Splitting Definitives: The Separation of the Definite Article in Medieval and Pre-Modern Written Judeo-Arabic

Magdalen M. Connolly

Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies, University of Cambridge,
Cambridge CB3 9DA, UK

Mmc53@cam.ac.uk

Abstract

This article explores the reasons behind the orthographic practice of representing the definite article in written Judeo-Arabic as an independent entity, a phenomenon which became widespread in Jewish Arabic-speaking communities in the pre-modern era. Commencing with its representation in fifteenth to nineteenth-century Egyptian Judeo-Arabic manuscripts, the orthographic feature is traced back to Judeo-Arabic texts produced in medieval al-Andalus, Sicily, and the Mağrib, and from there, to post-1492 CE Sephardi Jewish refugees, who settled in North Africa and Egypt. The phenomenon is revealed to be the result of a two-stage process: (i) direct language contact between Romance and Judeo-Arabic; and (ii) the influence of Judeo-Spanish writing on Judeo-Arabic spelling practices in diaspora communities after their expulsion from the Spanish Kingdoms.

Keywords

Judeo-Arabic – orthography – al-Andalus – Jewish languages – Cairo Genizah – Judeo-Spanish

Introduction¹

In the Classical Arabic (henceforth CA) reading tradition and vernacular forms of Arabic,² the *lām* of the definite article – CA: *ʾal-*; Modern Cairene Arabic (henceforth MCA): *ʾil-* – assimilates³ to following coronal consonants (Zemánek

- 1 Acknowledgements: An early draft of this article was circulated among my colleagues at the University of Cambridge's Faculty of Asian and Middle Eastern Studies and benefitted from their combined input. I am particularly grateful to Dr. Mila Neishtadt for her insightful comments, and to Nick Posegay for suggesting the title. I would also like to thank Prof. Geoffrey Khan for reading a draft of this article and for offering useful feedback, as always. I am indebted to the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments and suggestions. This being said, any errors herein are mine alone. This research was funded by the Leverhulme Trust and the Isaac Newton Trust in the form of a Leverhulme Early Career Fellowship. This article is based on a section of my Ph.D. thesis (Connolly 2018:95–102), and as such was also funded by a 'Le Bas Award,' Cambridge Home and European Scholarship Scheme (CHESS), University of Cambridge. All of the images used here have been reproduced by kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.
- 2 In MCA, it is not only the coronal consonants that assimilate the /l/ of the definite article, but also the two velar stops /k/ (*kāf*) and /g/ (*ǧīm*).
- 3 Heselwood & Watson contend that 'the Arabic definite article does not assimilate' (2013:34). Their argument is predicated upon refined definitions of the terms 'geminate,' 'assimilation,' and 'coarticulation.' The former is divided into three subcategories, comprising on the one hand (i) 'true' geminates, and on the other (ii) 'false' or 'concatenatory' and (iii) 'fake' or 'assimilatory' geminates. A 'true' geminate, as termed by Heselwood & Watson, is "obligatory, contrasts (at least potentially) with singletons, and displays 'geminate inseparability'" (Gafos 2002:274 in Heselwood & Watson 2013:38). 'False' geminates arise from the linking of 'two identical consonants, e.g., bad dog,' while 'fake' geminates occur when one consonant fully assimilates to another consonant, e.g., bad boy [bab bɔɪ] (examples from Heselwood & Watson 2013:38). Through the examination of these various types of coarticulation using four words, two speakers and electropalatographic (EPG) data, Heselwood & Watson demonstrate that the /l/ of the definite article should not be regarded as assimilated by the following coronal consonant, but as "'true' geminates which occur as phonologically-determined allomorphs of the definite article" (2013:34, 46). The one major impediment to this theory is that in MCA when preceding the velar stops /g/ and /k/, the definite article may be realized as either [ʔil] or [ʔig]/[ʔik]. While Heselwood & Watson acknowledge this phonetic feature of MCA (2013:47), they do not offer a satisfactory resolution to the issue. Despite this theory's compelling nature, the term 'assimilation' will continue to be used here to describe the phonetic change that occurs to the /l/ definite article when placed before coronal consonants.

