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Abstract
As a continued discussion about the Judeo-Arabic as a cultural symbiosis of the Jews in the Islamicate context, the present article enhances it with the discussion of frontier as a theoretical framework to understand the Jewish condition in the Muslim realm, in particular in Al-Andalus. Hence, the Judeo-Arabic becomes an actualization of the politics of language by the Jews. In addition to the fact that the Judeo-Arabic being nurtured by the Arabic literature, the Jews also carried out their experiences in diaspora critically through the usage of the Arabic and the Judeo-Arabic cultural container.
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A. Introduction
“In the midst of Ruṣāfa a palm has appeared in a Western land, far from the home of palms. So I said: This is me for I, too, am in exile, far from my family and friends. In exile you have grown tall, and alike we’re far from home” (Quoted in Cole, 1995, p. xxvi).

‘Abd al-Raḥmān I (r. 756-788), the grandson of the last Umayyad caliph (661-750 CE) and an Emir from Syria arrived in Spain in 756 to save his life from the pursuit of the Abbasid executors. In this “land of the setting sun” (al-maghrīb al-'aqsā), he built Munyat al-Ruṣāfa (villa of al-Ruṣāfa), by imitating the Syrian palaces; basically, it was a replication of the palace of the Umayyad caliph, Hishām (724-743) (Ruggles, 2000, pp. 42–43). This beautiful palace was entirely first built by the Arabs in Cordoba. The garden of the palace, according to Arabs sources planted with beautiful and unusual plants. In the embrace of his sublime beauty garden, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān inscribed the above beautiful poem: So I said: This is me/ for I, too, am in exile.

A yearning of al-Andalus was apparently shared not only by the Jews as a
people of diaspora, but also by the Arabs. Driven from their celebrated homeland, the Fertile Crescent, to live in the farthest end of the world beyond the sanctities of Haram’ayn (Mecca and Medina) was made their heart miserable. Though ‘Abd al-Raḥmān came to Spain with his loyalists not only to escape, but also to prolong the glory of Umayyad after Damascus taken over by the new dynasty of Abbasid, he could not help himself be overwhelmed by pain. The poem was a way to cope with the exilic pain, as to the Psalmist when in the Babylonian exile, longing for Zion in Psalms 137:1: “By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat, sat and wept, as we thought of Zion.” From the history of Arabic literature, this yearning was labeled ʿal-ḥanīnilā al-awṭān (Ar. “yearning for one’s homeland”), which according to Esperanza Alfonso, is “the unhappiness and homesickness felt by travelers, traders, and scholars/poets” (Alfonso, 2008, p. 53). Mutual feeling of “lost” was, perhaps, one of the common characteristics of multiculturalism of al-Andalus.

Many people will point out to al-Andalus episode in the medieval when being asked about the example of the best era of interreligious interaction and multiculturalism throughout history. Later after the Umayyads were deposed, and the power was broken down into independent domains called “mulūk al-tawā’if” or the “ṭā’ifās” (Spa. losreinos de taifas, such as Toledo, Seville, Granada, and others), the cultural excellence continued, and attracted the best poets, artists and scientists, competing for the highest achievements of the political-military competition of the times. “The market for sciences was brisk,” observed al-Shaqundī, the thirteenth century Muslim architect, “and they competed in giving recompense for prose and poetry.” He continued, “there was no a greater glory for them but that it should besaid that the learned so-and-so lived in such-and-such a kingdom and that some poet was in the court of such-and-such a king” (Ruggles, 2007, p. III: 126).

If so, thus it is easy to agree with the prominent Palestinian poet and author, the late Mahmoud Darwish (1941-2008) in his idolization of the era and place, al-firdaws al-mafijud, the paradise lost. While at the same time concealed his lamentation of the present discord between Jews and Muslims, and asymmetrical fate between Israelis and Palestinians, he projects:

“Andalus … might be here or there, or anywhere … a meeting place of strangers in the project of building human culture …

It is not only that there was a Jewish-Muslim coexistence, but that the fates of the two people were similar …

Al-Andalus for me is the realization of the dream of the poem” (quoted in Cole, 1995, p. vii).

