

1 Victor A. Friedman\* and Brian D. Joseph

## 2 **Lessons from Judezmo about the Balkan** 3 4 **Sprachbund and contact linguistics**

5  
6 **Abstract:** Kristian Sandfeld explicitly excluded Judezmo from consideration in  
7 the second footnote to his classic (1930 [1926]) work *Linguistique balkanique*,  
8 which laid the groundwork for Balkan linguistics as a discipline offering an em-  
9 pirical basis for Trubetzkoy's theory of the Sprachbund. To this day, Judezmo still  
10 receives relatively little attention from Balkanists. Nevertheless, the language  
11 offers some particularly important insights into the Balkan Sprachbund. As an  
12 Ibero-Romance language sufficiently different from contemporary forms of Span-  
13 ish to be considered separate and distinct, it represents a second sub-branch of  
14 Romance found within the Balkans. Judezmo has importance for Balkan linguis-  
15 tics owing to its relatively late arrival in the Balkans, when compared to the other  
16 convergent languages, and to the relative social isolation of Judezmo-speaking  
17 Jewish communities in the region. Importantly, there are features on which  
18 Balkan Judezmo converges with other Balkan languages, but others on which  
19 it does not. There are also Judezmo dialects outside the Balkans, and so, in  
20 conjunction with comparisons to other Ibero-Romance languages and dialects,  
21 Judezmo provides a control for distinguishing convergence from coincidence. In  
22 this article, we develop these observations and draw conclusions about the na-  
23 ture of language contact in the Balkans involving Judezmo-speaking Sephardim,  
24 as well as that involving the other languages, by contrast.  
25

26 **Keywords:** Balkans, convergence, Judezmo, linguistic area, Sephardim,  
27 Sprachbund

28  
29  
30 **\*Corresponding author: Victor A. Friedman:** University of Chicago.

31 E-mail: vfriedm@uchicago.edu

32 **Brian D. Joseph:** The Ohio State University. E-mail: joseph.1@osu.edu

## 33 34 35 **1 Introduction**

36  
37 The Balkan Sprachbund, as a group of geographically interconnected languages  
38 that through extensive and intensive language contact have come to share certain  
39 structural and lexical characteristics, offers a striking set of points of convergence  
40 between and among various languages which, in addition to Turkic (especially

West Rumelian Turkish and Gagauz), include several different Indo-European 1  
branches: Albanian, Hellenic, Indic, Romance and Slavic. For the most part, it 2  
can be shown that these convergent features do not derive from the starting point, 3  
genealogically speaking, that is common to the non-Turkic languages, namely 4  
Proto-Indo-European. As a result, the Balkans provide valuable lessons for any- 5  
one interested in language contact. 6

In the second footnote to his classic (1930) work *Linguistique balkanique*, 7  
in which he laid the groundwork for Balkan linguistics as a discipline that gave a 8  
detailed empirical basis for Trubetzkoy's (1923, 1928) theory of the Sprachbund, 9  
Kristian Sandfeld explicitly excluded Romani and Judezmo,<sup>1</sup> among other lan- 10  
guages, from his consideration. In more recent years, the participation of Romani 11  
in Balkan linguistic processes has been amply demonstrated.<sup>2</sup> Judezmo, however, 12  
has received much less attention from Balkanists, and is still routinely excluded 13  
(Montoliu and van der Auwera 2004: 471). 14

Still, Judezmo, the language of Sephardic Jews who arrived in the Balkans 15  
from 1492 onwards as a result of expulsions from Spain and Portugal, offers a 16  
basis for particularly important insights. Judezmo is a variety of Spanish, suffi- 17  
ciently different from contemporary forms of Spanish to be considered separate 18  
and distinct, so that it represents a second sub-branch of Romance, along with 19  
the Balkan Romance group of Eastern Romance (Aromanian, Daco-Romanian 20  
and Megleno-Romanian), that is found within the Balkans. 21

The importance of Judezmo for Balkan linguistics lies partly in its relatively 22  
late arrival on the scene, compared to the other convergent languages,<sup>3</sup> and 23  
partly in the relative social isolation of the Judezmo-speaking Jewish communi- 24

---

1 Among some specialists, the term *Ladino* is reserved for a written form of Judezmo that was 25  
used to translate Hebrew religious texts word-for-word. On the question of terminology see 26  
Harris (1982). Sandfeld uses the term *español*. In 1905, according to figures cited by him, there 27  
were 50,000 speakers in Istanbul and 75,000 in Salonica. The Jews expelled from Spain and 28  
Portugal brought their language with them to North Africa, Anatolia, and other places in addi- 29  
tion to the Balkans, but we are concerned specifically with those dialects spoken in the former 30  
European Turkey. Judezmo was spoken in every major town and many minor ones in Ottoman 31  
Europe until the upheavals and slaughters of the 20th century, and the dialectological picture 32  
is complex but not relevant to our purposes here. For recent descriptions of the language as it 33  
is still spoken in the Balkans, see Symeonides (2002) and Varol Bornes (2008). 34

2 See Friedman (2000a, 2000b, 2006). 35

3 Greek and Albanian were present in the Balkans already in ancient times, Latin speakers en- 36  
tered during the Roman period (c. early 2nd century AD, around the time of Trajan's conquest of 37  
Dacia), the Slavs arrived in the 6th century AD and Romani speakers (representing the Indic 38  
branch) were in the Balkans no later than the 12th century AD. Although Turkic speakers arrived 39  
in the Balkans during the Byzantine period, it was the Ottoman conquests of the fourteenth cen- 40  
tury that were crucial for the Balkan Sprachbund as we know it today.

1 ties scattered across the central areas of the region.<sup>4</sup> It is particularly interesting,  
 2 therefore, to find that there are some features on which Judezmo converges with  
 3 other Balkan languages, but others on which it goes its own way. Also crucial to  
 4 the significance of Judezmo for the Balkan Sprachbund is the fact that with both  
 5 Spanish and Judezmo dialects outside the Balkans, we have a control group for  
 6 distinguishing convergence from coincidence. In what follows, we develop these  
 7 observations and draw conclusions about the nature of language contact in the  
 8 Balkans involving Sephardim and, at the same time, that involving the other lan-  
 9 guages, by contrast.

10

11

## 12 2 Balkanisms

13

14 The term *Balkanism* was first used by Seliščev (1925) to refer to the specific results  
 15 of multilingual language contact in the Balkans, that is to particular contact-  
 16 related features shared by languages in the region. His article pre-dates both  
 17 Trubetzkoy's (1923, 1928) second formulation of the concept of Sprachbund and  
 18 Sandfeld's original (1926) Danish-language edition of his monumental work  
 19 (Sandfeld 1930 [1926]).<sup>5</sup> Although his article was eclipsed by the French transla-  
 20 tion of Sandfeld's book in 1930, the basic principles in all these works remain  
 21 clear but are at times forgotten. In recent years, the emphasis on structural (gram-  
 22 matical) borrowings has obscured Trubetzkoy's original insight (already implicit  
 23 in Miklosich [1861]) that contact-induced innovations in lexicon, morphology and  
 24 phonology also participate in the definition of a Sprachbund. Seen in this light,  
 25 the relevance of Judezmo for the Balkan Sprachbund is even clearer.

