

Jelena Filipović
University of Belgrade
jelenafilipovic@fil.bg.ac.rs

Ivana Vučina Simović¹
University of Kragujevac
ivanavusim@gmail.com

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES IN TIMES OF MODERNITY: THE CASE OF THE SEPHARDIM IN THE ORIENT

ABSTRACT: Herein, negative language ideologies leading to language shift from Judeo-Spanish to standard national languages of Balkan states are investigated in correlation with modernity as an overarching socio-political and cultural phenomenon.

The ‘modern’ approach to language that aroused across Europe in the 19th century was based on the direct and inseparable relationship between a nation, its state and its national *standardized* language. It practically called for acculturation and assimilation of ethnolinguistic minorities that found themselves living in the newly founded nation-states (such as the Sephardim in the Balkans) and for the shift of ethnic languages in favor of the proclaimed national languages. As the effects of modernity are still very much present, language shift and language loss among European minorities are issues debated even today. Transdisciplinary research, based on language revitalization, outlined in the last section of this paper, represents an attempt to preserve the linguistic diversity on the continental and global level.

KEYWORDS: modernity, language ideology, language shift, Sephardim, Judeo-Spanish.

Ideology and modernity in (socio)linguistic study

This paper focuses on a connection between social, political and cultural history of the Balkans and *language ideologies* among majority and minority speech communities which contributed to the process of language shift towards majority standard languages spoken in the nation-states founded in the 19th century.

Until relatively recently, sociolinguistic research was completely independent of findings from other social sciences and humanities. Consequently, the concept of ideology was not in any significant way present in (socio)linguistic research, nor was it used to account for linguistic phenomena investigated in sociolinguistics:

Although ideological studies are not a central part of linguistic theorizing at the moment, some scholars have given much

¹ This paper was completed within the project 178014: ‘Dynamics of the structures of the contemporary Serbian language,’ financed by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Serbia.

attention to the influence of ideologies. [...] we may well suspect that there are covert ideological influences on some aspects of linguistic thinking and that many of these are not recognized or acknowledged. Further, *some of these influences flow from the fact that, as we have noticed, a number of major (i.e., widely used) languages that possess written forms are believed by their speakers to exist in standardized forms. Our reliance on the standard languages of nation states may therefore have distorted our understanding in some ways.* (Milroy 2001: 531; italics ours)

In this analysis, we take Milroy's claim one step further and investigate *language ideologies* and their impact on native speakers' beliefs and attitudes about different linguistic varieties (non-standardized and standardized alike). By following the assertion of researchers of language ideologies who aim to 'reposition the anthropology of language in a research agenda addressing the social-historical processes that link face-to-face communities to national and transnational spheres' (Schieffelin, Woolard & Kroskrity, 1998: iv), we investigate symbolic function of linguistic varieties which is at the core of any language ideology. We define language ideologies as social constructs, as systemic, cognitive (and very often implicit) structures which allow the speakers to understand, apply and/or change language conventions of their social/speech communities (Cameron 2003; Woolard 1998, Schieffelin et al., 1998). They are an integral part of overall social, cultural and political ideological apparatus operating in all human activities, and we postulate that any linguistic research should benefit from a comprehensive and integrative, multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary analysis of all communicative social practices.

Communicative and cultural practices carried out in specific languages are used to define social hierarchies, legitimize or inhibit political engagement, and allow for or obstruct educational enrichment and prosperity of a speech community:

Language is central to institutional processes of symbolic domination, since conventional language practices serve to establish normality, the everydayness of institutional processes. Language norms are a key aspect of institutional norms, and reveal ideologies which legitimize (or contest) institutional relations of power. The forms of knowledge which are privileged as expert knowledge in institutions are taken to be inherently better for the accomplishment of institutional goals [...]. *By according legitimacy to certain forms of knowledge over others, and by restricting access to valued knowledge, groups can wield power.* (Heller, 1995: 373-74; italics ours)

Heller's view of language institutional power is a direct consequence of the European movement known as *modernity*. Modernity is a phenomenon which has made a tremendous impact on social thought and understanding of human knowledge over the last 300 years. Originating in Europe, and then transferred to other continents through imperialist and colonial expansion, the European so-

called 'modern science' which emerged in the late 17th century has created a Eurocentric ideological standpoint which is by many understood as a distinction between 'provincial' and 'cosmopolitan', 'primitive' and 'civilized', and which has, among other things, been represented in metadiscursive practices related to the understanding of the language and its role in the society (see Bauman & Briggs 2003 for a detailed discussion). A rationalist model of science and society, at the core of the *Enlightenment* period, set up a scene for an understanding of human language as separate from its social agents, purified, i.e., standardized, and of use only to those educated enough to be able to use the 'pure' language forms in the public domain and thus claim their position on the social hierarchy (Bauman & Briggs, 2003: 31).

This rationalist² view was gradually replaced by the romanticist valorization of *linguistic vernacularization*, 'which was fundamental [...] to the coalescence of nationalist ideologies and the formation of modern nation-states' (Bauman & Briggs, 2003: 161). It was through linguistic vernacularization that vernacular (folk) varieties were raised to the level of standard languages, and then associated with specific ethnic groups, identified as nations, entitled to their *national languages* within their own *nation-states*.

The concept of the *nation-state-language* 'holy trinity' (Bugarski 2004, 2005) is at the core of the cultural, political and historical framework which has ever since the 19th century influenced the relation between majority (standardized) languages and minority languages spoken in political entities recognized as nation-states in Europe. It is within this framework of *standard-language-cultures* (Milroy 2001) that the history and the loss of Judeo-Spanish can and should be analyzed.

All the above statements belong to the field of the *ideology of science* (Hacking, 1999; cit. in Phelan, 2001: 129), rather than the *practice of science* (interested in accounting for the phenomena of the natural world). The ideology of science linked to modernity legitimizes the high social status of scientists, and provides them with a privileged position to define the overall social attitudes and to reject points of view different from their own. Modernity thus defines a specific *politics of science* which sets up institutionalized epistemological orientations whose objective is to define scientific approaches and give preference to certain scientific fields, domains and disciplines, as well as to define narrative and rhetorical means and linguistic registers used to describe the investigated phenomena and to disseminate thus defined knowledge through formal educational systems and other state cultural and educational institutions.

² According to Geeraerts (2003), three models of language standardization can be identified in Europe since the French revolution, which emerged following the models of thought of larger historical periods they correspond to: 1. the *rationalist* model, developed during the Enlightenment period, 2. the *romanticist* model, based on the cultural and political notions introduced by Romanticism, and 3. the *nationalist* model, which represents the combination of the first two, and which has at the end of the 19th and throughout the 20th century evolved into what Geeraerts calls *identity nationalism* in which 'the nation derives its political legitimacy from the cultural identity of the people' (Geeraerts 2003: 45). This last one is the model of language standardization of the majority of European countries to this day.

The politics of science in modern Europe of the 18th and 19th centuries viewed language as one of the crucial factors used for demarcation between ‘modern, civilized and rational’ human beings from all others, considered ‘primitive and lacking reason’:

The practices of purification, [...], tools for stripping language of direct connection to things of social forms, would come to form some of the most important bases for constructing modern subjects in terms of their rationality and their availability to speak within the public sphere – and thus for evaluating each individual and community and determining his or her proper place in the emerging social order. (Bauman & Briggs 2003: 31)

All the above led to the formation of *standard language cultures* (Milroy 2001) in which normalized, written and ‘purified’ linguistic varieties are treated as symbols of national heritage, monuments that assure the preservation and further evolution of national and cultural identity of a nation. Even though standard language is always a social construct and in standard language cultures choices are made by language specialists, appointed by the institutions of the state and in accordance with political needs of a given time (in Europe of the 19th century, that was the ideology and politics of science defined by modernity), they become interpreted as universal truths by societies at large, that is, as *language ideologies* which are often explicitly articulated even when they are not so frequently applied in communicative practices (Kroskrity, 2004). Basically, in standard language cultures everybody seems to have a very explicit opinion about the value of their standard language and to treat those without one as less cognitively developed, less capable of expressing their communicative neEds.

