Romance in Contact With Semitic

Daniele Baglioni, Department of Humanities, Ca' Foscari University of Venice

https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.424

Published online: 29 September 2021

Summary

All through their history, Romance languages have been variously influenced by Arabic and Hebrew. The most relevant influence has been exerted by Arabic on Ibero-Romance and Sicilian in the Middle Ages, from, respectively, the Umayyad conquest of al-Andalus (711–716) and the Aghlabid attack on Sicily (827). Significant factors favoring Romance–Arabic contact have also been trade in the medieval Mediterranean (especially between Italy and the Crusader States), scientific translations from Arabic into Latin (notably those made in 13th-century Castilia), and medieval and early modern travelogues and pilgrimages, whereas of lesser importance are more recent lexical exchanges due to colonialism in North Africa and immigration, which have had a considerable impact on French. As for Hebrew, its influence has been quantitatively less relevant and mostly mediated through other languages (Greek and Latin, the Judeo-Romance languages, English). Still, it is of capital importance on a cultural level, at least as far as biblical loanwords shared by all Romance languages are concerned.

Effects of Semitic influence on Romance are almost exclusively limited to lexical borrowing, in the form of both loanwords and loan translations, regarding several semantic fields, such as agriculture, architecture, clothing, medicine, natural sciences, and seafaring (Arabic); religion and liturgy (Hebrew); and anthroponomy (Hebrew and Arabic). Only in individual dialects does structural interference occur, as is the case with *pantesco*, the Sicilian variety of Pantelleria, which shows traces of both phonological and syntactic contact-induced changes. Finally, though not belonging to the Romance linguistic family, a very peculiar case is represented by Maltese, the Semitic language of Malta that, throughout its history, has been strongly influenced by Sicilian and—to a lesser extent—by Italian both in its lexicon and in its grammar.

Keywords: Romance languages and Arabic, Romance languages and Hebrew, language contact, lexical borrowing, loanword adaptation, phonological interference, morphological and syntactic interference

Subjects: Historical Linguistics, Language Families/Areas/Contact

1. Introduction

The coexistence over centuries of Romance-speaking and Semitic populations in the Mediterranean basin has led to reciprocal long-lasting language contact. All Romance languages have been involved in this process, although unequally: Ibero-Romance and Italo-Romance (especially Sicilian) have been strongly affected, whereas other languages, such as Romanian, have only undergone a superficial and indirect influence.

As for Semitic languages, the most prominent role has been played by Arabic, notably in Moorish Spain (711–1492) and Muslim Sicily (827–1091), where interlinguistic contact between the Arab rulers and the indigenous Romance speakers was direct and impacted every aspect of daily life. Less intense, but still very relevant on both a linguistic and a cultural level, has been the contribution of Hebrew (and Aramaic), whose influence has been mediated first through the Greek and Latin translations of the Bible and later, from the Late Middle Ages on, through the Judeo-Romance languages. The other Semitic languages have had no influence on Romance, except for a very limited number of Amharic, Tigrinya, and Somali loanwords to be found in Italian (*amba* 'table-top mountain in Ethiopia' < Amharic *ambā*, *sciamma* 'long cotton robe' < Amharic *šāmmā*, *dubat* 'Somali soldier of Italian colonial troops' < Somali *duub ʻad* 'white turban'), as a consequence of Italian colonialism in East Africa (Nichil, 2016).

Although Medieval Spanish and Sicilian show traces of Arabic interference at all levels, including phonology, morphology, and syntax, in most of the cases the effects of contact have been limited to the lexical sphere. Semitic loanwords in the Romance languages include both direct borrowings and structural calques, pertaining to several semantic domains, from trade, agriculture, botany, medicine, and astronomy (Arabic) to religion and religious practices (Hebrew), whereas Romance loans in Semitic mostly comprise commercial and seafaring terms, as well as administrative and bureaucratic vocabulary in the former French colonies of North Africa. A very peculiar case is represented by Maltese, originally an Arabic dialect, whose enduring exposure to Sicilian and Italian has had relevant repercussions not only on its lexicon but also on its phonological and morphosyntactic structures.

2. Romance in Contact With Arabic

2.1 Historical Background

The Arab expansion across the Mediterranean started soon after the death of the Prophet Muḥammad, in the year 632, and reached Europe in the first decade of the 8th century, at the time of the Umayyad conquest of Hispania (711–716). By 732, Muslim armies had crossed the Pyrenees and reached the city of Tours in France, where they were defeated by Charles Martel and gradually forced back to the Iberian Peninsula. Approximately a century later, in 827, the Aghlabid emirs of Ifrīqiyya attacked Sicily, thus inaugurating the Arab conquest of the island, which concluded in 902 (with the sole exception of Rometta, put under Muslim control in 965). Finally, in 870, during the Sicilian campaign, the Maltese Archipelago was invaded and repopulated with Arabic-speaking colonizers (Brincat, 1995).

These events had heavy repercussions on the political, economic, and linguistic history of Europe, especially the Romance-speaking regions (Norman, 1979). As a matter of fact, in a vast territory corresponding to almost one third of the *orbis romanicus* (Pellegrini, 1972, p. 43), the local population happened to be in daily contact with the Arabic-speaking community, which included not only the Arab elite but also Berbers and Jews, both early arabized. This situation was ephemeral in the north of the Iberian Peninsula, where the Christian *Reconquista* had begun already in the 8th century and led to the foundation of new states, such as the Kingdom of Asturias (718 or 722) and the County of Barcelona (801). However, in the rest of the Arab-ruled Romance-speaking world, the so-called *Romania Arabica* (Kontzi, 1998a, p. 329), cultural and linguistic contact between the locals and the dominant group was much longer and steadier, especially in Sicily and southern Spain (al-Andalus), where Romance–Semitic bilingualism not only flourished until, respectively, the Norman conquest (1091) and the Fall of Granada (1492), but also survived after the Muslim defeat, encouraged or at least tolerated by the local authorities. In these areas, linguistic contact affected above all oral conversation, leading to the formation of peculiar spoken varieties of both Romance and Arabic, such as Andalusi Romance or Romandalusí (also dubbed Mozarabic: Galmés de Fuentes, 1983) and Hispano-Arabic (or Andalusi Arabic: Corriente, 1977, 1992; Institute of Islamic Studies of the University of Zaragoza, 2013) (see ORE of Linguistics article "Ibero-Romance II: Astur-Leonese, Spanish, Navarro-Aragonese *<https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.718>*"), as well as the so-called Sicilian Mozarabic (Varvaro, 1981, p. 116) and Siculo-Arabic (Agius, 1996). Written records of Arabic–Romance contact are few and mostly limited to the Romance words occurring in Arabic texts or, as far as only Ibero-Romance is concerned, to the final refrains (*kharjas*) of Andalusi poems known as *muwaššaḥāt*, which were composed in the local Romance vernaculars written in Arabic and — to a lesser extent — Hebrew script (Stern, 1964). An exceptional case is represented by Malta, where the Arabic-speaking population outnumbered the Romance-speaking community, thus allowing the preservation of the local Semitic variety until the present, despite the considerable traces of Italian (Sicilian) influence (Brincat, 2011; Kontzi, 1998b).

At the end of the 11th century, while Christendom regained Sicily, Malta, and the Spanish city of Toledo, the experience of the Crusades led to new forms of cultural and linguistic contact between Romance and Arabic speakers, this time in the heart of the Muslim world. Although the Kingdom of Jerusalem (1099–1291) and the other Crusader states in the Holy Land and Asia Minor had a relatively short existence, leaving very few traces in both the Romance (mostly French) varieties of the "Latins" and the local Arabic dialects (Minervini, 2012, 2016), the subsequent opening or reopening of commercial routes between Western Europe and the Middle East favored a continuous and long-lasting exchange of men, goods, and also commercial terms, involving the most dynamic harbors and markets in the West, such as Pisa, Genoa, and Venice. These terms were then further diffused to other non-Mediterranean languages, most notably by French and, through French and Italian, to English and German.

More or less in the same centuries, in the "reconquered" regions of Spain (above all Castile) and in Norman and Swabian Sicily, Romance/Arabic contacts continued thanks to the many Muslims who remained in those areas, eventually converting to Christianity or preserving their Islamic faith (as in the case of the Spanish *mudéjares*). Bilingualism and, as far as Jews were concerned, trilingualism Romance/Arabic/Hebrew were not only diffused among the population but also incentivized in the local courts, where enlightened sovereigns such as Roger II of Sicily (1130–1154), Frederick II Hohenstaufen (1220–1250), and Alfonso X "the

Wise” of Castile (1252–1284) promoted translations of the most important Arabic scientific and philosophical treatises. The city of Toledo, where already in the first half of the 12th century the Archbishop Raymond had gathered a team of translators including Christians, Muslims, and Jews, became in the Alphonsine age the most important center of direct transmission of Arabic knowledge to medieval Europe (Bossong, 1979). The diffusion of the Toledan translations (together with those made in the Ebro valley) from Castile to the rest of Europe irradiated, generally through Latin, a great amount of scientific loanwords to the other European languages (see section 2.2).

The 13th century represented the acme of the cultural and linguistic contacts between the Arabs and the Western Europeans. However, in the same century the defeat of the Almohads at Las Navas de Tolosa (1212) and, on the Eastern front, the Mongol Sack of Baghdad, the capital of the Abbasid Empire (1258), hastened the decline of the Arab powers, whose place in the Muslim world would soon have been taken by the Ottoman Empire. As a result, in the Modern Era the amount of Arabic loanwords in the Romance languages dramatically decreased. Furthermore, in this epoch Arabic loans were normally mediated through Turkish, not only in those languages whose speakers neither had nor had had previously any contact with Arabs, such as Romanian, but also in Italian and in the other Romance languages of the Mediterranean. Only in the Iberian Peninsula, between the second half of the 15th century and the early 17th century, a form of direct Romance/Arabic contact did continue within the community of the *moriscos* (i.e., Muslims who had publicly converted to Christianity) but mostly maintained Islamic practices in secret. Moriscos preserved the Arabic script as a religious identity marker, but since they were all linguistically hispanized, and most of them incapable of writing correct Arabic, they used the Arabic script to transcribe Spanish (on this peculiar allographic tradition, the so-called *literatura aljamiado-morisca*, see the vast online bibliography gathered by Suárez García & Roza Candás, 2018).

