characterized by strong ties, favored by their living within the *mellahs,* dense, well-organized walled Jewish communities within Moroccan cities that included both Sephardim and Mizrahim (Díaz-Mas 1997: 74). Sephardim lived in extremely tight-knit groups with multi-level relationships, and, as previously described, held a strong and consistent language ideology valuing Romance and devaluing Arabic. Community members lived in the same neighborhoods together, ate together as families, worked together, prayed at Sephardi synagogues together, and married within their community, all while speaking in Ḥaketía, at least much of the time. This near-constant and ubiquitous reinforcement of tight social networks, combined with communal religious gatherings that advocated the use of an in-group language variety, allowed for the persistence of Ḥaketía for centuries after immigration.

The Community of Practice approach provides another framework to think about how community shapes language use. As defined in Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2007), the community of practice is defined as a group of individuals coming together in pursuit of an endeavor. In contrast to a traditional conception of community, a community of practice is not only an aggregate of its members, but also examines the purpose of the community and the practices its members engage in to further the mutual goal (McConnell-Ginet 1999: 246). The preservation of the religious rites and community of the Sephardim proves to be this purpose in the case of Ḥaketía, which in this model can be thought of as an important practice that served to

mark and reinforce belonging to the group.[22] The existence of both tight social networks of speakers and dedicated communities of practice to ensure its use explain how Ḥaketía remained in widespread use for centuries after arrival in northern Morocco.

3. An Ecological Approach to Ḥaketía (1492-1859)

A. The Language Ecology of Morocco

In his seminal work *The Ecology of Language*, Einar Haugen defines the ecology of language as the system of changing relationships between various languages and their speakers within a society (Haugen 1972: 325). This theory sets up the metaphor of languages as species, surviving and competing in one or more ecosystems, which are understood as the various human societies of the world. The theory is useful for the purposes of this thesis, as it provides an excellent framework to examine the changing social status and functions of languages within a community and society. In this section, I will analyze the changing social roles and statuses of Ḥaketía and Ladino in relation to other languages and communities in Morocco.

The historical language ecology of Morocco does not correspond to the conventional, modern Western concept of the nation-state[23], of borders roughly corresponding with spoken languages (see Mar-Molinero and Smith 1996: 1-27). The linguistic diversity found in Morocco during the period from 1492 to 1956, the period of the greatest use of Ḥaketía, was more akin to the situation in societies that existed before the advent of the concept of the nation-state, or to the situation in many modern societally-multilingual countries, such as India or Nigeria. Indeed, the

[22] Conversely, the later decline of Ḥaketía, and of Judeo-Spanish as a whole, particularly after the establishment of the state of Israel, can also be described via these models. This idea will be touched upon at the end of this thesis, but very simply the purpose of the Sephardic community may now be the establishment and maintenance of a Jewish homeland, a practice of which is the revival and perpetuation of Hebrew, viewed as important.

[23] However, this idea is clearly far from the reality; not all French people speak French, for example. There are hundreds of thousands who primarily speak regional languages, such as Provencal, Occitan, Breton, or Basque, and many who primarily speak immigrant languages.

history and physical geography of Morocco have long been disadvantageous to linguistic and cultural homogeneity. However, one dichotomy that appears over and over is the contrast between the coastal cities and the mountainous interior. The coast has historically been prone to invasions from both the Mediterranean and from North Africa, and has been of great strategic importance to foreign powers seeking to control the Strait of Gibraltar and access to the Mediterranean. The interior, however, is composed of the Atlas Mountains, which are rugged and difficult to successfully control. They have long fostered linguistic diversity, evidenced by the persistence of the various indigenous Berber languages[24] to this day (Zouhir 2013: 271-272). By contrast, the coast has been invaded over the millennia by Punic-speaking Carthaginians, Latin-speaking Romans, Germanic-speaking Vandals, Greek-speaking Byzantines, and finally and most importantly for our purposes, the Arabic-speaking Arabs, with later conquests of port cities and regions by the Spanish, Portuguese, and French. Each of these subsequent invaders brought with them new languages and language varieties, further complicating the language ecology of Morocco. For the purposes of this thesis, the relevant hegemonic languages at the time of Ḥaketía's greatest usage from 1492 to 1956 are Classical and Moroccan Arabic, Spanish, Portuguese, and French.

Zouhir (2013) describes the society of modern and historical Morocco as perpetually multilingual and multifaceted, with numerous languages competing for space under intense linguistic pressures both from within and without, including political, religious, and economic pressures. In addition to the Judeo-Spanish varieties employed within the Sephardi community (Ḥaketía and Ladino), the most important languages and language varieties to note for this study that have historically exerted political or linguistic influence on the Sephardim within Morocco

[24] Judeo-Berber languages, however, no longer exist as spoken languages in Morocco. While they may still have a few speakers in Israel, these speakers are typically elderly (www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org).

include: the various Berber languages, Judeo-Berber, Hebrew, Aramaic, Classical Arabic, Moroccan Arabic, Judeo-Moroccan Arabic, Portuguese, Castilian Spanish, and French. These languages were spoken by different ethnic or national groups at different times depending on the situation, and to understand the language ecology of Morocco we must situate when and where each language was used, and describe the changing social status of each language and its speakers.

The linguistic influence of the many Berber and Judeo-Berber languages on Ḥaketía is presently understudied, and the languages are mainly relevant in understanding the important political role of the Berber tribes in Morocco, as well as in understanding the long history and heterogenous nature of Moroccan Mizrahim. The Berber and Judeo-Berber languages were spoken in the countryside and particularly in the Atlas mountains, and were used by Muslim and Jewish members of Berber tribes respectively (Pennel 2000: 97). After the rule of the Marinids (1471-1549), the language family and its speakers would be increasingly seen as uncivilized and threatening by both the coastal Arabic speakers and Europeans (Pennel 2000: 97). However, even during this decline in prestige, the Berber tribes were frequently king-makers in Moroccan politics, and often effectively ruled themselves. For centuries, in order to raise an army the sultan had to request that specified *jaysh* (literally ‘army’) Berber tribes send soldiers and cavalry in exchange for land usage and exemption from taxation, although they were often unreliable and frequently rose up in rebellion (Pennel 2000: 21-22). Berber tribes also often directly controlled the sultanate as a whole. The ruling dynasty when the Sephardim arrived, the Marinids (1471-1549), were of the Zenata Berber tribe and spoke Berber as the court language throughout their rule (Pennel 2003: 65). Furthermore, the preceding three dynasties dating all the way back to the eleventh century were also Berbers (Pennel 2003: 34-60, 75). The Saadi dynasty (1549-1659)

that replaced them were nominally Arab, but relied extensively on support and soldiers from Berber tribes (Pennel 2003: 78-81).

Berber political power would lessen somewhat over time, however, with the still-ruling Alaouite dynasty – for the first time in Moroccan history – seizing control of the sultanate in 1666 without the support of any Berber tribe (Pennel 2003: 97-99). Despite this, Berbers would continue to effectively control the countryside and mountains, and even during the French protectorate they were allowed to use their own legal systems (Pennel 2003: 141-142). They would also rebel frequently, and even the sultans of Morocco blamed their insubordination on linguistic and identity differences between the Arabic cities and plains and the Berber mountain (Pennel 2000: 97). For example, starting in the 1860s many tribes mounted an insurrection that would last for decades, challenging the reign of the Arab (or Arab-oriented) sultans, and many tribes fought the rule of the French until independence (Pennel 2000: 96-97; Pennel 2003: 141). The tribes would continue to be a formidable force all the way until the early twentieth century, and their languages and roles are important to Morocco's ecology of language and to the delicate power balance of Moroccan politics.

In the cities and plains of Morocco during the period of study (1492-1956), the Arabic language varieties and sedentary Arabic culture dominated. However, much like in Judeo-Spanish, there were several varieties, each with different functions and status. Classical Arabic was a liturgical and literary language variety used by all Muslim Moroccans for religious purposes, but did not necessarily match the colloquial, everyday speech of Moroccans. Moroccan Arabic, on the other hand, is a vernacular descendant variety of Classical Arabic (itself a result of koineization and language contact), and was the common vernacular of a plurality of the populace of Morocco, particularly in the cities. It was and is markedly different from Classical

Arabic and even other varieties of spoken Arabic. Existing alongside Moroccan Arabic, Judeo-Moroccan Arabic was a primarily Mizrahi Jewish variety (although it was also spoken by many assimilated Sephardim) written in Hebrew characters. Judeo-Moroccan Arabic borrowed a substantial amount of its lexicon from Spanish, Ḥaketía, French, Hebrew, and Aramaic. It was the primary language of most of the Mizrahi Jews, especially inland and in the south; however, many of their descendants in the north, as I have previously noted, switched to Ḥaketía after the arrival of the Sephardim.