The standardization of the majority of languages in Europe, presents a clear example of implementation of the *nationalist* model of this process (Geeraerts, 2003), which has a *rationalist* component in as much as it is supposed to lead to a more democratic participation in public, professional and political domains of the majority of people in a given state. This majority, however, is understood as *nation*, which is viewed as the principal element of political organization, and thus the main factor in decision-making regarding status and corpus planning of the chosen standard variety. On the other hand, a *romanticist* aspect of this standardization model cannot be ignored, reflected in the idea that the nation develops its cultural identity from its language which is the carrier of the people’s cultural heritage. In other words, from the 18th century onwards, European nation-states, including those founded in the Balkans, such as Serbia (albeit a bit later in this particular region of Europe, where nation-states begin to emerge in the 19th century), language has been treated as ‘cultural *possession* analogous to religion and legal systems rather than part of human mental and cognitive faculties’ (Milroy, 2001: 538).

The Sephardim: socio-cultural and linguistic context in the Orient

Within the above outlined European context, all the afore mentioned meant that ethnolinguistic minorities, that all of a sudden found themselves living in newly founded nation states with strongly defined standard language ideologies, had to learn to cope with new socio-political, cultural and educational circumstances. European nation-states in the Balkans, unlike the Ottoman empire, which was home of many Sephardim since their arrival to this region at the beginning of the 16th century, were very much interested in linguistic practices of their citizens and expressed a clear political stand toward assimilation of all peoples living in their territories into nations represented by the corresponding states. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that in standard language cultures not only political elites, but also common citizens, native speakers of national languages believe that the fact that they have a firmly fixed standardized language systems (where ‘correct’ forms and structures are invariable, clearly identified and separated from the ‘wrong’ ones) is highly important for their national and individual existence. And, by proxy, such views become a topic of debate among members of ethnolinguistic minorities who start challenging the traditional views on their non-standardized linguistic varieties as carriers of their ethnic, religious, etc., culture and tradition. They start questioning their position in the new states and within newly defined social networks in which membership to the majority community becomes a passport to social mobility. As we will show in the following sections of this paper on the example of the Sephardim in the Orient, language ideologies of the speakers of minority languages become more varied at that point in time, and start shifting from extreme traditionalism, which aims to preserve the ethnic linguistic variety, to calls for radical innovations, proposing the abandonment of the ethnic language in favor of the majority standard language (or another standard language relevant to a given speech community, such as Hebrew or peninsular Spanish in the case of the Sephardim). As our analysis illustrates, negative language ideologies toward the minority language, in this case, Judeo-Spanish in Sephardic communities across the Orient, led to language shift and language loss in those speech communities in the second half of the 19th century and during the 20th century. It is interesting to point out that Judeo-Spanish was since the 16th century a dialectal system independent from Spanish, with several sets of communicative norms³ (Quintana, 2010: 51), but as none of them had any institutional or academic support, their speakers viewed them as ‘jargons’ not sufficiently developed or structured⁴ in comparison with the ever increasing number of European standard languages (Vučina Simović, 2011). Elena Romero summarizes this belief:

³ ‘Como he podido demostrar, la lengua sefardí se desarrolló fuera del marco del estándar hispano y se ubica claramente fuera del diasistema español. Como diasistema, el judeoespañol contaba con sus propios estándares que servían de punto de referencia para todas las variedades y marcas diasistemáticas.’ (Quintana 2010: 51)

⁴ Furthermore, there are testimonies of the belief that regional variation of Judeo-Spanish itself was a barrier to mutual understanding among the Sephardim from different parts of the Orient and another ‘proof’ of its inadequacy (e.g. R. P. 01/03/1894: 201).

La ya aludida inmersión en el mundo cultural de Occidente dejó en la mente de muchos sefardíes la peregrina idea de que lo que hablaban era una «jerga» imposible, aberrante e insuficiente, humillante idea que se fundamentaba en muchos casos en una errada y perniciosa comparación con el español normativo (E. Romero, 2010: 58).

Even more importantly, the above outlined concepts of modernity and standard language cultures are still very much present, albeit in disguise of globalization, internationalization and social mobility, and they continue to pose a serious threat to linguistic diversity of Europe. The status and the future of many European minority languages at the beginning of the 21st century can also be analyzed from the same epistemological perspective. In other words, a possible revitalization and/or maintenance of minority languages in Europe (Judeo-Spanish included) can only be successfully initiated if this complex relationship of different factors and conclusions is taken into consideration and applied within one overarching transdisciplinary critical paradigm of linguistic research. An argument in favor of the revitalization of Judeo-Spanish will be discussed in more detail in the last section of this paper.

Ideology of modernity among the Sephardim at the beginning of the 19th century

Ever since their arrival to the Balkans up to the beginning of the 19th century, the Sephardic communities in the Orient had lived under similar socio-historical circumstances and organized themselves following the same social, religious, ethnic, educational and other traditions. This remark can also be extended to their communicative practices, that is, to the linguistic varieties of Judeo-Spanish they all used in spoken and written form, as well as to their language ideologies (both those regarding their ethnic variety and linguistic varieties of other ethnic groups they came into contact with). (Vučina Simović 2010)

During the Turkish rule, the Balkan Peninsula was a multiethnic and multicultural region, and different ethnic groups coexisted each maintaining their ethnic language as the vehicle of in-group communication. Inter-ethnic mixing was carried out at a very superficial level, normally related to trade and other professional communicative domains. The *millet*, the Ottoman political and administrative system, favored not only ethnic language maintenance, but also the preservation of cultures and traditions of ethnolinguistic groups living within its borders. It granted certain rights in terms of ethnic and linguistic diversity in exchange for strict respect of taxation laws and rules regulating a number of varied cultural restrictions (Freidenreich 1979: 14; Benbassa & Rodrigue 2004: 100-103; Díaz-Mas & Sánchez Pérez 2010: 12). Those restrictions were related to their dress code, places for living and for religious services, use of animals, etc. (R. Romero 2008a; 2008b). Such a policy towards non-Muslim population supported the traditional set-up and maintenance of Sephardic communities as

independent ethnolinguistic groups for over three centuries as it allowed for the establishment of Sephardic neighborhoods, Jewish schools, and the overall maintenance of Judeo-Spanish communicative, cultural and religious practices, transferred from the Iberian Peninsula of the end of 15th century, practically throughout the Balkan Peninsula until the mid-19th century:

Inasmuch as Judeo-Spanish was associated with tradition and community life, with ritual, and with religion, that language came to be perceived as an essential determinant of group unity and identity. (Malinowsky 1983: 137)

The nation-states established throughout the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries in the territories of the former Ottoman Empire (as well as in the territories of the Austro-Hungarian Empire), however, aimed at the implementation of a unitarian, monolithic and unicultural model of political organization, typical of West European countries, and thus seriously shook up the foundations of the centuries long continued existence of Sephardic communities (Benbassa & Rodrigue 2004: 237). Concepts of modernity were introduced in all parts of the Balkan Peninsula, and with them, European notions of romanticism and national awakening. The idea of a nation-state and the concept of a national language as the carrier of national identity were consequently gaining ground throughout the region.

Modernity, as a way of life and a way of thinking, as well as a form of scientific knowledge, brought along many challenges and changes not only into the Sephardic way of life, but, more importantly, it had strong ideological implications on the Sephardic perception of their own ethnic, political and linguistic identity. As it turned out, the Sephardim,

Just like the Ashkenazim, [...] had to grapple with issues of identity, community, loyalty to the collectivity versus the local state, and with the larger question of how to be a Jew, indeed a *Sephardi Jew*, in the modern world. (Benbassa & Rodrigue, 2000: xxiii)

However, as some authors indicate, this adjustment to ‘new cultural realities’ was too abrupt, thus leading to a rather unprecedented intellectual and cultural upheaval among the Sephardim, known for their centuries-long extremely traditional way of life:

El antagonismo e incluso aborrecimiento hacia el judeoespañol parece tener su origen en las nuevas realidades culturales fruto de la modernidad que, como la alteración hormonal de la pubertad, sacudió las mentes de los sefardíes en el último tercio del siglo XIX. Ello nos lleva a pensar que quizá la apertura al mundo exterior fuera demasiado precipitada sin dar tiempo a una paulatina y madura adecuación a las nuevas realidades. (E. Romero 2010: 57)

Of course, the rate and intensity of this ideological shift varied from one Sephardic community to the other. Those communities more open to modernization underwent the shift much more rapidly than the more traditional and conservative ones: the Sephardic communities of Belgrade and Bitola (Monastir) can be taken as paradigmatic examples of the two extremes of the dynamics spectrum of this process (see Vučina Simović 2010, for a detailed account). Furthermore, it is important to point out that in the communities themselves the ideology of modernity first affected the intellectual elite⁵ and/or younger generations, who were the first to receive Western European education (E. Romero 2010: 57; Vučina Simović 2010: 235-238).