This situation only changed in the 19th century, when the French (and, to a much lesser extent, Italian and Spanish) colonization of North Africa led to a renewed, on-the-spot exchange of vocabulary between Maghrebi Arabic and Romance. Nevertheless, contact in the colonial context was less intense than in medieval Iberia and Sicily and affected more the local Arabic dialects than the Romance languages of the colonizers. As a result, only in Algeria the presence of French occupation forces for over 130 years (1830–1962) allowed the transmission of a significant amount of loanwords from Arabic into the slang of the French soldiers and, through it, into common French (Christ, 1991). In Tunisia, in the first decades of the 20th century, daily on-the-spot contacts between the Arabic-speaking population and the large community of Sicilian immigrates led to the formation of a Sicilian/Tunisian Arabic (and French) mixed dialect, which was parodied by the local Italian-language newspaper *Simpaticuni* (Lakhdhar, 2006). However, this dialect was ephemeral and apparently left no traces either in Sicilian or in Italian.

After World War II, contact between Arabic and Romance was mostly mediated through international press and has concerned almost exclusively Islam and the political institutions of the Arab states. Consequently, loanwords have been few and generally shared with all other European languages. Moreover, almost all the loanwords have been borrowed from English (i.e., the language of the international media), as is often revealed by their spelling (section 2.2). However, a relevant exception is represented by spoken French. As a matter of fact, the wide diffusion of Maghrebi Arabic/French bilingualism among North-African immigrants in France and also among the local population in Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco, especially in

urban areas, has led to massive interference in daily speech, resulting in frequent code-switching at both an intersential and an intrasentential level (Bentahila & Davies, 1983; Caubet, 1998; Ziamari, 2008).

2.2 Contexts of Language Contact

Modes and dynamics of Romance/Arabic contact sensibly differ according to language, period, and many other factors, including linguistic register and semantic field. The main geographical and sociohistorical contexts of interference, already individuated by Steiger (1948–1949), are

1. the medieval Iberian Peninsula (except for the northernmost part, that was little affected by Arab influence);
2. medieval Sicily (from the Arab conquest until Angevin rule), with the inclusion of Malta, where Romance/Semitic contact has continued until at least the 20th century; and
3. the Crusader States and the commercial routes between Western Europe and the Eastern and Southern Mediterranean.

To these *Aufmarschstrassen* ('ways of penetration'), all originated in oral conversation between bilinguals, two further modes of loanwords transmission in written texts can be added, one for the Middle Ages (4) and one also for the Modern Period (5):

4. the scientific translations from Arabic into Latin and, to a lesser extent, into Romance vernaculars (Bossong, 1979; Ineichen, 1997, pp. 58–79); and
5. travelogues, pilgrimages, reports of ambassadors and slavery accounts of Western Europeans in Arabic-speaking countries.

Finally, two more domains of cross-linguistic contact can be mentioned for the 19th and 20th centuries, one involving oral conversation, pertaining almost exclusively to French (6), and the other implying written communication, shared by all Romance languages (7):

6. the North-African colonies, especially French Algeria (and, from the second half of the 20th century on, the Arabic-speaking immigrant communities in France); and
7. contemporary international press on Islam and the Arab states.

Unlike contexts 1–3 and 6, in which contact has been reciprocal, in contexts 4 and 5 it was only Romance that borrowed words from Arabic, some of which have had an ephemeral existence (especially if referred to exotic designata or now obsolete institutions, offices, and honorific titles of the Muslim word). Moreover, in contexts 4, 5, and 7 contact with Arabic has generally passed through intermediary languages (Latin for the medieval scientific translations, Ottoman Turkish for the early modern travelogues, English for contemporary journalistic writing), whereas contexts 1, 2, and 6 have been characterized by direct and in situ contact. Finally, in context 3, contact has generally been direct but has involved only a very small part of the population (i.e., merchants and sailors trading between Western Europe, the Levant, and North Africa). Kontzi (1998a, p. 330) defines this latter situation as 'punctiform contact', in contrast with 'surface contact' (in case of extensive bilingualism such

as in al-Andalus and medieval Sicily) and ‘individual contact’, which is typical of written interference. The different modes of contact have had important repercussions on the form of the loanwords (section 2.4) and also on their typology.

2.3 Loanword Typology

On a quantitative level, the great majority of the Arabic loans is concentrated in the languages of the former *Romania Arabica*, above all Spanish and, to a lesser extent, Portuguese (and Gallician), Catalan, and Sicilian (and Italian). These include function words (Pt. *até*, Sp. *hasta* ‘until’ < *ḥattā*), adverbs (Pt., Sp. *(de) balde* ‘gratis’ < *bāṭil(an)* ‘useless(ly)’) and interjections (Pt. *oxalá*, Sp. *ojalá* ‘hopefully’ < *law šāʾ allāh* ‘may God will it’). Nevertheless, nouns are by far the most prevalent category, whereas adjectives are quite seldom and verbs very rare (see Pt., Sp. *achacar* ‘to impute’ < *šakwah* ‘to complain’; Sic. *(ar)raccamari*, It. *ricamare* ‘to embroider’ < *raqama*; Sic. *cam(m)iari* ‘to heat the oven’ < *ḥamma* ‘to warm up’). The main semantic areas are represented by agricultural products and techniques (especially concerning irrigation), building and architecture, household, clothing, and names of professions and institutions, as shown in the following list of examples taken from Pellegrini (1972, 1989), Kiesler (1994), Corriente (2008), Schweickard (2017), and Ruhstaller and Gordón Peral (2017)—on Medieval Sicilian, see also Caracausi (1983):

- agricultural products: Pt. *açúcar*, Sp. *azúcar*, Sic. *zuccaru*, It. *zucchero* (> Fr. *sucre*) ‘sugar’ < *(as-)sukkar*; Pt. *alcachofra*, Sp. *alcachofa*, Sic. *carcioff(ul)a*, It. *carciofo* ‘artichoke’ < *(al-)ḫaršūfa*; Pt. *beringela*, Sp. *berenjena*, Cat. *albergínia* (> Fr. *aubergine*) ‘aubergine’ < *(al-)bāḏinǧān* (Sic. *milinciana* and It. *melanzana* derive from the Byzantine Gr. adaptation *melintzánion*);
- irrigation: Pt. *acéquia*, Sp. *acequia*, Cat. *sèquia*, Sic. *zac(c)hia* ‘irrigation ditch’ < *(as-)sāqiya*; Pt. *azenha*, Sp. *aceña*, Cat. *cinia*, Sic. *senia* ‘water mill’ < *(as-)sāniya*; Pt. *nora*, Sp. *noria*, Sic., It. *noria* ‘water wheel’ < *nāʿura*;
- building and architecture: Pt. *açoute* and *açoite*, Sp. *azote*, Cat. *assot*, Sic. *zotta* ‘pitch’ < *(as)-sawṭ*; Pt. *alcácer*, Sp. *alcázar*, Cat. *alcàsser* ‘castle’, It. *càssero* ‘quarterdeck’ < *(al-)qaṣr* ‘castle’ (from Lat. *castrum*); Pt. *açoteia*, *soteia*, Sp. *azotea* ‘roof terrace’, Sic. *zaddacca* ‘roof pavement’ < *(as-)suṭayyaḥ* ‘little terrace’;
- household: Pt. *almofada*, Sp. *almohada* ‘pillow’ < *al-miḫadda*; Pt., Sp., Cat. *garrafa*, It. *caraffa* (> Fr. *caraf(f)e*) ‘carafe’ < *ġarrāfa*; Sp. *alacena*, Sic. *gazzana* ‘wall cupboard’ < *(al-)ḫazāna*;
- clothing: Pt., Sp. *albornoz*, Cat. *barnús*, Sic. *bornussu*, It. *bernusso* (> Fr., Prv. *bernus*) ‘long cloak with a hood’ < *(al-)burnūs* and *barnūs*; Pt. *gabão*, Sp. *gabán*, Sic. *cabbanu*, It. *gabbano* (> Fr. *caban*) ‘hooded coat’ < *qabāʿ*; Sp. *aljuba* ‘coat’, Sic., It. *giubba* ‘jacket’ (> Fr. *jupe* ‘skirt’) < *(al-)ǧubba* ‘cotton vest’;
- professions and institutions: Sp. *albañil* (OPt. *alvanel*) ‘mason’ < *al-bannāʾ*; Sp. (OPt., Old Cat.) *alcalde* ‘mayor’ < *(al-)qāḍī* ‘judge’; Pt. *arrais*, Sp. *arráez*, Sic. *ràisi* ‘ship captain’ < *(ar-)raʾīs* ‘captain’.

Very sizable is also the amount of proper nouns deriving from Arabic, both anthroponyms (especially in Sicily and Southern Italy, as shown by the surnames *Buscemi* < *(a)bū šāma* ‘the one with the birthmark’, *Càfaro* < *kāfir* ‘infidel, non-Muslim’, *Macaluso* < *maḫlūs* ‘released

(slave)’) and toponyms (*Albufe(i)ra* < *al-buḥayra* ‘the Lagoon’, *Alcántara/Alcantara* < *al-qanṭara* ‘the bridge’, *Guadalquivir* < *wādī-l-kabīr* ‘the big river’, *Caltanissetta* < *qal‘at an-nisā’* ‘fortress of the women’). Non-Arabic toponyms often occur in an arabized form, especially in Iberia: see *Zaragoza* < *(Cae)saraugusta*, through the Ar. adaptation *Saraqusṭa*; *Sevilla* < Ar. *Išbīliyya* < Lat. *Hispalis*; *Alacant* (*Alicante*) < Ar. *al-Laqant* < Lat. *Lucentum*.