The Jews of Morocco also had their own liturgical languages, Hebrew and Aramaic, which were used by all Jews for religious purposes. However, very few individuals in Morocco except rabbis and educated Jews could actively understand, read, or write them. Clearly, given the amount of borrowings from Hebrew and Aramaic in colloquial Ḥaketía, the Sephardim were familiar with the languages, and the amount of religious terms borrowed from Aramaic and Hebrew highlight the sacred importance of the languages. Aramaic is not itself a holy language, but was commonly spoken by Jews as a vernacular in Biblical times, and therefore is a language of rabbinical texts and analyses such as the *Gemara*, a seminal work in Judaism that analyzes and comments on the Bible and *Mishnah*, oral law and tradition that was not previously written down. The Hebrew language, on the other hand, is revered in Judaism as the language spoken by angels. Hebrew is referred to in many traditions as the sacred language spoken by God and the first humans, and thus holds a very high degree of prestige and reverence in Jewish practices (www.myjewishlearning.com). Many of these terms, such as *malah* ‘angel’, have equivalents in Romance (*angel*), but as previously noted (Lexicon), speakers of Ḥaketía chose to communicate religious topics specifically by borrowing from Hebrew or Aramaic.

Finally, there are the Romance languages, which were employed both by Moroccan Sephardim and by Europeans: Ḥaketía, Ladino, Portuguese, Spanish, and French. Ḥaketía and Ladino, respectively the informal spoken and formal written registers of Moroccan Judeo-Spanish, were spoken and written primarily by the Sephardim of northern Morocco, and will be discussed in more detail throughout the ecology section. Portuguese was a relatively minor influence, and was spoken by Portuguese settlers, soldiers, and merchants in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in several conquered port cities such as Ceuta. Importantly for the maintenance of Ḥaketía, the Portuguese established trade networks with local Sephardim, who employed their Romance language abilities to trade with the Portuguese, establishing the importance of Romance in commerce from the very arrival of the Sephardim (Sisso Raz 2015: 115). French, on the other hand, was a colonial language in wide usage by both French officials and native Moroccans, used throughout Morocco. Critically for Ḥaketía, French was also frequently the language of education, and enjoyed very high worldwide prestige during the 19th and early 20th centuries. Peninsular Spanish was used in much the same way, but for a far longer period of time, though perhaps without the same level of prestige as French, at least from the 18th century. These last two languages are the most critical for the decline of Ḥaketía, as their political, economic, and educational hegemony combined with their Romance base helped to reinforce the idea that Ḥaketía was poorly spoken Spanish. Given the high number of languages existing within the Moroccan sociolinguistic ecosystem, Ḥaketía speakers' originally tight social networks may have helped to conserve use of the community languages, at least until the middle of the twentieth century.

Language and ethnic or regional origin were critical and recurring cultural distinctions between groups of Jews in Morocco. The Sephardim ('Spaniards' in Hebrew), or the

megorashim (a Hebrew term meaning ‘exiles’) as they called themselves, distinguished themselves from other peoples of Morocco through the vehicle of Ḥaketía. The Mizrahi Jews, on the other hand, were all the previous Jewish inhabitants of Morocco, a diverse mix of Berber- and Arabic-speaking communities. As previously mentioned, they predominantly spoke Judeo-Moroccan Arabic, and occasionally Judeo-Berber languages, and distinguished their religious traditions from those of the Sephardim, refusing to follow the communal *takkanot* created by Sephardim in Fez. They were viewed by the Sephardim as social and cultural inferiors, likely relegating their languages (and by extent, Moroccan Arabic) to lesser statuses.

B. Ladino and the Sephardi Community

Ḥaketía was used continuously over five centuries to mark the religious and cultural identity of the Sephardim. The language did not survive merely by necessity: the Sephardim were largely multilingual, and many spoke Judeo-Moroccan Arabic proficiently (Michaux-Bellaire and Salmón 1905: 35). Therefore, while the Sephardim could over time have easily shifted their language use from Ḥaketía to the more immediately relevant and societally hegemonic Arabic, several factors encouraged the persistence of the language community. Ḥaketía’s survival for such a length of time can largely be traced to a few key events that occurred in Morocco at the time of the arrival of the Sephardim. First and foremost, upon their coming to Morocco, the *megorashim* were not readily welcomed by the preexisting Mizrahi Jewish populations in Morocco (Díaz-Mas 1997: 72-73). The Mizrahim lived in a relatively impoverished state, heavily taxed by the ruling Muslim dynasty in exchange for their protected status as *dhimmi*, tolerated non-Muslims. According to Díaz-Mas (1997: 72), they likely saw the wave of expelled Sephardim as economic or religious competitors, as the newcomers were educated and relatively wealthy, having brought many possessions from Iberia or possessing

specialized skillsets as craftsmen. However, the sultan of Morocco saw the advantages of absorbing the large stateless body of exiles, many of whom were educated or brought some wealth or possessions with them, and invited the immigrants to inhabit the major cities of the Moroccan sultanate, particularly Fez (Díaz-Mas 1997: 72).

A second and more critical factor for the survival of Ḥaketía was the use of the *takkanot* to organize and govern the community internally. From early on, Ladino became a relevant force for communal cohesion. These communities were governed via an intricate system of Jewish communal courts headed by rabbis (*ḥakhamim*) and *dayyanim* ('religious judges') (Zafrani 2005: 121-125). As I discussed above (Koineization and Standardization), the Sephardim fled to Morocco from numerous different communities around the Iberian peninsula, often arriving at a destination as the only members or families of their original communities. Since the exiles had previously followed different rabbis, and therefore somewhat different rites, in different communities throughout disparate kingdoms in Iberia, they had competing ideas for what the norms and laws of this new Moroccan Jewish society should be. As early as 1494, various rabbis from the new communities of Morocco gathered in Fez, which was to be the spiritual capital of the Sephardim until the Spanish and French protectorate periods, to redact various *takkanot* ('ordinances' in Hebrew) (Díaz-Mas 1997: 73). These communal edicts were based on Castilian laws, and were meant to govern every aspect of the day-to-day lives of the Sephardim, from marriage, care for the poor, and conflict resolution (Corcos 1976: 166) to judicial, monetary, and measurement systems (Zafrani 2005: 142-144). The *takkanot* standardized coinage, salaries, and trade prices, facilitating cohesion and exchange throughout Jewish Morocco. Corcos (1976: 166) lists several such issues of communal cohesion that could have easily splintered the fledgling Sephardic community and caused its dispersion into an unwelcoming Moroccan society. For

example, they provided answers to pressing concerns: on what grounds was a divorce acceptable in this new community? What should be done to ensure that the poor could afford food? Who could inherit property when its owners passed away? A significant divide arose over the question of polygamy; in Christian lands, such as Portugal, Castile, and the Crown of Aragon, polygamy was not only illegal but punishable by death (Corcos 1976: 166-167). However, in Morocco as in other Muslim countries such as the former Al-Andalus, polygamy was not only permitted but widely practiced. So, to prevent the dissolution of the exile communities, the rabbis of Morocco released a set of *takkanot* in Ladino beginning as early as 1494. The *takkanot* were eventually published in Judeo-Arabic and Hebrew (both of which slowly began to supplant publication in Ladino), and the practice of publishing *takkanot* continued with further publications in 1497, 1545, 1593, 1599, and then continuously all the way until 1755 (Díaz-Mas 1997: 73). [25]

At such a critical juncture, the *takkanot* may have saved the Moroccan Sephardi community in its infancy not only by communicating how its communities would initially govern themselves, but also how those communities would express their culture and identity. Over the course of time, the *takkanot* began to be published in Judeo-Arabic as well, such as the 1550 *takkanah* published for the use of the Mizrahim (Zafrani 2005: 124). The extension of the *takkanot* to Mizrahim helped to further cement the relations between the two communities, easing the assimilation of Ḥaketía's community of speakers into the Judeo-Arabic-speaking communities of the south and integrating northern Mizrahim into the predominantly Ḥaketía-speaking communities of the north. The *takkanot* also played a key role in reinforcing a strict social order and strengthening the social ties of the Sephardi social network, that itself favored the development and evolution of spoken Ḥaketía (at least in the northern communities where the

[25] From my research, it is unclear why the last known publication date of *takkanot* was 1755, but Díaz-Mas (1997:73) does state that they continued to be utilized into the twentieth century.

Sephardim clearly dominated the local Jewish community). For the most severe offenses, the *takkanot* prescribed exile from the *mellah* and the community, or even being handed over to the secular Moroccan law enforcement authority, the *makhzen*, as a punishment for very severe transgressions, (Zafrani 2005: 124).