The acceptance of the ideology of modernity among the Sephardim, however, did not lead to a complete assimilation and consequent loss of their ethnic and religious identity. Quite to the contrary, all research of written documents saved in different communities in the territories of former Yugoslavia (Vučina Simović & Filipović 2009; Vučina Simović 2010; Filipović & Vučina Simović 2010; Filipović & Vučina Simović 2013, etc.), indicates that the acculturation process affected the process of language shift, as the minority language was viewed as an obstacle to individual participation in the educational, social, economic and political progress of the Sephardim in the newly founded nation-states. However, other aspects of the Sephardic ethno-religious identity were kept practically intact until the beginning of the Second World War.

Language shift among the Sephardim as a consequence of language ideology of modernity in standard language cultures

As Edwards (2009: 155) acutely observes, ‘perception, subjectivity and symbolism’ are key concepts in any discussion of ethnicity and identity. Analyzing the writings by Brubaker (1999) and Dieckhoff (2005), the same author claims that ethnicity is often viewed as much more than ethnic ancestry, which includes different aspects of ‘cultural belonging’ (Edwards, 2009: 155). As we would like to point out in this section, we also view ethnicity as a relatively broad scope of factors, which take account of sociopsychological perceptions and constructions of one’s self and of one as a member of a particular group, along with a number of ‘cultural markers’⁶ (Riley, 2006). In that sense, we postulate that the maintenance of ethno-religious features within Sephardic communities was relatively independent from linguistic, communicative practices, which led to the shift from Judeo-Spanish to the national languages of the region upon the break-up of the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian empires.

⁵ As intellectuals everywhere, they were more open to new ideas, new world views, new epistemologies, and, consequently, more sensitive to the concept of individual participation in political and social life of majority communities.

⁶ Cultural markers are linguistically indexed elements of culture which very often foster language shift (in a sense that ethnolinguistic identity is defined through a number of borrowings and singly occurring code-switches between minority and majority languages with a clear favorization of the socially more influential majority language; see Filipović 1998; 2009 for further discussion).

Romanticism-induced nationalistic ideology which from the second half of the 19th until the middle of 20th century led to the creation of nation-states with strong standard language cultures, were undeniably recognized and interpreted by members of the Sephardic communities in all parts of the Orient. In consequence, a number of language ideologies among the Sephardim can be identified as crucial in their re-interpretation and reconstruction of their ethnicity, based on the value placed on the importance/relevance of their linguistic ancestry.

Ángel Pulido in his book *Españoles sin patria y la raza sefardí*, provides a classification of language ideologies based on his own experiences in the Orient and on correspondence with a number of Sephardic intellectuals from all over the world. Pulido identifies four distinct groups of views towards the future of Judeo-Spanish, each of which can be further developed and interpreted as a more comprehensive world view, i.e., a more generalized ideology⁷: those who argue for the loss of Judeo-Spanish in favor of the majority languages of the countries where the Sephardim live or Hebrew, the Jewish language *par excellence* ('los que piden la muerte del judeo-español'), those who are in favor of its evolution as an independent variety ('los que piden su evolución'), those who are weighing up the scope of its possible exploitation ('los que tantean las proporciones de su aprovechamiento'), and those who would welcome a complete regeneration (i.e., *recastellanización* in Quintana's (1999) terminology) based of the variety using the modern Spanish model ('los que desean la regeneración total de la jerga') (Pulido 1905: 108-109). These four groups reflect directly language ideologies present in Sephardic communities in the Orient at the time and can be interpreted as a more or less direct consequence of rapid sequence of modernity-induced socio-political, economic and technological changes which affected the Sephardim at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century⁸.

1) 'Anti-Castillian' language ideologies: Zionists and Integrationists

Anticastillanistas, or *hispanóforos*, according to Pulido, believed that Spanish to the Sephardim was a 'material' and 'adopted' language, which they should use only for gaining money ('por el provecho que de ella puede sacarse, comercialmente') (from a letter by Gad Francos, Izmir, to Pulido). The same author, calls Turkish and Hebrew 'sentimental languages' of the Sephardim, as for him, Hebrew expresses their 'feeling of national preservation' ('sentimiento de conservación nacional'), and Turkish the 'feeling of patriotic duty' ('el sentimiento del deber patriótico') (Pulido, 1905: 110-111). Very similar discourse can be found in the article signed by 'Damy', which Pulido reproduced from the Sephardic journal from Salonica, *El Avenir*:

⁷ For a more detailed account on these language ideologies, see Vučina Simović (2011). For data on Pulido's campaign, see Díaz-Mas (1997) and Meyuhas Ginio (2008).

⁸ In this research, we focus only on secular written sources and do not take into account a number of rabbinic writings, some of which contain elements of language ideologies which can be clearly accounted for by their formal religious education and their understanding of their own role as religious, but also cultural, leaders within Sephardic communities over centuries (see Bunis 2011b, for an excellent discussion on this topic).

Nosos somos y queremos restar antes de todo judios, y esto demanda de nosotros una conocencia de mas en mas profunda de nuestra lengua, el hebreo, nuestra historia y nuestra literatura. Nosos somos súditos otomanos y debemos laborar por los entereses generales del pais que nos abriga y nos acorda tantos favores. Nosotros somos hombres y por esto somos obligados de ambesar por nuestros hijos y por nuestros estudios el frances, el italiano, el aleman y quien sabe cuantas otras lenguas. Despues de esto no queda tiempo ni lugar para el español. (Pulido, 1905: 113)

These views reflect more general ideologies of the first group in Pulido's clasification, which consists of the Sephardim who argue for integration into majority society and a complete shift to its language and/or for the Zionist movement and a shift to Hebrew. The same ideas were object of animated debates about the future of the language of the Sephardim, published from time to time in Sephardic periodicals since the second half of the 19th century (E. Romero, 1992, 2010; Bunis, 1996; Busse, 1996; Ayala, 2006; Quintana, 2011). One of the main questions was: should the Sephardim 'abandon' or 'clean' their Judeo-Spanish language? (G. D. May, 1889: 16) In case of 'abandonment', the Sephardic intellectuals recognized majority languages and Hebrew as two posible successors. In both cases standardized and prestigious linguistic varieties were chosen: the first because it offered social and economic mobility, the other for being the traditional language of Jewish faith and literacy, and what is more, only recently proclaimed the Jewish national language.

Even before the establishment of the official Zionist movement at the First congress in Basel (1897), the Sephardim were expresing in public their belief that Hebrew was or should be their 'real mother tongue' and that as such it should replace Judeo-Spanish. Bunis (2011b: 49) for instance, demonstrates that rabbinic writings from the the earlier ages (e.g., 18th century Constantinople) argued for the return of Hebrew as the language of all Jewry:

We do not know how the average descendant of Spanish Jewry in the Ottoman Empire felt about the matter, but their rabbis yearned for a return of the Jews to their most ancient ancestral language, Hebrew. (Bunis, 2011b: 49)

As the Zionist movement was spreading among the Oriental Sephardim, Hebrew was gaining more advocates as the 'universal Jewish language', although many of them had only basic knowledge of this language. Examples of this anguage ideology are easy to find in above mentioned magazine, *El amigo del puevlo*. At the time when the magazine was still published in Belgrade, the alleged relative and friend of the editor Samuel B. Elias (signed G. D.) sent a letter to the redaction in which he claimed that Judeo-Spanish was sure to disappear. He pointed out that the Sephardim regreted this fact only because they were about to lose their mother tongue and literature that was the cornerstone of the Jewish faith and of the study of the Torah. The same author made a sugestion

for ‘saving the Torah’ by filling the place of Judeo-Spanish with Hebrew, the Jewish holy language (*Lashon Hakodesh*):

[...] mi opinion es ke el mas importante remedio por salvar la Tora de este grado es el azer todo lo posivle a tomar unas mezuras bazadas sovre el eskopo de remplasar el posto de lengua nasionala ke kedara vazio kon el alešamyento del ešpanyol, por la lengua santa: kero dezir dešar el ešpanyol i tomar el lašon hakodeš. (G. D. May 1889: 18, transcr. by I. V. S)

