INTER-CITY SEPHARDIC RELATIONS

The United States experienced an influx of Sephardim from Turkey and the Balkans from the end of the nineteenth century until the end of the first quarter of the twentieth. Aviva Ben-Ur estimates that as many as sixty-thousand Sephardic Jews entered the United States during this period, the majority remaining in New York City (“We Speak and Write This Language Against Our Will” 131 and 140 n. 2). With the ever-increasing number of Sephardim to arrive in the country at the start of the twentieth century, correspondence between major Sephardic cities became apparent. This is, in part, due to the booming Judeo-Spanish printing press, primarily situated in New York City. Los Angeles, however, was home to one such periodical, El Mesajero (1933–35), which allows one to understand not only how the Los Angeles Sephardic community evolved, but also how its development fits into the larger narrative of Sephardim in the United States.

The Los Angeles Sephardic community was initially divided into three groups representing religious, charitable, and fraternal organizations: The Sephardic Hebrew Center (formerly known as the Peace and Progress Society), the Sephardic Community, and the Haim Vehessed Society. In the June 1934 edition of Los Angeles’s monthly Judeo-Spanish bulletin, El Mesajero, Samuel Berro writes that there is a great divide between these organizations. He notes that each community “has unfortunately maintained an attitude of indifference, isolation, and ignorance in the welfare and communal work of its
sister organizations now in existence in America, for the last twenty-five years or so” (“Let Us Promote” 6). This divide, he asserts, prevents the advancement of Sephardic life in Los Angeles.

The history of the Sephardic congregations in Los Angeles is one of a series of mergers, re-mergers, and name changes from as early as 1912 to as recently as 1994. While a number of Sephardic congregations are located throughout Los Angeles today, Judeo-Spanish speakers and their predominantly English-speaking descendants make up the minority. In 1912, the A(ha)vat Shalom Congregation broke into various factions, including Peace and Progress of the Rhodeslis—Jews originating from the Greek island of Rhodes—and the Sephardic Community of Los Angeles, consisting of Jews of Turkish origin. The former would change their name to that of the Sephardic Hebrew Center when they relocated their congregation to 55th and Hoover, while the latter would split into the Sephardic Community of Los Angeles and the Sephardic Brotherhood of Los Angeles (known as Haim Vehessed). In 1959, the original Sephardic Community of Los Angeles remerged into the Sephardic Community and Brotherhood of Los Angeles, eventually renamed as the Sephardic Temple Tifereth Israel (STTI), whose congregation has been located at 10500 Wilshire Blvd since 1975. The Rhodesli Sephardic Hebrew Center was renamed Sephardic Beth Shalom in 1990, before merging congregations with the Sephardic Temple Tifereth Israel and taking the name of the latter congregation. After eighty years of separations and mergers, the Judeo-Spanish-speaking congregations of the early 1900s were reunified.

The problem of solidarity among the Sephardim, however, was not unique to those in Los Angeles. Marc Angel, former Rabbi of the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue in New York, has noted a similar issue among his congregation of Sephardim early in the twentieth century. He notes, “A serious problem of New York’s Sephardim since their arrival . . . has been disunity” (95). Sephardim formed various congregations, societies, and social organizations based on the geographical origin from which they came. Therefore, Judeo-Spanish-speaking Sephardim formed congregations for those from Monastir, Kastoria, Dardanelles, Rhodes, Gallipoli, and Izmir, among others. Angel refers to such problems as a common development for Sephardic communities nationwide, as demonstrated by the case of the Sephardim in Los Angeles. He asserts: “The difficulties plaguing the New York Sephardim were those of the Sephardim in Seattle, Atlanta, Los Angeles, Rochester, Indianapolis, and elsewhere” (108). In this regard, New York City faced similar concerns, as did not only Los Angeles, but also other Sephardic communities nationwide.
Sephardic communities were often in contact with one another. In July 1934, the then president of New York City's Shearith Israel Congregation Dr. David de Sola Pool commended the Sephardic community in Los Angeles's *El Mesajero*. He writes to Dr. Benveniste congratulating him for “creating a genuine Sephardic community,” one that appears to be unified despite representing various communities and their respective organizations (6). De Sola Pool comments that this sense of community “is something we have not succeeded in doing in New York, notwithstanding many well meant attempts.” He continues to congratulate Benveniste and the Sephardim of Los Angeles for setting an example for Sephardic communities nationwide. Despite editors of *El Mesajero* reporting on ruptures among Sephardic organizations in Los Angeles, leading Sephardim in New York City applauded these groups for working toward unification between them.

In its inaugural edition of *El Mesajero*, the editorial staff notes that they will be publishing articles on a monthly basis in New York's *La Vara*. They indicate that, in this way, New York, as well as those receiving the publication abroad, will be well informed of activities occurring within the Los Angeles Sephardic community. The staff of *El Mesajero* furthermore wanted “ke konoskan ke la sosiedad paz i progreso esta mas o menos kontribueno a el desenvolapamiento moral i kultural de nuestra kolektividad,” that is to say, that the Sephardic community “should know that the Peace and Progress Society is more or less contributing to the moral and cultural development of our collectivity” (“Artikolos en La Vara” 10). From these examples, we observe regular correspondence passing between Los Angeles and New York City Sephardim.

The third largest Sephardic community in the United States can be found in Seattle, Washington. The Sephardic community of Los Angeles kept regular correspondence with Sephardim in Seattle, as evinced by *El Mesajero*. For example, in the December 1934 edition, the editorial staff announced that the principal of the Talmud Torah in Seattle, Albert Levy, would be relocating to New York to take over the responsibility as editor of one of the city’s more successful newspapers, *La Vara* (“Una Nueva ‘Vara’” 2).

Editors of *El Mesajero* often wrote highly of Seattle, noting that the Sephardim, with all of their separated organizations, could learn a great deal from their cohesion. In the bulletin’s October 1933 edition, Isaac Benveniste reflects upon his recent visit to Seattle and notes, “la komunidad se distinguo siempre por su avanzamiento, sus akumlimientos i por su atitud moderno en todas sus sferas de aktividad,” that is to say, “the community has continuously distinguished itself by its advancements, its accomplishments and for
its modern attitude in all spheres of activity” (2). He continues to highlight the strong connection among the Sephardim, both in religious and education settings. He notes that not only are Sephardim active within their community, but they are respected by their brethren, the Ashkenazim. Furthermore, Sephardim are making great strides in education, with several young men and women attending college and several taking on professional jobs.