2006:204), e.g., السَّمَاوَات 'the heavens' (CA: *'al-samāwāt*; CA pronunciation: [ʔas:ama:wa:t]; MCA pronunciation: [ʔis:amawa:t]). These consonants were referred to by the Arab grammarians as *'al-ḥurūf 'al-šamsiyya*⁴ 'the sun letters' (as opposed to *'al-ḥurūf 'al-qamariyya* 'the moon letters,' in which the *lām* of the definite article is retained in pronunciation) (Fischer 2002:26, §44.1). The written representation of the definite article in Arabic, however, is invariably *ال* *'al-*, irrespective of its immediate phonetic environment (Fischer 2002:11, §18). Where the *lām* of the definite article is assimilated in the reading tradition, this is indicated by the writing of *šadda* (ّ) above the following grapheme (ibid.) in vocalized texts (see the previous example).

In written Judeo-Arabic (henceforth JA),⁵ the representation of the definite article varies across the centuries. In their detailed study of early JA documentary papyri,⁶ Blau & Hopkins note that the *lamed* of the definite article is always omitted preceding coronal consonants, e.g., אֲרַחִים 'the Merciful One' (CA: *'al-rahīm*) I, line 1; II, line 1; XIII, line 1); אֲדוּנְיָה 'the world' (CA: *'al-dunyā*) (II, line 1; III E, line 2) (examples from Blau & Hopkins 1987:148). In classical JA, however, the writing of the definite article follows written CA convention and appears in full (and often in ligatured) form (i.e., אֵל 'l-/l' 'the'), regardless of the phonetic realization of the following consonant, e.g., אֵלְסַחַר 'the magic' (CA: *'al-siḥr*) (CUL T-S NS 298.55, 1 recto, line 6, ca. eleventh century CE); אֵלְסָמָוָא 'the heavens' (CA: *'al-samāwāt*) (CUL T-S Ar. 8.3, recto, line 14) (example from Khan 2010:202; see also Hary 1996:730; Khan 2016:396–397). This classical JA practice is continued in the late JA period, with one major difference:

4 The transliteration used here and elsewhere represents the written CA spelling, rather than the phonetic realization. Where phonetic transcriptions are used, they are bounded by square brackets [].

5 Written JA is generally categorized into three periods: early JA (ninth–tenth centuries CE); classical JA (tenth–fifteenth centuries CE); and late JA (fifteenth–nineteenth centuries CE) (Khan 2007). This categorization is based on orthographic developments, of which the representation of the definite article, discussed here, is an important feature. For an alternative categorization of JA, which combines written and spoken manifestations of JA, see Hary 1992, 2009. In using the term 'Judeo-Arabic,' I do so in reference to written manifestations of the language, following the example set by Khan (2007) to mean simply 'Arabic written in Hebrew script.' For a recent discussion of spoken JA dialects, see Khan (2018).

6 Blau & Hopkins (1984) differentiate between scribes educated in CA and those ignorant of its principles; the former used classical JA spelling before the tenth century, while the latter universally favored early JA spelling (which Blau & Hopkins state was based on Hebrew and Aramaic spelling practice). Ackerman-Lieberman has convincingly challenged this dichotomy, instead suggesting that the type of spelling used may be determined by the urban/rural divide present in many Arabic-speaking countries at the time (2014:158–159). Most of Blau & Hopkins's observations about early JA spelling are based on papyri found in al-Aṣmūnayn, a town situated in the Nile Delta (ibid.:158).

the definite article is regularly written independently of the noun or adjective it modifies (Khan 1992:231, 2006:51, 2010:211; Hary 2009:110, §1.15; Wagner 2010:6, §4.7.1).⁷

Although the definite article's transformation into a separate entity⁸ is an oft-noted feature of eighteenth and nineteenth-century JA texts (see, for example, Khan 1992:231, 2006:51; Wagner 2010:66–67), to the best of my knowledge, the cause of its separation has yet to be explored. A potential explanation – twofold in nature – for this orthographic development is proposed in this article. Commencing with a brief examination of the definite article's representation in late Egyptian JA folk tales and letters (§2.1), I then examine orthographic precedents for the separation of the definite article in Arabic and JA texts (§2.2). While this exploration provides some significant insights into an orthographic practice that may have precipitated this phenomenon's emergence, it does not offer a comprehensive solution. Thus, I turn my attention to pre-seventeenth-century texts which display this phenomenon,