Good examples of integrationists’ attitudes and believes can also be found in the public debate led in *El Amigo del Puevo* at the very end of the 19th century among the Sephardim from Serbia and Bulgaria⁹. The debate clearly demonstrates different attitudes of Sephardic intellectuals towards Serbian as the national language of the country they lived in (Vučina Simović & Filipović, 2009: 126-129). Stating that the Jews in Serbia should ‘serve their new homeland’, ‘the country which has adopted them so selflessly’, ‘giving them all the civil rights recognized by the state in relation to all its citizens’, they believed that the shift to Serbian would be the most logical next step:

[...] ke komo lengua materna prime tomar la lengua de la tyera ke mos resivyo kon manos avyertas en el tyenpo de muestra dezgrasya la kualo mos dyo i mos da los frutos de todas las derečidades ke goza kada uno de nuestros konermanos. la deviza de la manseveria inteligente muestra es de aresivir por lengua materna la lengua serba i puede tener komo resultado de alešar la avla espanyola si no por entero alomenos komo lengua materna. para mozotros la lengua espanyola es una lengua ažena i kon poko sensya se puede pensar ke kada uno emprimero kale ke sepa la lengua de su tyera i *enos en segundo lugar lenguas aženas.” (R. P., 01/03/1894: 201, transcr. by A. Š. E.¹⁰)

Young Sephardim believed that they should repay their new country by adopting Serbian as their language of everyday communication:

ay mas grande verguensa ke el dezir ke un mansevo nasido en la serbia, bulgarya nemçya o françya no save serbesko, bulgaresko nemçesko o françes? [...] muy flošo patrioto es un serbo ke no save en serbesko o un bulgaro ke no entyende en bulgaresko. (R. P., 01/03/1894: 201, transcr. by A. Š. E.)

From these and similar individual attitudes, one can clearly deduce the relationship among the ethnic identity and linguistic choices for many young Sephardim. Many more examples of the same attitudes can be found in Sephardic

⁹ For a detailed analysis of linguistic debates in *El amigo del puevo*, see Quintana (2010).

¹⁰ We would like to thank Ana Štulić Etchevers for the transcription of the polemic about the language from *El Amigo del Puevo* from 1894.

written sources. In February 1888, in the magazine *Luzero de la Paciencia* from Turn-Severin, Samuel B. Elias informed about habits and inclinations of the Sephardim in Belgrade:

nuestros hermanos de Serbia [...] se esfuerzan de adoptar los usos y costumbres de sus compatreotas Serbos, viven en buenas relaciones con ellos, practican mas mucho la lengua del pais que sus propia idioma.
– En los conciertos, en los bales, en sus conversaciones los Judios emplean el Serbo; mesmo en sus casas, muchos de ellos hablan solo la lengua del pais. (Elias, 13/02/1888: 83-84)

2) Language ideology favoring independent development of Judeo-Spanish

According to Pulido's clasification, *dialectalistas*, or *autonomistas*, believed that it was precisely this traditional linguistic variety, the Judeo-Spanish of the exiled Spanish Jews, that should be maintained and supported by teaching the young generations about its relevance and its role in the centuries long survival of the Sephardim in distant lands. One of the most active representatives in this group was the editor of the journal *La Epoca* from Salonica, Samuel Saadi Levy. He writes to Pulido overwhelmed by emotions towards his mother tongue:

Y para mi, muy estimado señor mio, el mejor dia de mi vida sera aquel onde pudre, en su presencia, bajar las collecciones de *La Epoca* y leerle, con la misma emocion que yo los escrivi, algunos articolos de la larga serie que he tenido el honor de consacrar al judeo-español, la lengua-madre al altar de la cuala soy dispuesto a sacrificar lo poco de engeria que me queda. (Pulido, 1905: 117-118)

Although, S. Saadi Levy stated that the future of Judeo-Spanish was a promising one, he was also in favor of perfecting of Judeo-Spanish and bringing Spanish language teachers to the Orient who would 'improve' the language of the Sephardim (Pulido 1905: 117). He was convinced that improvement could be easily achieved and that there was no need for shift to other languages:

[...] yo compuse mesmo tres ovras de imaginacion, diversas novellas, por hacer ver que nuestro jargon se prestava a todo y era suseptible de perfeccionamiento, sin verse sustituir cual fuese lengua ni mesmo el puro español de España. (Pulido 1905: 117)

However, according to Levy, the Sephardim were also advised to learn 'wholeheartedly' official languages of countries in which they lived because that was seen as their 'patriotic and holy duty' and 'an absolute need' (Pulido 1905: 117).

The *dialectista/ autonomista* views can be also found among some of the participants in the above mentioned debate from *El amigo del puevlo*. According to S. R. from Belgrade, for the Sephardim Judeo-Spanish was the language

‘chosen to be almost as their own’ and an important bond between their communities ‘scattered all around the world’:

lakuala la eskožimos kaši komo ‘muestra’ la kuala la mayorita de nuestros konermanos la aprovečan i la kuala mos esta detenyendo i atando a mozotros kon los otros ermanos *sefardim* esparzidos sovre todas las partes del mundo. čusto komo los [aniyikos] de la kadena! (S.R., 15/02/1894: 182, transcr. by A. Š. E.)

At the end of his first contribution to the debate, the same author expressed his wish that the Sephardim, instead of creating societies for learning Serbian language, make joint efforts to ‘replace’ the loan words from the surrounding national languages with ‘real Spanish words’:

[...] i mos plazea si en kada lugar kontenyendo una mas grandizika kuenta de nuestros konermanos se adjuntava en komite kon eskopo de retirar de nuestro lenguaže todas akeyas palavras ke mos enprestimos de la lengua del paiz onde bivimos, komo: mozotros serbos de la lengua serba; los konermanos de la Bulgarya de la lengua bulgara i semežante i trokarlas kon sus veras palavras espanyolas ansi teneremos una lengua sana i kunplida i non segun oy. (S. R., 15/02/1894: 183, transcr. by I. V. S.)

3) Pragmatic and eclectic evaluation of Judeo-Spanish

As in S. Saady Levy’s writings cited above, the *dialectista* ideology among Sephardic intellectuals was often complemented by an attempt to redefine the position of the Sephardim within the newly founded states, which meant that they began to create a closer link between their ethnic identity¹¹ and a given nation-state they lived in (very similar to what Francos from Izmir was saying about Turkish). Those were identified by Pulido in a not very flattering way as *eclécticos* or *oportunistas*. The *eclécticos* made up a group of intellectuals who believed that, on one hand, there existed an emotional link between the Sephardim and their language, while on the other hand, they also recognized a bond with the national languages of the states they inhabited and their importance as a *resource* which should be exploited for the benefit of improving the Sephardic economic, educational and sociopolitical status within the newly founded states.

Isidor Sumbul writes to Pulido on behalf of the members of the Sephardic academic association *Esperanza* (Vienna, 1896) about the inferiority of Judeo-Spanish with regard to the official languages spoken in the states the Sephardim lived in:

En el tiempo presente, que la cultura esta penetrando en estos países [Bulgaria, Servia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Rumania, Grecia y Austria], la esta cada judio bien remarcando. La cultura esta

¹¹ For a detailed analysis of the changes in Sephardic ethnic identity, see Bunis (2011b).

venturosamente apoderandose y de los judios; por esto su lengua, el español que ellos hablan, no es capache de satisfacer las demandas de un pueblo que se esta civilizando. Esto lo siente muy bien cada uno. Por cual no reinchir esta falta de una complida madre lengua con la lengua del país, cuando razones economicas nos hacen su convencimiento perfecto y sin esto indispensable? (Pulido, 1905: 126)

Thus, Sephardic intellectuals acknowledged early on the importance of the majority languages in the acculturation process. The acculturation was deeply connected with the introduction of modernization and with the economic, social and cultural changes which were shaking up the roots of all the social groups in the Orient:

Así sera la purificacion de nuestra lengua española á cuento de la lengua del país, según esto contra nuestros intereses economicos. Solo economicos? Tambien cultureles y sociales. Los judios españoles formamos, - en los países de cualos tratamos - un elemento extranjero malgrado el tiempo de 4 siglos, mientras cualos moramos en ellos. La lengua ajena nuestra es la que de nosotros hace los mismos. (Pulido 1905: 126)

Interestingly enough, the same society (*Esperanza*) was originally founded with the objective to maintain and improve Judeo-Spanish and help emancipate the Sephardic communities in general. Nevertheless, after becoming Zionists, the members of the *Esperanza* relegated the language question to the second plan of their agenda; however as the official Zionist movement did not fulfill their expectations, they decided to use Judeo-Spanish to propagate a Jewish national movement of their own creation among their brethren. (Vučina Simović 2013) During *Esperanza's* long existence, and regardless of the reigning ideology, its members considered their ethnic language to be one of the main 'particularities' of the Sephardic identity. However, they also deemed it to be 'the medium for propagating Modern Hebrew' (Pardo, 26/09/1913: 1341), for which they reserved the status of their national language:

Kon el espanyol vamos enbezar el lašon hakodeš [Hebrew], ma antes prime konoser i saber bueno la lengua materna para poder ambezar una lengua ke por dezventura se pedryo del uzo kon anyos i anyos de entre nozotros [...]. De aki se vee komo la demanda del lašon hakodeš ke prime ke se resiva komo lengua materna para todos los djudyos, es una demanda la mas komplikada i la mas fuerte ke puede aver. Esto es una demanda ke no toka solo alos sefardim sino a todos, todos los djidyos (Bedjarano, 12/02/1897: 408, transcr. I. V. S.).