While some cultural tension between the *megorashim* and *toshavim* would continue for centuries after the arrival of the Sephardim, as evidenced by the persistence of separate Mizrahi and Sephardi synagogues and institutions, the Jewish identity in Morocco would become increasingly synthetic in nature, with Sephardic customs and legal institutions such as the *takkanot* eventually exerting considerable sway over not only the Sephardim, but over the *toshavim* as well (Schroeter 2002: 66). In the analysis of Schroeter (2002: 66), the Sephardi identity came to be viewed as "elastic," in that many Moroccan Jews, even many *toshavim* who did not follow the Sephardic religious rite, would self-identify as Sephardim in certain social contexts, particularly in matters of foreign trade. In Europe, the vast networks of Sephardim that had established themselves in numerous prosperous trading ports, such as in the Netherlands, Italy, and England, lent Sephardi culture and identity a perceived level of prestige that was contrasted with the poverty of the other large European branch of Jewry, the Ashkenazim. This uniquely fluid Sephardi identity would help even *toshavim* to participate in Morocco's integration into the pan-Mediterranean and European Sephardi trade networks.

C. Trade and Scholarship

As I discussed in the previous section, Sephardi culture and identity, which in Morocco included the usage of Ḥaketía, came to carry a great amount of prestige within Jewish circles in Morocco and the Mediterranean. But how did Ladino, a language once associated with desperate refugees and foreign religious laws that most Mizrahim at the time did not follow, come to be the

Jewish language of wealth and cultural prestige in Morocco[26]? The answer lies in the nature of the Sephardi Diaspora itself: despite what has been claimed by some scholars (see Penny 2000: 177), the social, religious, linguistic, and commercial networks the exiles had forged in Iberia were not dramatically severed with the advent of the expulsion, but rather were extensively maintained over the centuries (Díaz-Mas 1997: 75; Pennel 2003: 119).

Díaz-Mas (1997: 75) discusses how the Sephardim immediately carved out a living as merchants and craftsmen, and due to their international connections and language abilities they frequently served the Moroccan ruling dynasties in the royal court from the fifteenth to eighteenth centuries as interpreters, doctors, and councilors for the sultan. They forged extensive connections with other Sephardi communities across Europe and the Mediterranean, particularly in England and the Netherlands, where they acted as commercial and diplomatic intermediaries between Morocco and the Christian states (Pennel 2003: 119; Schroeter 2002: 45). For instance, in 1610 the sultan of the ruling Sa'adi dynasty appointed Samuel Palache, a Moroccan Sephardi, to establish the first ever formal trade deal between Morocco and a Christian state, the Netherlands; from there, he was similarly appointed to serve as the diplomatic intermediary between the sultan of Morocco and the states of Spain, England, and Italy (Díaz-Mas 1997: 75). When Samuel passed away, his brother José took his place as ambassador, followed sequentially by four other members of the Palache family for the entirety of the seventeenth century. Other Sephardi families residing in both the Moroccan coastal cities and the cities conquered by the Portuguese, Spanish, and English (respectively Ceuta, Melilla, and Tangier, to name a few) acted

[26] The success of wealthy Ḥaketía-speaking Sephardim in the north and in Essaouira and the dissemination of Ladino helped poorer Sephardim and Mizrahim come to see speakers of Ḥaketía as a sort of "upper class" (Pennel 2000: 35). This perception of wealth was not necessarily the truth: as will become clear later in my study, only a small upper class of Sephardim controlled most of the wealth, while most Sephardim and Mizrahim languished in poverty.

as interpreters and diplomatic and commercial intermediaries between the Europeans and the Moroccan sultans (Díaz-Mas 1997: 76). Several families such as the Dardeiro, Benzamero, and Adibe families even received formal royal protection by decree of the king of Portugal.

Indeed at times, Sephardim and their connections throughout the Mediterranean served as one of the *only* gateways to the outside world. In 1764, the Alaouite sultan Sidi Muhammad bin Abdallah (1757-1790), referred to as Mohammed III by many modern sources, forever changed the position of the Sephardim of Morocco with the creation of the tax-free merchant city of Essaouira, called Mogador by Europeans (Schroeter 2002: xi). This southern port city was to be the center of all trade between Morocco and Europe, and numerous Jews were invited to settle in the city as *tujjar al-sultan*, or 'the sultan's merchants' (Pennel 2003: 109). One account even states that the entire commercial district closed down for the observance of Shabbat (www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org). Jewish merchants, most notably the Macnin family[27] in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, already had the most well-established trade networks with Europe because of their connections with other Sephardim, and were therefore given permission by the sultan to conduct nearly all trade between Morocco and the Christian states of Europe (Schroeter 2002: xi). Schroeter (2002: xi) states that the head of the Macnin family, Meir Macnin, quickly developed a rapport with the new governor of Essaouira, and upon Macnin's move to London became effectively the central interlocutor between Morocco and Europe. Through his brother and a trusted circle of Sephardi merchants in Morocco, Macnin for a short time came to control a virtual monopoly on Moroccan trade and diplomacy with Europe, so much so that Macnin was referred to as "the governor's Jew" by the Europeans, and even Sultan

[27] Although the Macnins themselves were Judeo-Arabic-speaking Sephardim, it is thought that they were also very likely fluent in Judeo-Spanish. Many of their closest associates in Morocco and London, and even those families to whom the Macnins were connected by marriage primarily spoke and corresponded in Judeo-Spanish (Schroeter 2002: 73).

Mulai Sulayman (1792-1822) referred to Macnin as "our Jew" in official correspondence with European powers, denoting his diplomatic status (Schroeter 2002: xii). Macnin even frequently listed his own credentials as the "Moroccan diplomatic representative," presenting these credentials to English officials whenever he sought an audience at court. In 1827, after a brief but extremely profitable return to Morocco, he was sent by the new sultan, Mulai Abd al-Rahman, to act as "ambassador at large to Europe."[28]

Essaouira is a good example of the growing prominence and prestige of the Sephardi community in Morocco; the city is located on the coast of *southern* Morocco, not in the traditional Ḥaketía-speaking north. While by no means the majority of the Jewish population in the city, a number of Ḥaketía speakers did settle in Essaouira (Pennel 2000: 35), and a number of the most important merchants in Essaouira, such as the Geudalla family, spoke and corresponded primarily in Judeo-Spanish (Schroeter 2002: 73). Indeed, that Ḥaketía-speaking Sephardim could dominate the city's trade while deep in the traditionally Judeo-Arabic-speaking south (Schroeter 2002: 73) shows not only the economic clout the Sephardi community held, but also provides further evidence that the borders between Mizrahim and Sephardim were very porous, both geographically and linguistically. These diplomatic and trade networks established by the Sephardim of Morocco and the near-monopolies they possessed on the export and import of many goods such as beeswax, alcohol, textiles, rubber, ostrich feathers, and most importantly, refined sugar can be seen as an advantageous ecological niche for the speakers of Ḥaketía, which would have remained closely associated with the wealthy Sephardi mercantile elite (Zafrani 2005: 147; Díaz-Mas 1997: 75). According to the ecological view of language, the competitive

[28] However, it should be noted somewhat humorously that he was nearly turned away from Britain and threatened with arrest due to the large and often "scandalous" debts he accrued as a merchant in Europe (Schroeter 2002: xiii).

advantage that the Judeo-Spanish language (particularly high registers like Ladino) provided in commerce helped facilitate the continued usage and elevated prestige that the language and Sephardi identity would enjoy in Judeo-Moroccan society[29]. As I previously noted, many Mizrahim came to identify in some contexts as Sephardim, follow the Sephardi *takkanot* that began to be published in Judeo-Arabic as well as in Ladino, and in the north even speak Ḥaketía as their home language, referring to other Mizrahim who continued to speak Judeo-Arabic as *forasteros*, 'outsiders' (Schroeter 2002: 66; Sisso Raz: 113-133).

It is also important to note the effects the centuries-long contact with other, non-Moroccan Sephardim had on the Jewish Moroccan people. Through the extensive loose-knit networks they were incentivized to maintain with other Sephardic communities, speakers of Ḥaketía also participated in a broader religious, literary, and cultural exchange with Sephardim from outside Morocco as a part of a larger imagined community. From 1593 until at least the Napoleonic Wars, the Italian city of Livorno was unquestionably the nexus of the Sephardic cultural and mercantile world (Schroeter 2002: 39-40). In 1593, the grand duke of Tuscany, Ferdinand I, drafted the charter *Livornino*, inviting "Ebrei, Turchi, Mori" ('Hebrews, Turks, Moors') to settle in Livorno and granting them special social and financial privileges as merchants, specifying in particular being allowed to trade with "the Levant, Barbary (Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia), and Alexandria (Egypt)" (Schroeter 2002: 39). Jews from across the Mediterranean flocked to Livorno, seeking refuge from persecution by the Catholic Inquisition as well as the unique freedom the duke of Livorno granted them to reside in the city instead of in a designated ghetto, as was the common practice in Italy at the time. Near the center of both the

[29] It is important to note again, however, that this tremendous prosperity rarely extended beyond a tiny wealthy elite, and was often a precarious sort of wealth that could be seized (and was seized) at any time. The majority of the Jews of Morocco, including the Sephardim, lived very modestly within the mellahs (Zafrani 2005: 140).