7 Wagner also records two instances in eleventh-century letters (which she attributes to Egypt and the Mağrib, respectively) in which the definite article is written as an independent entity (2010:66, §4.7.1). The first of these (CUL T-S 13J17.3) was written by Efrayim b. Isma'il al-Ğawhari, a merchant based in Alexandria, but most probably of Mağribi origin (see Appendix, Table 3, number 85). The second letter (CUL T-S 12.218) contains consistent separation of the definite article from the noun it modifies. This trader's letter – dated to 'the sixth of *šawwāl*, the year four hundred and eleven' (i.e., 23 January 1021 CE) is written in a distinctly Sephardi script-style (complete with ligatures for final *heh*) and contains references to Cordoba and the Berbers (see recto, lines 18–19). I, therefore, suggest that this text may be more reflective of Andalusī writing practices than Mağribi standards of the day. I am grateful to Dr. José Martínez Delgado for discussing my doubts about the Mağribi origins of this text with me.

8 The definite article is categorized as an independent entity here when the space between it and the noun or adjective it governs is equidistant to other morphologically discrete units. So, for example, in the hand of Isma'il b. Ishāq Al-Andalusī (see Appendix, Table 1, number 2), the definite article is consistently separated from its noun or adjective by a space of approx. 0.2cm; the same distance which separates the majority of words from one another in this writer's letters (see, for example, CUL T-S 10J12.5, recto, line 6). Meanwhile, Efrayim b. Isma'il al-Ğawhari's (see Appendix, Table 3, number 85) writing has been described as displaying a tendency towards separation because, in some instances, the distance between the definite article and its noun is equidistant (0.2cm) with that between the preceding preposition and the definite article (e.g., CUL T-S 13J17.3 recto, line 6), but more often than not, the definite article is written attached to the noun it modifies, or is at least only 0.1cm apart from the following noun, rendering it closer than other independent morphological units. In those letters which are listed as not containing an independent definite article, the space between the definite article and its noun or adjective is consistently less than the space between morphologically distinct units (see, for example, CUL T-S 13J25.6, written in the hand of Ḥalfon b. Menašše b. al-Qaṭā'if (for other letters and documents by the same scribe, see Appendix, Table 4, number 115)).

leading me to explore the potential influence of Romance orthography on the writing practices of Andalusi Jews in the medieval era (§2.3). In a quest to understand the phenomenon's emergence as a stable feature of post-seventeenth century written Egyptian JA, I also examine the potential impact of Judeo-Spanish (henceforth JS) on Egyptian JA writing practices post-1492 CE (§2.4). I contend (§3) that the definite article's emergence as an independent entity in written JA was a twofold process. The first stage was borne of direct contact with Romance dialects and extended to areas of the Magrib with close ties to Al-Andalus. The second stage of the process was a consequence of the mass migration of Sephardi Jews from the Iberian Peninsula after 1492 CE, the influence of whom (at least in this regard) is felt as far east as Baghdad.

The Definite Article's Representation in Late JA Folk Narratives and Letters⁹

The dawn of the fifteenth century is generally considered a turning point in JA orthography (see Khan 2007;¹⁰ Hary 1992, 2009); it signifies the close of the classical JA period, in which JA spelling practices were primarily informed by CA, heralding the advent of an alternative writing style, often designated 'Hebraized' in contemporary scholarship (see Hary 1997:37, 2009). This 'Hebraized' manifestation of written JA is generally considered to be a combination – in varying degrees – of increased Hebraisms¹¹ and phonetic features on the one hand, and the retention of aspects of established classical JA writing practices on the other.¹²

9 Hary refers to two examples from the seventeenth-century text *Darke No'am* in which the *lamed* of the definite article is omitted when preceding a coronal consonant, e.g., אַצְגִּירָה 'the small (f.)' (CA: *'al-ṣaḡīra*); אָנָאס 'the people' (CA: *'al-nās*) (examples from Hary 1992:92). However, instances of this phenomenon seldom occur in other late JA texts and not at all in the corpora under examination here.

10 It should be noted that the shift from classical to late JA orthography occurs in different geographical regions at different times (see Avishur 1986:3 regarding the situation in Iraq) and – in the case of Yemen – not at all (Khan 2018:150, 154). Here, the main focus is on Egyptian written JA.

11 The Hebraisms – derived from Rabbinic Hebrew orthographic norms – include: (i) the representation of consonantal *waw* and *yā'* with double *vav* and double *yod*, respectively; (ii) increased *plene* spelling of the short vowels /i/ and /u/; (iii) and the representation of final long /ā/ with *heh* rather than *'alef* or *yod*.

