

Prikazi, ocjene, osvrti

Aldina Quintana Rodríguez, *Geografía Lingüística del Judeoespañol*, Peter Lang, Bern, 2006.

Preliminaries

The *Geografía Lingüística del Judeoespañol* [ISBN 3-03910-846-8] by Aldina Quintana Rodríguez is an unprecedented, long expected account on the geographical variation of Judeo-Spanish Language in the 20th century and first years of the 21st century which, nevertheless, includes important considerations on the historical process of the formation of this language. Apologizing for this seemingly premature praise and consciously violating all the rules of a well structured review, I want to emphasize that even to a highly critical reviewer it is impossible to avoid such an assertion. And although I don't agree with every single line of this book, I am going to try to justify what I wrote.

The basis of Quintana's book (for technical data see the title of this review) is constituted by the Ph. D. thesis *Geografía Lingüística del Judeoespañol en los Balcanes y en Turquía* presented at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem in 2005 and directed by professors Cyril Aslanoff and David Bunis. It is a fruit of very complex and well elaborated methodology which includes not only the critical reinterpretation of the works so far published and dialectological recordings previously realized by other authors but also of many new data obtained by the author from the interviews which she herself realized in various towns of Bosnia, Greece, Israel and Turkey, as well as the data from the historical Judeo-Spanish (rabbinical response, literary works etc.). Moving a step forward from the territories dealt with in her PhD thesis, Quintana also included some data from Haquetía (The Judeo-Spanish dialect of Morocco).

Author

Aldina Quintana Rodríguez first studied Journalism at the Complutense University, Madrid (1980-84), followed by the Studies of Spanish Philology, German Philology and Political Sciences at the Free University of Berlin (1985-91). Her early decision to dedicate herself to Judeo-Spanish dialectology seems to have been immediate and irrevocable. After obtaining MA in Spanish Philology and German Philology at the Free University of Berlin (*Dialektologie des Judenspanischen*, 1991), she used various scholarships to spend a longer period in Israel, at the same time teaching the courses "The History of the Spanish Language" and "Introduction to Spanish Linguistics" in the Department of Romance Languages of the Free University of Berlin. In 1997 she became a research assistant in the project *A Lexicon of Turkish Elements in Modern Ottoman Judezmo*, directed by Prof. David Bunis of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and Ph. D. candidate at the same university. In the period

1997 – 2005, the year in which she obtained her Ph. D., Quintana worked as a teaching assistant in the Department of Hebrew Language and in the Department of Spanish and Latino–American Studies of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. This worthwhile professional experience, working aside with great experts in Judeo–Spanish, could only help to form the one who, in my view, has become the leading dialectologist of Judeo–Spanish of our days. On the other hand, although a personal condition of a polyglot no assurance for the excellence in the philological matters, the fact that Quintana is not only native speaker of Spanish (Castilian) but also Asturian, has invested her with circumstantial research tools that many indisputable authorities of Judeo–Spanish linguistics did not have on their disposition.

The completion of Quintana’s Ph. D. thesis was preceded by the publication of some outstanding articles whereby I feel obliged to cite at least two: “Concomitancias lingüísticas entre el ladino (judeo–español) y el aragonés”, *Archivo de Filología Aragonesa*, LVII–LVIII, Zaragoza, 2001, pp. 163–192 and “El sustrato y el adstrato portugués en judeoespañol”, *Judenspanisch VIII* (= *Neue Romania* 31), Berlin, 2004, pp. 167–192. Although, in my opinion, in the first one Quintana neglected possible Catalan contribution to Judeo–Spanish lexicon (in the case where Aragonese and Catalan forms happen to coincide, both in form and meaning), while in the latter she somewhat exaggerated by proclaiming Portuguese what might be also Castilian or Aragonese words (e. g. *alongar*, *asender*, *entropesar*, *karrear*, *kurto*, *malfadado*, *tútano*)¹, she managed successfully to determine the circumstances, contexts and periods of the contribution of these two languages to the creation of Judeo–Spanish koiné.