Mediterranean and the burgeoning European trade networks, Livorno became a melting pot of peoples from all parts of Europe and the Mediterranean; in fact, by the Napoleonic era, forty-three percent of all Jewish merchant firms in Livorno were of North African origin (Schroeter 2002: 41). Among them, the Jews of Tetouan made up the vast majority of Moroccan Jewish settlers in Livorno (Schroeter 2002: 40).

As Morocco had no printing presses of its own, Sephardic rabbis from Morocco (along with others from across the Sephardic world) frequently accompanied merchants to have their books printed on the Hebrew and Ladino presses in Livorno (Schroeter 2002: 39). They also imported books, specifically prayer books, printed in a more-or-less standardized and "purified" literary Ladino (Schwarzwald 2008: 223). Díaz-Mas (1997: 77) states that a great number of books flowed into Morocco from the Ladino and Hebrew presses, and helped ensure that Morocco remained an integrated part of the Sephardic scholarly and religious world. One such example of this outside influence is the surge in popularity that Kabbalah experienced in Morocco from the mid-1600s and peaked in 1741 or 1742, when the prominent Moroccan rabbi Moses Ben-Attar published *Or haḥayim* in Italy, one of the most important treatises on Jewish mystical thought that was read throughout the Mediterranean. Another well-attested example of scholarly travel between Morocco and Livorno is the case of Abraham Coriat, a *dayyan* ('judge') of Tetouan in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, who authored *Zekhut Avot* and spent time in both Gibraltar and Livorno in order to print his works. However, Livorno would significantly decline in importance when it was invaded by Napoleon's armies in the first years of the 1800's, when it lost its freeport status and London's rose to prominence as the political and economic center of Europe (Schroeter 2002: 46).

4. The Decline of Ḥaketía (1860-1956)

Despite the prominence and prestige of the Sephardim due to their many connections across Europe and the Mediterranean in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, their international orientation would ironically facilitate the decline of their heritage language. From 1860 onwards, European colonial powers, in particular the Spanish and French, would increasingly come to dominate Moroccan politics and culture, including that of the Sephardim.

A. Spanish and French Colonial Efforts

Before the era of the protectorate in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, European empires such as the Portuguese, Spanish, and English had vied almost continuously to control pieces of Morocco since at least 1399, when Castile landed soldiers in Morocco and destroyed the city of Tetouan in retaliation for ongoing corsair attacks (Pennel 2003: 69). The Portuguese, however, began a new phase of permanent colonial holdings when they conquered the port of Ceuta in 1415. By the dawn of the nineteenth century, almost every major port city in Morocco had experienced a period of European occupation at some point (Pennel 2003: 69-81). However, Europeans had never made much headway in conquering the interior – at least until the mid-nineteenth century. Facing internal political pressures as well as a popular desire to seize North African territory after the French conquered Algiers in 1830, the Spanish government declared a war of conquest on Morocco in 1859, ostensibly due to a minor border incident near the Spanish-controlled North African port of Melilla (Pennel 2003: 117).[30] The Spanish army, although by almost all accounts militarily mismanaged and suffering from cholera, managed to seize Tetouan on February 6, 1860 (Pennel 2000: 67). The city was looted, with the Jewish *mellah* suffering particular destruction. The quarter was nearly destroyed and entirely looted by

[30] The Spanish came to control Ceuta in 1668 when it was ceded by Portugal, and Melilla was invaded by Spain in 1497.

the invading Spanish and Riffian Berber tribesmen. By the time the Spanish evacuated Tetouan in May 1862 under diplomatic pressure from the British, the damage had been done; houses had been destroyed, mosques desecrated (Pennel 2003: 122). The 1861 Treaty of Madrid expanded Spanish holdings in Morocco, forced Morocco to grant Spain tremendous trade concessions in its ports, and obligated Morocco to pay an enormous indemnity of 100 million Spanish pesetas (Pennel 2000: 66, Pennel 2003: 118).

The invasion of Tetouan marks the beginning of the decline of Ḥaketía. Not only was one of the largest and most prosperous Ḥaketía-speaking Jewish communities in Morocco laid to waste, but despite the destruction wrought by the Spanish troops, the increasing European influence in Morocco also led many Jews to begin to see a better future under the Europeans than under the sultan (Pennel 2000: 83). Pennel (2000: 83) explains how several major factors combined to favor this shift. First, for as long as Muslims had ruled Morocco, Jews lived as *dhimmi*, a sort of second-class citizenship. While they were permitted to live and practice their religion in Morocco, as in all Muslim lands they were subject to the *jizya*, a heavy tax levied on non-Muslims in exchange for this protected status (Pennel 2000: 36). Their property, as noted in the previous section, could be seized at any time, and in court the word and legal status of a Jew were not equal to those of Muslims. Jews were frequently subjected to corporal punishment, which was reserved for non-Muslims. From 1808, all Jews, both Sephardim and Mizrahim, were legally confined to the *mellahs*, and travelers such as the British envoy to Morocco at the time, Sir John Drummond-Hay, described the sickly people and the poor conditions in the *mellahs* of Rabat, Marrakesh, and Setta[31]: "'[in] the dirty *Millah* or Jewery… we noticed much activity in various tradesfolk, decent assortment of goods exhibited in the little shops and air of business

[31] Despite being in the south, the Jews of these cities were not entirely Judeo-Arabic speaking. In fact, many spoke Ḥaketía, especially in Rabat and Marrakesh (Zafrani 2005: 13).

about this singular here unluckedly enslaved people'" (Pennel 2000: 34-35). Given these inequities, it is understandable that many Moroccan Jews, particularly the wealthy[32], came to see the Europeans and the protégé system (see below) as their protectors; however, many Muslim Moroccans blamed all Jews as subversive agents of the Europeans (Pennel 2000: 36). As the Jews turned more to the protection of the Europeans, their political and economic situation in Morocco would become more and more precarious.

The European powers, however, had been extending formal protection to Jewish intermediaries in trade for many decades, in what came to be known as the "protégé system" (Pennel 2003: 80-83). Because so few of their own subjects had lived in Morocco, European powers like the English, Spanish, and French would also regularly appoint Jews as vice-consuls or protégés, essentially granting them a guarantee of diplomatic protection from that country in exchange for acting as its diplomatic intermediaries. This effectively exempted them from the *jizya*, prevented the sultan's administration from seizing their property, and freed them from unequal treatment in the sultan's courts (Pennel 2000: 43-44). However, Morocco's tax system was already fraught with difficulties: inhabitants of the countryside, such as the Berbers, often simply refused to pay any taxes, and Muslims in the cities could not be taxed, as sharia law allowed only two types of taxes to be levied on Muslims: *zakat*, which amounted to a tax on livestock, and *ushur*, a tax on harvests (Pennel 2000: 22). Therefore, the sultan's only true revenue sources came from taxes and duties on foreign trade and the *jizya*, both of which were primarily the domains of Jews, for the sultan and the elite believed that sharia law prohibited trade with Christians (Pennel 2000: 23).

[32] Wealthy Jews were more likely to be Sephardim at this point due to their trade networks (Pennel 2000: 35)

It is therefore an understatement to say that Morocco's defeats and trade concessions to the European powers, combined with the legal and economic disruption of the protégé system, wreaked havoc on the Moroccan economy (Pennel 2000: 69). The countryside again became impossible to control as both tribal and popular revolts sprang up. Indeed, the country began to be referred to as two nearly institutional entities by Moroccans and Europeans alike: the *bilad al-makhzan* ('zone of the government,' the Arabic-speaking cities and plains) and the *bilad al-siba* ('zone of rebellion,' the Berber-speaking regions, particularly the mountains and the desert) (Pennel 2000: 28, 96-97). Combined with the loss of much of their trade and tax revenue to the Europeans, poor harvests in the 1860s, a horrible famine from 1878-84, and a vicious plague that swept the country at the turn of the century, Morocco was collapsing (Pennel 2000: 96-107). Europeans began to openly discuss "the Morocco question": not when Morocco would be formally colonized, but by whom. The German Empire, only recently consolidated and not well-enough entrenched in Morocco, knew it could not colonize it but supported British influence in an effort to stymie the French (Pennel 2000: 118). The Spanish, freshly humiliated by the United States in the Spanish-American War and facing economic collapse in 1898, could not muster the power to do so on a large scale, nor could the Italians, who had suffered a humiliating defeat to Ethiopia in 1896 (Pennel 2000: 118). While the French seemed the most likely to take formal control, the influence of the British, concerned with access to the Mediterranean, kept them from annexing Morocco outright until the end of the 1800s (Pennel 2000: 118).