12 While the influence of Rabbinic Hebrew writing practices on late JA orthography is clearly discernible, it is possible that direct Arabic influences, most notably in the use of the diacritical dot, have been overlooked in JA scholarship (Connolly 2018).

A brief survey of late JA texts – dating from the fifteenth to nineteenth centuries – is necessary to: (i) determine the approximate date at which the writing of the definite article as a separate entity becomes a common phenomenon in Egyptian JA texts; and (ii) qualitatively assess the regularity of the feature's use after this date. The following sections summarize findings regarding this feature in (i) fourteenth/fifteenth- and sixteenth-century and (ii) eighteenth- and nineteenth-century JA folk tales and letters.

Fourteenth/Fifteenth- and Sixteenth-Century Folk Tales

The ligature of the definite article is consistently attached to the noun (or adjective) it modifies in these folk tales, e.g., ואלסאבֿק 'and the former' (CA: *wa-ʿl-sābiq*) (Firk. Evr.-Arab. II 1528, 1 recto, line 5); אלתעלבֿ 'the fox' (CA: *ʿal-taʿlab*) (Firk. Evr.-Arab. II 852, 2 recto, line 5); אלשאבֿ 'the youth' (CA: *ʿal-šabb*, *ʿal-šābb*) (Firk. Evr.-Arab. I 2996, 14 recto, line 2).

Late Fifteenth-Century Letters

In all three letters written by Egyptian hands (Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/13, Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/39 and CUL T-S 13J26.7), the definite article is attached to the noun or adjective it refers to, e.g., אלכתאבֿ 'the letter' (CA: *ʿal-kitāb*) (Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/13, recto, line 13); אלגואבֿ 'the reply' (CA: *ʿal-ġawāb*) (Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/39, verso, line 10); אלסלאםֿ אלתאםֿ 'the perfect greetings' (CA: *ʿal-salām ʿal-tāmm*) (CUL T-S 13J26.7, recto, line 20). However, in the contemporaneous letter Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/18, which was sent from Syracuse, Sicily, and appears to have been composed by a Sephardi trader,¹³ The definite article is consistently detached from its noun, e.g., ואלֿ נאסֿ 'and the people' (CA: *ʿal-nās*) (Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/18, recto, line 6); אלֿ נצראניֿ 'the Christian' (CA: *ʿal-naṣrānī*) (Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/18, recto, line 11).

Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Folk Tales

In the eighteenth/nineteenth-century folk tale AIU VII.C.16, the definite article is written as a separate entity, e.g., ואלֿ קמחֿ ואלֿ בייץֿ ואלֿ זבדאֿ 'and the wheat, eggs, and butter' (CA: *wa-ʿl-qamḥ wa-ʿl-bayḍ wa-ʿl-zubda*) (AIU VII.C.16, recto, lines 18–9) (see Connolly 2020). The same is true in contemporaneous folk tales, e.g., אלֿ וולדֿ 'the boy' (CA: *ʿal-walad*) (CUL T-S Ar. 46.10, recto, line 35); אלֿ דעווהֿ 'the appeal' (CA: *ʿal-daʿwa*) (BnF Hébreu 583, 138 recto, lines 9, 17, 19, 138 verso, line 5).

13 This letter contains the Andalusī Arabic construct state marker *matā* 'of' (rendered מתאעֿ/מתעֿ in JA), and the purposive subordinating conjunction *bāš* 'in order to' (באשֿ). These two features are hallmarks of Andalusī Arabic (see Corriente 2006: §2.2.3.2 and §2.2.3.6).

However, in the late nineteenth-century folk tale NLI Cairo JC 104, the definite article is often (but not consistently) written attached to the following noun or adjective, e.g., אֶלְאִנְסָן 'the people' (CA: *'al-'insān*) (NLI Cairo JC 104, 13 recto, lines 1 and 2).¹⁴ The writing of the definite article attached to the following noun in NLI Cairo JC 104 may indicate a greater awareness of Arabic orthographic practices with regard to the definite article and (perhaps) a desire to replicate the written Arabic norm.¹⁵

Eighteenth/Nineteenth-Century Letters

The definite article is regularly written as an independent morpheme in late JA letters, e.g., אֶל בֵּיע וְאֶל שֶׁרָה 'the buying and selling' (CA: *'al-bay' wa-'l-širā'*) (Manc. Rylands L192, 1 recto, margin 3); אֶל נָאֵס 'the people' (CA: *'al-nās*) (CUL T-S 13J25.24, 1 verso, col. 1, line 25); אֶל דּוּרָה 'the maize' (CA: *'al-dura*) (CUL T-S 10J16.35, 1 recto, line 26).