Out of the *Romania Arabica*, most of the Arabic loans are due to trade with the Levant and North Africa (and also with Spain, Catalonia, and Sicily). These are concentrated in Italian and the Italian dialects and — to a lesser extent — in Old Provençal and French, thanks to the frequent relations between medieval France and the Crusader States (Sguaitamatti-Bassi, 1974). They mainly concern exotic goods (clothes, precious stones, musical instruments), as well as customs, customs duty, and seafaring. Some of these terms also occur in Portuguese, Spanish, Catalan, and Sicilian, where they have generally been borrowed from the local Arab settlers, as shown by phonetic and morphological peculiarities:

- exotic clothes: OPrv. *bocaran*, Old Fr. *boquerant*, It. *bucherame* ‘fine Oriental cloth’ < **buḫārān* ‘(cloth) from Buḫārā’ (Schweickard, 2000); It. *bordo* ‘Egyptian cotton fabric’ < *burd* (Pt. *bordate* is a borrowing from the It. variant *bordato*: Baglioni, 2012); Fr. *c(h)amelot* (> Sp. *camelote*, OPrv. *camelin* and *camelot*, It. *camellotto* and *c(i)ambellotto*) ‘long haired wool’ < *ḫamla*;
- precious stones: Fr. *ambre*, It. *ambra* ‘amber’ < *‘anbar* (probably through Medieval Lat. *ambra*, whereas Sp. *ámbar* is a direct loanword); Fr., Prv. *azur*, It. *azzurro* ‘lapis lazuli’ and ‘blue’ < Dialectal Ar. **lāzūrd* — from Persian *lāžward* — (see also Pt., Sp. *azul*); Fr. *balais*, OPrv. *balach* and *balais*, It. *balascio* ‘a kind of ruby’ < *balaḫš*;
- musical instruments: Fr. *l(e)ut(h)* (> It. *liuto*), OPrv. *laut* ‘lute’ < *al-‘ūd* lit. ‘wood’ (see also Pt. *alaúde*, Sp. *(a)laúd*); Fr., OPrv. *rebec* (> Cat. *rabec*, It. *ribeca*) ‘rebec’ < *rabāb* (see also Pt. *arrabil*, Sp. *rabel*); Fr. *ta(m)bour*, It. *tamburo* ‘drum’ < *ṭanbūr* ‘string instrument’— from Persian *ṭabīr* — (see also Pt., Sp., Cat. *(a)tam(b)or*);
- customs and customs duty: It. *do(g)ana* ‘customs’ (> OPrv. *doana*, Fr. *douane*) < *dīwān* (see also Pt., Sp. *aduana*, Cat. *duana* < *(ad-)dīwān*); It. *fondaco* ‘residence of merchants in the Mediterranean harbours’ < *funduq* ‘inn’— from Gr. *pandokheîon* — (see Pt. *alfândega* ‘customs’, Sp. *alhóndiga*, Cat. *alfòndic* ‘grain storehouse’ < *al-funduq*); It. *gabella* (> OPrv. *gabela*, Fr. *gabelle*) ‘tax’ < *qabāla* (see also Pt. *alcavala*, Sp. *alcabala* < *al-qabāla*);
- seafaring: Sp. *almirante*, Cat. *almirall*, It. *ammiraglio* (> Fr. *amira(i)l*) ‘admiral’ < *’amīr al-* ‘captain of’ (probably via Byzantine Greek *amirâs*); Venetian *arsenà*, It. *arsenale* (> Fr. *arsenal*) ‘dockyard’ < *(dār-)aṣ-ṣinā‘a* ‘house of manifacture, factory’ (see also OPt. *taracena*, Sp. *atarazana*, Cat. *drassana* < *dār-aṣ-ṣinā‘a*); It. *caracca* (> Pt., Sp., Cat. *carraca*, Old Fr. *caraque*) ‘type of ship’ < *ḥarrāqa*.

A great bulk of Arabic loanwords, shared by most of the Romance languages, is represented by scientific terms pertaining to astronomy, mathematics, alchemy, botany, medicine, and anatomy. These loanwords have entered Romance via the Medieval Latin translations of Arabic scientific treatises, with the only exception of Romanian (see ORE of Linguistics article, “History of the Romanian Lexicon <https://oxfordre.com/linguistics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.001.0001/acrefore-9780199384655-e-471>”), where they have been secondarily borrowed from Italian (*cifră*, *zenit*) and French (*algebră*, *almanah*, *amalgam*):

- astronomy: Pt., Sp. *almanaque*, Cat. *almanac*, Fr. *almanach*, OPrv. *almanatz*, It. *almanacco* ‘almanac’ < *al-manāḫ* ‘calendar’ (through Medieval Lat. *almanac(hus)*); Pt., Sp., Cat., Fr., It. *nadir* ‘nadir’ < *naẓīr (as-samt)* ‘opposite direction’; Pt. *zénite*, Sp. *cenit*, Fr. *zénith*, Cat., It. *zenit* ‘zenith’ < *samt (ar-ra’s)* lit. ‘the way over the head’ (through Medieval Lat. *cenit* and *zenit*, misspellings of the original adaptations *cemt* and *zemt*);
- mathematics: Pt., Sp. *álgebra*, Cat. *àlgebra*, Fr. *algèbre*, It. *algebra* < *(‘ilm) al-ǧabra (wa-l-muqābala)* ‘science of calculation by restoring and balancing’ (through Medieval Lat. *algebra*, a technical term first employed by the Italian mathematician Leonardo Fibonacci in his *Liber Abbaci*, 1202); Pt., Sp., Cat., It. *cifra*, Fr. *chifre* < *ṣifr* ‘empty, nothing’ and also ‘zero’ (through Medieval Lat. *cifra*; the same word has been adapted as Lat. *zephirum* by Fibonacci and subsequently evolved into It. *zero* ‘zero’, borrowed by Port, Cat. *zero*, Sp. *cero*, Fr. *zéro*);
- alchemy: Pt., Sp. *alquimia*, Cat. *alquímia*, Fr. *alchimie*, It. *alchimia* ‘alchemy’ < *al-kīmiyā’* (through Medieval Lat. *alchimia*); Pt., Sp. *alambique*, Cat. *alambí*, Fr., Old Prov. *alambic*, It. *alambicco* ‘alembic’ < *al-‘anbīq* ‘distilling flask’; Pt. *amálgama*, Sp., Cat., It. *amalgama*, Fr. *amalgame* ‘amalgam’ < *(‘amal) al-ǧamā‘a* ‘execution of blending’ (through Medieval Lat. *amalgama* ‘alloy of mercury’);
- botany and medicine: Pt. *borragem*, Cat. *borratja* (> Sp. *borraja*), Fr. *bourrache*, It. *borragine* ‘borage’ < *(’a)bū ‘araq* (lit. ‘father of sweat) ‘sudorific’ (through Medieval Lat. *borrago*, *-inis*); It. *ribes* ‘redcurrant’ < *rībās* (through Medieval Lat. *ribes(ium)*); Pt. *xarope*, Sp. *jarabe*, Cat. *xarop*, Fr. *sirop*, OPrv. *(e)issarop*, It. *sciroppo* ‘syrup’ < *šarāb* ‘beverage’ (mainly through Medieval Lat. *siruppus*);
- anatomy: Sp., It. *nuca*, Fr. *nuque* ‘nape of the neck’ < *nuḫā’* ‘medulla’ (through Medieval Lat. *nucha* ‘medulla’; the current meaning is probably due to the paretymological influence of Ar. *nuqra* ‘nape’); Pt., Sp., It. *safena*, Fr. *saphène* ‘saphenous vein’ < *sāfīn* (through Medieval Lat. *saphena*); It. *taccuino* ‘notebook’ < *taqwīm* ‘correct disposition’ (through the title of the Medieval Lat. translation of the Ar. medical treatise *Taqwīm as-siḥḥa*, made in Southern Italy in the 13th century and known as *Tacuinum sanitatis*).

Noteworthy are also several loan translations, as for instance the doublet Sp. *duramadre* and *piamadre*, Fr. *dure-mêre* and *pie-mêre*, It. *dura madre* and *pia madre*, designating the two membranes surrounding the brain, which derive from Medieval Lat. *dura mater (cerebri)* and *pia mater (cerebri)* — lit. ‘hard mother’ and ‘tender mother of the brain’ — respectively, calques of the Arabic expressions *’umm (ad-dimāġ) aṣ-ṣafīqa* and *’umm (ad-dimāġ) ar-raqīqa*.

As for post-medieval loanwords, almost all of them regard designata characteristic of the Arab world and, more generally, of the Islamic countries. Early modern borrowings in Italian and Western Romance mostly occur in reports of travelers, ambassadors, and slaves from North Africa and the Middle East and usually derive from Turkish adaptations of Arabic words, as exemplified next:

- Fr. *cadi*, It. *cadì* ‘Islamic judge’ < *qāḍī* (through Trk. *kadı*; but see Sp. *alcalde* ‘mayor’, directly from Ar. *al-qāḍī*); Fr. *divan*, It. *divano* ‘sofa’ < *dīwān* ‘council’ (through Trk. *divan* ‘hall of the Ottoman Imperial Council [full of seat cushions]’; but see It. *dogana* ‘customs’ directly from Arabic); Pt., Sp. *minarete*, Fr. *mineret*, It. *minareto* ‘minaret’ > *manāra* ‘lighthouse’ (through Trk. *minare* ‘minaret’; but see Pt., Sp. *alminar*, directly from Ar. *al-*

manār); Pt. *sultão*, Sp. *sultán*, Fr. *sultan*, It. *sultano* ‘sultan, head of the Ottoman Empire’ < *sulṭān* ‘ruler’ (through Trk. *sultan*, whereas OPt. *soldão*, Old Sp. *suldán*, Old Fr. *soudan*, Old It. *soldano* ‘sultan of Babylon’ are direct borrowings from Arabic).