 “[T]he realization of the dream of the poem” was called “Golden Age” by a German Protestant scholar, Franz Delitzsch (1813-1890). It was “the site of memorable and distinctive interfaith relations,” praised the other (Menocal, 2002, p. 30). And, it was a “Spanish miracle” where the Jewish geniuses pursued their philosophical and literary perfection (Goitein, 1988, p. V: 425). “Al-Andalus” is then more than simply a name of a place. It is a place of exile and redemption altogether; a panacea for our present problems.

The famous Spanish historian, Américo Castro y Quesada (1885 – 1972) coined for the first time the term La Convivencia (Spa. “dwelling together, coexistence”), to refer to this cultural interaction among various social groups
under Islamic and Christian rulers. The term mainly connoted to the Muslim Spain era, though not exclusively, where interreligious, intellectual and cultural freedom, became the benchmark. This optimistic term captures nicely the above Darwish “dream.” Al-Andalus is also seen as the best example, and sometime a litmus test of the Islamic politics of tolerance. The Indonesian title of the translation of Menocal’s work, *The ornament of the world* (2002), is *Sepotong Surga di Andalusia: kisah peradaban Muslim, Yahudi, Kristen Spanyol pertengahan (750-1492)* (2006) (*A piece of paradise in Andalusia: a story of Muslim, Jewish, and Christian civilizations in the Medieval Spain (750-1492)*) accentuated this politics further.

However, it was more complicated than the above projection and demand broader explanation.

**B. Method**

The present article owed from the frontier perspective and theory to delve the above complication of interaction, as pronounced by Sander Gilman. “The frontier is not the periphery, as it relates only to itself. It is the conceptual and physical space, where groups in motion meet, confront, alter, destroy, and build” each other (Gilman, 2003, p. 15). He proposes *frontier* as an alternative reading of Jewish history. However, his main concern is to challenge the standard *topos* of Jewish historical account that emphasizes on the center-periphery model of Jewish Diaspora, which strongly proposed by Zionism. Through which the diaspora experience is considered peripheral.

In the present article, the frontier perspective is using not to challenge the center-periphery model, though this notion somehow informs to the presentation. It is used in order to understand better the tension undergone by in a socio-cultural interaction in history. Frontier in this regard is a category to overcome the tendency to read the past interaction by way of redemptive reading of history; so as to find “answers” of contemporary problem in the past. This perspective is also helpful to see history in a dialogic manner by paying a more attention to the different voices that struggle to structure the past moments, by saying that each subject has undergone or dealt with her/ his own frontier.

Gilman asserts, “[A] history marked by the dynamics of change, confrontation, and accommodation, a history that focuses on the present, and in which all participants are given voices” (Gilman, 2003, p. 15). Though it is legitimate in its own academic containment, in the case of the Judeo-Arabic culture (and earlier *al-yahūdīyya*) is quite apparent that it could not easily be assessed simply as a derivative product of “pure” linguistic category, i.e. Jewish (Hebrew) and Arabic. Frontier perspective allows it to be treated as a creolized and hybrid identity.

**C. Result and Discussion**

**C.1. Al-Andalus as Frontier of Interaction**

Among the specialists, the aforementioned *La Convivencia* has long been deconstructed (Wacks, 2007, p. 5). Historical evidences interpreted by the scholars, such as David Wacks provided with more nuance and complicated report of the interaction through the Andalusian experiences in Al-Andalus. In many points the popular attitude toward the subject tends to reify to the place and era, to the extent of the constructing the “myth of interfaith utopia” (Cohen, 1994, pp. 3–14).

In reality it was a complex interaction and did not necessarily comply with modern “tolerance” as philosophical inquiry and peaceful interfaith relationship. The notion
of “tolerance” as we understand today, was absent in classical world and not until the seventeenth century when British philosopher, John Locke substantiated this notion in his book, *On Tolerance* (1689) the idea was current (Stroumsa, 1995, p. 3).

Moreover, during the period, not only there was sharing cultural values and language but also social and cultural tension. Wars and bitter confrontations between Christians and Muslims, and among Christians and among Muslims were parts of the interaction (cf. Nirenberg, 1996, pp. 166–169). In both sides of the Christian and Muslim territories in Medieval Spain, the rulers ruling based on the ethnic hierarchy that involving the necessary second-class and protected social groups.