All the Egyptian JA folk narratives and letters from the fourteenth/fifteenth and sixteenth centuries adhere to the classical JA (and Arabic) practice of attaching the definite article to the following noun or adjective. This practice has all but been abandoned in the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Egyptian folk tales and letters in favor of the definite article's representation as an independent entity.¹⁶ Thus, the seventeenth century (approximately speaking) would appear to be the period in which this orthographic shift became widely adopted among Egyptian Jewish writers. As can be seen, however, from its occurrence in the Sephardi letter, Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/18 (see above), this phenomenon predates the seventeenth century. Does this constitute an idiosyncratic quirk of a Sephardi Jewish Arabic-speaking merchant, or is it

14 This is only the case, however, when the definite article is not preceded by the bound morphemes *bi-* 'in, with' (CA: *bi-*) or *li-* 'to, for' (CA: *li-*). In such cases, the definite article forms a separate entity with the bound morpheme, e.g., בְּאֵל אִסֵּם 'in the name' (CA: *bi-'l-'ism*) (NLI Cairo JC 104, 2 verso, line 5); בְּאֵל טוֹרָאב 'with the earth' (CA: *bi-'l-turāb*) (NLI Cairo JC 104, 7 recto, line 12). This practice is common to all late JA texts that I have examined.

15 It seems, however, that this adherence to Arabic orthographic norms is the exception rather than the rule in eighteenth to twentieth-century JA texts. The tendency to write the definite article as an independent entity is evident even in printed JA material from Baghdad in the early twentieth century CE.

16 Unfortunately, we do not have at our disposal JA texts that can be confidently dated to the seventeenth century CE.

perhaps indicative of a more widespread writing practice, prevalent among Sephardi Jews?

Orthographic Precedents in Arabic and JA

In early Arabic documentary and literary texts, division of words at the end of a text line is a common phenomenon. Borne of a desire to ensure a rectangular written area, with four neat sides (Gacek 2012:146), it was superseded by the elongation (*mašq*) or contraction (*ġamʿ*) of letters, or the superscription (*taʿlīq*) of the final word(s) of a line (ibid.). The latter practice was particularly prevalent in the Eastern tradition, while the former found favor in the Maġrib. The scribes of earlier texts in which word division is frequently encountered at the end of the text line do not seem to have been concerned with morphological boundaries, so much as with aesthetic uniformity. Yet, the practice of separating words for the purposes of textline justification is not as arbitrary as it may first appear; only those graphemes which do not connect to the following grapheme by means of a ligature – such as *ʿalif*, *wāw*, *rāʾ*, etc. – are used for this purpose. Thus, in an early *hiġāzī*-script copy of the Qurʾān, BnF Arabe 328(a), recto, lines 13–14, we find the lone *ʿalif* of the definite article positioned at the end of the text line, while its *lām* sits at the start of the following text line, connected to the word it modifies (for similar examples of this phenomenon, see Figs. 1 and 2).

FIGURE 1 CUL MS Add. 1125, f2 verso, lines 1–2: A section of an eighth-century CE Qurʾān fragment, written in vertical format on parchment (Qurʾān 8:57–60)¹⁷

¹⁷ These lines read as follows:

لعلهم يذكرون وأما تخفن من قوم خينة فانبذ الهم على سوان الله لا تحب الخنن ولا تحسن
الذين كفروا سبقوا انهم لا يعجزون واعدوا ...

FIGURE 2 CUL MS Add. 1146, f2 verso, lines 1–5: A section of a vocalized eighth/ninth-century CE Qur'an, written in vertical format on parchment (Qur'an 34:2–4)¹⁸

FIGURE 3 CUL T-S 13J20.22, recto, lines 19–20: Section of a letter written by Ḥalfon b. Menašše b. al-Qaṭā'if on behalf of the daughter of Hillel b. 'Eli¹⁹

The same preoccupation with text line justification is apparent in some JA manuscripts. Hebrew graphemes, however, are inherently independent; they are not connected to one another with a ligature. Therefore, the points at which a word may be divided are as many as there are letters. It is noteworthy, therefore, that the division of the word in JA texts most often occurs at the point at which the definite article ends and the noun or adjective it modifies begins; the *alef* and *lamed* of the definite article – written as a single entity, often ligatured – are positioned at the end of the text line, while the noun or adjective is written at the start of the following text line (see Fig. 3).