However, the 'opportunist' inclinations of the Sephardim had appeared far earlier in the 19th century. A document written by the Sephardic elders and sent to the *Serbian Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs* in order to seek support in the process of modernizing the Jewish school serves as a good example of this strategy. The fact that Jewish children could not attend Serbian state schools in

1860s, due to their lack of linguistic competences in Serbian, was considered a clear obstacle to their future professional, social, and economic progress:

only in this way will the Jewish youth be given an opportunity to learn Serbian and gather knowledge needed to advance their education at higher levels. (Archive of Serbia, *Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs*, XII r. 1774/ 1864, n° 565)

It is significant that the Sephardim at the same time recognized the relevance of their religious and cultural identity and aimed at reforming the existing Jewish school (and maintaining Ladino as the language of religious services) rather than sending their children to Serbian schools (see Vučina Simović & Filipović, 2009: 128-129 for further details).

4) 'Pro-Castilian' language ideology

Castellanistas, or *hispanófilos*, as Pulido calls them and includes himself among them, viewed Judeo-Spanish as 'agrammatical', 'not-cultured enough', incapable of becoming a carrier of serious literary tradition (a view very often seen in other places and other times in the world history), i.e., as a variety incapable of undergoing the process of standardization, modernization and status raising. Thus, in his letter to Pulido, a Sephardic Jew from Izmir, Aaron José Hazan, suggests that this 'corrupted language' should be brought closer to the 'true language of Cervantes', namely to the standard modern-day Spanish (Vučina Simović & Filipović, 2009: 119).

Long before Pulido's campaign in favor of the Sephardim and the 'reconciliation' between Spain and the Sephardim at the beginning of the 20th century, voices in favor of bringing closer Judeo-Spanish to modern Spanish had been heard. Bunis (2011b) quotes several fragments from Viennese periodicals which he considers to be the first testimonies of 'ethnic and linguistic re-identification (...) with Spain and Spanish', present among the Sephardim since the second half of 19th century, and common even today among their descendants. According to Bunis, a quote from 1867 from an editorial written by Josef Kalwo, editor of the periodical *El Nasyonal*,

[...] documents a pivotal moment in the social development of the Levantine Sephardim [...]; the editor of a Judezmo periodical voiced full identification with Spain and its 'glories' – both Jewish and Gentile – in the Middle Ages, and with the Castilian language [...]:

'Compatriots! ... We have a language ... And what a language! The one which was immortalized by the great Cervantes, the celebrated Calderón de la Barca, and a thousand others; [...] Yes, our language is Spanish!... [...] However, compatriots, in order to sustain our glory with pride [...] it is necessary for us to ready ourselves to undertake a great, immense and lofty project. [...] This project is: the regeneration of our language! Yes. It is necessary for us to abandon these borrowed letters,

these signs which only belong to us as Jews, but not as Spaniards, to abandon little by little the words taken from other languages; and to use our script, our words, and our smooth Spanish phrases. [...] (Kalwo 1866: 411-412)' (Bunis, 2011b: 63)

As Díaz-Mas (2000: 326-339) observes, the reception of Pulido's activities among the Sephardim in the Orient has not been investigated enough. Nevertheless, we know of several supporters of Pulido's ideas in the Orient, especially of his 'pro-Castilian' language ideology: Yosef Estrugo from Izmir, Jaques Danon from Edirne, Eliyau Torres from Salonica (Bunis, 1996: 229) and others. As for the Former Yugoslav communities, we can indicate that Pulido had only few correspondents and sympathizers: Benko S. Davicho from Belgrade, Enrique Haim from Panchevo, Abraham Levi Sadic and Abraham A. Cappon from Sarajevo, José Misraeli from Bitola and María (Micca) Gross Alcalay from Trieste (originally from Sarajevo). The latter did not have much influence on their brethren, who were at that time much more interested in possible integration in the majority society and/or Zionist ideology than in making connections with the Spaniards (Vučina Simović, 2010: 165).

One of the mentioned *castellanistas*, rabbi Abraham A. Cappon, was a well known Sephardic author and the editor of *La Alborada* (published first in Ploesti and Ruse and later in Sarajevo). His book of poems was actually dedicated to Spain on behalf of the Sephardim, 'the devotees and guardians of the language of Cervantes' (Cappon, 1922):

Las cartas sobredichas [de Ángel Pulido y Ramón Menéndez Pidal] y las alentadas palabras de mi distinguido amigo Sr. Manuel Manrique de Lara. [...] me hacen creer que el producto de mi péndola será de buen agrado á mis correligionarios sefarditas, y que hasta en España será bien acogido, ya que es el trabajo de un descendiente de los desterrados de aquel país, donde sus agüelos dejaron las cenizas de muchos célebres que contribuyeron á la extensión de la cultura en el mundo y que, aunque esparcidos por toda la tierra, conservan todavia la lengua de Cervantes.

Por lo tanto me honro dedicando esta obra á los amantes de nuestro dulce y armonioso idioma castellano. (Cappon, 1922: V-VI; italics ours)

Of course, the above words can only be understood as a metaphor used in an attempt to raise Judeo-Spanish to a level of symbol, not only of Sephardic, but also of the overall Hispanic culture, as Cervantes was born almost sixty years after the Jewish exodus from the Iberian Peninsula. (Vučina [Simović] 2006; 2007)

Aside from the underlying relevance of the standard language culture, as a carrier of written culture and of future national development present in the 'pro-Castilian' ideology of the Sephardim, it is very likely that such identification with Spain had more generalized cultural implications, in a sense that it ...

[...] could enable people whose families had lived for centuries in an eastern setting, which enjoyed low prestige in the West and was identified with the declining Ottoman Empire, to realign themselves sociologically, culturally and psychologically with what was perceived as the more progressive, ‘civilized’ West, which was rapidly gaining prestige in the East. (Bunis, 2011b: 68).

An analysis of the outcomes of operation of the above outlined language ideologies clearly demonstrates that positive language ideologies towards national and/or official languages were the most prominent, and they quickly spread down to other social classes among the Sephardim, thus confirming the status of Judeo-Spanish as a stigmatized variety, whose public use was interpreted by many (especially from the outside perspective of majority language users) as unwillingness to integrate, or, better to say, assimilate, into the majority society. In other words, competence in Judeo-Spanish was soon considered an obstacle to those who aimed at achieving overall higher positions on the socio-economic scale. The fact that Judeo-Spanish was a threat to social mobility was consequently accepted as common-sense knowledge among the Sephardim, which opened up a clear and straightforward path to the language shift towards majority languages in the Balkan nation-states (for a detailed account of the language shift within the Belgrade Sephardic community, viewed as paradigmatic for the Balkan region, see Filipović & Vučina Simović, 2012).

Should Judeo-Spanish be revitalized?

At this point we should make one important clarification. Namely, we do not equate revitalization with standardization in the European, modernist, nationalist framework. Consequently, we do not see language standardization following the so-called ‘nationalist model’ (Geeraerts, 2003), applied in most European countries as a direct consequence of modernity (e.g., see, Filipović 2011 for a discussion on the standardization of Serbian, as an illustration of language policy typical of standard language cultures), as a prerequisite for language revitalization. Quite to the contrary, we view pluricentric coexistence of mutually understandable linguistic varieties as a new window of opportunity for transgenerational transfer of minority languages, through a number of communicative domains and carried out via concrete communicative practices, relevant to interested speech communities and communities of practice.