So that the *ahl al-dhimma*, under which Christians and Jews were protected by a Muslim ruler, and in more sociological categories such as Mozarabs (Arabized Christians), Musālima (converts of Islam), and Muwalladūn (children of Musālima), so Moriscos (Muslims converted to Christianity) and Marranos/Conversos (Jews converted to Christianity) and the rest non-converted second class groups.

On both cases, they were tolerated, but in many ways also oppressed, notably the Jews who never became the ruler themselves. Through those categories, all parties, especially the rulers maintained the technique of Othering. In certain contexts even, both rulers exercised heavy taxation, forced conversion, expulsion, and slaughter. Along the course of history, it seems that monotheistic religions in power often have felt it requisite, to persecute nonconforming religions.

In many instances, medieval Islam persecuted non-Muslims just as medieval Christianity persecuted Jews and Muslims. Judaism during the Hasmonean period (second century BCE), persecuted the pagan Idumeans, and converted them forcibly (Cohen, 1994, p. xix), so as the Jewish Ḥimyarite persecuted the Christian Arabs. “[N]either Judaism nor Christianity treated apostasy and apostates with any particular kindness,” observed a scholar (Friedmann, 2003, p. 5).

Plenty of examples demonstrated “genuine” cultural interactions instead, such as visible participation of Christians and Jewish minorities in social and political life. The example of that was Shmuel ha-Nagid (Ismā‘īl ibn al-Nagrīlah, 993-ca. 1056), the leader of Jewish community who became the chief vizier of Granada; such position that was almost impossible for the Jews to obtain in the Christian Lands. In this point, al-Andalus was unique in many ways and a stunning example of the envied multiculturalism in the past. For the Jewish part, as against diasporic experiences elsewhere, it was also a cultural space where the previous restraint exilic trauma somehow transformed into a more optimistic, even to a point of unorthodox manner. The question of cross-fertilization of cultures was also the tenor of the era; at least it served to minimize factionalism and promoted of common enterprise among the people who came in from different cultural and religious background (Cole, 2007, p. 358).

Some scholars proposed a modified view and model for this cultural interaction. Al-Andalus connotes to the “mutual interpenetration and creative influence, even as it also embraces the phenomena of mutual friction, rivalry, and suspicion,” asserted by Thomas Glick; it is better to be seen as “a field of interaction” (Cole, 2007, p. 529). Brian Catlos introduced the term “Conveniencia” (convenience) that individuals are defined not first by religion, but by occupation, hometown, family, or sex, thus provided a more living experience in interaction. Lastly, David Wacks introduced a more relational model that he called “Contravivencia” (counter-experience) by emphasizing “an agonistic yet productive
symbiotic relationship in which each participant is a *sine qua non* in the construction of the other’s identity and cultural formation” (Wacks, 2007, p. 5).

Rather cynical perspective, however, speaks about “Golden Men” of the Jewish culture rather than the “Golden Age,” to refer to few hundred Jewish elite people who participate to the cultural euphoria of the time (Cohen, 1994, p. xv), which exclusively world of men with little women’s participation. While female poets hold a high esteem since pre-Islamic era and even more in the medieval Arabic and Christian literatures (Cole, 2007, p. 363; cf. Kahf, 2000, pp. 147–171), the Hebrew women almost disappeared in this cultural ardor. Only two poems survived and they came from the wife of Dunash bin Labrat (unknown name) and the presumably the daughter of Shmuel ha-Nagid, Qasmuna bint Ismā’īl al-Yehuḏī. As I mentioned earlier that many Hebrew poems produced around this era were related to religious themes, thus required extensive knowledge of the Bible, as well as familiarity with the rabbinic literatures, to this point Jewish women largely lack of (Cole, 2007, p. 363).

By the end of the fourteenth century however, *convivencia* came to an end when the last Muslim stronghold, Granada surrendered to the Catholic Monarchs on January 2, 1492, and as the Christians effectively controlled the entire Iberian Peninsula, *convivencia* lost its charmed and no longer necessary (Utterback, 2009). The following events marked with the one of the saddest episodes of the Jews and Muslims in Christian Lands, especially the Jews who compelled to choose between baptism and permanent exile.