Book

In somewhat abbreviated form (although someone could say it is all but not abbreviated) I shall present the structure of Quintana’s book. I believe there is nothing to object, what is more it should be used as a pattern of a transparent, logical and comprehensive structuring of a larger work. The book comprises 546 pages, whereby 95 of them are linguistic maps with short annotations (pp. 355–450). After the index (pp. v–xv) some preliminary notes, abbreviations and symbols annotations (pp. xvii–xx) and the preface (pp. xxi–xiii) comes the first part of the book (pp. 1–349), structured as follows:

The introductory part (1 Introducción, pp. 3–27) is divided in six parts: 1.1 *Estado de la cuestión* (3–14), 1.2 *Metodología* (14–18), 1.3 *Problemas metodológicos* (19–20), 1.4 *Estructura del presente trabajo* (21–22), 1.5 *Criterios de selección de los hechos lingüísticos* (22–23) and 1.6 *Las fuentes documentales y el sistema de abreviaturas empleado en las anotaciones* (23–27). The greatest methodological problem Quintana urged into was the impossibility of establishing

1 See: *alongar*, DRAE 121; *acender*, DRAE 23; *carrear*, DRAE 462; *kurto*, DRAE 270; *entropesar*, DRAE 936; *malfadado* 1425; *tútano*, DRAE 2247). The references are from *Diccionario de la Real Academia Española*, 21st edition, 2001.

a firm net of points and of realizing any interviews *in loco*, many of the Sephardic communities having disappeared some 50 years ago, by means either of Nazi extermination of the Jewish population in many countries, either of emigration of the Holocaust survivors to Israel following World War Two. Realizing that interviews in Israel could solve the problem only in part, given the fact that in that country Sephardim of various regional descent are undergoing the process of koineization, stimulated lately by the existence of *Ladinokomunita*, an internet correspondence circle in Judeo-Spanish. Nevertheless, the koineization process could already have been observed in pre-World War Two Judeo-Spanish of Bosnia, as well as in the interviews realized by August Kovačec in Dubrovnik in the early seventies (e. g. the lack of the internal neutralization of the oppositions /e/ : /i/, /o/ : /u/ or unexpected omitting of [f-]). Furthermore, and needless to say, all Judeo-Spanish speakers are multilingual or at least bilingual and no single one among them uses Judeo-Spanish as his/her first language. Even worse, most of them are indeed *Halbsprecher*.² Those among them willing to save what is left readily accept other Judeo-Spanish speakers as a source of language enrichment, thus irretrievably changing the physiognomy of his/her own Judeo-Spanish dialect or idiolect. Quintana coped with this problem to the best of her possibilities.

The part dedicated to phonetic and phonological variation (*Variación en los niveles fonético y fonológico*, pp. 29–133) is divided in five major subchapters: 2.1 *Vocales* (30–69), 2.2 *Consonantes* (69–106), 2.3 *Fonología segmental: Metátesis* [-rð-] > [-ðr-] (107–109), 2.4 *Áreas del judeoespañol según criterios fonéticos y fonológicos* (109–130) and 2.5 *Variación en el nivel de fonética sintáctica* (130–133), whereby the unit 2.1.2.3 (*Neutralización interna reductiva de las oposiciones /e/ : /i/ y /o/ : /u/*) and the whole subchapter 2.4 seem to be of major interest. Admitting that the “[...] la reducción de las vocales mediales en judeoespañol supone una innovación [...] que se produjo como resultado de una tendencia general del español a reducir las distinciones vocálicas en posición átona [...]”, Quintana insists in the Portuguese influence for the final unstressed [e] > [i], [o] > [u], discarding the Leonese influence where “[...] el cierre total de [-e] solamente tiene lugar en un número limitado de palabras [...]”. Not underestimating the Portuguese influence, I think it would have been prudent if Quintana had consulted the data from Northwestern Extremadura dialects, since J. F. García Santos (1992: 702) affirms that “[...] tanto por nuestra propia experiencia directa como por los resultados de las encuestas del futuro *ALEP* y las investigaciones de otros lingüistas, estamos en condiciones de poder afirmar que el cierre -e > -i es igual o más intenso que el de -o > -u en la zona noroccidental de Cáceres [...]”³, meaning that the presence of

2 From my personal experience I know that even if one parent talks to the child only and uniquely in Judeo-Spanish the child undergoes the devastating influence of the majority language, deprived of a larger Judeo-Spanish speakers’ community.

3 García Santos, J. F. 1992. “Extremeño”, in Holtus, G. / Metzeltin, M. / Schmitt, Ch. (eds.), *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, VI, 1. *Aragonesisch/Navarresisch, Spanisch, Asturianisch/Leonesisch*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1992: pp. 701–708.