Samuel Berro also called into question how the Sephardim could adapt culturally and linguistically in the United States, particularly in Los Angeles. He looked to Seattle as a model in solving the continuous problems of unity among the various Sephardic organizations in Los Angeles. In his April 1934 article, Berro comments that the Sephardim in Seattle have set “a fine example of the unity and brotherly love . . . through the creation of the Seattle Progressive Fraternity, a representative body which has constantly rendered great services to the Sephardic Jewry” (“A Great Sephardic United Front” 8). Such sentiments were echoed the subsequent month, where Berro again commended Seattle for its “remarkable example of good will,” noting that “the various fraternal and social organizations now in existence in Seattle are in excellent terms and friendly relations” (“Good Will” 6). Like Benveniste, Berro remained in close contact with the Sephardic community of Seattle in order to solve internal issues that the Sephardim were experiencing in Los Angeles.

The Sephardic community in the Northwest served as an inspiration to the Southwest, as demonstrated regularly in the Judeo-Spanish bulletin *El Mesajero*. And while Angel includes Seattle in his list of Sephardic cities nationwide that experienced “plagues” similar to those among Sephardim in New York City, the editors of *El Mesajero* only highlighted the progress made by the Sephardim in Seattle. Today, due to concentrated centers of religious and communal activity, Seattle’s Sephardic community5 may be considered more cohesive than those found in Los Angeles and New York City, where Sephardim currently live all throughout these cities.

Language Ideology and Shift among Sephardim
Angel notes that for many Sephardim the first problems experienced in coming to the United States were those on Ellis Island. According to articles published in the New York City Judeo-Spanish newspaper *La Amerika*, Turkish Jews “were not familiar with American immigration laws and did not know how to answer the questions put to them” (89). Such problems were the reason that the editor of *La Amerika*, Moise S. Gadol, published a booklet in 1916
entitled “Livro de Embezar las Linguas Ingleza i Yudish” (“Book for Learning the English and Yiddish Languages”). This served as a guide for Sephardim entering the United States, reviewing information they would need to know in order to become American citizens. Apart from the English component to this text, Yiddish was included so as to serve as a multilingual resource for the Sephardim. One section, “Egzamen por Devener Sudito Amerikano” (“Exam for Becoming an American Citizen”), reviewed possible questions that Sephardim could encounter upon taking their citizenship exam. These sections were printed in the Rashi alphabet, both in Judeo-Spanish as one may expect and in phonetically transliterated English. Gadol advertised this booklet and its various editions over the years of the newspaper’s publication (Kirschen 29).

In *El Mesajero*, Berro regularly contributed articles on how the Sephardim should make a strong effort to learn English. His December 1933 article, “Why ‘The Messenger’ Should Also Publish in English,” discusses the numerous benefits for the Sephardim to become active learners of the English language. He compares the Sephardim with the Ashkenazim, noting that the latter have made numerous strides in their acculturation into the United States, while the Sephardim have a great deal of work ahead of them. He writes, “It is to be regretted that contrary to our brethren, the Eshkenazim who have made a remarkable progress towards the culture and mastery of the English language, we Sephardic Jews, have contributed little to that valuable asset” (6). Berro suggests that the Sephardic community of Los Angeles is indifferent in many aspects and is generally just not interested in reading. Due to these concerns, he writes that *El Mesajero* will begin to also publish articles in English, thereby hoping to encourage readers—especially young ones—to learn the language. Berro also suggests that besides learning English, older Sephardim should be educating their youth on religious and cultural matters since they will be the leaders of the future. Berro suggests that these matters, in particular that of learning English, are fundamental for the Sephardim.

Including articles in English in Judeo-Spanish newspapers was also common in New York City. In August 1934, the editorial board of *El Mesajero* extended its congratulatory remarks to *La Vara* for “su loavle iniciativa de entruduir una seksion ingleza en sus kolunas por el benifisio de nuestra joventud sefaradita,” or “their respectable initiative in introducing a section in English in their columns for the benefit of our Sephardic youth” (“Seksion Ingleza” 2). A month later, editors then suggested that Sephardic communities nationwide commend *La Vara* for introducing articles in English in its columns. They assert that the inclusion of English represents “a step forward toward the preservation
of many of our religious and other institutions in the future” (“English Section” 14). Of course, what they most likely did not consider at that time was that all shifts toward English would serve as a catalyst for the endangerment of their mother tongue in the years—and generations—to follow.

Not only did the Judeo-Spanish press comment on the linguistic hierarchy of English in the United States, but it also expressed various ideologies to its readership in regard to modern Spanish—Castilian. While some Sephardim in Los Angeles and New York City knew of Spanish-speaking populations before arriving in their new territories, those who did not know of these similar speech communities quickly came to realize their soon-to-be geographic and linguistic parallels. Ben-Ur notes, “In the goal to homogenize the two groups, it was clear who bore the burden of linguistic conformity. Ladino, not modern Castilian, was in need of rehabilitation, partly for pragmatic reasons” (Sephardic Jews in America 91). She cites articles in La Vara that would comment both on opportunities to learn modern Spanish for the Sephardim as well as hindrances in learning this variety. In a 1924 article entitled “Kursos Gratis de Lingua Kastiliana” (“Free Courses in the Castilian Language”), the director of organizations and clubs announced that sisterhood activists had asked Spanish professor Leo Pasternak to offer courses in Castilian Spanish to the Sephardim at the Settlement House located at 133 Eldridge Street (Sephardic Jews in America 91). These courses were to be offered twice a week and at no charge to those in attendance. Among those encouraged to enroll in these courses were those, “ke kieren a darsen a komersio kon los paizes de avla espanyola i para akeyos ke bushkan pozisiones de korespondensia i sekretarios en kozas de eksportasion,” that is to say, those “that want to get into business with Spanish-speaking countries and those who are looking for positions as correspondents and secretaries in exportation houses” (“Kursos Gratis” 9). The announcement suggests a number of reasons that the readership should take advantage of this opportunity. The sisterhood encouraged young men and women in particular to attend these courses since the Castilian language was widely used in both speech as well as literature.