Away from the debate of degree of tolerance/intolerance and the nature of multiculturalism in al-Andalus, the above complicated issue leads us to other possible perspective to observe the relationship between Jews and Muslims in general; the perspective that relates to the politics of language actualized in Judeo-Arabic. The above poem of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān I and Darwish’s statement each succinctly leads to a new question namely: in what capacity those subjects arrived at “al-Andalus”? Besides its physical and geographical features, and its spatial attainment, to which a person like ‘Abd al-Raḥmān and Darwish deeply entranced, “al-Andalus” is also Diaspora space, real and figurative altogether. The “Andalusian frontier/exile,” if we may call of this earliest phase of Muslim conquest, was a symbolic and physical space of frontier experience that shared by many people: the Arabs, Jews, Berbers, and Mozarabs (Arabized Christians), and others. Everybody is “stranger” (Darwish), in the sense of “a palm ... far from the home of palms” (‘Abd al-Raḥmān).

It may extend to the Simmel sociological excursus on the “stranger” as a social *typos*. He asserted that a stranger is not only a person comes today and leave tomorrow, but “the person who comes today and *stays to morrow* [my emphasis]” (Simmel, 1950, p. 402). In this point, as a stranger he may leave tomorrow but maybe not, yet maintain the mentality of “temporality.” To dramatize this situation, interestingly ‘Abd al-Raḥmān I was also known as *al-dākhil*, “the immigrant,” which imposed his symbolic “stranger” at the land, meanwhile Darwish was a diasporic Palestinian. The redemption sought by Darwish, seemingly conflated with the exilic narrative that put al-Andalus as the spatiotemporality where strangers, presumably coming from different origins and different religious persuasions, dwell to build their own belonging (“*the project of building human culture*”) and sharing their fates. Furthermore, still on the Simmel’s notion of “stranger” that:

“The stranger is by nature no “owner of soil” – soil not only in the physical, but
also in the figurative sense of a life-substance which is fixed, if not in a point in space, at least in an ideal point of the social environment. Although in more intimate relations, he may develop all kinds of charm and significance, as long as he is considered a stranger in the eyes of the other, he is not an “owner of soil” (Simmel, 1950, p. 402).

Al-Andalus is “the soil” where her inhabitants could not claim of total ownership. Politically, this might lead to concessions, dispensations, alliances, and power-sharing among the Christians and Muslims rulers. Whilst, cultural sharing was part of propensity of such mentality, though indeed there were other factors that contributed to such process. This is apparent since the Spanish Christian rulers (of different kingdoms and principalities), with substantial support from other Christian rulers throughout Europe, for roughly seven centuries attempted to “reclaim” (Spa. reconquista, Ar. al-’Istirdād) Christian soil in Iberia from the Muslims; an attempt that ended with total “repossession” of the entire Iberian Peninsula in 1492; in which Wacks called it as “Christian conquest of al-Andalus” (Wacks, 2007, p. 5, 1 and 3). Al-Andalus was a frontier, physically and symbolically, where accommodation and conflict, feeling “in exile” and “at home,” and other cultural disjunctures and coherences were constantly contested, thus produced specific human interaction and cultural productions.

C.2. Judeo-Arabic as a Frontier

At this point, I end the discussion on the diasporic condition undergone by al-Andalus multicultural contributors that contributed to the frontier mentality. At least from the above narratives we can shift our attention to frontier as a model to understand the interaction between Jews and Muslims in Medieval period. Beyond “al-Andalus” paradigm, it want to assess that such frontier perspective also useful in dealing with Judeo-Arabic cultural phenomenon in Muslim Spain, and elsewhere as far as the Islamicate context. The following issues come to fore to appraise the plausibility of the model.

At the first place, religious theories that inhabits in precepts, doctrines, and theologies often pose themselves in a frontier of religious symbolic boundary. When Islam emerged in the sixth century Arabian, surely the Muslims were minority among non-Muslims and non-Arabs of their new Islamic domain. The centuries to come, roughly until thirteenth century where it virtually concluded, mass conversion increased and the Muslims steadily became the majority. The conversion of Christians (and, to a lesser extent, of Jews) to Islam obviously enhanced Islamic politics and religious prestige and dominance. However, bringing non-Muslim subject into the Islamic religious territory in many cases were smooth and less problematic. But, in other cases there were immediate problems since the conversion might lead to threatening Islamic dominance.