This tendency to separate the definite article and noun from one another for the purposes of textline justification may be indicative of its perception as a morphologically distinct entity. This same tendency may also motivate the orthographic practice of writing the *lām* (or *lamed*) of the definite article, even when it is assimilated, in CA (and JA). However, while this representation of the

¹⁸ The manuscript reads as follows:

ורבי לנאיתכם علم الغيب لا يعرف ۥ عنه مثقل ذرة في السموت ولا في الأرض ۥ ولا اصغر من
ذلك ولا اكبر الا في ۥ كتب مين. ليجزي الذين امنوا وعلمو ۥ الصلحت اوليك لهم مغفرة
ورزق ۥ

¹⁹ For another example of this phenomenon, see Bodl. MS Heb.d.11/9, recto, lines 30–32, a letter written by (Abū Zikrī) Yahūda b. Sa'adya ha-Rofe.

definite article in classical JA texts may grant us some insight into how the definite article was perceived among Arabic-speaking Jews in the medieval era, it does not answer the question of how the independent definite article emerged as a standard feature of post-seventeenth-century Egyptian JA texts. To answer this question, it is necessary to delve further into the history of orthographic representations of the JA definite article, beginning with the earliest evidence of this phenomenon that we have encountered so far, namely, the fifteenth-century JA letter Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/18.

Al-Andalus, Romance Orthography, and Sephardi Jews

Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/18 is found among a cache of letters addressed to Mošeh b. Yahūda²⁰ in Alexandria. Amongst these letters, which predominantly appear to be sent from Cairo and the Maḡrib, there is at least one other letter composed in the most westerly regions of the Arabic-speaking world (Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/23), but by a different hand to that found in Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/18.²¹ In both letters, the definite article is consistently and clearly written as an independent entity, e.g., אל ספר תורה ‘the book (of the) Torah’ (Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/23, 1 recto, line 15); דאלך אל זוג ‘that pair’ (CA: *dālīka ’al-zawǧ*) (Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/23, 1 recto, line 22). This suggests that the practice of separating the definite article from its noun is not unique to the author of Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/18, but may, in fact, constitute a more widespread orthographic convention. In order to ascertain the extent of its use, I surveyed the autographs of known Sephardi Jews in the Cairo Genizah collections.

A brief examination of the autographs of two renowned Sephardi Jews – Yahūda ha-Levi (ca. 1075/1086–1141 CE) and Mošeh b. Maimon (Maimonides)²² (ca. 1135/1138–1204 CE) – reveals that the representation of the definite article as a separate entity predates the late fifteenth/early sixteenth-century letters mentioned above. As can be seen from the following examples (see Figs. 4–8), this phenomenon occurs sporadically in both ha-Levi (Figs. 4–6) and Maimonides’ (Figs. 7–8) autographs.

20 See Arad & Wagner (forthcoming).

21 The contemporaneous texts Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/2 and Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/24, composed by the same hand and possibly fragments of the same text, display intermittent separation of the definite article from the noun, e.g., אל חכמים ‘the sages’ (Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/2, 1 verso, line 12); אל כאמל אל אכיר ‘the final perfection’ (Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/2, 1 verso, line 8); and ופי אל תורה ‘and in the Torah’ (Bodl. MS Heb.c.72/24, 1 verso, line 9).

22 I would like to thank Dr. Mila Neishtadt for pointing me in the direction of Maimonides via Blau (1980).

FIGURE 4
אל ראי פי 'the opinion on ...' (CUL T-S 8J18.5, recto, line 10)

FIGURE 5
אלחכם אל גליל אל רייס 'the honorable sage, the head ...' (CUL T-S 8J18.5, verso, line 1)

FIGURE 6
פי אל בקיה אל קלילה '... among the remaining few ...' (CUL T-S 10J15.1, recto, line 5)

FIGURE 7
באל נטר אל אנסאני '... in human sight ...'²³ (CUL T-S 10Ka4.1, f2 recto, line 2)

FIGURE 8
ופי אל וסאס 'and in the temptation ...' (CUL T-S Ar.21.112a, fi recto, line 5)

To assess the veracity of these preliminary impressions, I expanded this search to encompass individuals whose documents are preserved in the Cairo Genizah collections and about whom we have some biographical data (see the Appendix for Tables 1–4).²⁴ The Tables list some 125 Jewish individuals of (i) Andalusī and Sicilian (Table 1), (ii) Maḡribī, (Table 2), (iii) Alexandrian (Table 3), and (iv) Egyptian, Palestinian, and Iraqī (Table 4) origins, noting the

23 Here, the first ligatured definite article (prefixed with the preposition *bi-*) is written independently of the following noun, while the following definite article is attached to the noun.