The question of who would control Morocco was answered in the years from 1900 to 1907. In a failed attempt to reform a devastated economy, the Moroccan government was forced to take out substantial loans at very unfavorable rates from French banks (Pennel 2000: 130). In light of this, a convention of the European colonial powers in 1900 declared Italian supremacy

over Libya and Spanish control of the western Sahara coast in exchange for preponderance of French domination of most of Morocco. In 1902, the first draft of a territorial treaty between France and Spain to split Morocco emerged, which would have given Spain most of northern Morocco and even Fez, though the Spanish initially refused (Pennel 2000:130). The French, however, already confident of their economic domination and their eventual colonial control over Morocco, built up their military strength in the Moroccan-Algerian border region, seizing small Moroccan towns such as Bechar in 1903 under the guise of preventing border raids on Algeria (Pennel 2000: 130). Despite some diplomatic attempts by Germany to stop the French, France emerged victorious from the 1906 Conference of Algeciras, which conceded to France control over all of Morocco except for the now-international city of Tangier and a Spanish-controlled sliver of land in the north that included the important Ḥaketía-speaking communities of Tetouan, Asilah, and Larache (Pennel 2000: 166). Ḥaketía speakers suddenly found themselves split into three different territories: Tangier, Spanish Morocco, and French Morocco.

I. Language Ideology and Perceiving Ḥaketía as "Bad Spanish"

In Chapter 3, I mentioned that when writing in Ladino, Ḥaketía-speaking scholars worked very cautiously to remove all traces of Arabic vocabulary from their writing. While speakers colloquially employed a very high proportion of Arabic loan words in their lexicon, as evidenced in Haketia dictionaries (see especially Benoliel's (1977) work on this subject[33], they excised all Arabisms from their high-register writings when communicating with other Sephardim around the Mediterranean. They substituted any Arabisms with lexicon of Romance and Hebrew origin, and then often applied Hebrew syntax to their "purer" Judeo-Spanish if they were translating directly from Hebrew texts. Furthermore, even in colloquial speech, religious themes were

[33] Some estimates, such as Bentolila (www.jewishlanguages.org), suggest that up to 34.5% of the words in Benoliel's dictionary of Ḥaketía may have been of Arabic origin.

conveyed with loanwords from Hebrew. They referred to the *toshavim* as *forasteros*, further cementing their separation from anything Arabic. What this suggests is a preexisting language ideology in the minds of Moroccan Sephardim: a system of ranking the prestige of the languages around them.

Arabic appears to have been situated at the bottom of the prestige hierarchy[34], followed by the Arabicized colloquial Ḥaketía, then with a more prestigious, "purified" (more Romance-influenced) Judeo-Spanish koine (Ladino) above it, and Hebrew at the very top, reserved for religious purposes. Importantly, this language ideology may have laid the ground for the decline and Re-Hispanicization of Ḥaketía that occurred from the 19th century.

From the Spanish invasion and two-year occupation of Tetouan in 1860, northern Ḥaketía speakers were increasingly exposed to Castilian Spanish. In 1894, there were an estimated 9000 foreigners residing in Morocco, mostly Spaniards; there were approximately six times as many Spaniards (~7,000) as there were British (~1,200) in Morocco, and twice as many British as French (~600) (Pennel 2000: 89-90). Given Ḥaketía speakers' demonstrated pre-existing preference for Romance, it comes as no surprise that Ḥaketía speakers would have increasingly seen this new hegemonic language variety in a prestigious light, similar to how they had previously seen Ladino, their literary register. Schwarzwald (2008: 224) states that the tumult of this period and the imposition of the Spanish and French languages caused two extreme changes in Ḥaketía. First, Sephardim switched from writing Ḥaketía in the Hebrew script to the Latin script, pushing it closer to the dominant Romance languages. Second, it caused the formation of a new widespread diglossia between the European standards and Ḥaketía. Essentially, Spanish or

[34] It is unclear where Berber language varieties would have fallen on this hierarchy, as little scholarly work has been done on Berber influences in Ḥaketía. It is clear, however, that Berberisms were excised from Ladino texts just as Arabisms were.

French replaced Ladino in the Sephardic language ideology hierarchy as the prestige language, while Ḥaketía was further restricted to use only in the domestic sphere. Schwarzwald's (2008) comparison of several *haggadot* from Tetouan (published around 1940) and Tangier (published in 1912 and 1923) with *haggadot* produced at the same time in the eastern Mediterranean (Salonika, Jerusalem, Istanbul) reveals in the Moroccan *haggadot* such strong convergence with standard Castilian that Schwarzwald questions whether they still genuinely represent Ladino renderings or whether they are fully re-Hispanicized. Take, for example, the differences between the *haggadot* produced in Tangier (the most re-Hispanicized variety), Tetouan (somewhat re-Hispanicized, particularly in orthography), and the one produced in Istanbul (the most traditional Ladino translation, adapted to its own spelling norms)[35]:

"**TANGIER**: **El hombre sabio dice** que los testamentos y las **leyes** y las justicias que encomendó הי **nuestro Dios** a **vosotros**, también tu **dile**, **que según** la ley del Pesah, **no se debe comer ninguna fruta, después de haber comido el carnero.**

TETUÁN: **Sabio** que él dicién, que los testamentos y los fueros y las justicias que encomendó A" **nuestro Dios** a vos, también tú dí a él como los Dinim del Pesah, **no hablará después de comer el carnero sacar maneras de frutas.**

ISTANBUL: Savio ke el dizyen? ke los testamentos i los fueros i los cuisyos ke enkomendo Adonay noestro Dio a vos? tambien tu di a el komo dinim del Pesah no espartiran despoes del korbanpesah afikomen."

The Tetouan *Haggadah* demonstrates lexical, syntactical, and orthographic convergence towards standard Spanish, but is still closer than the Tangier version to the traditional norms

[35] This passage is from *The Four Children* section of the *Haggadah*, which Schwarzwald translates to English: 'What does the wise (son) say? 'What are the testimonies, statutes, and laws which the LORD our God commanded you?' Also you should tell him the laws of Passover down to the details of the Afikoman, which is not to be eaten after the paschal lamb [or: one should not say anything after eating the Afikoman]'

shown in the Istanbul *Haggadah*. Words such as "*fueros,*" "*dicién,*" "*di a él,*" and "*vos*" are all remnants from medieval Spanish (cf. modern peninsular Spanish: "leyes," "dice," "dile," and "ti"). It also maintains some Hebrew syntax ("Sabio que él dicién") and some Hebrew words ("Dinim del Pesah"). However, several changes toward standard Spanish are evident, such as the replacement of the first-person plural possessive *muestro* with *nuestro*, and *Dios* in place of the well-known Judeo-Spanish form *Dio*.

The 1923 Tangier *Haggadah* in particular most closely conforms to standard Spanish, with only two Hebrew words remaining: "Pesah" ('Passover') and "חי" (literally 'life'), and no Hebrew syntax. This second word, however, is actually just a placeholder for the name of God, a common practice in Jewish writing – the same thing is done in the Tetouan version with "*A"*". Strikingly, both Moroccan varieties have even removed the iconic *Dió*, arguably the most famous adaptation in Judeo-Spanish, that evolved even before the expulsion from Iberia. Some slight re-Hispanicization can even be witnessed occurring between the earlier (1912) and later (1923) versions of Tangier *haggadot*: For example, the famous phrase "*en los demás noches* ('from all the nights')" in 1912 is changed to "*en las demás noches*" in 1923. What this seemingly tiny change reflects is actually a major clue in the disappearance of Ḥaketía; The change in the grammatical gender of *los noches* from masculine, a typical feature of Ḥaketía, to the feminine *las noches*, the standard variant in Spanish, demonstrates how speakers of Ḥaketía had begun to think about their language, even their formal language: Ḥaketía was coming to be seen as "bad Spanish", in need of correction.

II. Education and the Disappearance of Ḥaketía

In linguistic studies of immigrants and their children, two individual factors that have been identified to correlate with immigrant language shift/death are formal education in the

dominant language and attitudes towards the minority language (Potowski 2013: 323). I have previously shown that many speakers may have held negative attitudes towards Ḥaketía, but one factor that may have facilitated these negative attitudes is the introduction of formal, European-style education, which privileged national standard languages such as French and Spanish, and downgraded all other varieties. While the rabbinic and scholarly classes in the Moroccan Jewish community were clearly literate, and the merchant class of Sephardim were well-off thanks to their commercial connections, the vast majority of Moroccan Jews remained poor and uneducated (Pennel 2000: 83). Furthermore, the connections the Sephardim had built over the centuries with their European counterparts began to manifest less as a partnership, as Morocco was technologically and economically lagging behind the European powers, and more as an influx of resources seeking to educate and Westernize the Jews of Morocco (Pennel 2000: 83).