Turkish has served as an intermediary language also for the words of Arabic origin in Romanian (see ORE of Linguistics article, “History of the Romanian Lexicon <https://oxfordre.com/linguistics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.001.0001/acrefore-9780199384655-e-471>”), as clearly shown by the phonology and semantics of the borrowings: *calup* ‘mould’ < Trk. *kalıp* (Ar. *qālib*); *ciorbă* ‘soup’ < Trk. *çorba* (Ar. *šurba*); *musafir* ‘guest’ < Trk. *misafir* ‘guest’ (Ar. *musāfir* ‘traveler’).

In the Contemporary Era, Arabic terms enter Romance almost exclusively via the international media, notably the English-language press. English influence is particularly evident in the orthography (<j> for [dʒ], <k> for [k], <sh> for [ʃ], etc.), which is generally maintained in the different Romance languages, from Portuguese to Romanian (with the relevant exception of French):

- *burka* and *burqa* ‘garment for women covering body and face’ < *burqa‘*; *(d)jihad* ‘jihad’ < *ǧiḥād* lit. ‘effort’; *Hezbollah* (Sp. *Hezbolá*) < *ḥizbu-llāh(i)* ‘party of God’; *rais* (Fr. *raïs*) ‘president of an Arab state’ < *ra’īs* ‘captain, leader’; *sharia* (Fr. *charia*, Ro. *şaria*) ‘Islamic law’ < *šarī‘a*.

As shown by these examples, contemporary loanwords regard either Islam or political institutions of the Arab states. A very small percentage, mostly of dialectal origin, concern traditional Arabic food, such as *couscous* < Magrebi Ar. *kuskusū*, *falafel* and *felafel* < Middle Eastern Ar. *falāfil*, *kebab* < Middle Eastern Ar. *kabāb*. Only in French — above all French slang — are several loans from Maghrebi Arabic to be found (see ORE of Linguistic articles “Language Contact and the Lexicon of Romance Languages <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.013.462>,” and “History of the Romanian Lexicon <https://oxfordre.com/linguistics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.001.0001/acrefore-9780199384655-e-471>” and “History of the French Lexicon,” both forthcoming), most of which have been borrowed orally by the French soldiers at the time of the colonial rule of Algeria (section 2.1). Following is a small selection of slang terms of Arabic origin, all taken by Christ (1991):

- *bled* ‘isolated town or village’ < Maghrebi Ar. [blɛ:d] (Ar. *bilād*) ‘town’; *flouze* ‘money’ < Maghrebi Ar. [flu:s]; *maboul* ‘crazy’ < Ar. *maḥbūl*, *niquer* ‘to copulate’ < Maghrebi Ar. [ni:k], 2nd person imperative of the verb *nāk* ‘to have sexual intercourse’.

2.4 Loanword Adaptation and Grammatical Interference

2.4.1 Phonology

It is generally assumed that no new phoneme has been borrowed from Arabic by the Romance languages (see Kontzi, 1998a, p. 334, as far as Ibero-Romance is concerned), whereas Arabic dialects in contact with Romance, such as Andalusi Arabic and Maltese, have enriched their phonemic inventories with new units (for instance, the consonants /p/, /tʃ/, /g/: Borg, 1978; Corriente, 1978). Nevertheless, there is at least one case of phoneme borrowing in the Sicilian

dialect of Pantelleria, where a voiceless pharyngeal fricative occurs in Arabic loanwords in correspondence of an originary /ħ/ (['ħabba] ‘seed’ < *ḥabba*, [ħa'mi̯ari] ‘to heat the oven’ < *ḥamma*) or any other voiceless velar and post-velar fricative ([ħar'rubba] ‘carob’< *ḫarrūba*; see Tropea, 1988).

Loanwords from Arabic in both Ibero-Romance and Sicilian generally display the phonetic peculiarities of the Maghrebi dialects (Steiger, 1932) and, notably, the so-called *imāla*, that is, the palatalization of a (mostly long) /a/: *(as-)sāniya* ‘water mill’ > Sp. *aceña*, Sic. *senia*. Other features, such as the lowering of /i/ and /u/, respectively, to /e/ and /o/ when preceded or followed by back consonants and /r/, are commonly found in most spoken varieties of Arabic: *tarīḥa* > Sp. *tarea* ‘assignment’, *(ar-)ruzz* ‘rice’ > Pt., Sp. *arroz*. Both phenomena are also shared by Maltese, where /a:/ has evolved into [ɪ:] (written <ie>: see *bieb* ‘door’ < Ar. *bāb*) and the lowering of /u/ has affected not only the Semitic vocabulary (*xogħol* ‘work’ < Ar. *šuġl*) but also the Romance borrowings (*frotta* ‘fruit’ < Sic. *frutta*).

As far as consonants are concerned, pharyngealized stops (the so-called emphatic consonants) have been generally replaced by their nonpharyngealized counterparts (*(al-)qaṭrān* ‘tar’ > Sp. *alquitrán*, Sic. *catrama*), whereas the uvular stop /q/ has been variously adapted as /k/ and /g/, according to a variation between voiceless and voiced realizations also to be observed in spoken Arabic (see, for instance, *(al-)qaṣr* ‘castle’ > Sp. *alcázar* vs *(al-)quṭn* ‘cotton’ > Sp. *algodón*). Pharyngeal voiced stops have been cancelled (*al-ʿaṭṭār* ‘the perfumer’ > Old Sp. *alatar* — see also the Sicilian toponym *(Via dei) Lattarini*, in Palermo, where *Lattarini* is the adaptation of the Arabic plural *al-ʿaṭṭārīn* ‘the perfumers’), while their voiceless counterparts have been generally preserved either as /k/ or as /f/ (see, for instance, *ḥabb ar-raʾs* ‘stavesacre’, adapted in Sicilian as *cabbarasi* and in Old Spanish as *fabarraz*). /k/ has replaced Arabic /x/ too (*(al-)ḫaršūfa* ‘artichoke’ > Sp. *alcachofa*, It. *carciofo*), although the adaptations /g/ and /f/ are also possible (see the outcomes of *(al-)ḫarrūba* ‘carrob’, going from It. *carruba* to Sp. *algarroba* [Cat. *garrofa*] and Pt. *alfarroba*). Both in Old Ibero-Romance and in Sicilian (and Italian) alveolar fricatives have been often replaced by affricates, as in the case of *(as-)sukkar* > Pt. *açúcar*, Sp. *azúcar*, Sic. *zuccaru*, It. *zucchero* (but Fr. *sucre*), probably because they were perceived as sensibly different from Romance [s] and [z], especially when they were word-initial (Baglioni, 2015). Characteristic of only Ibero-Romance is the adaptation of an alveolar fricative followed by a dental stop, both paryngealized and nonpharyngealized, into an affricate (evolved into an interdental fricative in Modern Spanish): *mustaʿrab* ‘Arabized’ > Sp. *mozárabe*, *ʿusṭuwān* ‘hallway’ > Pt. *çaguão*, Sp. *zaguán* (and see also the toponym *Saraqusṭa*, i.e., the Arabic adaptation of Lat. *(Cae)saraugusta*, which has evolved into *Zaragoza*).

2.4.2 Morphology

There is only one Arabic affix that has been borrowed by a Romance language (i.e., *-ī*, by which adjectives are derived by nouns). This suffix occurs in Spanish as *-í* and applies not only to Arabic lexical bases (*tunecí* ‘Tunisian’, *tetuaní* ‘from Tétouan’) but also to non-Semitic nouns, as in the case of *alfonsí* ‘Alphonsine’ (Montero Muñoz, 2006, p. 1661). In Italian, the same suffix has been adapted as *-ino* in words like *assassino* ‘murderer’ < *ḥaššāšī* ‘hashish smoker’, *garbino* ‘libeccio’ < *ġarbī* ‘western (wind)’, *zerbino* ‘doormat’ < *zirbī(ya)* ‘carpet’, thus overlapping with the indigenous diminutive ending *-ino* (although in words such as *assassino* and *zerbino -ino* is not perceived as an affix by the Italian speakers, since no lexical bases

assass- and *zerb-* occur in this language). Conversely, in the Arabic varieties of the *Romania Arabica* Romance suffixes are not infrequent: see Andalusi Ar. *al-ǧummella* ‘the little hairlock’, showing up in a kharja, which is formed by Ar. *al-ǧumm* + the Spanish diminutive suffix *-ella* (Kontzi, 1998a, p. 331); Maltese *wiċċinu* ‘little face’ (Semitic *wiċċ* + Sic. *-inu*), *sakranazz* ‘drunkard’ (Semitic *sakran* + Sic. *-azzu*), *xemxata* ‘sunstroke’ (Semitic *xemx* + Italo-Romance *-ata*).