While Judeo-Spanish speakers often considered learning Spanish as advantageous, there were also those who wanted to keep a distance established between the two languages, especially within the domains in which they emerged. Maír José Benardete contributed to La Vara on occasion and was accused of writing in Castilian in Hebrew characters, rather than in Judeo-Spanish. Ben-Ur reviews one such 1936 article, “La Boz de Nuestros Lektorees,” in which readers complained about the inclusion of Benardete’s writings in
their newspaper. One reader notes that Benardete “is abusing the columns of La Vara and readers as well… If Professor Benardete wishes to write Castilian, he should write for La Prensa, a Spanish newspaper which appears in New York” (Sephardic Jews in America 92). Regardless of content, the language that Benardete used appeared more similar to that of Castilian than Judeo-Spanish. In this case, it is clear that modern Spanish was not well received nor sought as a beneficial component to their newspaper. Rather, the inclusion of Castilian-like material offended some of La Vara’s readership and caused them to respond by making their discontent widely known to the Sephardic community at large.

**PLACING JUDEO-SPANISH IN THE UNITED STATES TODAY**

As section one reveals, Judeo-Spanish speakers in Los Angeles and New York City saw acculturation into American life as a main priority. Sephardim opted to use English as a visible—and audible—way to present themselves as American. Throughout such a process, they often learned that Yiddish and Hebrew, not Judeo-Spanish, were the Jewish languages of the United States and that Latin American Spanish rather than Judeo-Spanish was the primary Spanish variety in the country. These dynamics are necessary to recognize in order to comprehend the state in which the language finds itself today, as not only a Jewish language and a Romance language, but also as a modern and yet endangered one. In this section, I relate Judeo-Spanish to the theories of language endangerment, heritage languages, metalinguistic communities, diasporic language ideologies, (post-) vernaculars, and social networks. Collectively, these fields help identify the state of the language today in the United States and, in many cases, abroad.

**As an Endangered Language**

Like most languages in the world, Judeo-Spanish is endangered. According to Michael Krauss’s language endangerment typology, Judeo-Spanish would be classified as severely endangered, wherein the language is spoken only by those of the grandparental generation and older. Utilizing Joshua Fishman’s Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (GIDS) would suggest a similar conclusion and place the language at least at Stage 7. In this stage, “most users
of Xish are a socially integrated and ethnolinguistically active population but they are beyond child-bearing age” (*Reversing Language Shift* 87). Given that Judeo-Spanish-speaking populations throughout the world represent different dialects of the language, as well as somewhat unique histories, one could categorize them individually based on the location of the Sephardim. Rey Romero, for example, suggests that the Judeo-Spanish-speaking community in Istanbul is at Stage 7 of Fishman’s GIDS, while those of Salonika and Sarajevo better fit into Stage 8 (65). In Stage 8 of GIDS, “most vestigial users of Xish are socially isolated old folks and Xish needs to be re-assembled from their mouths and memories” (*Reversing Language Shift* 88). No Judeo-Spanish-speaking community appears to fit into Stage 6 since, at this stage, Fishman suggests that younger generations attain the language from older generations. This may have been the case, however, during today’s quadragenarians’ and quinquagenarians’ childhoods, typically acquiring elements of the language from their parents or grandparents. Judeo-Spanish in the United States appears to be situated at Stage 8 along with several other communities of speakers worldwide.

**As a Heritage Language**

Those who do still speak the Judeo-Spanish language no longer use it on a daily basis, as many of their family members with whom they spoke it are deceased, and children of these speakers never acquired nor learned the language. The endangered state of the language positions most of its speakers as heritage speakers. Heritage speakers, according to Guadalupe Valdés, are individuals raised in homes where a language other than English is spoken and who are, to some degree, bilingual in English and the heritage language. To better understand and adapt this definition beyond English, I consider the distinction Elabbas Benmamoun, Silvina Montrul, and Maria Polinsky make between the majority language and the minority language, the former being “typically the language spoken by an ethno-linguistically dominant group in a country or region,” and the latter being the language “spoken by ethnolinguistic minority groups” (10). These two definitions complement one another since the majority language will need to be substituted since it will not always be English. Judeo-Spanish is not only a heritage language within the United States with English as the majority language, but among speakers in Israel with Hebrew as the majority language and Turkey with Turkish as the majority language. While Judeo-Spanish is the mother tongue for most speakers of the language, it is also a heritage language for these speakers. This occurs when the language
has restricted use and often remains in particular domains, such as the home or other familial settings.

As a Metalinguistic Community
Communities of Judeo-Spanish-speaking Sephardim throughout the world often come into contact with one another, not necessarily because of their shared Sephardic rite of Judaism, but due to their shared cultural and specifically linguistic heritage. Due to the establishment of both physical as well as virtual organizations in recent decades, speakers worldwide find themselves working together in an effort to host events and create programs in their local cities, while encouraging other Sephardim to participate. Many of those participating in such activities are highly proficient in Judeo-Spanish, while others see participation as a way to learn about a language that was not passed down to them by older generations. What forms among these participants is what Netta Rose Avineri refers to as a metalinguistic community. Avineri notes that such a community serves as a “framework for diverse participants who experience a strong connection to a language and its speakers but may lack familiarity with them due to historical, personal, and/or communal circumstances” (2). While Avineri’s research concentrates on students of a variety of ages within the United States learning Yiddish within secular realms, Judeo-Spanish speakers often find themselves forming metalinguistic communities as well. One must learn how to become socialized into the culture of the language, whether or not that means actually speaking the language or having competence in it. This socialization allows those involved to understand and take pride in “the past as a way to understand one’s place in the present” (2). Therefore, the Judeo-Spanish global community is very much a metalinguistic one. Since Judeo-Spanish speakers are heritage speakers of their mother tongue, their active and passive proficiencies of the language vary widely. While one might be inclined to assume that younger speakers of Judeo-Spanish are often less proficient, this is not necessarily the case, as older speakers’ proficiencies will differ greatly depending on the community in which they reside and the domains in which they use their language(s).

As a Diasporic Language Ideology
One central characteristic of the Judeo-Spanish-speaking metalinguistic community is their socialization into diasporic language ideologies. Avineri notes
that such an ideology “focuses on linguistic structure as an iconic symbol of Jews’ mobile history. It is related to an ‘endangered’ language ideology in that it focuses on the ways that historical circumstances and forces beyond a community’s control have shaped the fate of a language” (225). In her research, Avineri discusses how introducing learners to the source language of the Yiddish lexicon facilitates the relationship between language and the community’s mobile history. In the case of the Judeo-Spanish language, it is curious to note that speakers have high metalinguistic awareness on the source language of various lexicons in their mother tongue. That is to say, speakers are often aware which lexicon enters Judeo-Spanish from languages other than Castilian. While Avineri explores the socialization of learners of Yiddish and the scope of this study deals with speakers of Judeo-Spanish, the diasporic language ideology performs similarly among learners and speakers of these languages, constructing what it means to be a Jewish language.