26 Although considerable effort has been expended in “defining” linguistic  
 27 areas in terms of morphosyntactic isoglosses (see Masica 1976, 2001), Hamp  
 28 (1989) is closer to the mark when he describes the situation as one of “a spectrum  
 29 of differential bindings”.<sup>6</sup> While the genealogical model of the language family  
 30 requires that a language either belong or not (although see Thomason [2007] as  
 31

32

33 **4** Thus, for example, in nineteenth century Macedonian jokes, Albanians, Turks, Roms, Greeks  
 34 and Vlachs all speak in their ethnic languages, but the Jews speak Turkish, not Judezmo (see  
 35 Friedman 1997). At the same time, however, it is also true that in some Balkan towns resident  
 36 merchants learned Judezmo for business purposes.

37 **5** Trubetzkoy's original formulation (1923), was in Russian, and so would have been accessible  
 38 to Seliščev in principle, although it is not cited by him.

39 **6** It is worth noting that while Masica's morphosyntactic isoglosses identify what he calls an  
 40 Indo-Turanian area (South Asia + Central Asia), the phonological criterion of retroflexion, when  
 added to these, clearly sets off South Asia. This does not mean, pace Masica (2001: 210) that a  
 single isogloss by itself suffices to define a linguistic area, but rather, that in combination with

well as Enfield [2005] for discussions of problems even with this model), the boundaries of an areal grouping are not like the boundaries of a nation-state. Some convergent processes may be present in a larger number of languages than others in a given area where multilingualism has brought about convergence, but the intersection of multiple features (whose development can be shown to have temporal congruence or overlap) is what defines an area.

Moreover, the fact that features characterized as Balkanisms may have developed in languages outside the Balkans does not vitiate the possibility that they are due to contact within the Balkans. Thus, for example, Scandinavian developed postposed definite articles but that does not change the fact that both Balkan Romance and Balkan Slavic developed postposed articles out of native materials and on the basis of native syntactic patterns at precisely at the time when speakers were in contact with one another as well as with the language that became Albanian. Thus Balkan Romance and Balkan Slavic can be described as convergent, and the Scandinavian development must be taken simply to be an independent though parallel development (even if it may well have something to do with an analogous construction in North Russian). Given the fact that by the time Judezmo entered the Balkans it already had the (preposed) definite article of Spanish, it is unsurprising that no positional change occurred. Similarly, given that Greek already had a (generally preposed) definite article before the arrival of the Romans and the Slavs, there is nothing surprising in the absence of this Balkanism from Greek. The development in Romani, however, which in all likelihood took place in contact with Greek but involved native material (despite superficial similarities with Greek, see already Sampson [1926]), is possibly a Balkanism in our sense.<sup>7</sup>

Taking a different kind of Balkanism, namely the analytic comparison of adjectives, in the context of the Balkans this development is one that separates Balkan Slavic and Balkan Romani from non-Balkan Slavic and Romani, which preserved older synthetic comparatives. The timing of the Greek development (we cannot say anything about the Albanian) also points to the Ottoman period. The Romance developments inside and outside the Balkans are clearly parallel given the differences in lexical choice between French and Italian, on the one hand, and Ibero-Romance and Balkan Romance, on the other. Thus, for example while the analytic comparison of adjectives is a Balkanism in Greek, Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance, Albanian (presumably), and Romani since we know

---

other features, a single significant cross-genetic systemic isogloss, e.g. retroflexion, can be crucial and diagnostic.

<sup>7</sup> We write “possibly” because the development might have taken place in contact with Greek in Anatolia.

1 these languages used synthetic comparison at the time they came into contact  
 2 with one another and with Turkish, the analytic comparison of Spanish and  
 3 Judezmo was already in place at the time of its arrival in the Balkans and thus is  
 4 not a Balkanism.<sup>8</sup> So in examining Judezmo in its Balkan context, we must take  
 5 into account both the time of its entry into the Balkans and those Judezmo dia-  
 6 lects that developed outside the Balkans, e.g. in North Africa, Northwest Europe,  
 7 the Levant, etc.

8     A phonological example of these complexities is the apparent similarity of  
 9 *au, eu, iu* > *av/af, ev/ef, iv/if* (with *v* vs. *f* governed by voicing of following seg-  
 10 ment) in the Judezmo of Salonica (cf. Crews 1935; Harris 1994: 70–71), as in *kavsá*  
 11 ‘cause’, *devda* ‘debt’, *sivdað* ‘city’ (cf. Castilian Spanish *causa, deuda, ciudad*),  
 12 with developments affecting the same diphthongs in the same way in Aromanian  
 13 and Greek. However, although some linguists – e.g. Sala (1970: 30) – see it as due  
 14 to Greek influence, this development is actually an archaism in Judezmo, accord-  
 15 ing to Sephiha (1996–1998: 87) and Harris (1994: 71). That is, *sivdad* represents a  
 16 preservation of the fifteenth century Spanish pronunciation of ancestral *civita(t)-*,  
 17 and the development with other vowels is also found in Castilian Spanish, as in  
 18 *Pablo* from earlier *Paulo* (presumably through *Pavlo*, a form actually found in  
 19 Judezmo, as given in Subak [1906: 131]).

20     It is also the case that the details of how a particular feature is realized can  
 21 show that it is not to be taken as a Balkanism. For instance, again on the phono-  
 22 logical level, northern Greek, eastern Macedonian, eastern Bulgarian and Aro-  
 23 manian all show raising of all unstressed /e, o/ to /i, u/, and this development  
 24 is found also in several regional varieties of Judezmo, e.g. in Bitola (Ottoman  
 25 Manastir, now in southern Macedonia), and in Veroia (Karaferye) and Kastoria  
 26 (Ottoman Kesriye, both now in northern Greece). However, some varieties of  
 27 Judezmo raise these vowels only in word-final position, while others have the  
 28 raising of /o/ only pretonically (Harris 1994: 70), and further /a/ is also subject to  
 29 raising, to /e/, a development that is unlike any other Balkan version of vowel  
 30 raising, where /a/, if raised, becomes schwa. Further, the Judezmo of Bitola has  
 31 significant influence from Portuguese (via expulsions of 1497), which thus rep-  
 32 resents another likely source for the raising.

33     Nonetheless, there are features of Balkan Judezmo which, owing to their  
 34 timing and particular realization, as well as their absence from other Judezmo  
 35 dialects as well as Spanish and Portuguese can be considered as Balkanisms. We  
 36 turn to those in the next section.

37

38     <sup>8</sup> To be sure, analytic comparison is a strategy that the various Balkan languages had available  
 39 to them prior to contact, but the intensity of the development took place precisely at the time of  
 40 convergent multilingualism.

### 3 Judezmo Balkanisms

Balkanisms can be identified for Judezmo at all linguistic levels. In the phonological domain there is the occurrence of particular affricates. The morpho-syntactic level has the use of evidential verb forms, the retreat of the infinitive, object reduplication, and also the treatment of conditionals, futures, and perfects. In the lexical domain, and here we include derivational morphology even though it could also go with morphology, various types of shared vocabulary are attested, primarily from Turkish, although post-Ottoman recent varieties show additional influences.