An interesting peculiarity of Spanish and Portuguese loanwords is the almost systematic agglutination of the Arabic article: see Pt. *alcachofra*, Sp. *alcachofa* vs Sic. *carcioff(ul)a*, It. *carciofo*; Pt. *alcavala*, Sp. *alcabala* vs. It. *gabella*; Pt. *açúcar*, Sp. *azúcar* vs. Sic. *zuccaru*, It. *zucchero*. There has been much debate on the origin of this phenomenon (for a synthesis, see Noll, 1996). The most probable explanation is that the agglutination of *al-* is due to Arabic/Berber language contact, as has been hypothesized by Corriente:

> the majority of the Muslim invaders were superficially Arabicized Berbers who, lacking an article in their native language and being therefore scarcely able to master the rules of its usage, attached it permanently to the Ar. loanwords acquired by B[e]r[ber], as well as to every substantive in the Ar. they learned, spreading this usage in the areas invaded by their troops, the Iberian Peninsula and wide expanses of Western Africa .
>
> (Corriente, 2008, p. lxvi)

As far as adaptation is concerned, medieval loanwords have generally been integrated into an inflectional class of the receiving Romance language: see Sp. *azote*, *alhóndiga*, *jarabe*, *mozárabe*; It. *bernusso*, *bucherame*, *azzurro*, *tamburo*. In order to derive verbs, nouns and adjectives, Romance affixes have often been applied to Arabic lexical bases, as in the case of Sp. *achacar* ‘to impute’ < *šakwah* ‘to complain’ (+ *a-* and *-ar*), Cat. *aladroc* ‘anchovy’ < *al-ḥaṭr* lit. ‘bigmouthed’ + *-oc*, Sic. *arraccamari* ‘to embroider’ < *raqama* (+ *a-* and *-ari*). Non-integrated loanwords date almost all from the Modern and Contemporary Era, except for a few medieval scientific terms whose diffusion has been mediated through Latin (e.g., Sp. *cenit*, Fr. *zenith*, It. *zenit*; It. *alcol* ‘alcohol’ < *al-kuḥl*; It. *ribes*).

2.4.3 Syntax

As recently stated by Sala (2013, p. 228), “there is simply nothing in the syntax of Spanish that can be unambiguously assigned to Arabic influence and which does not have parallels in other Romance varieties.” This is generally true also for all other Romance languages, although medieval texts, especially translations from Arabic, do display frequent traces of syntactic interference. For instance, in the Castilian versions of Arabic scientific treatises, indirect relative clauses are often formed according to the Arabic pattern, that is, through an invariable relativizer at the beginning and a resumptive pronoun or possessive adjective in situ (Bossong, 1979, p. 171): *las [estrellas] que es so çenptro el polo* ‘the stars whose centre is the pole’ (lit. ‘the stars that their center is the pole’). This construction is also possible in Romance, but its high occurrence rate in these texts suggests a decisive role of the Arabic model. A probable calque on Arabic (and Hebrew) syntax is also the omission of the auxiliary

in perifrastic perfectives, a phenomenon to be observed in Andalusi Romance in sentences like *mio Cidello benid* ‘my little Lord (has) come’ (in a kharja edited by Corriente, 1997, pp. 309–311; see also Loporcaro, 2018, p. 308).

As far as contemporary Romance languages are concerned, evidence of Arabic morphosyntactic influence has only been preserved in the Sicilian dialect of Pantelleria, where past perfect is formed by combining the 3rd person singular imperfect indicative *era* ‘was’ and the simple past of the main verb: [era ʧa'mammu] ‘we had called’, [era di'ʧisti] ‘you had said’ (Tropea, 1988, p. xli). As pointed out by Sgroi (1986, pp. 126–128), the construction is a morphological calque on the Arabic past perfect, which is composed by the imperfect indicative of the verb *kāna* ‘to be’ + the simple past of the main verb (*kunta qulta* ‘you had said’). The only relevant difference is that in Arabic the auxiliary verb agrees with the subject (thus ‘you had said’ corresponds to *kunta qulta*, both verbs occurring in the 2nd person singular), whereas in Pantelleria Sicilian only the main verb is inflected.

3. Romance in Contact With Hebrew

3.1 Historical Background

Jews have been living in Western Europe since the time of the Roman Empire, perhaps even earlier, at least in the Italian peninsula, where the presence of Jewish communities is apparently attested as early as in the 2nd century BCE (Rubin, 2016, p. 298). Nevertheless, despite the earliness of the settlements, effects on the languages of the local populations have been relatively limited. As a matter of fact, Jews easily assimilated to the societies they lived in, and therefore spoke non-Semitic languages, such as Greek and Latin in the Late Antiquity and Romance vernaculars in the Middle Ages, as well as Arabic, the prevailing language within the Jewish communities of Arab-ruled Iberia and Sicily. Hebrew was only employed as a learned and sacred language, notably for liturgical uses. As a result, it mostly remained within the boundaries of inter-Jewish communication and did not affect the language of the surrounding majorities.

However, Hebrew was also the language of the Old Testament, the most important text of Christendom, together with the gospels. As is well known, the Old Testament was translated first into Greek (the so-called Septuagint, dating from the 3rd–2nd centuries BCE) and later into Latin (the Vetus Latina, entirely depending on the Greek text of the Septuagint, and the Vulgate, dating from the late 4th century CE). Therefore, much of the early influence of Hebrew was exerted through written translations made by non-Jews and affected the Romance languages through the mediation of Greek and Latin. This circumstance had relevant repercussions on the form of the biblical loanwords (section 3.3).

During the Middle Ages, Jewish communities flourished all over Europe and occasionally reached a high degree of integration, both in Muslim-ruled countries (al-Andalus, Sicily) and elsewhere (Castile, Southern France, Continental Italy). Although Hebrew continued to be used as a learned and liturgical language, communications within and outside the Jewish communities were normally kept in Romance. By this epoch, Jewish sociolects might have differed for a characteristic “accent and lexical peculiarities” (Ineichen, 2006, p. 1669), but grammatical features were still identical with those of the non-Jewish majorities. The only

significant difference to be observed in written texts is the use of the Hebrew script, which was frequently employed by Jews in Iberia (Minervini, 1992; Strolovich, 2016), Northern France (Kiwitt & Dörr, 2016; Zwink, 2017), Provence (Strich & Jochnowitz, 2016), and Italy (Aprile, 2010; Baglioni, 2021; Rubin, 2016) for texts concerning religion (book of prayers, translations of the Bible and Mishnaic treaties) and the internal administration of the communities.

This situation dramatically changed at the end of the Middle Ages, when Jews were expelled first from the kingdom of France (1394) and then from Spain (1492) and Portugal (1497). In the Italian states, Jews were allowed to remain, although they were mostly discriminated against and forced to live in the ghettos (in Venice from 1516, in Rome from 1555, in Florence from 1571 on). Isolation led to the formation of characteristic Jewish sociolects, the so-called Judeo-Romance languages or "varieties" (Arnold, 2017), differing from the local dialects in both lexical and grammatical features. The most striking case is Judeo-Spanish, also known as Ladino, Judezmo, or "Sephardic La'az" (Bunis, 1993, 2016) (see ORE of Linguistics article "Judeo-Spanish (Judezmo, Ladino)," forthcoming), which developed independently from Peninsular Spanish and preserved several phonological features of Medieval Castilian (the majority of the Sephardic communities had settled in the Ottoman Empire and lacked direct contact with Spanish speakers). Less divergent from the corresponding non-Jewish varieties are the Judeo-Italian dialects, which also display archaic features on a phonological level (particularly evident in Judeo-Roman), as well as morphological and lexical innovations (Aprile, 2012; Massariello Merzagora, 1977). In Italy, where enclosure in the ghettos did not impede linguistic interchange between Jews and non-Jews, a few Hebrew terms managed to spread from Judeo-Italian to the Italian dialects and, eventually, to common Italian (see ORE of Linguistics article "Judeo-Romance in Italy and France (Judeo-Italian, Judeo-French, Judeo-Occitan)," forthcoming). Most of these terms regard Hebrew rituals and practices. Nevertheless, their semantics in the non-Jewish dialects has generally undergone ironic or pejorative deformation, mostly via slang and nonstandard uses (see section 3.2).

As in the case of Arabic (section 1.1), at this time contact between Hebrew and the Romance languages is very limited. Recent loanwords from Hebrew concern almost exclusively either Jewish religion and culture or Israeli institutions. They are generally shared by all European languages and mediated through the English-language press, as is often revealed by their orthography (section 3.2).

3.2 Contexts of Language Contact and Loanword Typology

Two main ways of penetration of Hebrew loanwords into Romance can be individuated:

1. the translations of the Bible, notably of the Old Testament (but also the Greek gospels contain Semitic terms, generally in their (Judeo-)Aramaic form);
2. linguistic interchange between the European Jewish communities and the surrounding majorities, from the Middle Ages until the first half of the 20th century.

In neither case has contact been direct. Biblical loanwords were mediated via the Greek and Latin translations of the Holy Script (or via Church Slavonic, as far as only Romanian is concerned), therefore through written language. Conversely, non-Biblical loanwords have been transmitted orally through the mediation of the Judeo-Romance languages.

Finally, a third, much less relevant context can be added for the Contemporary Era:

3. articles, books, radio, and TV programs concerning the Jewish culture and the institutions of the State of Israel.

As shown by Mancini (1998), it is important to keep these contexts separate, since both the forms and the meanings of the loanwords strongly vary according to the circumstances and the chronology of their diffusion.