As a Post-vernacular
Speakers of Judeo-Spanish often iconize the language as a vehicle of memory traveling back in time over five centuries. The language, therefore, becomes more than a means of communication, but a symbolic remnant of Sephardic culture and history. This is similar to Jeffrey Shandler’s Yiddishland, where Yiddish in secular realms shifts from “a vernacular struggling for recognition of its legitimacy, to its current value as a prized object of heritage” (142). Although the primary purpose of language is to achieve communication between two or more speakers, the semiotics of language allows for the construction of additional meaning. That is to say, while Judeo-Spanish—much like Yiddish—once served primarily vernacular purposes, the language is often utilized as a post-vernacular. While the former values communication, the latter values use of a given language and its extra-symbolic meaning more. Judeo-Spanish as a post-vernacular “might be expected to do work beyond denotation and communication, acting also to preserve culture, promote identity, or stand for the past” (Brink-Danan 117). Thus, as speakers of Judeo-Spanish utilize their language, we must ask whether or not they do so merely for communicative purposes or for reasons beyond the verbalized content of their speech. This concept will prove valuable as we review the sociolinguistic histories of the Judeo-Spanish-speaking informants concerned with this study.
As a Social Network

Judeo-Spanish-speaking Sephardim in the United States are quite heterogeneous. While many share a middle-class or higher social standing today, their individual histories vary a great deal. In order to place all of these speakers into a given collectivity, the theory of the social network is useful to employ. According to Lesley Milroy, a social network “may be seen as a boundless web of ties which reaches out through a whole society, linking people to one another, however remotely” (550). This model is particularly beneficial given that speakers of Judeo-Spanish in the United States are first, one-point-five, or second-generation immigrants in the country. Furthermore, this model “provides a set of procedures for studying small groups where speakers are not discriminated in terms of any kind of social class index” (556). Given the communities in question, an analysis at the macro level does not seem beneficial to understand the internal relations among the Sephardim. However, while analyzing relations between the Judeo-Spanish-speaking Sephardim and Latino speakers of Spanish in Los Angeles and New York City, such an approach may prove useful. Speakers of Judeo-Spanish relate to one another in both strong and weak ties, in which the former represents relations with friends or family and the latter represents those relationships with acquaintances.

Judeo-Spanish speakers are often connected to other speakers of the language, albeit a limited number, and most commonly through relations of kinship. Strong ties between these speakers exist not only due to a blood connection, but also due to similar histories and a common mother tongue. The weak-tie model may be utilized, however, to ascertain the relation between Judeo-Spanish-speaking Sephardim and Spanish-speaking Latinos. Oftentimes, Judeo-Spanish speakers communicate with Spanish-speaking Latinos in various domains. Such weak-tie relations may be the cause for dialect (or language) leveling between Judeo-Spanish and modern Spanish. Milroy notes that in this process, leveling results in the “eradication of socially or locally marked variants (both within and between linguistic systems) in conditions of social or geographical mobility and resultant dialect contact” (565). This is also what Maír José Benardete refers to when Judeo-Spanish speakers who learn Spanish remove and replace features of their language “when confronted with genuine samples of the Spanish language in its modern vigor” (147). Similar to eradication is the concept of erasure, which Judith Irvine and Susan Gal define as “the process in which ideology, in simplifying the sociolinguistic field, renders some persons or activities (or sociolinguistic phenomena) invisible” (38). In this regard, it is expected that erasure will be a prevalent
characteristic in leveling. As Judeo-Spanish speakers shift toward Peninsular and Latin American varieties of Spanish, they enable themselves to create more connections with speakers of Spanish who are outside of their Sephardic network. Oftentimes, however, the use of modern Spanish by Judeo-Spanish-speaking Sephardim results in a great deal of transference from their newly acquired language to their Judeo-Spanish, thus extending the moribund state of their ancestral tongue.

Many speakers are connected with one another virtually through the online listserv Ladinokomunita, established in 2000. This listserv provides a unique case of the strong- vs. weak-tie model. The only requirement for posting in this online forum is that all messages be written in (a dialect of) Judeo-Spanish. Although many members of this virtual network do not speak the language themselves—as either students or researchers—those who most often contribute to the continuous array of conversations are proficient—and often native speakers—of the language. Frequent contributors to this virtual network oftentimes do not know each other, thus establishing a weak-tie connection with one another. However, what is most curious is that, upon reading the forums over the years, members across the globe establish strong-tie connections with one another due to their connection through the Judeo-Spanish language. In reading the forums, one notes that speakers often write that they feel immediate familial connections with other contributors to the forum, particularly due to common shared stories, sayings, and mobile histories. As a result of establishing such strong virtual rapports, members of Ladinokomunita began organizing annual trips (starting in 2007), where participants meet one another and travel to various sites related to Sephardic history. Several of the informants that participated in this study—both from Los Angeles and New York City—have established a social network with one another formed by this virtual community.

METHODOLOGY
This section reviews a number of languages that are frequently part of the Sephardic narrative, along with their domains of utility. In order to explore these domains, I conducted sociolinguistic interviews with twenty-five (n=25) speakers of Judeo-Spanish. Interviews were typically conducted in groups of two and carried out in Judeo-Spanish. Of the twenty-five informants, twelve
reside in the metropolitan area of New York, and thirteen reside in Los Angeles. Informants are first, one-point-five, or second-generation immigrants in the United States.