Judeo-Spanish, as all other Jewish languages, can only be analyzed from the more general socio-cultural and political lens which accounts for its present sociolinguistic situation. As Abrevaya Stein (2006: 509) astutely points out in her detailed comparison of secular Yiddish and Ladino languages and cultures,

The convergence of the fate of these languages—that is, the fact that both, today, are endangered (in the case of Yiddish) if not nearly extinct (in the case of Ladino) as living tongues and vehicles of secular culture—is an anomaly of the modern period, and, thus,

comprehensible only through a wide historical lens. Studying these languages alongside one another and as lived languages with indeterminate fates reiterates that languages are not only sensitive vehicles of expression but finely tuned barometers of possibility: cultural forms that were never static nor simply repositories of sentimentality but, on the contrary, were crystallized versions of the people, politics, and periods that shaped them.

Some authors (e.g., Myhill, 2004) believe that Jews across the world have build and kept their identity through race and religion rather than through languages they have used for everyday communication. According to this view, due to the fact that they have lived in Diaspora for centuries, the Jews have used a number of languages they have been exposed to, and the only authentic linguistic variety they can associate with is Hebrew, the national language of the nation-state of Israel. Myhill (2004) even claims that Judeo-Spanish (just like Yiddish) should not be treated as a Jewish language, ‘suggesting that scholarly interest in these languages stems from various political and cultural agendas, rather than their inherent linguistic distinctiveness’ (Krohn, 2006: 2). Of course, there are other more positive (and in our view, less discriminative) scientific attitudes about Judeo-Spanish and its relationship with the Sephardim, descendents of Spanish Jews expelled from Spain in 1492:

The future of Judezmo does not appear to be very bright. And yet, its surviving speakers insist on maintaining a distinctive linguistic identity [...]. Let us hope these traditions will survive among future generations, adding their precious threads to the rich weave of Jewish culture. (Bunis, 2011a: 34)

One thing is certain:

There is no home country today where people speak Judeo-Spanish, as in the case of other immigrant languages. This means that there will be no influx of Judeo-Spanish speakers who can help revitalize the language [...]. Since there are no young Judeo-Spanish speakers left, there is no replacing generation of native speakers. (Harris, 1999: 443)

However, in her 2011 article the same author claims that ‘attitudes concerning Ladino and its perpetuation have improved greatly in the last fifteen or twenty years, especially due to the acceptance and endorsement of ethnicity the world over’ (Harris, 2011: 52)

Furthermore, we are witnesses to an ever growing academic interest in the field of Sephardic studies in Europe, Israel and North America that has taken place over the last couple of decades, particularly since the 1992 Quincentennial commemoration of the Edict of Expulsion (Stillman & Stillman, 1999: xiii). Along with it the need to offer courses on Judeo-Spanish in formal academic contexts has arisen, in an attempt to bridge the gap between ‘scholarly research

and academic presentations and the communities that could nurture and benefit from them' (Frank 1999: 533). Steps in the area of language policy and language documentation have also been taken by the Israeli government which set up the National Authority for Ladino (*Autoridad Nacional del Ladino - ANL*) in 1997 (Harris 2011). Presently, Judeo-Spanish is taught at five Israeli universities in Jerusalem, Tel-Aviv, Haifa, Beer-Sheva and Ramat-Gan (Navon, 2011: 5). Periodicals, newspapers, textbooks to study Judeo-Spanish, together with other media contents (among which we believe a number of websites and forums to be of the utmost importance) that have been kept active in different parts of the Sephardic world (Israel, Spain, United States, Bulgaria, Turkey, etc.), have also contributed to this increased interest in revitalizing Judeo-Spanish (see Harris 2011, for an extensive list of media resources and publications in Judeo-Spanish).

In a nutshell, the principal conclusion of this paper is that the affirmation of languages of a large number of ethnolinguistic communities cannot be carried out without a direct action geared towards challenging negative language ideologies among the members of those communities. In other words, grassroots activities are a necessary prerequisite for any attempt at reversing language shift or assuring language maintenance of minority/ endangered languages. Despite the fact that in the eyes of some authors and a large number of international institutions (such as the Council of Europe, UNESCO, etc.) the nationalist model of language standardization and language ideology of standard language cultures was being replaced by a post-modern interpretation of reality as fragmented, multifaceted and, by default, plurilingual (Geeraerts 2003), the fact still remains that in many parts of the world there still exists a strong nationalist tendency, derived from and supported by the modernity scientific principle of ages gone by. It equals language with nation and nation with state, thus (implicitly or explicitly) placing high value on different kinds of official monolingualism (see, for instance, examples of US 'English Only' language education policies (e.g., see Cummins 1981; 1984; 2001), or policies towards the education of Roma in Europe: e.g., Filipović, Vučo & Djurić, 2007; Filipović, 2009). In other words, the heritage of modernity language ideology is still very much present in many sociopolitical contexts in the world even in the 21st century.

On the other hand, strong movements for the protection of language and human language rights (see, for instance, Skutnabb-Kangas, 2002a; 2006) view plurilingualism and pluriculturalism as the core concepts of the knowledge-based society which values and supports linguistic diversity as one of the prerequisites for personal cognitive and emotional growth and development.

Endangered linguistic varieties need to be recognized, presented and accepted as a valuable resource by the members of both minority and majority communities, primarily through a definition of top-down language policies which valorize active minority/ endangered language use in different communicative domains (Hornberger, 1998).

Reversing language shift (Fishman, 2001: 452) and language revitalization are possible ways of aiding languages in danger of extinction¹². Language revitalization is a systemic and systematic activity aimed at assurance of transgenerational transfer of linguistic material under social and political circumstances which normally would not support such a process. However, unilateral grassroots activities of interested ethnolinguistic speech communities are not sufficient to accomplish this extensive and complicated task. Rather, revitalization needs to be undertaken as a comprehensive, multilateral activity in which all interested parties (states and ethnolinguistic communities) carry out activities aimed at re-establishing the communicative and functional domains of endangered languages and changing negative ethnic language ideologies in a direction which recognizes the value and the worth (both functional and symbolic) of minority languages through transdisciplinary research. Transdisciplinary research implies active engagement of scientists in solving real people's problems. Based on critical theory and constructivism in social sciences and humanities, it attempts to make a direct correlation between knowledge production and demands for knowledge application in order to make a difference in real people's lives:

Such research succeeds by building joint visions of the issue of concern, by finding a common language, by jointly discussing the trade-offs that result from particular choices, and above all through collaborative *learning* [...], so that the bridges between knowledge and action become stronger and progress can be made in tackling major issues faced by society. (Jäger, 2008: vii-viii).

Even though we do not have space here to elaborate on this subject, we conclude this paper with a call for transdisciplinary approach to the revitalization of Judeo-Spanish. It should be viewed as a pro-active, collaborative and comprehensive effort to reclaim the Judeo-Spanish communicative functions in all domains of language use. It should fall upon the already existing vast body of literature in Judeo-Spanish and about Judeo-Spanish in a systematic attempt to bring together academic interests and communicative needs of members of different Sephardic communities across the world which could bring Judeo-Spanish back on the map of European and world languages (see Filipović 2012a; 2012b, for further details), and which could be taken as a starting point in ensuring a new transgenerational transfer of Judeo-Spanish among the interested communities of practice.

Bibliography

¹² Skutnabb-Kangas (2002b) offers 'pessimist' and 'optimist' forecasts about the future of endangered languages: according to the 'pessimist' view, up to 90% of all languages in the world will be extinct by the end of the 21st century; according to the 'optimist' forecast, 50% of world languages will disappear in the same time frame.