In al-Andalus, the success of Islamic army to defeat Christian Visigoth kingdoms in the eighth century would follow with political and religious initiatives to increase the Muslim populations to ensure the stability of the new conquered territory. However, during the Spanish Umayyad Emirate (756-1031) the converts instead, were partial cause of the instability of the Muslim polity. The participation of muwalladun (converts to Islam and their descendants) in the rebellions nearly overwhelmed the Emirate in the late ninth and early tenth centuries.

Therefore, conversion may present serious problems for the regime, since apparently in this context, embracing the new converts into Islamic political and social fabric was far from simple (Safran, 2001, p. 574). Often “acculturation,” intermarriage, and conversion generated anxiety and new
challenges, especially among the religious authorities of Abrahamic religious traditions, let alone for the Muslim authorities, the ‘ulamā’. Their literatures in the medieval Andalusia often displayed their concern on the “trespassing” religious and communal boundaries that would corrupt Islam and even lead to Muslim apostasy (Safran, 2001, p. 575). Any of those cases, there was a (symbolic) frontier context, where the complex interaction defines and redefines the meaning of self and other. Being a Muslim for a convert in this context, is more than simply chanting shahada (creed) but immediately inhabits a subtle world where subscription was often coupled with suspicion.

Among the Jews, similar logic was also at work. Some of the later generations saw with a strong contempt to the cultural symbiotic of Jews and Muslims demonstrated by Judeo-Arabic culture. Sa’adia ben Maimūn ibn Danān, a Sephardi scholar in his departure to Algeria after the expulsion by the Spanish king in 1492, expressed his distaste that:

“[T]he Sephardim studied grammar, they composed beautiful poetry and they wrote excellent prose, just as the Muslims. Personally, however, I cannot see the use of this particular science. The great scholar and chief pupil of Maimonides, Joseph ibn Aqnīn, wrote in his ‘Healing of the Souls’ that the students of Torah should always learn this discipline, since he considered it quite useful. I am not at all convinced that he was right” (Zwiep, 1998, p. 913).

Apparently, Judeo-Arabic as a hybrid culture was not necessarily pleased everybody; presumably this hybridity practice would harm Jewish identity.

A Tenth-Century Egyptian Jew, Abū al-Munajjā bin Sha’ya, an administrator in al-Afdal Shahanshah (1066-1121) palace, was a constructor of Nile sluice. Despite his contribution to the ruler at the time, he incurred the death penalty because he wrote a Qur’ān (Goldziher, 1902, p. 74). Arabic (al-‘Arabiyya, the “pure” Arabic) is a sacred language, as to Hebrew by the Jews, therefore text with Arabic character often in an odd position since it impregnates the possibility of the profanation the sacred. In this regard, at least there were Islamic authorities that maintained the principle of that ahl al-dhimma prohibited to use Arabic script outright (Fenton, 1990, p. 48–49, 49n7).

Moses Maimonides (Abū‘ Imrān Mūsā bin Maymūn, 1135–1204), a prominent medieval Jewish philosopher, religious authority, and physician in the Salah al-Din of Ayyubid palace (ca. 1138-1193), serves as a good example of Judeo-Arabic as a frontier space. As prolific writers that produced numerous writings, for the purpose of his work in Jewish community and other non-Jewish matters, his mastery in Arabic, Hebrew, and Judeo-Arabic allowed him to switch between those languages in order to adapt to his varied readership (Hary, 2003, pp. 64–65).

In his two works, Epistle to Yemen (Iggeret Teman) and Guide to the Perplexed (Ar. Dalālat al-ḥāširīn, Heb. Moreh Nevukim), Maimonides was critical to Islam. In these he needed to be extremely cautious in stating his opinion. Therefore, he employed techniques to avoid Muslims anger by firstly writing his work either in Hebrew or Judeo-Arabic that mostly inaccessible by the Muslims (Hourani, 1986, p. 156).

Language is another frontier line that contestation and specific relationship and power relation often shaped upon it. To this, we can conclude that Judeo-Arabic was not only a dialect of Arabic, but also a cultural gesture in the frontier context, whereupon a complexity, even ambivalence on the retaining the Hebrew, and to a degree, Aramaic as an imagined core of Jewish identity, while there was also a cultural
maneuver to adapt to the dynamic of Diaspora context. In this position, the contempt among the Jews of the adoption Arabic by Judeo-Arabic Jews, and on the other direction, the limit of the Jews to use Arabic by Islamic authority, became the corridor of the Judeo-Arabic performance.