#### 3.1 Phonology

With regard to the affricates, there are two issues that serve to align Judezmo with the Balkan languages. First, as discussed in more detail in Friedman and Joseph (2013: Ch. 5), drawing in part on Feuillet (1986: 45–53), multiple affricates, showing, moreover, a hissing/hushing opposition, specifically [c] and [tʃ], are found in the more central Balkan northern dialects of Greek, in Albanian, in Balkan Slavic and in Balkan Romance. Significantly, these sounds and this opposition are found in at least some Balkan Judezmo varieties – in Bucharest for instance, as reported by Sala (1971) – and importantly, they are not found in other Spanish dialects. Other varieties of Balkan Judezmo, e.g. Salonica as reported by Symeonidis (2002), have only the hushing affricates, [tʃ] versus [dʒ], but even here the occurrence of the voiced sound is important as it is absent from most Continental Spanish dialects.<sup>9</sup> Old Spanish did have a [dʒ], but importantly, it remains in Judezmo while in Modern Castilian it changed to [ʃ] and later [x] (Harris 1994: 73). While it is true that the timing of these changes, inasmuch as they occurred “toward the end of the sixteenth century or the beginning of the seventeenth century in Spain” (Harris 1994: 73), would have excluded Judezmo in any case, nonetheless, under the assumption that such developments were an incipient tendency at the time of the departure of the Jews from Spain,<sup>10</sup> it seems to have been a tendency that was suppressed in the Balkan environment where the affricates abounded in the ambient languages.

<sup>9</sup> Admittedly, [dʒ] has developed from earlier [j] and [l] in most New World Spanish dialects.

<sup>10</sup> Following, for instance, the views of Ohala (2003) about sound change being rooted in low-level phonetic variation, of the sort which can persist for a long time before becoming dominant.

## 1 3.2 Morpho-syntax

2  
3 With regard to evidentiality, it is significant that the Judezmo of Istanbul uses the  
4 pluperfect as a calque on the Turkish use of its perfect marker *-miş* in its function  
5 as a non-confirmative, reported, or unwitnessed past (cf. Friedman 2000c). In  
6 (1) and (3), cited in Varol Bornes (2001: 91), the pluperfects *aviya entrado* ‘he  
7 had entered’ and *s’aviya etcho* ‘he had become’; would not be grammatical in  
8 (Castilian) Spanish. In (1), the effect is to calque the Turkish perfect in its un-  
9 witnessed meaning – illustrated in (2) – while in (3) the effect is one of reported-  
10 ness, which is another meaning conveyed by the non-confirmative use of the per-  
11 fect in Turkish:

12  
13 (1) *Kuando estaban en l’ Amérika, les aviya entrado*  
14 When they.were.IMP in the America them.DAT had.IMP enter.PST.PTCP  
15 *ladrón*  
16 thief  
17 ‘When they were in America [i.e., absent], a thief (apparently) broke into  
18 their house.’  
19

20 The equivalent form in Turkish would be *girmiş*, as in (2):

21  
22 (2) *onlar yok-ken, hırsız gir-miş*  
23 they not.exist-while thief enter-PRF  
24 ‘While they weren’t there, a thief entered’  
25

26 (3) *Dos ermanos eran, uno salyó doktor dişçi, el*  
27 two brothers they.were.IMP one he.became.PRET doctor dentist the  
28 *otro salyó dahilkiye después s’ aviya*  
29 other he.became.PRET internist afterwards REFL had.IMP  
30 *etcho doktor de bebés*  
31 made.PST.PTCP doctor of babies  
32 ‘There were two brothers, one became a dentist and the other became an  
33 internist, afterwards he became (lit. had become) a pediatrician.’  
34  
35

36 This kind of evidential deixis is attested in other forms of Spanish influenced  
37 by languages with evidential systems or usages, e.g. in the Spanish of Peru,  
38 where the pluperfect is used to render evidential effects, much as in the examples  
39 cited here, owing to the substratal influence of Quechua’s evidential system  
40 (Dan Slobin, p.c.). In the Balkans, however, Judezmo, or at least some of its

dialects, join Balkan Slavic and Albanian in terms of being influenced by Turkish evidentiality.<sup>11</sup>

With regard to infinitival usage, it can be noted that although Judezmo preserves the Ibero-Romance infinitive (see Section 4 below), there is some reduction in use of infinitive in favor of finite complementation, and this reduction involves the subjunctive mood forms thus moving Judezmo in the direction of the usage of coterritorial Balkan languages. For instance, the Judezmo use of the subjunctive by itself in modal questions such as ‘When might we come to get you?’, as in (4a), mirrors Balkan clauses (here, from Greek and Macedonian) with the subordinating marker (SM), as in (4b) and (4c), and whereas in Modern Spanish or North African Judezmo, as in (4d), a controlling verb (*quieres*) is needed to introduce the subjunctive of ‘come’:

(4) a. (Balkan Judezmo)

*Kwando ke te vengamoz a tom-ar?*  
When that you.ACC we.come/SUBJ to take-INF

b. (Greek)

*póte na ‘rthúme na se párumē?*  
when SM we.come SM you.ACC we.take

c. (Macedonian)

*Koga da ti dojdeme da te zemame?*  
when SM you.DAT we.come SM you.ACC we.take

d. (Modern Spanish)

*Cuándo quieres que vengamos a recog-er-te?*  
When you.want that we.come to take-INF-you  
‘When do you want us to come to get you?’

At issue here is not so much infinitive replacement as the spread of subjunctive constructions, which spread ultimately replaced the infinitive to varying degrees in all the Balkan languages (see Joseph [1983] for full details). In the case of Judez-

---

**11** While the question of whether Balkan Slavic and Albanian evidentials resulted from internal development or external influence continues to be debated, the fact that Turkic shows evidential usage already in the eighth century while Albanian and Balkan Slavic do not yet have fully developed evidential systems in the sixteenth but do have them now makes it clear that even if those languages had the internal possibility of developing such systems or usages on the basis of native material prior to the Ottoman period – what Enfield (2003: 5) calls *typological poise* – nonetheless, what we know about the social position of Turkish and of multilingualism in the Balkans during Ottoman rule makes it impossible to discount Turkish influence in this respect unless one dons the blinders of nineteenth-century nationalism.



1 mo, at issue is not the replacement of the infinitive itself – and it should be re-  
 2 membered that, e.g., Geg Albanian and Daco-Romanian both have significant  
 3 (albeit analytic) infinitives – but rather the spread of the type of construction as-  
 4 sociated with infinitive replacement. Here, as in other morpho-syntactic features  
 5 to be considered below, at issue is not so much a quantifiable “Balkanness” in  
 6 terms of the integration of contact-induced changes into the grammar but rather  
 7 the strengthening of tendencies which, while they may have been brought with  
 8 Judezmo from Spain in the fifteenth century, have increased in the direction of  
 9 coteritorial languages while those same features have not been so strengthened  
 10 elsewhere in Spanish. Moreover, while it is true that Jews were relatively isolated  
 11 in terms of key social factors such as religion and marriage, their multilingualism  
 12 in the Balkans (as elsewhere) is also well attested. To insist that these phenomena  
 13 are mere parallelisms is to deny that multilingual speakers have any effect on  
 14 language.