Twelve of the twenty-five informants in this study are male (n=6 in LA, n=6 in NYC), and thirteen are female (n=7 in LA, n=6 in NYC). Nine informants in the present study were born in the United States, while sixteen informants were born abroad. Those born in the United States were born in New York City, Los Angeles, or Seattle. The locations of those born abroad consist of cities throughout Turkey (Istanbul, Izmir, Milas) and Greece (Thessaloniki, Kavalla, Rhodes) as well as Italy (Milan), Bulgaria (Sofia), Mexico (Mexico D.F.), Rhodesia (Salisbury and Que Que—current-day Harare and Kwekwe, Zimbabwe), and Cuba (Havana). Several of those born outside the United States grew up in countries other than those in which they were born, including France, Spain, and Israel. The average number of years living in the United States for those born abroad is forty-seven. This range encompasses informants who arrived nearly seventy-five years ago, at the age of five or six, and as little as ten years ago in the exceptional case of the youngest informant to this study. The mean age of participants in this study is 74.25, which is quite telling in regard to who speaks the language today. The language is not being transmitted to younger generations, with the rare occasion of passive acquisition. The oldest participant in this study is eighty-nine years old, while the youngest is forty-three. My study consists of two quadragenarians, one quinquagenarian, four sexagenarians, eight septuagenarians, and ten octogenarians. The existence of a speaker below the age of fifty is quite rare today; these speakers typically share similar narratives in growing up with their nona or vava (grandmother) at home. The mean age for participants in New York City is seventy-two and for Los Angeles is seventy-six. The mean age of all males participating in this study is 69.25 and of females is 78.75.

Throughout this study, I follow a similar system of coding participants to that of Romero. Aside from coding for gender and age, I also indicate the city in which participants reside. For example, M_{LA}76 is a seventy-six-year-old male participant residing in Los Angeles. Correspondingly, F_{NY}88 is an eighty-eight-year-old female participant residing in New York. The following data comes from these interviews.
DIGLOSSIC DISTRIBUTION
Using selections from the sociolinguistic interviews described above, this section reveals the multilingual nature of the Sephardim. I describe the diglossic distribution of my participant pool, a term that I use to explore the languages that participants speak in addition to the domains in which they use each of them. Aside from Sephardim speaking a variety of languages—several mentioned in earlier sections—I examine patterns of participant narratives that demonstrate the unique roles in which these languages function in relation to Judeo-Spanish. In this section, I discuss Turkish and Greek as secret languages, Hebrew as the language of recitation, French as the language of the elite, Portuguese as the language of comparison, and perceived prestige among modern Spanish dialects. I then discuss the concept of linguistic insecurity, code-switching, and code-shifting as evidenced by (proficient) participants of this study.

Diglossia
One of the most useful sociolinguistic models that may be applied to Judeo-Spanish-speaking Sephardim is that of diglossia. The term diglossia describes domains of language use when there is more than one language used in a given community. This community can be a single city, state, or country. Charles Ferguson developed this theory in exploring varieties of the same language. After assessing the domains in which speakers used Classical Arabic (Fusha) compared to Colloquial Arabic (Darija or Ammiyyah) in Arabic-speaking countries, Ferguson determined that diglossia could be divided into two tiers: High (H) and Low (L). Classical Arabic, Fusha, would be the High variety of the language, given its prestige and connection to liturgical texts such as the Quran. The community at large must learn this variety. The native varieties of Arabic, Ammiyyah or Darija, are the colloquial vernaculars of Arabic, and thus classified as the Low variety. Further research he conducted comparing German and Swiss-German in Switzerland and French and Creole in Haiti strengthened his argument that each variety of language pertained to a specific social territory. He notes that speakers of a given language, where linguistic variety is a staple in society, are nurtured into diglossic behavior and understanding. Ferguson posits that the High (H) variety is typically the prestigious one, often associated with literary history, education, and religion. This variety, which may vary in any linguistic branch from its lower (L) counterpart, is often a learned variety, and not acquired as a native tongue. The Low (L) variety of
diglossia is used to describe one's mother tongue, which is often spoken in the home and more familiar domains.

Subsequent theory on diglossia has expanded the original model and allowed for the inclusion of speech communities that may use two typologically distant languages in the High and Low domains. Shortly after Ferguson published his theory of diglossia, additional research by scholars in related fields expanded upon this model. Joan Rubin’s research in Paraguay was pivotal for the theoretical extension of diglossia. Diglossia, as attested to by Ferguson, explored the relation of varieties of a given related language and their unique domains. Rubin, however, documented the linguistically unrelated languages of Guarani and Spanish, which were used side by side in a similar socio-linguistic manner that Ferguson initially described by means of diglossia.

Soon after, Fishman suggested the term *extended diglossia*, accounting for such cases reported by Rubin. Fishman’s theoretical extension of diglossia, therefore, described sociolinguistic phenomena that occur when two language varieties, related to one another or not, are utilized in distinct ways within a given speech community. Fishman explains that High and Low varieties are still relevant to this extended understanding of diglossia. Whereas the High variety is utilized in the domains of high culture—education, religion, and politics—the Low variety is employed throughout the home, social gatherings, and work. His own research, based on Yiddish and Hebrew, fits appropriately into this extended model. He describes Yiddish (pre-World War II) as the L variety whereas Hebrew served as the H variety. Yiddish (L) would be used for intragroup communication, while Hebrew (H) would serve religious, cultural, and liturgical purposes.

Ferguson’s theory of diglossia, along with Fishman’s extended diglossia, should be considered when dealing with language description and typology as well as historical linguistics. Given that languages are often in contact with one another within and across nations, diglossia may serve as an appropriate theoretical model in exploring the multidimensional sociolinguistic patterns within a speech community. Related fields, such as bilingualism or contact linguistics, complement the theory of diglossia, varying, however, in both their approach and end goal. While bilingualism may be present in a diglossic community, it is used to describe the linguistic behavior and knowledge of a speaker. Diglossia, however, serves to describe the linguistic organization at the socio-cultural level. Diglossia is often related to bilingualism as various languages or language varieties/repertoires are involved. Exploring a particular speech community will reveal the degree of bilingualism among speakers, the
sociolinguistic situation of diglossia, and whether or not these two phenomena are intertwined.

**Turkish and Greek as Secret Languages**

Many Sephardim report that their parents hardly spoke in Judeo-Spanish, and that they learned whatever they know from their grandparents, from *dichas* (sayings) to *konsejas* (stories). Those who do recall their parents speaking in Judeo-Spanish note that their parents only spoke it when they did not want them—their children—to understand what they were saying. Tracy Harris accounts for this phenomenon in her research, stating that many youth understood more than their parents thought they did (167). This is one of the domains that Harris suggests Judeo-Spanish inhabits today, as the “secret language” of the Sephardim. Although the participants in my study are all highly proficient in Judeo-Spanish, they have slightly different narratives, still relating to this concept. M_{NY}85—born in New York City, residing in Los Angeles during his adult life, and whose parents were born in Salonika—comments that his parents spoke in Turkish, Greek, or Bulgarian when they didn’t want him to understand what they were saying. He notes that for his parents, having lived in the Balkans, this was a natural way of life and communication for them. Similarly, participant M_{NY}53 notes that Turkish and Greek were the “go-to” languages for his parents since Judeo-Spanish was the language of the household for everyone. He notes,

(1a.) En mi kaza siempre se avlava todo en ladino, i kuando no kerian ke los ijikos entendieran, avlavan en turko, si no turko, grego.