this Leonese characteristic (in García Santos' words) is not altogether that limited as asserted by R. Penny. As for the classification, Quintana has traced the following isophones: 1) appearance of /ə/; 2) maintenance of /dz/; 3) neutralization of the opposition /r/ : /r̄/; 4) reduction of [ej]; 5) [-w-] > [-uɣw-] / [-uv-]; 6) neutralization of unstressed /e/ : /i/ and /o/ : /u/; 7) [-a] > [-e]; 8) [e] > [a]/—[r]+V, [e] > [a]/—[r]^{t, d, s, l, n}; 9) [-ð-] > [-d-]; 10) [-ɣ-] > [-g-]; 11) loss of the distribution [g-] and [-ɣ-] for [g-], [-g] / [ɣ-], [-ɣ-] / [h-], [-h-]; 12) [k] > [k^j]/i—V, 13) [g] > [g^j]/i—V; 14) maintenance of [f-] or [f-] > Ø; 15) [χ] > [h]; 16) adaptation of Semitic sounds [h] > [χ]/[h], [ʕ, ʔ, h] > Ø; 17) metathesis [-rð-] > [-ðr-]. In the basis of these 17 isophones, Quintana identified three bounds of isophones (I: 8, 13, 16; II: 5, 6, 9, 10; III: 2, 12; all seen on the map 32, p. 389) and proposed the following dialect areas: *área A o área central* (communities of Eastern Macedonia, Greece, Turkey and Egypt) whereby Thessaloniki, Veria, Serres and Skopje dialects constitute a special subarea; *área B o área periférica europea* (Northern and Western Balkans with Dalmatia) with four subareas: b1) communities of South–Western Bulgaria, b2) communities of Serbia and Rumania, b3) communities of Bosnia and Croatia, b4) Bitola; *área C o área periférica extra-europea* (Israel). Quintana's proposal presents a considerable, pertinent and useful innovation when compared to already classical Révah's implicit classification based on the opposition between Thessaloniki and Istanbul.⁴ Quintana correctly noted that three towns of Thessaloniki, Istanbul and Izmir constitute the nucleus of formation and irradiation for the Judeo–Spanish koiné whereby Istanbul played the role of a stronger partner causing a gradual but never fully completed shift towards more common solutions in Thessaloniki dialect (as reflected in the special position of Thessaloniki and neighboring dialects within the central area). Last but not least, to Quintana goes the merit for having pointed out to the Cairo, Alexandria and Vienna dialects as Judeo–Spanish varieties where no koineization process ever took place.

The third section of the first part of this book is dedicated to the morphological variation (*Variación en el nivel morfológico*, pp. 135–161). After dealing shortly with the disappearance of the form *ambos* (section 3.1, pp. 135–139), Quintana exhaustively analyzes the changes within the Judeo–Spanish system of interrogative and relative pronouns (3.2.1 and 3.2.2, pp. 141–150), managing to define three zones (see map 38, p. 395): a) innovative area with the predomination of *loké* as interrogative and relative pronoun: communities of Croatia, Bosnia–Herzegovina, Macedonia, Serbia, Rumania, parts of Bulgaria and Ankara; b) conservative area from the formal point of view, with the predomination of *kuálo* and *ké* as interrogatives but with the innovative confusion of *kuálo* and *ké*: communities of Priština, parts of Bulgaria, Greece, Turkey, Jerusalem and Hebron; c) conservative area that maintains the morphologic opposition between *kuálo* (determined antecedent) and *ké* (any antecedent), cor-

4 Révah, I. S. 1965. "Formation et évolution des parlers judéo-espagnol des Balkans", in *ACILPR X*, vol. III, Paris, 1965: 1351–1371.

responding with the Castilian norm in the times of the Expulsion: Skopje and Thessaloniki. The section 3.3 (*Verbo*, pp. 151–158) deals with the maintenance of the Aragonese forms *se* (vs. *so*) and *semos* (vs. *somos*) in the central area (communities of Turkey and Western Bulgaria, Athens, Thessaloniki, Adrianopolis, Skopje, map 39, p. 396) and the Aragonese forms of the Imperfect Indicative in the verbs on *-er* and *-ir* (*komiva* vs. *komía*, *viniva* vs. *vinía*) in the communities of Serbia, Eastern Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania, Rhodes and Israel (map 40, p. 397), the adoption of the Galician–Portuguese and Old Leonese forms in the Imperfect Indicative of the verb *ir* (*ia*, *ias*, *ia*, *iamos*, *iash*, *ian* vs. *iva*, *ivas*, *iva*, *ivamos*, *ivash*, *ivan*) in the communities of Croatia, Bosnia–Herzegovina, Serbia, Macedonia, Greece, Dardanelos, Izmir, Jerusalem, Hebron and Cairo, as well as in some communities of Bulgaria (map 41, p. 398), and finally with the Gerund in the function of Imperative in Macedonia and Eastern Greece communities as well as in Izmir (map 42, p. 399). In 3.4 *Variación diatópica en el nivel morfológico* (pp. 159–161), *à mode de conclusion*, Quintana asserts that morphological criteria do not permit any kind of classification seen in the part dedicated to the phonological variation, since six isomorphes that she was able to determine do not coincide.