15 The term *object reduplication* is used in Balkan linguistics to refer to the phe-  
 16 nomenon of the appearance of a clitic pronoun that agrees in gender/number  
 17 with a direct or indirect object. While the conditions triggering such reduplica-  
 18 tion vary from language to language, it is clearly a Balkanism in the context of the  
 19 Balkans (see Friedman [2008] for details). The occurrence of object reduplica-  
 20 tion in Western Romance is, as already observed by Sandfeld (1930: 192), mostly  
 21 a matter of clefting and thus fundamentally different from object reduplication  
 22 in the Balkans. Wagner (1914: 130–131) observes that reduplicated object pro-  
 23 nouns occur more frequently in Constantinople Judezmo than in Spanish, and  
 24 Kramer and Perez-Leroux (2007) give details on the distributional rules for Ju-  
 25 dezmo, which show much greater pragmatic conditioning than in Spanish. Ex-  
 26 amples (5a) and (6a) are Judezmo examples from Bitola cited by Kolonomos  
 27 (1995: 266–267) with their Macedonian equivalents, given in (5b) and (6b), and  
 28 display the kind of object reduplication that is typical of the Balkans but not of  
 29 Spanish:

30

31 (5) a. *Il palu tuertu la lumeri lu indireche*  
 32 the stick crooked the fire it.ACC straightens

33 b. *k riv stap ogn-ot go ispravuva*  
 34 crooked stick fire-DEF it.ACC straightens  
 35 ‘A crooked staff is straightened in the fire’  
 36

37 (6) a. *Al hamor kwandu mas l’ aroges mas alvante*  
 38 to.DEF donkey how.much more it.ACC you.beg more raises  
 39 *las urezhes*  
 40 the ears

b. <i>Magare-to</i>	<i>kolku</i>	<i>poveќе</i>	<i>go</i>	<i>moliš</i>	<i>poveќе</i>	1
donkey-DEF	how.much	more	it.ACC	you.beg	more	2
<i>gi</i>	<i>diga</i>	<i>ushi-te</i>				3
them.ACC	it	raises ears-DEF				4
'The more you beg the donkey, the more it raises its ears.'						5
						6

Here even more clearly than in the previous example, we have a Spanish or even general Romance tendency that Judezmo brought with it into the Balkans. Object reduplication is one of those Balkan phenomena that has multiple potential sources and different specificities in various Balkan languages. Nonetheless, its complete absence from non-Balkan Slavic and its significantly weaker degree of integration into the grammatical systems of the non-Balkan Romance languages combined with its strength of development in Albanian and presence in Greek – and all of these taken together with such textual evidence as exists – indicate that the development is at least influenced by language contact and in some instances may have arisen as a result of it. Thus the relative historical increase in object reduplication in Judezmo since the time of its separation from Ibero-Romance can reasonably be attributed to its linguistic environment, i.e. the Balkans.

In their study of the Judezmo conditional, Montoliu and van der Auwera (2004) compare Judezmo with Old and Modern Spanish as well as Greek and Turkish. Perhaps most crucial is the fact that Judezmo can have both a protasis and an apodosis with an indicative imperfect: both features are absent from both Old and Modern Spanish but present in Greek and the second also occurs in Turkish. Moreover Judezmo also uses the anterior past posterior in the apodosis, like Greek and Turkish but unlike Modern or Old Spanish. Montoliu and van der Auwera (2004) discuss these and a number of other comparisons among Modern and Old Spanish, Judezmo, Greek and Turkish conditionals, and from their data it is clear that the parallels in usages between Judezmo, on the one hand, and Greek and Turkish (and, we can add, Balkan Slavic and Balkan Romance) on the other, leave little doubt that even if some (and in any case not all) of these features were present in Old Spanish, the continuation of these features and the development of new usages occurred in tandem with, and thus connected to, Balkan innovations.<sup>12</sup>

Our penultimate morpho-syntactic consideration is the future. As in some other parts of Europe, verbs meaning 'want' and 'have' have come to mark futurity. Two features of Balkan futurity that mark it as having developed during the

<sup>12</sup> Like infinitive replacement and object reduplication, conditional formation and usage is a feature of significant Balkan convergence. For a general discussion of Balkan conditionals, see Gołab (1964), Kramer (1988), Hacking (1997) and Belyavski-Frank (2003).

1 period when the Balkan languages were in mutual, multilingual contact with one  
 2 another (the definition of a Balkanism) are (1) the fact that etymological ‘want’ is  
 3 chosen as the main marker of futurity for Balkan Romance and Balkan Slavic  
 4 versus other verbs or means in the other Slavic and Romance languages, com-  
 5 bined with (2) the reduction of that marker to an invariant particle.<sup>13</sup> In the case  
 6 of Balkan Judezmo, the crucial bit of data is the favoring of analytic over synthetic  
 7 constructions. Like Modern Spanish (and English, French, etc.), Judezmo can use  
 8 a verb meaning ‘go’ to mark futurity, although it also has at its disposal the  
 9 non-Balkan Romance synthetic future, itself derived from (Late Latin) infinitive +  
 10 ‘have’. However, Kramer and Perez-Leroux (2007), based on a ten-page text in  
 11 Crews (1935), observe that out of 40 futures only 2 were synthetic, and those were  
 12 both in more formal contexts. On the other hand, the analytic ‘go’ future is com-  
 13 mon everywhere in colloquial Spanish, especially in Latin America, where the  
 14 synthetic future is increasingly rare. The fact that Latin America is the other place  
 15 where the synthetic future is most rare could be significant, since the timing of  
 16 the separation of Latin American Spanish coincides roughly with the separation  
 17 of Judezmo. One could even speculate that the two contact environments each  
 18 favored such a development. On the other hand, it could simply be parallel con-  
 19 tinuations of internal drift. Nonetheless, based on various studies of Latin Amer-  
 20 ican Spanish (e.g. Orozco [2007] and the literature cited therein), it appears that  
 21 Judezmo has gone significantly further than any Spanish dialect in this regard. In  
 22 Continental Standard Spanish, the ‘go’ future is more frequent colloquially, but  
 23 the analytic future is vastly more common in written texts. Moreover, the two fu-  
 24 tures are not entirely interchangeable in Standard Spanish.<sup>14</sup> Although it requires  
 25 further study, it is possible that the various Balkan analytic futures influenced the  
 26 degree to which the analytic replaced the synthetic future in Judezmo.<sup>15</sup>

27

28

29 **13** The Greek textual evidence shows that its future developed its current shape during the Otto-  
 30 man period, as was also the case in Romani. In the case of Albanian, although much of Central  
 31 and Northern Geg use a future in ‘have’ (as can Balkan Slavic for the negative future, which is  
 32 then calqued into Romani and West Rumelian Turkish), ‘want’ is in competition with ‘have’ pre-  
 33 cisely in those north and Central Geg regions with the most Albanian-Slavic contact.

34 **14** Cf. the difference in English between *Don’t talk to J.R. about Macedonia. He’ll have a hissy fit.*  
 35 and *Don’t talk to J.R. about Macedonia. He’s going to have a hissy fit.* In the first pair of sentences,  
 36 using the standard future, there is a causal *If . . . then . . .* connection between the two sentences,  
 37 implying one should never talk about Macedonia to J.R. In the second pair, however, the causal-  
 38 ity is not implied, and one could assume that J.R. is about to have a hissy fit regardless of the  
 39 topic of conversation, but one might be able to talk to J.R. about Macedonia at some other time in  
 40 the future.

39 **15** Such influence has even affected the West Rumelian Turkish dialects, where the synthetic  
 40 negative future is replaced by an analytic calque of the Balkan Slavic negative future.