(1b.) In my house, Judeo-Spanish was always spoken, and when they [the parents] didn’t want the kids to understand, they spoke in Turkish, if not Turkish, Greek.

This is often the reason that, apart from of Judeo-Spanish, several participants are familiar with certain words or phrases in Turkish or Greek; this is due to acquiring them at a young age. Similarly, younger generations of Sephardim in the United States share passive knowledge of Judeo-Spanish since their parents would use the language with each other when they did not want their child(ren) to be a part of the conversation, thus believing that their child did not understand. Participant F_{NY}80—born in Manhattan, raised in Brooklyn,
and whose parents were from Salonika—recalled a difference in the languages her parents spoke at home depending on the subject matter. She comments:

(2a.) Mis parientes avlavan en grego kuando no kerian ke mozotros entendiaramos lo ke estavan avlando, i kuando avlavan en turko era importante ke no saviamos lo ke estavan avlando.

(2b.) My parents spoke in Greek when they didn’t want us to understand what they were saying, and when they spoke in Turkish it was very important that we didn’t understand what they were speaking about.

Judeo-Spanish, however, was her first language—she only learned English when she began school. In this case, her parents made a conscious decision about which language to use based on the topic and possible understanding by their daughter.

Hebrew as the Language of Recitation

Informants of this study indicated a wide range of proficiencies in Hebrew, ranging from a few words and phrases to fluency. Those fluent in Hebrew typically spent a number of years in Israel, such as participant MLA86, who lived there for seventeen years. Others either went to a kibbutz, ulpan, or rabbinical school in Israel. Only a select number of participants are highly proficient in Hebrew, all of whom are males. This does not come as a surprise, however, since it is the man who often learns Hebrew to utilize not only in communicative contexts but also for religious purposes. In most traditional ceremonies, men carry out the reading of prayers in Hebrew.

On the other side of the spectrum, several participants—both male and female—express various degrees of proficiency in Hebrew, but only in certain domains. That is to say, these participants are/were able to read Hebrew for religious purposes, most of the time without understanding what they are/were reading. This is a common experience, however, not just for the Sephardim. In the United States, like many countries outside of Israel, Jewish youth participate in some sort of religious after-school program in order to prepare them for their Bar or Bat Mitzvah ceremony, a service that officially recognizes them as an adult. Participants would regularly go to these schools after attending a day of public—secular—education. Such a ceremony varies based on the country in question as well as the period of time referenced. Many of the participants in this study—either raised in Turkey or the United States—noted that they
learned enough Hebrew to read the language, a skill oftentimes forgotten years after attending religious school if they did not continue attending synagogue services. These religious schools, regularly known as Talmud Torah (literally, the study of Torah), placed reading Hebrew (mostly biblical but sometimes modern) as a high-function domain. In this setting, being able to read Hebrew serves as the prestigious H variety, which must be learned, and is valued over communicative acts of proficiency in the language.

While most of my informants were too young to remember newspapers in Judeo-Spanish, participant MNY86 comments that once he learned the Hebrew alphabet in preparation for his Bar Mitzvah, he began to read the La Vara newspaper that his parents would receive. He notes that, while he did not actually understand when reading Hebrew in the Hebrew alphabet, he was able to understand articles in Judeo-Spanish written in the Hebrew alphabet. This case seems common in reviewing Denah Levy’s research of Sephardim from Izmir in New York as of the early 1940s, noting that younger generations of Sephardim did not usually learn how to read or write in Judeo-Spanish. Proficiency in the Hebrew alphabet, nevertheless, was attained upon studying Hebrew. While literacy in Judeo-Spanish was more common among men due to a greater number being enrolled in some sort of Hebrew school, women did account for some of the readership of Judeo-Spanish periodicals (Ben-Ur, “Ladino Press”).

As Bar Mitzvahs became a part of Sephardic culture—primarily due to Ashkenazi influence—Sephardim would often deliver their Bar Mitzvah speeches in Judeo-Spanish with smatterings of religious quotations and expressions in Hebrew throughout. This was the case for MLA85 and a number of testimonies recounted by Hank Halio (62). Among Sephardim today, Bar Mitzvah speeches are no longer delivered in Judeo-Spanish; however, the use of terms and proverbs in Hebrew is still commonplace alongside a predominantly English discourse.

**French as the Language of the Elite**

Several participants, either born abroad or whose parents were born abroad, were proficient in French. This is due to the fact that they attended L’Alliance Israélite Universelle, a chain of schools established throughout the Ottoman Empire that sought to educate—and westernize—the Jews. One way in which L’Alliance accomplished such a task was by making the French language the primary language of instruction and “remapping the linguistic and cultural
terrain of Jews in these regions” (Rodrigue and Stein xxv). Sephardim often replaced their everyday Judeo-Spanish with French, believing it to be more modern, intellectual, and rich in culture. Aron Rodrigue states that the positioning of French as the elite language situated all other languages of the Sephardim at the peripheries, noting that “the place given to French as the language of mass education created a non-integrated polyglot Jewry unprepared for the requirements of the new nation-state” (172). Despite being exposed to a variety of languages, the Sephardim often received most of their academic training in French.

FNY80 notes that when her mother came to New York, she used her knowledge of French to pronounce common street names in New York City. She recalls:

(3a.) Mi madre kuando era chika en Salonik, estava estudiendo en l’alliance fransez, i kuando vinieron aki en New Y oor k, estava kaminando por las kayes—Orshád Street, not Orchard Street—Orshád, Delancé Street, not Delancey. So, everything with the French accent.9

(3b.) When my mother was little in Salonika, she was studying at L’Alliance, and when they [the parents] came here in New Y ork, she was walking in the street—Orshád Street, not Orchard Street—Orshád, Delancé Street, not Delancey. So, everything with the French accent.

This example illustrates that the French language—and the ideologies associated with it—may have even affected the way in which Sephardim learned English in the United States.