They found their benefactors in European Jews. In the aftermath of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, the status of the Jews of Western Europe had begun to improve significantly; they began to assimilate, to represent themselves in European national politics, and to think of themselves as members of the European countries in which they lived (Laskier 1983: 31-32). Famously, the wealthy and prominent Sephardi philanthropist Sir Moses Montefiore of Britain took a personal interest in the well-being of North African and Middle Eastern Jews, who now lived in ever-worsening conditions as their countries underwent significant political and economic chaos brought on by conflict with the encroaching colonial European powers (Miller 2013: 44-45). Another benefactor was the Alliance Israélite Universelle, a coordinated effort by European Jewish benefactors to provide education and resources to their North African and Middle Eastern coreligionists. However, it is important to recognize that the Alliance Israélite Universelle, founded in Paris by affluent French Jews in 1860, worked in tandem with the

French government and actively promoted its colonial interests in its mission to provide education and resources to the Jews of the Muslim world (Laskier 1983: 31-32). Instructing primarily in standard French, it worked alongside the colonial powers, particularly France, to instill European political and cultural values in Moroccan Jewry (Laskier 1983: 2). The AIU saw the French language and the ideas of Europe as the keys to "emancipation and moral progress" (Laskier 1983: 33); however, along with it came the famously forceful language ideology of France (in which the French national standard was presented as the "most logical" of languages), the European ideologies of nationalism (one state = one nation = one language) and colonialism (European cultural superiority) (Laskier 1983: 2-3). From the establishment of its first school in Tetouan in 1862 to the Second World War, AIU teachers often did not come from Moroccan Jewish communities, but rather from Europe or from the Judezmo-speaking regions of the eastern Mediterranean, such as Salonika, Constantinople, and Rhodes; during their training in promoting Western culture these teachers were frequently taught that Moroccans in general were both "uncultured" and "primitive souls" in need of "cultural rejuvenation" (Laskier 1983: 3-4). Moroccan rabbis were frequently referred to by AIU teachers in derogatory terms, as "reactionaries" or "ignoramuses" because of their often-cautious views towards the motives of the AIU; once enculturated, even Moroccan-born AIU teachers would often refer to Moroccan rabbis with this level of disdain (Laskier 1983: 3). Seeking to help the Jews of Morocco, the AIU would ultimately become one of the catalysts for the abandonment of Ḥaketía.

While it is important to recognize that the efforts of the AIU did not arise from bad intentions, the organization was one of the few non-rabbinical educational institutions available to Moroccan Jews (Laskier 1983: 101), and it likely facilitated negative attitudes towards Ḥaketía. For example, the curriculum of the AIU's Tetouani boys' and girls' primary schools in

1873 is as follows: French, Arithmetic, European Geography, Biblical History, Hebrew, and Spanish (Laskier 1983: 100). Indeed, no education was given in Ḥaketía; rather, standard Spanish was the language of instruction in Tetouan and other communities in the north, taught in order to move Moroccan Jews away from Judeo-Spanish and towards standard Spanish (Laskier 1983: 100-101). Interestingly, the education of young women in particular was likely critical to the abandonment of Ḥaketía. Women, as traditional keepers of the home, previously were almost entirely illiterate and in accordance with Jewish tradition did not participate in Hebrew prayer and religion as actively as men did in their daily lives (Díaz-Mas 1997: 121). In Moroccan society as a whole, women were not allowed to participate as actively in public life as did men, and frequently were culturally obligated to isolate themselves from the social spheres of men, frequently tending to the home or attending all-female gatherings while the men worked (Díaz-Mas 1997: 121). Women were the guardians of the community's oral traditions, and had less knowledge of language varieties that carried more prestige, further helping to pass on Ḥaketía to future generations (Díaz-Mas 1997: 121). The education of Jewish women in Morocco certainly helped to give them more economic and social freedoms, but also may have unintentionally had the effect of instilling European language ideology (the supposed superiority of European standard languages) in the keepers of the oral traditions of Ḥaketía, and thereby lessening the likelihood that they would pass on the language they came to see as backwards to their children.

Over time, French instruction gradually became more and more emphasized in all communities, including Tetouan (Laskier 1983: 101). By 1897 the AIU had over 1,700 students in Essaouira, Casablanca, Tetouan, Tangier, and Fez (Pennel 2000: 83). English classes, sponsored by English Jews and the Board of Deputies, were taught in Essaouira, Casablanca, and Tangier (also temporarily in Tetouan), and Spanish was introduced into the curriculum of

northern and coastal towns where it would have the greatest political and cultural impact (Laskier 1983: 101). Fez was the most interesting case: there the Jewish population was primarily ethnically Sephardi, but, as previously mentioned, most had long before adopted Judeo-Arabic in place of Ḥaketía (Laskier 1983: 102). There, unlike many other schools with higher proportions of Ḥaketía speakers, they began to teach French from the outset, and no Spanish was taught; Arabic and Judeo-Arabic grammar and literature were taught, but often those subjects involved translating Arabic literature to French (Laskier 1983: 102). In some places where Arabic was taught, as in Fez or Tangier, it was genuinely meant to bridge the growing ethnic divides between Jews and Muslims; however, in other places such as in Casablanca, formal teaching of Arabic and other languages like English were meant more so that Jews could conduct written business with Muslims on behalf of Europeans (Laskier 1983: 103-104). Many schools also offered evening or workshop classes for adults, facilitating the extension of European language ideologies and consequent language shift decades before the Spanish and French ever established their protectorates (Laskier 1983: 106). Effectively, the language ideology held by Ḥaketía speakers gradually changed. Hebrew (and to a slightly lesser extent, Aramaic) likely remained at the top, or at least would have held a venerated position in the new ideology as the Jewish holy language, but Ladino was supplanted by the French and Spanish languages. French, the language of Jewish education and advancement, very likely held a slightly higher position than Spanish in the minds of Moroccan Sephardim, as France held a dominant position in world affairs as in Morocco, while Spain was significantly weaker militarily and economically. The different varieties of Arabic are difficult if not impossible to place in the hierarchy, as some Jews were now trained to employ varieties of Arabic as tools to conduct business with Muslim Moroccans on behalf of the European colonial powers, and most

Moroccan Jews spoke Judeo-Moroccan Arabic as a first language; therefore, because the Arabic language varieties filled a new ecological niche, they likely no longer occupied the bottom of the hierarchy. Arabic varieties appear to have at least risen above Ḥaketía in the hierarchy, as evidenced by the continued use of Arabic varieties while Ḥaketía experienced Rehispanicization and language shift to French.

Ḥaketía would not die entirely, but its domains of use became restricted to the most intimate conversation within the domestic sphere, while Spanish or French would become the public language in speech and writing, replacing Ḥaketía and Ladino. This is a situation that *could* be referred to as diglossia, where one variety or language fills the private or more intimate ecological niche, and another in the public niche. Speakers today remember the difference between how their parents spoke to them in the home, and how they and their parents would speak in public (Sisso-Raz 2015: 124). Jews were undergoing "Europeanization," and the non-standard, Arabic-infused Ḥaketía came to be seen as an obstacle to progress, something holding them back. Spanish and French were presented as the languages of the future and modernity, and as a path to escape the poverty many Sephardim had descended into after centuries of heavy taxation and being confined to the overcrowded *mellah*s in 1808. Thus, they began the processes of Re-Hispanicization and language shift in earnest (Díaz-Mas 1997: 114-115).

The killing blow to Ḥaketía was the emigration of nearly all of its remaining speakers and the breakup of the social networks that had supported its maintenance. This came in the years following Morocco's independence in 1956. Despite Benoliel's work to formally document and study the language that was published (mostly posthumously) from 1926 to 1952, which generated a newfound interest in the language, it was no longer useful or prestigious as a commercial or public language or even as a language of solidarity. Díaz-Mas (1997: 84) states

that after the turmoil of the Second World War and the founding of Israel, the Sephardim would experience the so-called "Second Diaspora." Violence against Jews had occurred in Morocco since even before the Sephardim arrived, part of the reason why in 1808 Jews were restricted to the walled-in *mellahs*. But the violence grew substantially with the rise of European influence in Morocco; immediately after the establishment of the European protectorates in 1912, for example, anti-Jewish pogroms destroyed the *mellah* in Fez, killing hundreds and displacing over 12,000 Jews (Miller 2013: 89). In 1948, riots broke out across Morocco, resulting in another pogrom against Jews, and the violence showed no signs of stopping (Pennel 2000: 277). The colonial powers, severely weakened by the Second World War, could no longer protect the Jewish population nor maintain their hold on their colonies. In April 1956, Spain agreed to withdraw from northern Morocco, and France, facing international pressures and struggling with a bloody war in Algeria, finally conceded in October of 1956 (Miller 2013: 159). It is estimated that in 1948, on the eve of the founding of the state of Israel, the Jewish population of Morocco was the largest in the Muslim world, at around 250,000 (Pennel 2000: 310-311). Knowing that independence placed them in peril, many began to emigrate clandestinely, despite legal restrictions on Jews leaving the country (Miller 2013: 159). Hundreds of thousands of Sephardi and Mizrahi Jews emigrated to escape anti-Jewish violence in Morocco, as well as across the rest of the Muslim world (Miller 2013: 159-160). The Israeli government's Central Bureau of Statistics released a report in 2018 detailing immigration to Israel by period of immigration and country of origin, and the numbers of Moroccan immigrants came in huge waves. From 1948-1951, there were 28,263 Moroccan immigrants; from 1952-1960, coinciding with Moroccan independence and the lifting of the emigration ban, there came another 95,545 immigrants; the largest wave, 130,507 Moroccan immigrants, migrated to Israel between 1961-1971, largely due

to the Six Day War in 1967 (which increased anti-Jewish sentiment across the Arab and Muslim world? (Central Bureau of Statistics 2018: 1, Miller 2013: 160).