Gabinskij (1992: 97) discusses the formation of a resultative perfect using conjugated *tener* ‘hold, have’ with both transitives and intransitives and a non-agreeing participle, which is also mentioned by Kramer and Perez-Leroux (2007) as well as Luria (1930: 193–194). This creation of a new ‘have’ resultative in the face of the weakened resultativity of the old ‘have’ perfect could be interpreted as the influence of the Balkan environment, where new resultatives have been integrated into the grammar during the early modern period. However, the *tener* perfect occurs in Portuguese, Galician and Asturian as well as Asturian and Galician Spanish, and the Judezmo of Bitola, which is the source of the texts examined by Kramer and Perez-Leroux (2007), had a significant Portuguese influence (as mentioned above).<sup>16</sup> The development of the *tener* perfect is the subject of ongoing research (e.g., Harre 1991; Chamorro 2011; cf. also Malinowski 1984), and thus a more detailed comparison of the Judeo-Spanish and Iberian phenomena remains a desideratum. Thus, like the ‘go’ future, the *tener* perfect is probably a continuation of a direction of drift that may or may not have been reinforced by the Balkan environment.<sup>17</sup>

### 3.3 Lexicon

Finally, there is the lexical domain to consider. As the features discussed here suggest, more recent work on the Balkan Sprachbund has focused on shared structural properties, especially morphosyntactic ones. However, one of the earliest conceptions of the Sprachbund, that found in Miklosich (1861), as well as Trubetzkoy’s (1923, 1928) original formulation of the Sprachbund, referred not just to structural properties but to certain types of lexical items, namely so-called cultural vocabulary. In the case of Judezmo and the Balkan Sprachbund, there are a number of Turkish culture words, covering administrative terms, terminology for food, names for items of material culture, and the like, all of which spread throughout the Balkans during Ottoman Empire; Judezmo shares in some of these words, e.g. *tavan* ‘ceiling’ (Turkish *tavan*), *talašis* ‘wood chips’ (Turkish *talaş*), *aboyadear* ‘to paint’ (Turkish *boya* ‘paint’), and many others (Subak 1906). Hill

<sup>16</sup> We wish to thank Professor Terrell Morgan and doctoral candidate Pilar Chamorro of The Ohio State University for their help with sources and data concerning the ‘go’ future and *tener* perfect in Spanish.

<sup>17</sup> For both the analytic ‘go’ future and the *tener* perfect – as well as vowel raising and other features of Lusitano-Hispanic origin – we need comparisons with North African and other non-Balkan Judezmo dialects in order to illuminate the question of whether the Balkan environment contributed to the direction of drift for Balkan Judezmo.

1 and Studemund-Halévy (1978) report identifying 3,000 Turkisms in Balkan Judez-  
 2 mo, using only proverbs, *romances*, and collections of oral texts. This is approxi-  
 3 mately half the number of Turkisms in dictionaries such as Škaljić (1966) for  
 4 Serbo-Croatian or Grannes et al. (2002) for Bulgarian, but those dictionaries also  
 5 made extensive use of literary sources. According to Sephiha (1996–1998: 89),  
 6 15% of Judeo-Spanish vocabulary is from Turkish and 1% from Greek. Thus  
 7 in terms of Turkisms (and to a lesser extent Hellenisms), Judezmo is certainly  
 8 Balkan. Stankiewicz (1964), furthermore, reports on the penetration of vocabu-  
 9 lary in all sectors of the lexicon from a variety of Balkan languages, especially  
 10 Turkish, into Judezmo.

11 Moreover, a further lexical dimension to the Sprachbund that is noteworthy  
 12 is the fact that numerous loans involve highly colloquial, discourse-based vocabu-  
 13 lary. Elsewhere (Friedman and Joseph 2013) we suggest that these are precisely  
 14 the lexical items which depend on – and thus demonstrate – close, intimate, and  
 15 sustained everyday interactions among speakers that are essentially conversa-  
 16 tional in nature. Accordingly, we refer to them as “E.R.I.C.” loans (= those *Essen-*  
 17 *tially Rooted In Conversation*),<sup>18</sup> and we include among them closed class and  
 18 generally borrowing-resistant items such as kinship terms, numerals, pronouns  
 19 and bound morphology, as well as conversationally based elements such as taboo  
 20 expressions, idioms, and phraseology, as well as discourse elements such as con-  
 21 nectives and interjections.

22 Such E.R.I.C. loans are to be found in Balkan Judezmo. For instance, wide-  
 23 spread Balkan discourse markers found in the Judezmo of northern Greece (cf.  
 24 Crews 1935; Bunis 1999) include *bre* ‘hey you’ (an unceremonious term of address,  
 25 ultimately from Greek – see Joseph [1997]), *ayde* ‘c’mon!’ (ultimately from Turk-  
 26 ish), *na* ‘here (it is); here ya go!’ (perhaps from Slavic ultimately, though most  
 27 immediately perhaps from Greek – see Joseph [1981]), and *aman* ‘oh my; mercy!’  
 28 (from Turkish). Moreover, there are widespread Balkan taboo expressions that  
 29 occur, most notably *asiktar* ‘scram; go to hell’ (from Turkish, actually stronger  
 30 in force). There is also Turkish bound morphology on words and expressions of  
 31 both Hebrew and Spanish origin, e.g. qualitative or concrete *-lik*, adjectival *-li*,  
 32 privative *-siz*, locational *-ana* and *-oğlu* ‘son of’ as in *hanukalik* ‘Chanukah pres-  
 33 ent’, *purimlik* ‘Purim gift’, *benadamlik* ‘good deed’, *azlahali* ‘profitable’, *azlahasiz*  
 34 ‘useless’, *perrana* ‘kennel’, *gregana* ‘Greek quarter’, *basinoğlu* ‘son of a urinal’  
 35 (abusive). Turkish *m-* reduplication is also borrowed into Judezmo, e.g. *livro*  
 36 *mivro* = Turkish *kitap kitap* ‘books and such’ (Varol Bornes 1996).

37

38

39

40 <sup>18</sup> This acronym honors Eric Hamp, Balkanist par excellence.

### 3.4 Summary

While the other languages of the Balkan Sprachbund show far more features in common with one another, there is still a significant number of such features in Judezmo (cf. Hamp [1989] on the non-absolute nature of the Sprachbund). There are phonological features involving the affricates, as well as some morpho-syntactic features, such as some uses of finite subordination, evidential uses of the pluperfect, tense usage in conditional clauses, and object reduplication. The analytic future and the new resultative perfect are more likely to be parallel developments but nevertheless deserve to be noted. Perhaps most importantly, there are many conversationally based loanwords as well as culture words and derivational affixes in Judezmo whose existence attests to the intense, intimate, and sustained contact that promoted the development of the Balkan Sprachbund. Thus, if we keep Trubetzkoy's original concept in mind together with Hamp's (1989) notion of "differential bindings" and our own caveat that a Sprachbund is not a club for which one must accumulate a certain number of points to become a member, then Judezmo does indeed participate in the Balkan Sprachbund and should be taken into account in studies of it.

## 4 Taking stock of Judezmo and the Sprachbund – a sociolinguistic excursus

From the foregoing, it is clear that while – consistent with its later arrival – some older features that are widespread among Balkan languages are not found in Judezmo, e.g. the absence of a postposed definite article (though see above, Section 2, on this), and also that some features found in Balkan Judezmo deviate in detail from other Balkan languages or have other possible origins, as with vowel raising (see above, Sections 2 and 3), nonetheless there are features of Balkan Judezmo that converge with those in coterritorial Balkan languages. Rather than taking a numerological approach, where numbers of features are toted up in order to assign a "Balkan" or "non-Balkan" "character" to the language – already eschewed above – a better understanding of how Judezmo fits into the Balkan scene comes from examining its sociolinguistic position and the way features relate to that position.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>19</sup> For a detailed discussion of Judezmo sociolinguistics in the Ottoman Empire and Turkey see Bunis (1982), Malinowski (1982), Altbæev (2003).