**Portuguese as the Language of Comparison**

While most informants related the roots of the Judeo-Spanish language to Castilian Spanish, some recognize the greater peninsular connection to the language, the Portuguese element.10 Some participants believe that, in some ways, Judeo-Spanish is more similar to Portuguese than Spanish, despite none of them being proficient in any variety of Portuguese. This was the case for MLA85, MNY66, FLA80, and FNY80, all born and raised in New Y ork City to parents from Salonika, Greece. FŁA80 comments on Judeo-Spanish,

(4a.) Me parese a mi komo portugez, komo avlan los portugezes; los sonidos son muy suaves.

(4b.) To me, it seems like Portuguese, how the Portuguese speak; the sounds are very pleasant.
These comments are not surprising, however, since Salonikan Judeo-Spanish shares certain features with Portuguese, such as the initial –f in fazer ‘to do’ and fijo ‘son’. Portuguese also shares a number of other features with different Judeo-Spanish dialects not necessarily related to Salonikan Judeo-Spanish. Like Judeo-Spanish, Portuguese includes the phonemes /ʃ/ and /ʒ/, as well as many equivalent lexemes. Furthermore, and most likely outside of the metalinguistic detection of any informant, Brazilian Portuguese raises unstressed /e/ → [i] and /o/ → [u] as do certain dialects of Judeo-Spanish, attested and produced by our Rhodesli informants.

**Perceived Prestige among Modern Spanish Dialects**

Because participants’ families can be traced to Spain and their language is an aural remnant of this period dating back over five centuries, informants often hold much nostalgia for the land from which their ancestors came. Many participants have never stepped foot in Spain, while others commented that they have traveled to the country in the past. One pattern among the participants, however, is that they regard Peninsular Spanish—which they regularly call Castilian—to be more prestigious and purer than that of the Spanish spoken in the Americas. There is a strong preference for Peninsular Spanish over varieties spoken in other countries that are more representative of the Spanish-speaking populations within the United States. F_{LA}80 notes:

(5a.) La djente en Nu York, kreo ke avlan mucho (sic) puertorikenyo i kubano i es muy difer[ente], i para mi no es el puro espanyol.

(5b.) The people in New York speak Puerto Rican and Cuban [Spanish] and it is very differ[ent], and for me, that is not pure Spanish.

Sharing a similar belief, F_{NY}80 notes that she has a difficult time understanding Puerto Ricans speaking Spanish, due to how fast they speak the language. F_{NY}76 also prefers Castilian Spanish, despite the fact that she often hears Dominican Spanish spoken around her neighborhood. She describes Dominican Spanish as being unique in that:

(6a.) No tienen konsonantos alkavo de los biervos . . . los ke lavoran, los dominikanos.

(6b.) They don’t have consonants at the end of their words . . . those that work [here], the Dominicans.
FNY76 then proceeds to provide examples of speech that contain word
final deletion as well as word final nasalization, features associated with
Dominican—and other varieties of Caribbean—Spanish.12

Another informant, MNY53, notes that he works with people from Latin
America who speak Spanish every day, each in the Spanish of his or her home
country. In regard to how he communicates with them, he states:

(7a.) Yo trato de avlar kon—trato, no se si lo ago, ma trato de avlar kon—
el espanyol, kon el aksento de Espanya ke me agrada.

(7b.) I try to speak—I try, but I don’t know if I do it, but I try to speak—in
Spanish, with the accent from Spain, which I like.

He explains that he always utilizes this variety of Spanish regardless of
the origin of his Spanish-speaking interlocutor. Furthermore, despite infre-
quent contact with Spaniards, he states that he has not advertently or inad-
vertently shifted to any Latin American variety of the language. MLA43, on the
other hand, remarks that ever since he moved to Los Angeles ten years ago
from Turkey, the variety of modern Spanish he speaks has changed. He recalls:

(8a.) El problema es ke kuando yo vine aki tuvi muncha difikulta porke
kuando yo yegi aki avlava el kastilyano de Espanya, i kon aksento
espanyol, pero desafortunadamente ya se me perdio (sic)—avlo mas
kon aksento mehikano.13

(8b.) The problem is that when I came here I had a lot of difficulty because
when I arrived here I spoke Spanish from Spain and with a Spanish
accent. Unfortunately, I lost it—I speak more with a Mexican accent.

When asked why he considered this to be unfortunate, he reiterated that
he had first learned Peninsular Spanish in Turkey, and that was his preferred
variety of the language. Participants do not often elaborate on why they prefer
one dialect to the other, but given their familial origins in Spain, we can conjec-
ture why many Sephardim hold such ideologies close to heart.

**Linguistic Insecurity**

Participants in this study often remarked that they had not spoken Judeo-
Spanish in—or for—such a long time. Several commented that they rarely use
the language, even if they are in frequent contact with someone who is profi-
cient in it, such as a spouse or sibling. It is clear that Judeo-Spanish is never
the preferred language of communication among the Sephardim today, given their proficiencies in a number of other languages. Other participants noted that they use Judeo-Spanish often but rarely have entire conversations in it. The production of certain words, expressions, and songs seems to be the remnants of the language for most speakers today. For some, speaking in Judeo-Spanish during the entire sociolinguistic interview proved challenging, and several commented on how proud they felt for “staying in the language” for so long. Others, however, often turned to me to ask how to say certain words in Judeo-Spanish. MLA85, in preparation for our interview, brought a Judeo-Spanish to English dictionary, as well as his wife’s Spanish to English dictionary. He mentioned that he often refers to the Spanish to English dictionary since Judeo-Spanish and modern Spanish are so similar.

Several participants displayed various degrees of linguistic insecurity while speaking. Jack C. Richards and Richard W. Schmidt note that linguistic insecurities are “experienced by speakers or writers about some aspect of their language use or about the variety of language they speak,” resulting in “modified speech, when speakers attempt to alter their way of speaking in order to sound more like the speakers of a prestige variety” (31). During the sociolinguistic interviews, linguistic insecurity was present; however, no participant felt that Judeo-Spanish was a jargon or any less important than other varieties of Spanish. Whether or not participants approximate modern Spanish varieties in their Judeo-Spanish speech may not necessarily be due to linguistic insecurity, as it is often the case that recurrent contact with modern Spanish has altered their lesser-used Judeo-Spanish.