Biblical loanwords are by far the most numerous lexical items borrowed from Hebrew (and Aramaic) into the Romance languages. Except for formulaic interjections such as *al(l)eluia* and *(h)osan(n)a*, they are all nouns and include names of religious holidays and titles, supernatural designata, and anthroponyms, as exemplified in the following list (underlined letters indicate fricatives deriving from the lenition of original plosives: *p* = [f]; *b* = [v]; *t* = [θ]; *d* = [ð]; *k* = [x]; *g* = [ɣ]):

- religious holidays: Pt., Sp. *sábado*, Cat. *(dis)sapte*, Prv. *(dis)sabte*, Srd. *sapatu*, It. *sabato* ‘Saturday’ < *šabbāt* (through Gr. *sábbaton* and Lat. *sabbatum* — and *dies sabbati* —); Fr. *samedi*, Ro. *sâmbătă* ‘Saturday’ < *šabbāt* (through Gr. **sámbata* and Lat. *sambata*, **sambati dies*); Pt. *páscoa*, Sp., Cat. *pascua*, Fr. *pâque*, Srd. *pasca (manna)*, It. *pasqua*, Frl. *pasche*, Ro. *paşte* (*paşti*) ‘Easter’ < *pesaḥ* —or rather Judeo-Aramaic *pisḥā’* — (through Gr. *paskha* and Lat. *pascha(e)*);
- religious titles: Pt. *abade*, Sp. *abad*, Cat. *abat*, Fr. *abbé*, It. *abate*, Engad. *abat* ‘abbot’ < Judeo-Aramaic *’abbā’* ‘father’ (through Grk. *abbâ(s)* and Lat. *abbās, abbātis*); Pt. *Messias*, Sp. *Mesías*, Cat. *Messies*, Fr. *Messie*, It. *Messia* ‘Messiah’ < Aramaic *mešîḥâ* ‘the anointed one’ (through Grk. *Messías* and Lat. *Messīas*); Pt., Sp., Cat. *rabí*, It. *rabbi* ‘doctor of the Jewish law’ < Judeo-Aramaic *rabbî* ‘my teacher’ (through Grk. and Lat. *rabbi*);
- supernatural designata: Pt. *serafim*, Sp. *serafín*, Cat. *serafí*, Fr. *séraphin*, It. *serafino* ‘seraph’ < *śərāpîm*, plural of *śārāp* lit. ‘the burning one’ (through Grk. and Lat. *seraphim*; Ro. *serafim* derives from Church Slavonic *serafimŭ*); Pt. *querubim*, Sp. *querubín*, Cat. *querubí*, Fr. *chérubin*, It. *cherubino* ‘cherub’ < *kərûbîm*, plural of *kərûb* ‘winged angel’ (through Grk. *kheroubím* and Lat. *cherubim*; Ro. *heruvim* derives from Church Slavonic *cheruvimŭ*); Pt., Sp. *maná*, Cat. *mannà* (masculine), Fr. *manne*, It. *manna* (feminine) ‘manna’ < Judeo-Aramaic *mannā’* (through Grk. and Lat. *manna*);
- liturgical interjections: Pt. *aleluia*, Sp. *aleluya*, Cat. *aleluià*, Fr. *alléluia*, It. *alleluia*, Ro. *aleluia* ‘halleluja’ < *haləlû yâh* ‘praise ye the Lord!’ (through Grk. *allēlouïa* and Lat. *alleluia*); Pt. *amém*, Sp., Cat. *amén*, Fr., Srd., It., Frl. *amen* ‘amen’ < *’āmēn* ‘truth’, used adverbially as an expression of agreement (through Grk. and Lat. *amēn*; Ro. *amin* derives from Byzantine Greek *amín*); Pt. *hosana*, Sp., Cat., Fr. *hosanna*, Srd., It. *osanna* ‘hosanna’ < *hôšî’âh-nnâ* ‘save us!’ (through Grk. *hōsanná* and Lat. *hosanna*; Ro. *osaná* has preserved the accent of the Greek form);
- anthroponyms: Pt., Sp. *José*, Cat. *Josep*, Fr. *Joseph*, It. *Giuseppe* < *Yôsēp* (through Grk. *Iōsēph* and Lat. *Joseph*; Ro. *Iosif* has passed through Byzantine Greek; Pt., Sp. *Miguel*, Cat. *Miquel*, Fr. *Michel*, It. *Michele* < *Mîkā’ēl* (through Grk. *Mikhaēl* and Lat. *Michael*; Ro. *Mihail* has passed through Byzantine Greek) (see article on “History of the Romanian Lexicon *<https://oxfordre.com/linguistics/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199384655.001.0001/acrefore-9780199384655-e-471>*” in this encyclopedia, forthcoming); Pt. *Benjamim*, Sp. *Benjamín*, Cat. *Benjamí*, Fr. *Benjamin*, It. *Beniamino*, Ro.

Beniamin < *Binyāmîn* (through Grk. *Beniamín* and Lat. *Beniamin*; also as a common name designating the ‘youngest son’ in a family — Sp. *benjamín* — and ‘favorite’— It. *beniamino*).

A few loan translations can be added to the words listed above, such as Pt. *anjo*, Sp. *ángel*, Cat. *àngel*, Fr. *ange*, Srd. *ànghelu*, It. *angelo*, Frl. *agnul*, Ro. *înger* < Lat. *angelum* (from Grk. *ángelos* ‘messenger’, the meaning ‘divine messenger’ being a calque on Hebrew *mal’āk*), and Pt. *igreja*, Sp. *iglesia*, Cat. *església*, Fr. *église*, It. *chiesa* < Lat. *ecclēsia* (from Grk. *ecclēsía* ‘assembly’, a calque on Hebrew *qāhāl* ‘religious assembly’).

As for non-Biblical loanwords, their number is much lower and their semantics more heterogeneous. The greatest bulk is represented by Hebrew words that have been transmitted by European Jews in the Middle Ages and in the Modern Era through the Judeo-Romance languages, mostly in Italy, from where Jews were not expelled, unlike France, Spain, and Portugal (section 3.1). These include both nouns and adjectives (in a few cases even verbs) and generally concern Jewish rituals. However, in the Romance languages they have mostly undergone ironic or pejorative deformation. These words are usually found in nonstandard varieties, frequently in the scoundrels’ slang, and often indicate negatively connoted designata, as shown by the examples listed next, all from Italian (Franceschini, 2011; Mancini, 1998, p. 370) and the Italian dialects (Fanciullo, 1992; Mancini, 1987; Mayer Modena, 1988):

- It. *fasullo* ‘false’ < *pāsûl* ‘not valid according to the Jewish rites’ (through Judeo-Roman *fasullo*); It. *marachella* ‘prank’ < *məraggēl* ‘spy’ (through Judeo-Triestine *maraghel*); It. *sciagattare* ‘to spoil, to waste’ < *šāḥaṭ* ‘to slay according to the Jewish rites’ (through Judeo-Tuscan *sciahtare*), It. slang *ganao* ‘thief’ and *ganaviare* ‘to steal’ < *gannāb* ‘thief’ (to be compared with Judeo-Tuscan *ganav*); It. slang *gòio* ‘simpleton, fool’ < *gôy* ‘non-Jew’ (through Judeo-Tuscan *gòi*); It. slang *tógo* ‘good, fine’ < *ṭôb* ‘good’;
- Roman *cascèrre*, Tuscan *cacèrre* ‘pure, good’ < *kāšēr* ‘clean, proper, lawful’ (through respectively Judeo-Roman and Judeo-Tuscan); Senese *gadollo* ‘packed, cram-full’ and ‘good’ < *gādôl* ‘big’ (through Judeo-Tuscan *gadol*); Livornese *ciamì* ‘homosexual’ < *šāmîr* ‘fennel’ (through Judeo-Livornese, as a calque on It. slang *finocchio* ‘queer’, lit. ‘fennel’); Piedmontese *tafus* ‘jail’ < *tāpûs* ‘arrested’ (through Judeo-Torinese *tafus*).

Much fewer are the non-Biblical loanwords to be found in the other Romance languages, such as Prv. *cacan* ‘rich’ < *ḥākām* ‘wise’ (through Judeo-Provençal), French *brouhaha* ‘noisy and overexcited reaction’ < *bārûk habbā’* ‘welcome’ (lit. ‘blessed (is) he who comes’), and Sp. *desmazalado* ‘unlucky’ < JuSp. *desmazal* ‘misfortune’ < *mazzāl* ‘constellation’ and ‘fate, luck’ (Kramer, 1993; Mancini, 1998, p. 370). Doubtful is the derivation of Pt. *tacanho*, Sp. *tacaño*, Cat. *tacany*, Fr. *taquin* and It. *taccagno* ‘tight-fisted’ from *taqqānāh* ‘regulations of the Jewish community, rabbinic decree’ (Corominas & Pascual, 1980–1991, pp. 5: 363–367).

Finally, a very limited category of loanwords is represented by recent borrowings occurring in all Romance languages, which regard either Jewish culture and history, such as *bar mitzva* < Judeo-Aramaic *bar miṣ(ə)wāh* ‘Jewish coming of age rituals’ (lit. ‘son of the law’), *haskalah* ‘Jewish Enlightenment’ < *haśkālāh* ‘wisdom, erudition’, *shoah* ‘Jewish holocaust’ < *šô’āh* ‘catastrophe’, or institutions of the State of Israel, for instance *kib(b)utz* ‘collective community’ < *qibbûṣ* lit. ‘gathering’, *knesset* ‘Israeli Parliament’ < *k(ə)neset* ‘assembly’. These

loanwords have been mostly borrowed through the English-language press, as is revealed by their orthography (<k> for [k], <sh> for [ʃ], <tz> for [ts], that is, <ṣ> in transliterated Hebrew script—through the influence of German and Romanized Yiddish).

3.3 Loanword Adaptation and Grammatical Interference

3.3.1 Phonology

Biblical loanwords often display traces of their mediation through Greek and Latin (and Church Slavonic, as far as Romanian is concerned). Hebrew and Aramaic [h] and [ħ] have been generally lost, both word-initial (*haləlû yâh* > Grk. *allēlouïa*, Lat. *alleluia*) and internal (Aramaic *mešîḥâ* > Grk., Lat. *Messias*), whereas [ʃ] has been depalatalized, since neither Greek nor Latin displayed a postalveolar fricative in their phonemic inventories (*šabbāṯ* > Grk. *sábbaton*, Lat. *sabbatum*; *Məṯûšelāḥ* > Grk. *Mathousalas*, Lat. *Mathusalem*). Occasionally, folk etymology has modified the form of the loanwords, as in the case of Latin *pascha* (from Grk. *paskha* < Judeo-Aramaic *pisḥā'*), which has been influenced by Lat. *pascua* 'pastures', as shown by the Romance outcomes displaying a back vocoid in the last syllable (Pt. *páscoa*, Sp., Cat. *pascua*, It. *pasqua*).