- Abrevaya Stein, S. (2006). Aymetric fates: Secular Yiddish and Ladino Culture in Comparison. *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 96(4), 498-509.
- Archive of Serbia, *Ministry of Education*, XII r. 1774/ 1864, n° 565.
- Ayala, A. (2006). Por nu'estra lingu'a" (1924): un artículo periodístico sobre la lengua y la identidad entre los sefardíes en la Bulgaria de Entreguerras, *Neue Romania*, 35, *Judenspanisch X*, 83-98.
- Bauman, R. & Charles L. Briggs (2003). *Voices of modernity. Language ideologies and the politics of inequality*, Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, Sao Paulo: Cambridge University Press.
- Bedjarano, Rafael A., 12/02/1897, [Letter] Vyena 5 februaryo 1897, *El Amigo del Pueblo*, 26, IX year, Sofia, 407-409.
- Benbassa, Esther & Aron Rodrigue. (2000). *Sephardi Jewry. A History of the Judeo-Spanish Community, 14th – 20th Centuries*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Benbassa, Esther & Aron Rodrigue (2004). *Historia de los judíos sefardíes. De Toledo a Salónica*, traducción José Luis Sánchez-Silva, Madrid: Abada.
- Brubaker, Roger. (1999) The Manichean myth: Rethinking the distinction between civic and ethnic nationalism. In Hanspeter Kriesi, Klaus Armingeon, Hannes Siegrist & Andreas Wimmer (Eds.), *Nation and national identity* (55-71). Zurich: Rugger,.
- Bugarski, Ranko (2004). *Jezik u društvu*, 2. ed., Belgrade: Čigoja.
- Bugarski, Ranko (2005). *Jezik i kultura*, Belgrade: XX vek.
- Bunis, David (1996). Modernization and the Language Question among Judezmo-Speaking Sephardim of the Ottoman Empire. In Harvey E. Goldberg (Ed.), *Sephardi and Middle Eastern Jewries: History and Culture in the Modern Era* (226-239). Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Bunis, D. (2011a). Judezmo: the Jewish language of the Ottoman Sephardim. *European Judaism*, 44(1), 22-35.
- Bunis, D. (2011b). The Changing Faces of Sephardic Identity as Reflected in Judezmo Sources, *Neue Romania*, 40, *Judenspanisch XIII*, 43-71.
- Busse, Winfried (1996). Le judéo-espagnol – un jargon? In Winfried Busse & Marie-Christine Varol-Bornes (Eds.), *Sephardica. Hommage à Haïm Vidal Sephiha* (239-245). Bern: Peter Lang,.
- Cameron, D. (2003). Gender and language ideologies. In Janet Holmes & Miriam Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language and Gender* (447-467). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cappon, Abraham A. (1922). *Poesías. Tomo segundo, Poemas compuestos á medida y cadencia por el desarrollo de los talentos y de las facultades intelectuales de la juventud*, Sarajevo, Slav. Brod: Librería Yehiel A. Cappon, Librería Jacob A. Cappon.

- Commission of the European Communities (2003). *Promoting language learning and linguistic diversity – An Action Plan 2004-2006*, Brussels: European Union.
- <<http://eurlex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2003:0449:FIN:EN:PDF>> (Web page accessed on March 31, 2011).
- Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Council of Europe (2003). *Guidelines for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Cummins, J. (1981). Empirical and theoretical underpinnings of bilingual education. *Journal of Education*, 163, 16-29.
- Cummins, J. (1984). Wanted: A theoretical framework for relating language proficiency to academic achievement among bilingual students. In Charlene Rivera (Ed.), *Language proficiency and academic achievement*, Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2001). *Negotiating identities: Education for empowerment in a diverse society*. Los Angeles: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Díaz Más, P. (1997). *Los sefardíes: historia, lengua y cultura*, 3^a edición, Barcelona: Riopiedras Ediciones.
- Díaz-Mas, P. (2000). Repercusión de la campaña de Ángel Pulido en la opinión pública de su época: la respuesta sefardí. In Juan González-Barba (Ed.), *España y la cultura hispánica en el sureste europeo* (326-339). Atenas: Embajada de España,
- Díaz-Mas, P. & Sánchez Pérez, M. (2010). Los sefardíes ante los retos del mundo contemporáneo. In Díaz-Mas, P. & Sánchez Pérez, M. (Eds.), *Los sefardíes ante los retos del mundo contemporáneo. Identidad y mentalidades* (11-29). Madrid: CSIC.
- Dieckhoff, A. (2005). Beyond conservative wisdom: Cultural and political nationalism revisited. In Dieckhoff, A. & Jaffrelot C. (Eds.). *Revisiting nationalism*, London: Hurst.
- Geeraerts, D. (2003). Cultural models of linguistic standardization. In: René Dirven, Roslyn Frank & Martin Pütz (Eds.). *Cognitive Models in Language and Thought. Ideology, Metaphors and Meanings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 25-68.
- Edwards, J. (2009). *Language and Identity. An Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Elias, S. B. (13/02/1888). Novitades Israelitas, *Luzero de la Paciencia*, 6, III year, Turnu-Severin, 83-84.
- Filipović, J. (1998). The status of Serbian as the minority language within a Serbian-American community, *Filološki pregled*, XXV(2), 147-157.
- Filipović, J. (2009). *Moć reči: Ogledi iz kritičke sociolingvistike [Social power of words: essays on critical sociolinguistics]*. Belgrade: Zadužbina Andrejević.

- Filipović, J. (2011). Language policy and planning in standard language cultures – an alternative approach. In: Vera Vasić (Ed.). *Primenjena Lingvistika u čast Ranku Bugarskom. JEZIK U UPOTREBI [Applied linguistics in honor of Ranko Bugarski. LANGUAGE IN USE]*. Novi Sad: Društvo za primenjenu lingvistiku Srbije, Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Novom Sadu, Filološki fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, pp. 121-136
- Filipović, J. (2012a). Digital corpora of endangered languages: culture, language and society. In A. Vraneš, Lj. Marković & G. Alexander (Eds.). *Digitalni izvori u društveno-humanističkim naukama: Digitalizacija kulturne i naučne baštine / Digital sources in social sciences and humanities: Digitalization of cultural and scientific corpora*, Vol. 3, Belgrade: Faculty of Philology Press, 47-65.
- Filipović, J. (2012b). L'importance des textes authentiques pour la revitalisation du judéo-espagnol. In S. Rouissi & A. Stulic-Etchevers (Eds.). *Recensement, analyse et traitement numérique des sources écrites pour les études séfarades*. Bordeaux: Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux (PUB), Université Michel de Montaigne - Bordeaux 3, 315-326.
- Filipović, J., Vučo J. & Đurić, Lj. (2007). Critical review of language education policies in compulsory primary and secondary education in Serbia. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 8(1), 222-242.
- Filipović, J. & Vučina-Simović, I. (2010). La lengua como recurso social: el caso de las mujeres sefardíes de los Balcanes. In P. Díaz-Mas & M. Sánchez Pérez (Eds.). *Los sefardíes ante los retos del mundo contemporáneo. Identidad y mentalidades*, Madrid: CSIC, 259-269.
- Filipović, J. & Vučina-Simović, I. (2012). El judeoespañol de Belgrado: un caso paradigmático de los Balcanes, *Hispania*, 95(3), 495-508.
- Filipović, J. & Vučina Simović, I. (2013). Philanthropy and emancipation among Sephardic women in the Balkans, *Journal of Sephardic studies*, 1, 78-95.
- < <http://www.sefarad-studies.org> > (Web page accessed on January 23, 2013).
- Fishman, J. A. (2001). From Theory to practice (and Vice Versa), in J. A. Fishman (Ed.). *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift revisited*, Clevedon, UK, Tonawanda, NY, USA, North York, Ontario, Canada, Artarmon, NSW, Australia: Multilingual matters, 451-483.
- Frank, T. (1999). The Sephardic heritage in the Jewish curriculum: current practices and future directions. In Y. K. Stillman & N. A. Stillman (Eds.). *From Iberia to Diaspora: studies in Sephardic history and culture*, Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 533-546.
- Freidenreich, H. P. (1979). *The Jews of Yugoslavia: A Quest for Community*, Skokie, Illinois: Varda Books.
- G. D., May (1889). Korešpondenčija entre amigos, *El amigo del pueblo*, 8, I year, Belgrade, 16-20.
- Geeraerts, D. (2003). Cultural models and linguistic standardization. In R. Dirven, R. Frank & M. Putz (Eds.). *Cognitive models in language and*