1 Thus, for example, with regard to phonology, while there are definitely agree-  
 2 ments between Judezmo and the other languages, there are also divergences, in-  
 3 cluding, beyond what was already mentioned above, the development of vowel  
 4 nasalization (Crews 1935) for the Judezmo of Salonica such that sequences of  
 5 *a/o + n* develop into “nasalized vowels in final position”.<sup>20</sup> Such development of  
 6 nasals is not typical of the Balkans, except in Geg Albanian. At the same time,  
 7 such divergences are actually to be expected, as phonology is an area which is  
 8 used emblematically to mark boundaries between groups and thus between lan-  
 9 guages while other features are convergent; in this way, social factors become  
 10 relevant in assessing the extent to which speakers of a language in the Balkans  
 11 show convergence. On the other hand, Gabinskij (1996) notes the shift from *ty/dy*  
 12 (or palatalized dentals) to *ky/gy* (or palatalized velars) precisely in Bosnia and  
 13 Macedonia (e.g. *Ingiltyerra* > *Ingilk'erra* ‘England’), where the same change took  
 14 place in the local Slavic (and, in Macedonia, also Albanian) dialects. A further  
 15 consequence as far as phonology is concerned is that in fact, it is best to speak in  
 16 terms of there being “Balkan phonologies” rather than “Balkan phonology” per  
 17 se (see Friedman 2011; Friedman and Joseph 2013: Ch. 5), since areas of agree-  
 18 ment in phonology are distinctly local and are not widespread in the way that  
 19 morphosyntactic features typically are. For that reason, divergences in phonol-  
 20 ogy are not unexpected and convergences can be rather less than diagnostic of  
 21 participation in the larger linguistic area of the Balkans.

22 Similarly, social considerations are also relevant in the realm of morpho-  
 23 syntax and help towards a fuller understanding of how an individual feature is  
 24 realized. As noted above, one of the features that aligns Judezmo with its Balkan  
 25 neighbors is a tendency towards the use of finite subjunctive mood that parallels  
 26 uses found in other languages of the region. At the same time, however, the in-  
 27 finitive of earlier Ibero-Romance remains in Judezmo in at least some use. For  
 28 instance, in texts from Judezmo of Salonica from the early 20th century (Wagner  
 29 1930), infinitives occur as complements to adjectives, e.g. *tiene una vos mui*  
 30 *buena para kantar* (INF) ‘you-have a voice (that is) very good for singing’, and  
 31 verbs, e.g. *ke pueda fazer* (INF) ‘What might-he-be-able to-do?’, among other  
 32 uses. Also, there are speakers of modern-day Judezmo of Salonica who still have  
 33 an infinitive with uses that parallel those found in Castilian Spanish (Joseph  
 34 1983: 252–253). Moreover, the surviving speakers in Skopje and Bitola (Republic of  
 35 Macedonia) also use infinitives, despite the fact that they have been speaking  
 36 mainly Macedonian for the past sixty years, and their children and grandchildren  
 37 speak to them in Macedonian, e.g. *¿Puede recontar historia?* ‘can I tell the story  
 38

39 \_\_\_\_\_

40 <sup>20</sup> Again, this could perhaps be a Lusitanianism.

(it-is-possible to-tell story)' (Friedman, field notes).<sup>21</sup> This example is also interesting for the calque on Macedonian in the impersonal use of the active *puede* (as opposed to *se puede*, which would be the Standard Spanish) on the model of Macedonian *može*.

Thus we have both a tendency to use finite subjunctives that calque typically Balkan constructions but also a retention of earlier infinitives. The infinitives persist even though these speakers are (now, at least) bilingual in infinitive-less Standard Greek or Standard Macedonian and are (now, at least) in constant contact with monolingual speakers of Standard Greek or Standard Macedonian. In the case of Greek ~~the~~ association ~~is~~ with Orthodox Christianity. Such an association is somewhat tempered in the Republic of Macedonia by almost fifty years of official atheism and the fact that the Partisans were connected with Jewish survival during World War II.<sup>22</sup> Moreover, the fact that the early Spanish starting point for Judezmo had an infinitive is no guarantee in and of itself that the infinitive would persist; Italian dialects in southern Italy, for instance, show reduced infinitival usage as opposed to the rest of Italian (Rohlf's 1958), a development plausibly attributed due to sustained contact with Arbëresh as well as Griko (South Italian Albanian and Greek, respectively).<sup>23</sup> Although the infinitive occurs and is used to a greater degree in Griko than in Standard Greek, the usage is much reduced vis-à-vis Western Romance.

Thus Balkan Judezmo displays contradictory tendencies towards innovative finite subjunctive usage and conservative infinitival usage, but the sociolinguistics of Jewish languages provide a basis for an explanation here. Jewish languages in general are likely to preserve archaisms different from those of coteritorial languages (cf. Wexler 1981), and given the local and social segregation of Jewish communities, Jewish speakers would have less exposure to linguistic innovations found in the usage of coteritorial non-Jewish speakers. The Judeo-Greek of 16th century Constantinople, for instance, shows archaic infinitival usage paralleling that of New Testament Greek (Joseph 2000). Thus the persistence of the use of infinitives in at least some Balkan Judezmo varieties seems to be an important reflection of a lesser degree of contact between Jews and non-Jews in the Balkans than among the non-Jewish speakers of various languages in the region.

<sup>21</sup> Victor Friedman wishes to acknowledge support from a Fulbright-Hays post-doctoral fellowship during 2008–2009 and a John Simon Guggenheim Fellowship during 2009 during which these and other Judezmo data were collected in Skopje and Bitola, Republic of Macedonia.

<sup>22</sup> The Nazis and their Bulgarian collaborators rounded up almost all the Jews of Macedonia and deported them to death camps in March 1943.

<sup>23</sup> In English, we use the term *Griko* to refer to all the Greek dialects of Southern Italy.



1 The fact that there is some subjunctive use that parallels non-Jewish usage,  
 2 as noted above (see [3]), shows that there has been some degree of contact, at a  
 3 high enough level to yield some convergence. But the relative social isolation  
 4 would have prevented Jewish speakers from fully converging linguistically with  
 5 their non-Jewish neighbors. Another source of evidence for this conclusion is to  
 6 be found in the anecdotal tales in Cepenkov's (1972) nineteenth-century Macedo-  
 7 nian collection from the Prilep region of Macedonia. Out of 155 such tales, 24 have  
 8 codeswitches into Turkish, 4 into Greek, 3 into Albanian, 2 into Vlah and 1 into  
 9 Romani. Conspicuous by its absence from this corpus is Judezmo. Representa-  
 10 tives of all the above mentioned languages codeswitch into the language associ-  
 11 ated with their ethnicity in these tales, but when Jews codeswitch from the Mace-  
 12 donian matrix of the narrative, the switch is into Turkish (Friedman 1995). We  
 13 would argue that this is another indication of the marginalization of Judezmo  
 14 with respect to the Balkan linguistic social hierarchy (see also Friedman 1997).

15 The lesson here is that a simple catalogue of features is not enough to offer  
 16 the best insight into the Balkan Sprachbund, and, we would argue, any complex  
 17 contact situation; the social setting and the dynamics of interaction must also  
 18 be considered. Moreover, we need to remember that lexicon complements and is  
 19 not extraneous to phonology and morphosyntax when discussing Sprachbund  
 20 phenomena.