Non-biblical loanwords are phonetically nearer to their Hebrew models. [ʃ] is generally preserved, at least in those varieties in whose phonemic inventories the consonant occurs (It. *sciagattare* < *šāḥaṭ*). Neither [h] nor [ħ] is lost, although both consonants are usually adapted as velars (It. *sciagattare* < *šāḥaṭ*, Prov. *cacan* < *ḥāḵām*). In Judeo-Italian, also the sound corresponding to the letter *'ayn*, usually realized as a glottal stop in Modern Hebrew, is preserved and variously adapted as [ŋg] or [ɲ]: see Judeo-Roman *ngkarelle*, Judeo-Veronese *gnarel* 'Christian' < *'ârēl* 'uncircumcised' (Aprile, 2012, pp. 22–23). Neither in older nor in more recent loanwords are originally "emphatic" consonants distinguished from their nonpharyngealized counterparts (and, analogously, /k/ from [q]): It. slang *tógo* < *ṭôḇ*; It. *càbala* 'lie' < *qabbālāh* 'tradition'; Pt., Sp. *kibutz*, Fr., It. *kibbutz*, Ro. *kibuţ* < *qibbûṣ*.

3.3.2 Morphology

Most of the Biblical loanwords have been integrated into an inflectional class of the Romance languages, often through a previous Greek and Latin adaptation (*'abbā'* > Lat. *abbās*, *abbātis*). The Hebrew masculine plural ending *-îm* has been frequently confused with the outcomes of the Lat. suffix *-īnum*, as in the case of Sp. *serafín*, Cat. *serafí*, Fr. *séraphin*, It. *serafino* 'seraph'. This confusion might have been favored by the evolution of Hebrew *-îm* into *-în*, as hinted at by the Greek adaptations *kheroub(e)ín* and *seraph(e)ín*, already occurring in the Septuagint beside the more frequent variants in *-ím* (Mancini, 1998, p. 367).

Also, non-Biblical loanwords deriving from Judeo-Romance have been mostly adapted morphologically (*pāsûl* > It. *fasullo*, *məraggēl* > It. *marachella*) or, at least, given a final epithetic vowel, as far as Italian dialects not allowing word-final consonants were concerned (*kāšēr* > Roman *cascèrre*, Tuscan *cacèrre*). An alternative option has been the elimination of the final consonant, as in the case of Livornese *sciamì* < *šāmîr*. In the Judeo-languages Romance affixes have been often added to Hebrew lexical bases (Aprile, 2012, pp. 37–47), notably for the derivation of verbs (Judeo-Livornese *aclare* 'to eat' < *'aḵal*) and nouns (Judeo-

Sp. *desmazal* 'bad luck' < *mazzāl* 'luck, fate'). In rare cases these hybrid formations have been borrowed by the corresponding non-Jewish varieties: see Emilian *sagatar* and *sagater* 'to slaughter' < *šāḥaṭ* (through Judeo-Emilian *sciahtar*), Sp. *desmazalado* 'unlucky' (through Judeo-Sp. *desmazalar*).

3.3.3 Syntax

There are no syntactic borrowings from Hebrew in any Romance language. Only in medieval and early modern translations of the Old Testament and other Jewish religious texts, all made by Jews and usually written in Hebrew script (section 3.1), are calques on Hebrew syntactic structures to be found, as for instance copula-less nominal clauses: see *Benedetto Tu Domedet escudjatore de Avraham* 'Blessed (are) Thou God, shield of Abraham' in a 15th-century Judeo-Italian book of prayer, corresponding to Hebrew *bārûḵ 'āttāh hā-ššēm māḡēn 'Aḇrāhām* lit. 'blessed you the Name, shield of Abraham' (Ryzhik, 2009, p.127).

Further Reading

Brincat, J. (2011). *Maltese and other languages: A linguistic history of Malta*. Santa Venera, Malta: Midsea Books.

Ineichen, G. (1997). *Arabisch-orientalische Sprachkontakte in der Romania. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters*. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Ineichen, G. (2006). *Sprachkontakte: Hebräisch und Romanisch/Contacts linguistiques: Hébreu et roman*. In G. Ernst, M. D. Gleßgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (pp. 1668–1672). Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter.

Kontzi, R. (1998). Arabisch und Romanisch. In G. Holtus, M. Metzeltin, & C. Schmitt (Eds.), *Lexicon der romanistischen Linguistik: Vol. 7. Kontakt, Migration und Kunstsprachen* (pp. 328–347). Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Kramer, J. (1993). Hebraismen in den romanischen Sprachen. In S. Kowallik & J. Kramer (Eds.), *Romanojudaica* (pp. 41–80). Gerbrunn bei Würzburg, Germany: Lehmann.

Mancini, M. (1998). Hebräisch und Romanisch/L'ebraico e le lingue romanze. In G. Holtus, M. Metzeltin, & C. Schmitt (Eds.), *Lexicon der romanistischen Linguistik: Vol. 7. Kontakt, Migration und Kunstsprachen* (pp. 366–372). Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Pellegrini, G. B. (1972). *Gli arabismi nelle lingue neolatine con speciale riguardo all'Italia* (2 vols.). Brescia, Italy: Paideia.

Schweickard, W. (2017). Italian and Arabic. *Lexicographica*, *33*, 121–184.

Steiger, A. (1932). *Contribución a la fonética del hispano-árabe y de los arabismos en el hibero-románico y el siciliano*. Madrid, Spain: Bernardo.

Steiger, A. (1948–1949). Aufmarschstrassen des morgenländischen Sprachgutes. *Vox Romanica*, *10*, 1–62.

References

Agius, D. A. (1996). *Siculo Arabic*. London, UK: Kegan Paul International.

Aprile, M. (2010). Giudeo-italiano. In R. Simone (Ed.), *Enciclopedia dell'italiano* (Vol. 1, pp. 586–587). Roma, Italy: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana.

Aprile, M. (2012). *Grammatica storica delle parlate giudeo-italiane*. Galatina, Italy: Congedo.

Arnold, R. D. (2017). Judeo-Romance varieties. *Lexicographica*, *33*, 321–357.

Baglioni, D. (2012). Un arabismo ben camuffato: "bord[at(in)]o". *Studi linguistici italiani*, *38*, 260–264.

Baglioni, D. (2015). *Z-* da sibilante tra ipotesi di sostrato e superstrato arabo. In L. Filipponio & C. Seidl (Eds.), *La lingua d'Italia e le altre. Contatti, sostrati e superstrati nella storia linguistica della Penisola* (pp. 81–94). Milano, Italy: Franco Angeli.

Baglioni, D. (2021). Altre scritture. In G. Antonelli, M. Motolese, & L. Tomasin (Eds.), *Storia dell'italiano scritto*. Vol. 6: *Pratiche di scrittura* (pp. 81–124). Roma, Italy: Carocci.

Bentahila, A., & Davies, E. E. (1983). The syntax of Arabic-French code-switching. *Lingua*, *59*, 331–343.

Borg, A. (1978). *A historical and comparative phonology and morphology of Maltese* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Jerusalem, Israel: Hebrew University.

Bossong, G. (1979). *Probleme der Übersetzung wissenschaftlicher Werke aus dem Arabischen in das Altspanische zur Zeit Alfons des Weisen*. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Brincat, J. (1995). *Malta 870-1054. Al-Himyari's account and its linguistic implications*. Valletta, Malta: Said International.

Brincat, J. (2011). *Maltese and other languages. A linguistic history of Malta*. Santa Venera, Malta: Midsea Books.

Bunis, D. M. (1993). *A lexicon of the Hebrew and Aramaic elements in Judezmo*. Jerusalem, Israel: The Hebrew University Magnes Press.

Bunis, D. M. (2016). Judezmo (Ladino). In A. D. Rubin & L. Kahn (Eds.), *Handbook of Jewish languages* (pp. 365–450). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Caracausi, G. (1983). *Arabismi medievali di Sicilia*. Palermo, Italy: Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.

Caubet, D. (1998). Alternance de code au Maghreb: Pourquoi le français est-il arabisé?. In Centre d'Etudes et de Recherches sur la Planification Linguistique (Ed.), *Alternance des langues et aprentissage en contextes plurilingues* (= *Plurilinguisme* 14) (pp. 121–142). Paris, France: René-Decartes.

Christ, G. (1991). *Arabismen im Argot*. Frankfurt am Main, Germany: Peter Lang.

Corominas, J., & Pascual, J. A. (1980–1991). *Diccionario crítico etimológico castellano e hispánico*. 6 vols. Madrid, Spain: Editorial Gredos.

Corriente, F. (1977). *A grammatical sketch of the Spanish Arabic bundle*. Madrid, Spain: Instituto hispano-árabe de cultura.

Corriente, F. (1978). Los fonemas /p/, /č/ y /g/ en árabe hispánico. *Vox romanica*, *37*, 214–218.

Corriente, F. (1992). *Árabe andalusí y lenguas romances*. Madrid, Spain: Editorial MAPFRE.

Corriente, F. (1997). *Poesía dialectal árabe y romance en Alandalús*. Madrid, Spain: Gredos.

Corriente, F. (2008). *Dictionary of Arabic and allied loanwords. Spanish, Portuguese, Catalan, Gallician and kindred dialects*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Ernst, G., & Gleßgen, M.-D., Schmitt, C., & Schweickard, W. (Eds.). (2006), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania*. Vol. 2. Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter.