- thought. Ideology, Metaphors and Meanings*, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 25-38.
- Hacking, I. (1999). *The Social Construction of What?*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harris, T. (1999). Code-switching in contemporary Judeo-Spanish, in Yedida K. Stillman & Norman A. Stillman (Eds.), *From Iberia to Diaspora: studies in Sephardic history and culture*, Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 432-445.
- Harris, T. (2011). The state of Ladino today, *European Judaism*, 44(1), 51-61.
- Heller, M. (1995). Language choice, social institutions and symbolic domination, *Language in Society*, 24, 373-405.
- Hornberger, N. (1998). Language policy, language education and language rights: indigenous, immigrant and international perspectives, *Language in Society*, 27, 439-458.
- Jäger, J. (2008). Foreword. In G. Hirsch Hadorn, H. Hoffmann-Riem, S. Biber-Klemm, W. Grossenbacher-Mansuy, D. Joye, C. Pohl, U. Wiesmann, E. Zemp (Eds.). *Handbook of transdisciplinary research*, Dordrecht, London: Springer, vii-viii.
- Krohn, N. (2006). Book Review: Language in Jewish Society: Towards a New Understanding. John Myhill. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters. (2004). Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 6(1), 1-3. <<http://journals.tc-library.org/ojs/index.php/tesol/article/viewFile/108/107>>. (Web page accessed on January 6, 2013).
- Kroskrity, P. (2004). Language Ideologies. In Alessandro Duranti (Ed.). *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden, MA, USA, Oxford, UK, Victoria, Australia: Blackwell Publishers, 496-517.
- Malinowsky, A. (1983). Judeo-Spanish language – maintenance efforts in the United States, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 44, 137-152.
- Meyuhas Ginio, A. (2008). Reencuentro y despedida. Dr. Ángel Pulido Fernández y la diáspora sefardí. In Raanan Rein (Ed.). *España e Israel veinte años después*, Madrid: Dykinson, 57-66.
- Milroy, J. (2001). Language ideologies and consequences of standardization, *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5(4), 530-555.
- Myhill, John, 2004, *Language in Jewish Society: Towards a New Understanding*, Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Navon, Y. (2011). The Israeli National Authority for Ladino and its culture, *European Judaism*, 44(1), 4-8.
- Pardo, D. (26/09/1913). Die Konferenz der sephardischen Juden in Wien, *Die Welt*, 39, XVII year, 1340-1341.
- Phelan, S. E. (2001). What is complexity science, really?. *Emergence*, 3(1), 120-136.
- Pulido, Á. (1905). *Españoles sin patria y la raza sefardí*, Madrid: Establecimiento tipográfico de E. Teodoro.

- Quintana, A. (1999). Proceso de recastellanización del Judesmo. In J. Targarona Borrás & Á. Sáenz-Badillos (Eds.). *Jewish Studies at the Turn of the 20th Century*, vol. II, Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 593-602.
- Quintana, A. (2010). El judeoespañol, una lengua pluricéntrica al margen del español. In P. Díaz-Mas & M. Sánchez Pérez (Eds.). *Los sefardíes ante los retos del mundo contemporáneo. Identidad y mentalidades*, Madrid: CSIC, 33-54.
- Quintana, A. (2011). De tímidos sefardistas a sionistas declarados: El círculo de *El Amigo del Pueblo* (1888-1902) y la cuestión de las lenguas, *Neue Romania* 40/ Judenspanisch XIII, 3-18.
- R. P. (01/03/1894). La lengua materna, *El amigo del pueblo*, 13 (VI year, Sofia), 200-202.
- Riley, P. (2006). *Language, culture and identity. Advances in Sociolinguistics Series*, London, New York: Continuum.
- Romero, E. (1992). *La creación literaria en lengua sefardí*, Madrid: Mapfre.
- Romero, E. (2010). La polémica sobre el judeoespañol en la prensa sefardí del imperio otomano: materiales para su estudio. In P. Díaz-Mas & M. Sánchez Pérez (Eds.). *Los sefardíes ante los retos del mundo contemporáneo. Identidad y mentalidades*, Madrid: CSIC, 55-64.
- Romero, R. (2008a). The Turkish word order and case in modern Judeo-Spanish in Istanbul. In M. Westmoreland & J. A. Thomas (Eds.). *Selected Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on Spanish Sociolinguistics*, Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 157-161.
- Romero, R. (2008b). *Structural consequences of language shift: Judeo-Spanish in Istanbul*, Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Washington D.C.: Georgetown University. <<http://gradworks.umi.com/3356112.pdf>>. (Web page accessed on September 14, 2011).
- S. R. (15/02/1894). La lengua espanyola, *El amigo del pueblo*, 12 (VI year, Sofia), 181-183.
- Schieffelin, B B., Woolard K.A. & Kroskrity, P. (Eds.). (1998). *Language ideologies. Practice and Theory*, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2002a). *Language policies and education: The role of education in destroying or supporting the world's linguistic diversity*, Keynote address at the World Congress on Language Policies, 16–20 April, 2002, organized by Linguapax Institute in cooperation with the Government of Catalonia, Barcelona, Spain. <<http://www.linguapax.org/congres/plenaries/skutnabb.html>>. (Web page accessed on July 2, 2010).
- Skutnabb-Kanhas, T. (2002b). Why should linguistic diversity be maintained and supported in Europe? In: *Guide for the Development of Language Policies in Europe: From Linguistic Diversity to Plirilingual Education*, Language Policy Division, 1-20.

- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2006). Language policy and linguistic human rights. In T. Ricento (Ed.). *An introduction to language policy. Theory and method*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 273-291.
- Stillman, Y. K. & Stillman, N. A. (Eds.). (1999). *From Iberia to Diaspora: studies in Sephardic history and culture*, Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.
- Vučina [Simović], I. (2006). ¿Es judeoespañol la lengua de Cervantes? In A. C. Prenz (Ed.). *Da Sefarad a Sarajevo. Percorsi interculturali: le multiformi identità e lo spazio dell'Altro*, Napoli: Gruppo Editoriale Esselibri-Simone, *Beth*, 175-182.
- Vučina Simović, I. (2007). El (judeo)español como lengua de Cervantes. In M. Fernández Alcaide & A. López Serena (Eds.). *400 años de la lengua del Quijote, Estudios de historiografía e historia de la lengua española*, Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla, *Colección Actas 64*, 611-619.
- Vučina Simović, I. (2010). *Stavovi govornika prema jevrejsko-španskom jeziku: u prilog stvaranju tipologije održavanja/ zamene jezika*, unpublished PhD thesis, Belgrade: Filološki fakultet u Beogradu.
- Vučina Simović, I. (2011). El léxico “lingüicida” vs. “favorecedor” en el proceso de mantenimiento/desplazamiento del judeoespañol de Oriente. In W. Busse & M. Studemund-Halévy (Eds.). *Lexicología y lexicografía judeoespañolas*, Bern: Peter Lang, 143-164.
- Vučina Simović, I. (2013). Los sefardíes ante su lengua: los esperancistas de Sarajevo. In M. Studemund-Halévy, C. Liebel & I. Vučina Simović (Eds.). *Sefarad an der Donau. Lengua y literatura sefarditas en las tierras de Habsburgo*, Barcelona: Tirocinio, 341-360.
- Vučina Simović, I. & Filipović, J. (2009). *Etnički identitet i zamena jezika u sefardskoj zajednici u Beogradu [Ethnic identity and language shift among the Sephardim in Belgrade]*, Belgrade: Zavod za udžbenike.
- Woolard, K. A. (1998). Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry. In B. B. Schieffelin, K. A. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (Eds.). *Language Ideologies. Practice and Theory*, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3-47.

IDEOLOGÍAS DE LENGUAJE EN TIEMPOS DE MODERNIDAD: LOS SEFARDÍES EN EL ORIENTE

RESUMEN: El impacto de las ideologías negativas hacia el judeoespañol que provocaron el desplazamiento de esta lengua étnica por las lenguas estándar de los países-naciones balcánicas a finales del siglo XIX está en el enfoque de esta investigación. Se analiza la interrelación entre las dichas ideologías y la modernidad, como un concepto más amplio social, político, cultural y económico que afectó todas las entidades políticas formadas entre las fronteras del ex-Imperio Otomano en aquella época. Asimismo, se analiza la importancia de la cultura de las recién formadas lenguas estándar y las turbulencias sociales y culturales provocadas por los cambios macro-históricos en las diferentes comunidades sefardíes en el Oriente. La parte final de este artículo está dedicada al estudio del estado actual del judeoespañol y a la posibilidad de su revitalización dentro de un marco teórico y metodológico transdisciplinar, describiendo así una situación paradigmática de muchas de las comunidades etnolingüísticas minoritarias en el siglo XXI.

PALABRAS CLAVE: modernidad, ideologías de lenguaje, desplazamiento lingüístico, los Sefardim, judeoespañol.