In the fourth section (*Variación en el nivel sintáctico*, pp. 163–170), although aware that “[...] la lingüística de variación suele fracasar cuando se trata de aplicar al plano sintáctico al no ser unidades las que se ponen en juego, sino complejos cominatorios de muchos componentes de distinta jerarquía [...]” (p. 163), Quintana undertakes the analyzes of the enclitic and proclitic position of the unstressed personal and reflexive pronouns in the Infinitive Final Clauses and the Infinitive Prepositional Phrases, the latter possibility only in the communities of Bosnia, Macedonia and Thessaloniki (map 43, p. 400).

Section 5 of part one (*Variación en el nivel léxico*, pp. 171–284) occupies the largest number of pages, as well as the corresponding maps 44–93 (pp. 401–450), and is divided in 7 larger subsections: 5.1 *Variación ocasionada por la elección de diferentes variantes iberrománicas* (pp. 172–212), 5.2 *Variación ocasionada por la elección de variantes diastráticas diferentes* (pp. 212–225), 5.3 *Variación ocasionada por el surgimiento de variantes interdialectales* (pp. 226–231), 5.4 *Variación léxica ocasionada por innovaciones fonéticas internas* (pp. 231–240), 5.5 *Variación ocasionada por innovaciones léxicas por derivación* (pp. 240–241), 5.6 *Variación léxica ocasionada por contacto de lenguas* (pp. 242–276, including borrowings from Portuguese, Post–1492 Castilian, Venetian, Greek, Turkish, Serbian, Bulgarian, Rumanian, Arumanian that Quintana calls *valaco*, French and German). For the large amount of words dealt with sometimes in a very detailed way, my intention is to avoid detailed analyses of individual words and present Quintana’s conclusion, it is the lexical classification of the Judeo–Spanish dialects. Quintana managed to define four bounds of isoglosses (pp. 281–282), all of them already existing since the 18th century: 1) (*a*)*bezba* ≈ (*a*)*bizba* ‘bee’, (*a*)*bezba* ≈ (*a*)*bizba* ‘wasp’, (*f*)*aldukerá* ≈ *aldikera*, *mangrana* ≈ (*a*)*granada* (cf. map 61); 2) (*la*)*gartija* ≈ (*la*)*garteja*, *djinoyos* ≈ *rodiyás*, *trevdes* ≈ *estrevdes* (cf. map 62); 3) *koda* ≈ *kola*, *djendjivas* ≈ *enzías*, (*f*)*égado* ≈ (*f*)*ígado*,

medko ≈ *mediko* (cf. map 63); 4) *almesha*, *djendjivres*, *shambashuga*, *trempis* (cf. map 79). On the basis of these four bounds of isoglosses Quintana has proposed three lexical areas (pp. 282–284 and map 87): area 1 embracing the communities of Turkey and Eastern Bulgaria (and to some extent communities of Rhodes, Jerusalem, Hebron and Cairo); area 2 embracing the communities Northern Greece, Central Macedonia, Western Bulgaria, Serbia and Rumania; area 3 embracing communities of Croatia and Bosnia–Herzegovina as well as those of Belgrade, Bitola and Kastoria. While the area 1 seems to be the most Castilian one (“[...] contiene más elementos de origen castellano que el que se usa en las otras [...]”, p. 283), the area 3 is characterized by a strong presence of Portuguese lexicon.

Section 6 deals with the semantic variation, analyzed only from the perspective of few obtainable examples (pp. 285–294). The final section (7 *Conclusiones*, pp. 295–318) of the first part deals with the synchronic variation in Judeo–Spanish (7.1 *La variación sincrónica del judeoespañol*, pp. 296–297), history of the variation (7.2 *Historia de la variación diatópica del judeoespañol*, pp. 297–311), with special attention dedicated to the process of koinezation irradiated from two major centres, Istanbul and Thessaloniki, and to Judeo–Spanish contact linguistics (7.2.3 *Contribución de las lenguas de contacto a la variación geográfica*, pp. 311–318) containing some important methodological considerations on contact between Judeo–Spanish on one side and Portuguese, Venetian, Italian, Hebrew, Greek, German, French as well as national languages on the other side. The pages 302–309 of this book (7.2.1.2 *No una coiné, sino dos coinés: Salónica y Estambul*) represent one of the finest chapters of Sociolinguistics ever published.

The bibliography embraces more than 400 bibliographical units (not counting the sources and manuscripts) as well as a detailed list of interviews realized by other scholars and Quintana herself including essential information on all the informants (over 60 altogether).

Going back to what I wrote in the beginning of this review, I can only assert that Quintana’s *Geografía Lingüística del Judeoespañol* represents not only a major and a most comprehensive account on Judeo–Spanish language today, but also a model for all future researches in this area.

Nikola Vuletić