Today, Ḥaketía is no longer widely spoken in Morocco, and there are only between 2,000 and 2,500 Jews left in the entire country, mostly in Casablanca. Unsurprisingly due to the policies of the Alliance Israélite Universelle and the prestige of the French language left over from colonial times, the majority speak neither Ḥaketía nor Judeo-Moroccan Arabic, but rather, French (www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org; Díaz-Mas 1997: 122). Large communities of Ḥaketía speakers settled in Israel, France, North America, and Latin America, but they and their descendants would slowly be linguistically absorbed by the majority population, particularly in Israel, where the rise of Hebrew as the national language forced the Sephardim to assimilate (Díaz-Mas 1997: 124-125). However, the use of Judeo-Spanish did not completely subside, and an interesting process occurred in Israel amongst the many speakers of different Judeo-Spanish varieties after their immigration: one final round of koineization and dialectal leveling (Díaz-Mas 1997: 124). This variety of koineized Judeo-Spanish exists in Israel to this day, although most of its speakers are elderly (Díaz-Mas 1997: 124). Intermarriage with Jews of other ethnicities has resulted in an Israeli (*sabra*) identity, with Hebrew as its linguistic marker (Díaz-Mas 1997: 124). In recent years, the Real Academia Española, the body that governs the Spanish language, has announced its intent to open an academy in Israel for the preservation of Judeo-Spanish. The future of Judeo-Spanish as a whole is uncertain, and although it is unquestionably in severe decline there is the distinct possibility that Sephardim will continue to use Judeo-Spanish as a liturgical language (as evidenced by the persistent popularity of Ladino songs such as *Non Komo Muestro Dios* and *Kuando el Rey Nimrod*) and as something like a identity marker in conscious performances of Sephardic identity, much as Yiddish lexicon and culture continue to serve as

emblems of the Ashkenazi identity in the United States. What can be said for certain is that the persistence of Ḥaketía and its speakers over five centuries does not represent simply a linguistic or cultural anomaly, nor are they simply a footnote about the outcome of the Spanish Inquisition in history books; rather, they represent a living continuity, a culture that has left a significant mark on the history and cultural development of Morocco.

5. Conclusion

In my study, I have sought to examine the language of the Sephardim of North Africa through an ecological lens, comparing the changing status of the spoken and written varieties of North-African Judeo-Spanish (respectively Ḥaketía and Ladino) over time with the status of other languages, namely Moroccan and Judeo-Moroccan varieties of Arabic, French, and peninsular Spanish. Using this approach, I have attempted to answer several questions: What Ḥaketía was/is, how it arose in the multilingual Moroccan context, how and why it survived for centuries in this context, and how and why it entered into decline. I have reviewed evidence provided by other scholars that indicates that Ḥaketía was similar to, yet different from, other varieties of Judeo-Spanish (and evolving Castilian Spanish). Ḥaketía is a language variety distinct from both a pan-Sephardic literary/written register of Judeo-Spanish (Ladino) and from eastern spoken varieties of Judeo-Spanish (Judezmo), but that all of these varieties can be and apparently were understood as varieties of a shared language, which we now commonly label Judeo-Spanish. The language formed and stabilized due to the process of koineization in conjunction with extensive language contact with the many languages that make up Morocco's language ecology. I have further demonstrated that Ḥaketía survived in a competitive ecosystem for over five centuries because of the tight social networks that characterized the relations between its speakers, its place within the Sephardic communities conceived of as communities of practice, and because Judeo-Spanish (namely Ladino) connected its speakers to a larger Sephardi

community across the Mediterranean. However, this study also made clear that the language ideologies of the Moroccan Sephardim played a role in the maintenance of use of Ḥaketía and Ladino and of their eventual abandonment. The Sephardim (at least in the North) traditionally ranked Hebrew and Aramaic above all other languages, then Ladino and Ḥaketía, and below these different varieties of Arabic (and possibly Berber even lower). With the penetration of European language ideologies, a ranking was maintained, but Ladino was abandoned and replaced by French or Spanish, while Ḥaketía held on somewhat longer to its place in intimate communications, though it was increasingly viewed as "bad Spanish" and an impediment to progress, success, and access to modernity, and was eventually abandoned with the breakup of the Sephardic communities (social networks) that had made possible its continued acquisition and use. As Bentolila (2008: 176) states, speakers of Ḥaketía likely always saw Ladino as proper Spanish, or at least a linguistic goal for which to strive – and with the arrival of the Spanish and French, Ḥaketía with its many Arabisms and irregularities began to be "cleaned" by its own speakers via Re-Hispanicization or complete abandonment of any variety of Spanish in favor of French.

Much research remains to be done on Ḥaketía, particularly with regards to its propensity for borrowing from other languages, the altered language ranking system during the colonial period, and the variety's significance in commerce. Significant gaps exist in research on the Arabic and potential Berber components of Ḥaketía. Bilingualism in Arabic varieties and Ḥaketía among Sephardim is well-attested, but the exact amount of lexical borrowing from Arabic in Ḥaketía is not entirely known. The level of borrowings, if any, from Berber languages has also been woefully understudied, and where exactly Berber languages would have fallen on the Sephardim's language hierarchy is logically somewhat difficult to determine. The fact that

borrowings from Berber languages, if they existed in significant numbers, were excised from Ladino may indicate that Berber loanwords were of the same or even lower prestige than Arabisms, and were therefore avoided. Further research would need to be done especially if Berberisms are mostly absent from Ḥaketía: their absence could be due to a lack of frequent contact with Berber speakers, but seems unlikely given that Riffian Berbers inhabited the Rif region in what became Spanish Morocco, and would therefore seemingly have been in some contact with Ḥaketía speakers. The absence may indicate that the Berber languages were of even lower prestige than Arabic was prior to the colonial period, which could very well be possible given the disdain shown by the sultans towards the Berber languages (Pennel 2000: 97).

Another potential area for future research is the exact relationship in the language hierarchy between Arabic, French, and Spanish in the twentieth century. It is unclear as to exactly where Arabic would have been on the hierarchy given its newfound utility, and the role of the European languages also requires further research. Were they merely languages for use at commerce, school, or government, or were they considered integral to the everyday lives of Moroccan Jews? More work also remains to be done on the role of Ḥaketía and Judeo-Spanish more generally in commerce across the Mediterranean. It is made evident in several sources, namely Schroeter (2002: 73), that Judeo-Spanish and even Arabic were spoken in many important Sephardic communities across Europe and the Mediterranean, namely in London and Livorno. Schroeter (2002: 73) states that members of the Moroccan Jewish elite in London usually spoke what he terms “Spanish,” and that London, Morocco, Livorno, Amsterdam, and the New World were all a part of a Sephardic scholarly and commercial circuit. The significance of Judeo-Spanish (specifically the significance of Ḥaketía) in these commercial interactions is an area that therefore requires substantial future research: what variety of Judeo-Spanish was

spoken in these ports? Was it an intentional sort of high-register koine like Ladino, or did it draw upon inspiration from local varieties that the merchants brought with them? To what extent did Judeo-Spanish serve to facilitate the actual commercial interactions that occurred in ports – as merely one tool to build trade relations, or as a major language in which goods and money were bargained over?

The most important question I have tried to answer in my thesis, however, is what the relevance of Ḥaketía was and is, both to its speakers and to the times and places in which those speakers lived. The story of Ḥaketía is relevant to the study of Jewish languages and minority languages the world over, which develop and survive because they fulfill a communicative need for their community of speakers and because they grant those speakers a sense of belonging to a shared group that can effect change in their society or connect with a wealth of cultural tradition. As my study demonstrates, an ecological approach to the study of minority language varieties and other Jewish languages can help elucidate the reasons that those language varieties survive and thrive, even against intense pressure to abandon the usage of those varieties for another one perceived as more hegemonic or prestigious. Ḥaketía and its survival over the course of five centuries stand as testaments to the tenacity and rich cultural tradition of the Sephardi Jews of the Maghreb, and it is hoped that the fascinating and layered story of the life and decline of Ḥaketía will inspire future research efforts into the many facets of the Moroccan Sephardi culture and language that remain still undiscovered.