**Code-switching and Code-shifting**

Harris’s *Death of a Language* carefully explores code-switching (Poplack) and code-shifting (Silva-Corvalán) among Judeo-Spanish speakers in New York City, Los Angeles, and cities throughout Israel. One theory of differentiation between these terms is that while code-switching occurs when speakers implement two or more languages in a given dialogue (within a single sentence, constituent, or throughout sentences), code-shifting occurs when speakers try to maintain conversation in a language that is not their dominant one, thus utilizing other—and more proficient languages—in their discourse. These are phenomena that can be witnessed throughout several of my informants’ comments, which I include throughout this study. Harris’s findings suggest that code-switching and code-shifting are the most salient characteristics of Judeo-
Spanish today, whereas English and modern Spanish lexicons most regularly appear in Judeo-Spanish speech in the United States. In fact, among her ninety-one informants, Harris notes, “There was rarely a sentence uttered by the informants that did not contain some kind of recent borrowing from English, modern Spanish, French, or Hebrew” (191). Outside of Los Angeles and New York City, FitzMorris’s research also indicates a similar trend in code-shifting among Judeo-Spanish speakers in Seattle, particularly among Los Ladineros (8).

While code-switching and code-shifting were also evident throughout my informants’ speech, Harris’s findings do not concur with mine. That is to say, informants in my study did not code-switch to the same (high) degree that Harris’s did. This is most likely due to the design of my study and selection of participants; I sought out speakers who acknowledged their ability and willingness to speak in Judeo-Spanish for extended periods of time. Like Harris, my informants were native—or heritage—speakers of the language, each representing unique sociolinguistic histories. It is very likely that of the dozens of informants who could have participated in my study but did not, either due to linguistic insecurity or actual low proficiencies in the language, many would have shown high levels of code-shifting.

CONCLUDING DISCUSSION

Linguistic patterns among Sephardim in the United States can be traced to the development of nationalistic ideologies that have encouraged this group to become “American” and speak English. These ideologies can be observed throughout the Judeo-Spanish press, which reached metropolises of speakers prior to World War II, thereby altering the linguistic landscape of their communities. Furthermore, many speakers today deem varieties of modern Spanish—either Peninsular or Latin American—more valuable in society given the ethnolinguistic makeup of the United States. Some speakers contribute their rather fast ability to learn modern Spanish to their familiarity with Judeo-Spanish, using their mother tongue as a platform to develop proficiency in the language. In this respect, MNY53 believes:

(9a.) Si no lo uviera savido [el ladino], no kreygo ke uviera podido ambezarme el espanyol moderno i estar al nivel ke esto.
If I hadn’t known [Judeo-Spanish], I don’t believe that I would have been able to learn modern Spanish and be at the level that I am in it.

Since Judeo-Spanish is a minority language and typically not known about among non-Jewish speakers of modern Spanish, the Sephardim are the ones who have become aware of such linguistic differences, not the other way around. Given that modern Spanish is more widespread than Judeo-Spanish in the United States and abroad, it serves as a majority language in which many Sephardim become proficient. This contrasts with Judeo-Spanish in that its speakers were to acquire the language as their first or heritage language.

Aside from modern Spanish, Sephardim exhibit proficiency in a number of languages outlined throughout this article. These languages pertain to the mobile history of their ancestors and to those with which they have come into contact. In regard to Judeo-Spanish speakers in the United States, however, it appears that their diglossic distribution currently places these languages in unique domains, most of which have disappeared with the passing of older generations of Sephardim. Judeo-Spanish may be pushed to the peripheries of use for most speakers today; however, it continues to reappear in a variety of religious, familial, and social gatherings among speakers of the language.

The analysis of sociolinguistic narratives from twenty-five Judeo-Spanish speakers in two of the largest Sephardic populations in the United States reveals a great deal about how the language and culture of the Sephardim has developed throughout the country over the past century. Although Judeo-Spanish, the mother tongue of all informants of this study, is only one of the several languages spoken by the Sephardim, it allows for extended utility. The Sephardim’s overall detachment from Judeo-Spanish has found new life for the language given close contact—both geographically as well as linguistically—with other Spanish-speaking populations. While replacing Judeo-Spanish with modern Spanish continues to endanger the ethnolinguistic vitality of the mother tongue of many Sephardim, speakers have chosen practicality over their former linguistic ways; Sephardim in Los Angeles and New York City utilize Judeo-Spanish as a platform to learn varieties of Spanish outside of their Sephardic networks.
Notes

2. This is according to modern day borders. Rhodes, formerly part of the Ottoman Empire, came under the control of the Italians in 1912. Rhodes became a part of Greece in 1947.
3. In 1975, the move to STTI was made from their prior location at 1561 W. Santa Barbara Avenue (Martin Luther King Boulevard today). In 1981 the sanctuary of STTI was completed.
4. I have constructed this timeline from a variety of sources including: 1) Angel and Rome; 2) Benveniste; 3) Hasson; 4) Hattem; and 5) various editions of *El Mesajero* (1933–35).
5. Consisting of both Turkish (Sephardic Bikur Holim) and Rhodesli (Ezra Bessaroth) congregations.
6. The moderators of the forum also request the use of the National Authority of Ladino’s Aki Yerushalayim convention of orthography. I have been an active member of this forum for the past five years. For further information on Ladinokomunita as a Digital Home Land or (Post) Vernacular see 1) Held; and 2) Brink-Danan.
7. An ulpan is an intensive course for learning Hebrew.
8. *La Vara*, the last Judeo-Spanish newspaper in the United States, stopped publishing its paper as of 1948.
10. For a historical overview of Judeo-Spanish in contact with Portuguese, see Quintana.
11. While in broad terms *castellano* can refer to the Spanish language, in narrow terms it refers to the Castilian Spanish of Spain. Informants typically utilize the term “Castilian” to refer to the narrow definition, differentiating the Spanish spoken in Spain from the Spanish spoken in Latin America. They seem to be unaware of the variety of Spanish spoken in Southern Spain, which contains a considerable number of features in common with Latin American varieties.
12. Her remarks make it clear that she is cognizant of word final deletion (“no tienen konsonantes alkavo de los biervos”) as a feature of Dominican Spanish, but makes no reference to nasalization, which she also most likely perceives as deletion.
13. One familiar with Judeo-Spanish lexicon, syntax, and phonology will notice modern Spanish influence in MLA43’s comment, or possibly, shifting between Judeo-Spanish and modern Spanish.
14. Of Harris’s ninety-one informants, n=28 in NY, n=35 in LA, n=28 throughout Israel.
15. According to FitzMorris, the Ladineros are a “self-selected group coming together to practice and preserve the Judeo-Spanish language” (8).
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