Fanciullo, F. (1992). Di qualche giudaismo passato ai dialetti toscani. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, *108*, 319–325.

Franceschini, F. (2011). Tre voci di origine giudeo-italiana dal primo Ottocento a oggi: *Bagitto* ‘giudeo livornese’, *gambero* ‘ladro’, *goio* ‘sciocco’. *Lingua nostra*, *72*, 106–115.

Galmés de Fuentes, Á. (1983). *Dialectología mozárabe*. Madrid, Spain: Gredos.

Holtus, G., Metzeltin, M., & Schmitt, C. (Eds.). (1998). *Lexicon der romanistischen Linguistik*, Vol. 7. *Kontakt, Migration und Kunstsprachen*. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Ineichen, G. (1997). *Arabisch-orientalische Sprachkontakte in der Romania. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte des Mittelalters*. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Ineichen, G. (2006). *Sprachkontakte: Hebräisch und Romanisch/Contacts linguistiques: Hébreu et roman*. In G. Ernst, M. D. Gleßgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (pp. 1668–1672). Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter.

Institute of Islamic Studies of the University of Zaragoza. (Ed.). (2013). *A descriptive and comparative grammar of Andalusi Arabic*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Kiesler, R. (1994). *Kleines vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Arabismen im Iberoromanischen und Lateinischen*. Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Kiesler, R. (2006). Sprachkontakte: Arabisch und Galloromania/Contacts linguistiques: Arabe et Galloromania. In G. Ernst, M. D. Gleßgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (pp. 1648–1655). Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter.

Kiwitt, M., & Dörr, S. (2016). Judeo-French. In A. D. Rubin & L. Kahn (Eds.), *Handbook of Jewish languages* (pp. 138–177). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Kontzi, R. (1998a). Arabisch und Romanisch. In G. Holtus, M. Metzeltin, & C. Schmitt, C. (Eds.), *Lexicon der romanistischen Linguistik*, Vol. 7. *Kontakt, Migration und Kunstsprachen* (pp. 328–347). Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Kontzi, R. (1998b). Maltesisch. In G. Holtus, M. Metzeltin, & C. Schmitt, C. (Eds.), *Lexicon der romanistischen Linguistik*, Vol. 7. *Kontakt, Migration und Kunstsprachen* (pp. 347–365). Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Kramer, J. (1993). Hebraismen in den romanischen Sprachen. In S. Kowallik & J. Kramer (Eds.), *Romanojudaica* (pp. 41–80). Gerbrunn bei Würzburg, Germany: Lehmann.

Lakhdhar, A. (2006). Fenomeni di contatto linguistico in Tunisia: La parlata mista dei siciliani di Tunisi e gli italianismi nella varietà dialettale di arabo tunisino. In E. Banfi & G. Iannàccaro (Eds.), *Lo spazio linguistico italiano e le "lingue esotiche": Rapporti e reciproci influssi* (pp. 371–394). Roma, Italy: Bulzoni.

Loporcaro, M. (2018). *Gender from Latin to Romance: History, geography, typology*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Mancini, M. (1987). Su tre prestiti giudaici nel romanesco comune. *Studi linguistici italiani*, *13*, 85–101.

Mancini, M. (1992). *L'esotismo nel lessico italiano*. Viterbo, Italy: Università della Tuscia.

Mancini, M. (1998). Hebräisch und Romanisch/L'ebraico e le lingue romanze. In G. Holtus, M. Metzeltin, & C. Schmitt, C. (Eds.), *Lexicon der romanistischen Linguistik*, Vol. 7. *Kontakt, Migration und Kunstsprachen* (pp. 366–372). Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.

Massariello Merzagora, G. (1977). *Giudeo-Italiano*. Pisa, Italy: Pacini.

Mayer Modena, L. (1988). A proposito di alcuni imprestiti ebraici di provenienza giudeo-italiana nei dialetti dell'Italia centro-settentrionale. *L'Italia dialettale*, *51*, 141–157.

Minervini, L. (1992). *Testi giudeospagnoli medievali*. 2 vols. Napoli, Italy: Liguori.

Minervini, L. (2012). Les emprunts arabes et grecs dans le lexique français d'Orient (XIII^{e}-XIV^{e} siècles). *Revue de Linguistique Romane*, *76*, 99–197.

Minervini, L. (2016). La variation lexicale en fonction du contact linguistique: Le français dans l'Orient latin. In M.-D. Glessgen & D. Trotter (Eds.), *La régionalité lexicale du français au Moyen Âge* (pp. 195–206). Strasbourg, France: Éditions de Linguistique et de Philologie.

Montero Muñoz, R. (2006). Sprachkontakte: Arabisch und Iberoromania/Contact linguistiques: Arabe et Iberoromania. In G. Ernst, M. D. Gleßgen, C. Schmitt, & W. Schweickard (Eds.), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Romania* (pp. 1655–1667). Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter.

Nichil, R. L. (2016). Voci dall'Africa. Un contributo per la ridefinizione dell'elemento coloniale nel lessico italiano <*http://www.atilf.fr/cilpr2013/actes/section-5.html*>. In R. Coluccia, J. B. Rosario, & M. Frankwalt (Eds.), *Actes du XXVII^{e} Congrès international de linguistique et de philologie romanes (Nancy, 15-20 juillet 2013). Section 5: Lexicologie, phraséologie, lexicographie*. Nancy, France: ATILF.

Noll, V. (1996). Der arabische Artikel *al* und das Iberoromanische. In J. Lüdtke (Ed.), *Romania arabica. Festschrift für Reinhold Kontzi zum 70. Geburtstag* (pp. 299–313). Tübingen, Germany: Narr.

Norman, D. (1979). *The Arabs and Medieval Europe*. 2nd ed. London, UK: Longman.

Pellegrini, G. B. (1972). *Gli arabismi nelle lingue neolatine con speciale riguardo all'Italia*. 2 vols. Brescia, Italy: Paideia.

Pellegrini, G. B. (1989). *Ricerche sugli arabismi italiani con particolare riguardo alla Sicilia*. Palermo, Italy: Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.

Rubin, A. D. (2016). Judeo-Italian. In A. D. Rubin & L. Kahn (Eds.), *Handbook of Jewish languages* (pp. 297–364). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Rubin, A. D., & Kahn, L. (2016) (Eds.). *Handbook of Jewish languages*. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Ruhstaller, S., & Gordón Peral, M. D. (2017). The lexical impact of language contact with Arabic on Spanish and Catalan. *Lexicographica*, *33*, 277–296.

Ryzhik, M, (2009). La proposizione nominale nelle traduzioni giudeo-italiane dei formulari di preghiera e della Bibbia, e in italiano antico. *Medioevo romanzo*, *33*, 121–149.

Sala, M. (2013). Contact and borrowing. In M. Maiden, J. C. Smith, & A. Ledgeway (Eds.), *The Cambridge history of the Romance languages*. Vol. 2. *Contexts* (pp. 187–236). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Scheludko, D. (1927). Über die arabischen Lehnwörter im Altprovenzalischen. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, *47*, 418–442.

Schweickard, W. (2000). Zur Etymologie von it. *bucherame*. In M. Guille & R. Kiesler (Eds.), *Romania una et diversa. Philologische Studien für Theodor Berchem zum 65. Geburtstag*. Vol. 1. *Sprachwissenschaft* (pp. 323–332). Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr Verlag.

Schweickard, W. (2017). Italian and Arabic. *Lexicographica*, *33*, 121–184.

Sgroi, S. C. (1986). *Interferenze fonologiche, morfo-sintattiche e lessicali fra l'arabo e il siciliano*. Palermo, Italy: Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.

Sguaitamatti-Bassi, S. (1974). *Les emprunts directs faits par le français à l'arabe jusqu'à la fin du XIII^{e} siècle*. Zürich, Switzerland: Juris Druck + Verlag Zurich.

Steiger, A. (1932). *Contribución a la fonética del hispano-árabe y de los arabismos en el hibero-románico y el siciliano*. Madrid, Spain: Bernardo.

Steiger, A. (1948–1949). Aufmarschstrassen des morgenländischen Sprachgutes. *Vox Romanica*, *10*, 1–62.

Stern, S. M. (Ed.). (1964). *Les chansons mozarabes: les vers finals (Kharjas) en espagnol dans les muwashshahs arabes et hébreux*. Oxford, UK: Cassirer.

Strich, A., & Jochnowitz, G. (2016). Judeo-Occitan (Judeo-Provençal). In A. D. Rubin & L. Kahn (Eds.), *Handbook of Jewish languages* (pp. 517–551). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Strolovich, D. (2016). Judeo-Portuguese. In A. D. Rubin & L. Kahn (Eds.), *Handbook of Jewish languages* (pp. 552–592). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Suárez García, R., & Candás, P. R. (Eds.). (2018). *Biblioteca Digital Aljamiada <http://www.arabicaetromanica.com/biblioteca-digital-aljamiada/>*.

Tropea, G. (1988). *Lessico del dialetto di Pantelleria*. Palermo, Italy: Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani.

Vàrvaro, A. (1981). *Lingua e storia in Sicilia*. Palermo, Italy: Sellerio.

Ziamari, K. (2008). *Le code switching au Maroc: L'arabe marocain au contact du français*. Paris, France: L'Harmattan.

Zwink, J. (2017). *Altfranzösisch in hebräischer Graphie. Teiledition und Analyse des Medizintraktats "Fevres"*. Berlin, Germany: de Gruyter.

Related Articles

Romance in Contact with Basque

Language Contact and the Lexicon of Romance Languages

Ibero-Romance II: Astur-Leonese, Spanish, Navarro-Aragonese

History of the Romanian Lexicon