Haketía Master Bibliography

Adam, R. and Quinto-Pozos, D. (2013). "Sign Language Contact". In Bayley, R., Cameron, R., & Lucas, C. (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of sociolinguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 379.

Alexander-Frizer, T. and Bentolila, Y. (2008). *La palabra en su hora es oro: El refrán judeoespañol del Norte de Marruecos*. Jerusalem: Instituto Ben-Zvi.

Batzarov, Z. (2001). Retrieved March 23, 2019, from http://www.orbilat.com/Languages/Spanish-Ladino/Grammar/Ladino-Noun.htm#FormationofthePlural

Baugh, J. (2011). "Power, Social Diversity, and Language". In Raj Mesthrie (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, 17-27.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bénichou, P. (1945). "Observaciones sobre el judeo-español de Marruecos," *Revista de Filología Hispánica* 7: 209-258.

Benoliel, J. (1977). *Dialecto Judeo-Hispano-Marroquí o Hakitía*. Madrid: Boletín de la Real Academia Española.

Bentolila, Y. (1999). *Alternances d'hébreu et de judéo-espagnol dans un Daroush marocain*. In S. Morag, M. Bar-Asher y M. Mayer Modena (eds.), *Vena Hebraica in Judaeorum Linguis*. Milan: Università degli Studi di Milano & The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. 203-219.

Bentolila, Y. (2008). "La lengua común (coiné) judeo-española entre el Este y el Oeste." *El Presente: Estudios Sobre La Cultura Sefardí* 2:159-176.

Bentolila, Y. *Jewish Languages*. "Haketia." (n.d.). Retrieved December 18, 2018, from http://www.jewish-languages.org/haketia.html

Bosworth, C. E. (1996). *The New Islamic Dynasties*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bunis, D. M. (1992). "The Language of the Sephardim: A Historical Overview." *Moreshet Sepharad: The Sephardi Legacy* 2:399-422.

Bunis, D. M. (2008). "The Differential Impact of Arabic on Haketía and Turkish on Judezmo." *El Presente: Estudios Sobre La Cultura Sefardí* 2:177-208.

Corcos, D. (1976). *Studies in the History of the Jews of Morocco*. Jerusalem: Rubin Mass.

Díaz-Más, P. (1997). *Los sefardíes: Historia, lengua, y cultura*. Barcelona: Riopiedras Ediciones.

Eckert, P. and Mcconnell-Ginet, S. (2007). "Putting communities of practice in their place." *Gender and Language*, Vol. 1, No. 1:27-37.

Gerber, J. S. (1994). *The Jews of Spain: A history of the Sephardic experience*. New York: The Free Press.

Gilbert, M. (2010). *In Ishmael's House: A History of Jews in Muslim Lands*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.

Gottheil, R., Kayserling, M., & Jacobs, J. (n.d.). "Spain." Retrieved March 22, 2019, from http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/13940-spain

Gruber, M. (2003). Hebrew's Theological Significance. Retrieved March 23, 2019, from https://www.myjewishlearning.com/article/hebrews-theological-significance/

Hassán, I. M. and Izquierdo Benito, R. (2008). *Sefardíes: Literatura y lengua de una nación dispersa*. Cuenca: Ediciones de la Universidad de Castilla - La Mancha.

Haugen, E. (1972). *The ecology of language*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Israeli Central Bureau of Statistics. *Immigration*. Retrieved February 18, 2019, from https://www.cbs.gov.il/he/publications/doclib/2018/4.%20shnatonimmigration/st04_04.pdf

Jewish Virtual Library. *Morocco Virtual Jewish History Tour*. (n.d.). Retrieved December 18, 2018, from https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/morocco-virtual-jewish-history-tour

Jewish Virtual Library. *Modern Jewish History*. (n.d.). Retrieved March 23, 2019, from https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/the-ladino-language

Kerswill, P. E. (1994). *Dialects converging: Rural speech in urban Norway*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kretzschmar, W. (2011). "Language and Region". In Raj Mesthrie (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, 187-202.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Langman, J. (2013). "Analyzing Qualitative Data, Mapping the Research Trajectory in Multilingual Contexts." In Bayley, R., Cameron, R., & Lucas, C. (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of sociolinguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 241-260.

Lapesa, R. (1980). *Historia de la lengua española*. Madrid.

Laskier, M. (1983). *The Alliance Israélite Universelle and the Jewish Communities of Morocco, 1862-1962.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lillich, L. (n.d.). *Los sefardíes y el judeoespañol de Marruecos* [Scholarly project]. In *Voces De Haketia*. Retrieved February 8, 2019, from http://www.vocesdehaketia.com/haketia/judeoespanoldeMarruecos-por_Liane_Lillich.pdf

Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology, and Discrimination in the United States*. London: Routledge.

Llamas, C. and Milroy, L. (2013). "Social Networks." In Chambers, J. K., & Schilling-Estes, N. (eds.), *The handbook of language variation and change*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell. 409-427.

Lleal, C. (1992). *El Judezmo: El dialecto sefardí y su historia*. Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona.

Mar-Molinero, C., & Smith, A. (1996). *Nationalism and the nation in the Iberian Peninsula: Competing and conflicting identities*. Oxford: Berg.

Martínez-Celdrán, E., Fernández-Planas, A. M., & Carrera-Sabaté, J. (2003). "Castilian Spanish." *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 33 (2):255-259.

Michaux-Bellaire, E., & Salmon, G. (1905). *El-Qçar El-Kebir: Une ville province au Maroc septentrional*. Paris.

Miller, S. G. (2013). *A History of Modern Morocco*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Minervini, Laura (2006). "El desarrollo histórico del judeoespañol". *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana* Vol. 4, No. 2:13-34.

Münzer, Hieronymus (1951). *Viaje por España y Portugal 1494-1495*. Madrid: Almenara.

Nirenberg, D. (1998) *Communities of Violence*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP

Pato, E., Schwarzwald, O., and Tuten, D. N. (2016). "Spanish, Asturian-Leonese, Navarro-Aragonese, and Judeo-Spanish". In Ledgeway, A., & Maiden, M. *The Oxford guide to the Romance languages*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press. 382-410.

Penny, Ralph J. (2000). *Variation and Change in Spanish*. Cambridge University Press.

Penny, R. J. (1986). *Patterns of language-change in Spain: An inaugural lecture delivered at Westfield College, Wednesday 26th November 1986*. London: Westfield College.

Pennel, C. R. (2000). *Morocco Since 1830*. London: C. Hurst & Co..

Pennel, C. R. (2003). *Morocco: From Empire to Independence*. London: Oneworld Publications.

Pérez, J. (2007). *History of a Tragedy: The Expulsion of the Jews from Spain*. Translated by Hochroth, L. University of Illinois Press.

Potowski, K. (2013). "Language Maintenance and Shift." In Bayley, R., Cameron, R., & Lucas, C. (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of sociolinguistics*, Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press. 321-339.

Real Academia Española, Diccionario de la Lengua Española. *Judeoespañol*. Retrieved December 18, 2018, from https://dle.rae.es/?id=MZfAhkl

Real Academia Española. "La RAE elige a ocho académicos correspondientes judeoespañoles." (2015, November 12). Retrieved March 23, 2019, from http://www.rae.es/noticias/la-rae-elige-ocho-academicos-correspondientes-judeoespanoles

Révah, I. S. (1970). "Hispanisme et judaïsme des langues parlées et écrites par les Sefardim". In Iacob M. Hassán (ed.), *Actas del Primer Simposio de Estudios Sefardíes.*, Madrid: CSIC. 233-242.

Ruiz, J. M. (1982). *Lenguas en contacto: Judeoespañol y arabe marroqui. Interferencias lexicas, fonéticas y sintácticas*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.

Schroeter, D. J. (2002). *The Sultan's Jew: Morocco and the Sephardi World.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Schwarzwald, O. (2008). Between East and West: Differences between Ottoman and North African Judeo-Spanish Haggadot. *El Presente: Estudios Sobre La Cultura Sefardí* 2:223-242.

Sisso Raz, A. (2015). "Haketia: Discovering the Other Judeo-Spanish Vernacular". In Kirschen, B. *Judeo-Spanish and the making of a community*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publ. 113-133.

Trudgill, P. (1986). *Dialects in contact*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Tuten, D. N. (2003). *Koineization in Medieval Spanish*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.

Unbegaun, B. O. (1973). The Russian Literary Language: A Comparative View. *The Modern Language Review* 68(4):19-25

Zafrani, H. (2005). *Two thousand years of Jewish life in Morocco*. New York: Sephardic House in association with KTAV Pub. House, Jersey City, NJ.

Zouhir, A. (2013). "Language Situation and Conflict in Morocco". In Orie, O., & Sanders, K. W. (eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 43rd Annual Conference on African Linguistics: Linguistic interfaces in African languages*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. 271-277.