21

22

## 23 5 Overall assessment and conclusion

24

25 The key question addressed here is whether Judezmo is a “Balkan language”,  
 26 in the sense of participating in the linguistic convergence seen with languages  
 27 in the Balkans. The answer here is a firm “yes, in some respects”. This qualifier,  
 28 “in some respects”, is exactly the crucial point here, as it directs our attention to  
 29 the fact that as indicated above, “membership” in a Sprachbund is not defined  
 30 by the accumulation of points, but by participation in processes of various types  
 31 of convergence at various linguistic levels. To be sure, Judezmo, as the latest ar-  
 32 rival, shows fewer such convergences than Romani, which arrived a few cen-  
 33 turies earlier but was also socially marginalized. Still, as Western Romance lan-  
 34 guages go, and as Ibero-Romance languages go, it shows important divergences  
 35 from their developments, and it did so in contact with other Balkan languages.  
 36 These divergent (from the rest of Ibero-Romance) and convergent (to other Bal-  
 37 kan) features not only constitute the essence of what it means to participate in  
 38 the Balkan Sprachbund but they also help to emphasize the value of Trubetz-  
 39 koy's original distinction between *Sprachfamilie* and *Sprachbund*. Moreover, the  
 40 linguistic evidence reflects the social ambiance for Judezmo in the Balkans. At

the same time, it offers an important window on the nature of Balkan contact and convergence.

In some instances, the sociolinguistic environment can be invoked as a reason for Judezmo divergence from other Balkan languages, as in the case of the general conservative nature of Jewish languages with regard to subordination to explain the infinitival developments. In other instances, chronology is responsible, as with the absence of a postpositive article, under the assumption that that feature is due to a substratum that was absorbed before Sephardim arrived in the Balkans.

What Judezmo shows, therefore, is how easily some features can penetrate into a language, especially those aspects of the lexicon and morphosyntax most tied to conversation and the habits of pronunciation acquired via heavy use of the socially dominant language. Overall, the mix of Balkan features in Judezmo sharpens the sense of what it means to be peripheral within a Sprachbund. At the same time, however, some of the developments of Judezmo, with either sources or parallels elsewhere in Ibero-Romance, remind us that both timing and environment – here the Balkan chronotope – are crucial in teasing out the differences between that which is convergent and that which is parallel.

## References

- Altbaev M. 2003. *Judeo-Spanish in the Turkish Social context: language death, swan song, revival or new arrival?* Istanbul: Isis.
- Belyavski-Frank, Masha. 2003. *The Balkan conditional in South Slavic*. Munich: Otto Sagner.
- Bunis, David. 1982. Types of nonergional Variation in early modern eastern spoken Judezmo. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 37. 41–70.
- Bunis, David. 1999. *Voices from Jewish Salonika*. Jerusalem: Misgav Yerushalayim.
- Cepenkov, Marko. 1972. *Makedonski narodni umotvorbi, vol. 6: Narodni prikazni* [Macedonian folk literature, Vol. 6: folk tales]. Kiril Penušliski (ed.). Skopje: Makedonska Kniga.
- Chamorro, Pilar. 2011. What does the construction *tener* + past participle mean in Galician Spanish? Paper presented at the Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages 41, University of Ottawa, 5–7 May.
- Crews, Cynthia M. 1935. *Recherches sur le judéo-espagnol dans les pays balkaniques*. Société de publications romanes et françaises. Publications XVI.
- Enfield, Nicholas J. 2003. *Linguistic epidemiology: Semantics and grammar of language contact in Mainland Southeast Asia*. London: Routledge.
- Enfield, Nicholas J. 2005. Areal linguistics and mainland Southeast Asia. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34. 181–206.
- Feuillet, Jack. 1986. *La linguistique balkanique* (Cahiers Balkaniques 10). Paris: INALCO.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1995. Persistence and change in Ottoman patterns of codeswitching in the Republic of Macedonia: nostalgia, duress and language shift in contemporary Southeastern Europe. In Durk Gorter, Hendrik E. Boeschoten, Pieter C. Muysken &

- 1 Jacomine M. Nortier (eds.), *Summer school: code-switching and language contact*, 58–67.  
 2 Ljouwert/Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy.
- 3 Friedman, Victor A. 1997. One grammar, three lexicons: ideological overtones and  
 4 underpinnings in the Balkan Sprachbund. In Kora Singer, Randall Eggert & Gregory  
 5 Anderson (eds.), *CLS 33: Papers from the panels on linguistic ideologies in contact,*  
 6 *universal grammar, parameters and typology, the perception of speech and other acoustic*  
 7 *signals*, 23–44. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- 8 Friedman, Victor A. 2000a. Romani multilingualism in its Balkan context. *Sprachtypologie und*  
 9 *Universalienforschung* 54. 146–159.
- 10 Friedman, Victor A. 2000b. Romani in the Balkan Linguistic League. In C. Tzitzilis &  
 11 \*K. Symeonidēs (eds.), *Valkanikē Glōssologia: Sygkhronia kai Diakhronia /*  
 12 *Balkanlinguistik: Synchronie und Diachronie* [Balkan linguistics: synchrony and  
 13 diachrony], 95–105. Thessaloniki: University of Thessaloniki.
- 14 Friedman, Victor A. 2000c. Confirmative/nonconfirmative in Balkan Slavic, Balkan Romance,  
 15 and Albanian, with additional observations on Turkish, Romani, Georgian, and Lak. In Lars  
 16 Johanson & Bo Utas (eds.), *Evidentials in Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages*,  
 17 329–366. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 18 Friedman, Victor A. 2006. Dialectological perspectives on Romani in the Balkan Linguistic  
 19 League. *Balkansko ezikoznanie – Linguistique balkanique* 45(1). 45–54.
- 20 Friedman, Victor A. 2008. Balkan object reduplication in areal and dialectological perspective.  
 21 In D. Kallulli & L. Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic doubling in the Balkan languages*, 25–63.  
 22 Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- 23 Friedman, Victor A. 2011. The Balkan languages and Balkan linguistics. *Annual Review of*  
 24 *Anthropology* 40. 275–291.
- 25 Friedman, Victor A. & Brian D. Joseph. 2013. *The Balkan languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge  
 26 University Press.
- 27 Gabinskij, Mark. 1992. *Sefardskij jazyk* [The Sephardic language]. Kišinev: Știința.
- 28 Gabinskij, Mark. 1996. Die sephardische Sprache aus balkanologischer Sicht. *Zeitschrift für*  
 29 *Romanische Philologie* 112(3). 438–457.
- 30 Gołąb, Z. 1964. *Conditionalis typu bałskańskiego w językach południowosłowiańskich*  
 31 [The Balkan conditional in the south Slavic languages]. Cracow: Polska Akademia  
 32 Nauk.
- 33 Grannes, Alf, Kjetil Rå Hauge & Hayriye Süleymanoğlu. 2002. *A dictionary of Turkisms in*  
 34 *Bulgarian* (The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture, Series B: Skrifter  
 35 108). Oslo: Novus Forlag.
- 36 Hacking, Jane F. 1997. *Coding the hypothetical: a comparative typology of Russian and*  
 37 *Macedonian conditionals*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- 38 Hamp, Eric P. 1989. Yugoslavia – A crossroads of Sprachbünde. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*  
 39 25(1). 44–47.
- 40 Harre, Catherine E. 1991. *Tener + past participle: a case study in linguistic description*. London  
 & New York: Routledge.
- Harris, Tracy K. 1982. Editor's note: the name of the language of the Eastern Sephardim.  
*International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 37. 5.
- Harris, Tracy K. 1994. *Death of a language. The history of Judeo-Spanish*. Newark: University  
 of Delaware Press.
- Hill, Peter & Michael Studemund Halévy. 1978. A dictionary of the Ottoman Turkish elements  
 in the languages of South-Eastern Europe. *Estudios sefardies* 1. 342–345.