D. Conclusion

Throughout this paper, I would shift the question that, no more on the dream of assimilation, but as the recognition of “culture untranslatability,” as put by Homi Bhabha regarding the migrant culture, “[T]he migrant culture of the in-between, the minority position, dramatizes the activity of culture’s untranslatability; and in so doing, it moves the question of culture’s appropriation beyond the assimilationist’s dream …” (Bhabha, 1994, p. 224). Judeo-Arabic was a dramatization of cultural untranslatability, it demonstrated a contested identity. This will allow us to assess the limits and extent for co-habitation of different cultural and linguistic groups (cf. Schjerve, 2003, pp. 1–3). It is also the central argument of the frontier experience, as pronounced by Sander Gilman, in which a frontier is not a periphery but a space where confrontation, alteration, destroying and building of interaction among groups take place.

The finding suggests further, the disjuncture and incongruence of human interaction, as the outcome of different voices that shape it, is basically formative and influential. Through this disjuncture and incongruence, the Jewish subjective identity was constantly in the state of negotiation, resistance, submission, and so forth, against the world beyond, as the basis for ongoing dialectic tensions. In this frontier experience, it may be marked by not only enthusiasm (Goitein, 2005, p. 137ff.), but also hesitation and ambivalence. The frontier perspective of this cultural production along with other perspectives may help us to see it as complex interaction that resists to the totalized historicization.

To conclude, following the excerpt of didactic poem written in Hebrew reflected the hybrid self that dwelled in the frontier. The work of the Jewish genius on the Judeo-Arabic poetry in the eleventh century al-Andalus, Shlomo ibn Gabirol (Sulayman ibn Jabirūl) entitled “Prologue to the Book of Grammar” (Ibn Gabirol, 2000, p. 49).

“… Examining the Lord’s congregation [i.e. the Jews/Israel] with all my soul,

I saw the exiled remnant escaped,

found among them the sacred speech [i.e. Hebrew, lashon ha-qodesh, the holy tongue] destroyed,

almost wholly in ruins and erased,
given over to languages distant from Hebrew

and utterly strange to the lips of the Jews,

half of whom speak in the manner of Edom [i.e. Romans, probably Romance language],

and half with the darkening tongue of Qedar [i.e. Arabic],
in their hopelessness drowning, engulfed by the deepening whirl,
in their ignorance sinking within it like stone …”
E. Appendix:

Judeo-Arabic

Transliteration Table (Arabic and Judeo-Arabic):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ﺑ</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>ﺱ</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>ﻖ</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺪ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ﺤ</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ﺕ</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺦ</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ﻕ</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺜ</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>ﺪ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ﺤ</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﻟ</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>ﻕ</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>ﺪ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺝ</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>ﺖ</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ﻕ</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺜ</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>ﺦ</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ﺡ</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺣ</td>
<td>dh</td>
<td>dh</td>
<td>ﻕ</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>ﺩ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ﺟ</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ﺤ</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ﻕ</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hebrew script consisted of twenty-two characters (or twenty-three sin [s] and shin [sh]) while Arabic script twenty-eight. To compensate the six characters deficit and additional tā’ marbūta, the Medieval Jews have to modify the existing script:

ا ُ ث َ خ ُ ح ّ ص ُ ط َ غ َ ء

Arabic

א ָ כ ָ נ ָ ז ֶ ה ָ ת ֶ ד ָ ה ַ ג ַ ב ָ ר

Judeo-Arabic

Here is a sample of Judeo-Arabic work from a spiritual manual written by Rabbi ‘Obadya Maimonides (‘AbdAllāh ibn Ibrahīm ibn Maymūn) in the Thirteenth-Century Egypt. The title of the work is *The Treatise of the Pool* (1981):
For through the conviction man’s soul acquireth after immersion that veils, as it were, have been lifted, there ensueth a state similar to spiritual predisposition (tahayyu’) and communion (ittiṣāl) with God.

Two terms, i.e. tahayyu’ (“spiritual predisposition” or “preparation”) and ittiṣāl (“communion”) are common among the Sūfis, thus indicated either Sūfism influences upon Jewish spiritualism/mysticism or the far-flung extent of Islamicate to non-Muslim subjects, including Jewish communities, or both.
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