- Joseph, Brian D. 1981. On the synchrony and diachrony of Modern Greek *na*. *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 7. 139–154. 1
- Joseph, Brian D. 1983. *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan infinitive. A study in areal, general, and historical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press. 2
- Joseph, Brian D. 1997. Methodological issues in the history of the Balkan lexicon: the case of Greek *vré/ré* and its relatives. In V. Friedman, M. Belyavski-Frank, M. Pisaro & D. Testen (eds.), *Balkanistica*, Vol. 10 *Studies dedicated to the memory of Zbigniew Golab 19 March 1923–24 March 1994*, 255–277. Columbus: Slavica Publishers. 3
- Joseph, Brian D. 2000. Processes of spread for syntactic constructions in the Balkans. In C. Tzitzilis & C. Symeonidis (eds.), *Balkan Linguistik: Synchronie und Diachronie*, 139–150. Thessaloniki: University of Thessaloniki. 4
- Kolonomos, Žamila (ed.). 1995. *Sefardski odglaski* [Sephardic echoes] (Nezavisni izdanja 50). Skopje: Ćurgá. 5
- Kramer, Christina E. 1988. Towards a typology of conditionals in Albanian, Bulgarian and Macedonian. *Makedonski jazik* 38. 264–270. 6
- Kramer, Christina E. & Ana Teresa Perez-Leroux. 2007. Balkan lives, Jewish voices: Judezmo in the context of the Balkan Sprachbund. Paper presented at the Third Biennial Conference of the Southeast European Studies Association, The Ohio State University, 26–28 April. 7
- Luria, Max. 1930. A study of the monatir dialect of Judeo-Spanish based on oral material collected in Monastir, Yugoslavia. *Révue Hispanique* 79. 323–583. 8
- Malinowski, Arlene. 1982. Report of the status of Judeo-Spanish in Turkey. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 37. 7–23. 9
- Malinowski, Arlene. 1984. Distribution and function of the auxiliaries *tener* and *aver* in Judeo-Spanish. *Orbis* 33. 211–221. 10
- Masica, Colin. 1976. *South Asia as a linguistic area*. Chicago: University of Chicago. 11
- Masica, Colin. 2001. The definition and significance of linguistic areas. In P. Bhaskararao & K. Subbarao (eds.), *The yearbook of South Asian languages and linguistics*, 205–268. New Delhi: Sage. 12
- Miklosich, Franz. 1861. Die slavischen Elemente im Rumunischen. *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 12. 1–70. 13
- Montoliu, César & Johan van der Auwera. 2004. On Judeo-Spanish conditionals. In O. M. Tomić (ed.), *Balkan syntax and semantics*, 462–474. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 14
- Ohala, John. 2003. Phonetics and historical phonology. In Brian D. Joseph & Richard D. Janda (eds.), *Handbook of historical linguistics*, 669–686. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 15
- Orozco, Rafael. 2007. Social constraints on the expression of futurity in Spanish-speaking urban communities. In Jonathan Holmquist, Augusto Lorenzino & Lotfi Sayahi (eds.), *Selected proceedings of the third workshop on Spanish sociolinguistics*, 103–112. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. 16
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1958. La perdita dell'infinito nelle lingue balcaniche e nell'Italia meridionale. In *Omagiul lui Iorgu Iordan cu prilejul împlinirii a 70 de ani*, 733–744. Bucuresti: Academia Republicii Populare Romîne. 17
- Sala, Marius. 1970. *Estudios sobre el judeoespañol de Bucarest*. Flora Botton-Burlá (trans.). Mexico: Universidad Nacional Autónoma. 18
- Sala, Marius. 1971. *Phonétique et phonologie du judéo-espagnol de Bucarest*. The Hague: Mouton. 19
- Sampson, John. 1926. *The dialect of the gypsies of Wales*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 20
- Sandfeld, Kristian. 1930 [1926]. *Linguistique balkanique*. Paris: Klincksieck. 21

- 1 Seliščev, A. 1925. Des traits linguistiques communs aux langues balkaniques: Un balkanisme  
2 ancien en bulgare. *Révue des études slaves* 5. 38–57.
- 3 Sephiha, Haim Vidal. 1996–1998. Le judéo-espagnol de l'ex-Empire ottoman: musée de cinq  
4 cents ans d'histoire. Problématique et programmation. *Elinikë dialektologia* 5. 83–112.
- 5 Škaljić, A. 1966. *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku* [Turkisms in the Serb-Croatian language].  
6 Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- 7 Stankiewicz, Edward. 1964. Balkan and Slavic elements in the Judaeo-Spanish of Yugoslavia.  
8 In Lucy S. Dawidowicz (ed.), *Studies in Jewish language literature and society, for Max*  
9 *Weinreich on his 70th birthday*, 229–36. The Hague: Mouton.
- 10 Subak, J. 1906. Zum Judenspanischen. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 30. 129–185.
- 11 Symeonides, Haralambos. 2002. *Das Judenspanische von Thessaloniki* (Sephardica 2).  
12 Berlin: Peter Lang.
- 13 Thomason, Sarah G. 2007. Language contact and deliberate change. *Journal of Language*  
14 *Contact: Thema* 1. 41–61.
- 15 Trubetzkoy, N. S. 1923. Vavilonskaja bašnja i smešenje jazykov [The Tower of Babel and the  
16 confusion of languages]. *Evrazijskij vremennik* 3. 107–124.
- 17 Trubetzkoy, N. S. 1928. Etablissement et délimitation des termes techniques, Proposition 16.  
18 In Cornelis de Boer, Jacobus van Ginneken & Anton G. van Hamel (eds.), *Actes du Premier*  
19 *congrès international des linguistes*, 18. The Hague: A. W. Sijthoff.
- 20 Varol Bornes, Marie-Christine. 1996. Influencia del turco en el judeoespañol de Turquía. In  
21 W. Busse & M.-C. Varol Bornes (eds.), *Sephardica: Hommage à Haïm Vidal Sephiha*,  
22 213–236. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- 23 Varol Bornes, Marie-Christine. 2001. Calques morphosyntaxiques du turc en judéo-espagnol:  
24 Mécanismes et limites. In A. Donabedian (ed.), *Faits de langues: Langues de diaspora*,  
25 85–99. Paris: Ophrys.
- 26 Varol Bornes, Marie-Christine. 2008. *Le judéo-espagnol d'Istanbul* (Sephardica 4). Berlin:  
27 Peter Lang.
- 28 Wagner, M. L. 1914. *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Judenspanischen von Konstantinopel. Schriften*  
29 *der Balkankommission: Linguistische Abteilung XI*. Vienna: Kaiserliche Akademie der  
30 Wissenschaften.
- 31 Wagner, M. L. 1930. *Caracteres generales del judeo-español de oriente* (Revista de Filología  
32 Española, Anejo XII). Madrid: Librería y Casa Editorial Hernando.
- 33 Wexler, Paul. 1981. Jewish interlinguistics: facts and conceptual framework. *Language* 57.  
34 99–149.
- 35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40