24 The data available are often very limited. I have relied heavily on the historical works of Stillman (1973), Ben-Sasson (1976), Cohen (1980), Gil (1992, 1997), Simonsohn (1997), and Goldberg (2012) for much of this information. Where available, I have also used the writer's *nisba* – such as *'al-Andalusī* 'the Andalusian' – mentioned in the letters. This is by no means proof of the writer's geographical origin, as it may refer to a historical-geographical association belonging to a previous generation of his/her family, but it is used here in the absence of other details.

classmarks which have been attributed to them, and whether or not the definite article is written as a separate entity in their letter(s) and documents.

The overall trends revealed by this search confirm that the separation of the definite article was not simply an orthographic peculiarity of ha-Levi and Maimonides or the two fifteenth-century merchants, but was a widespread orthographic practice among Andalusī and Sicilian Jews (see Table 1, individuals 1–31).

The propensity towards writing the definite article as an independent entity is also evident among Maḡribī Jews, albeit to a lesser extent (see Table 2, individuals 32–84). A little over half of the Maḡribī writers consistently separate the definite article from the noun/adjective in their letters. In some of the texts (approximately 30%), the writers seem uncertain of the definite articles' status, sometimes writing it as a separate entity, sometimes as a bound morpheme. The remaining minority (approximately 15%) write the article attached to the noun/adjective.

Of those letter-writers who lived and worked in Alexandria²⁵ (see Table 3, individuals 85–92), three merchants wrote the definite article as an independent entity, while the remaining five veered between attached and detached representations of the definite article.

The final category (Table 4, individuals 93–125) contains letters from merchants and Jewish notables who lived in Egypt, many of whom emigrated from Iraq, Palestine, or present-day Syria as adults. Of these, only two separated the definite article from the noun/adjective (see Table 4, numbers 108, and 122), while another individual showed an inconsistent representation of the definite article (see Table 4, number 121).

This review of the Sephardī, Maḡribī, Egyptian, Palestinian, and Iraqi Cairo Genizah documents indicates that the separation of the definite article from the noun/adjective it modifies was an enduring practice among Sephardī and – to a lesser extent – Maḡribī Jews. Yet, we are still no closer to understanding the motivation behind the phenomenon's development. In order to do so, it is necessary to examine the emergence of the Romance languages in the Iberian Peninsula.

The early Romance dialects – which gradually fragmented and evolved into the independent languages Catalan, Spanish, French, Romanian, Portuguese,

25 It is probable that some of the individuals included in this category – such as Efrayim b. Isma'īl 'al-Ġawharī (see Appendix, Table 3, number 85) – were in fact of Maḡribī origin. However, as little is known for certain about their birthplace and educational backgrounds, I have included them in this category.

and Italian – are documented in written form²⁶ as early as the eighth and ninth centuries CE (see Frank-Job & Selig 2016:24, 27). Therefore, the spoken forms are thought to have emerged as early as the seventh – mid-eighth centuries CE (see Herman 1996 for a discussion of the geographical differences in the development of Romance languages).²⁷ Whether these early manifestations of the Romance dialects were considered independent of Latin by their native speakers and writers is much discussed (see Wright 1976, 2016; López-Morillas 2000; Ledgeway 2012; and Clackson 2016), but for our purposes, it is sufficient to state that Romance dialects were in circulation in the Iberian Peninsula prior to the Islamic conquest of the region in 711 CE.

More specifically, one of the most fundamental linguistic innovations of Romance languages – namely, their independent definite and indefinite articles,²⁸ conspicuously absent in their predecessor language, Latin – was also either established or at the very least inchoate in the early eighth century CE (Ledgeway 2012:89–105; Ramat & Ricca 2016:52–53; Giusti 2016:551). *When* the feature came into wide circulation is a source of much contention; some scholars suggest that its relative morphological uniformity and functionality within the varieties of Romance languages indicates its emergence ca. sixth century CE (Giusti 2016:552); while others – on the basis of the extant written evidence – claim that it did not develop until the eighth century CE (Ledgeway 2016:766; see also Adams 2013). Yet, it is evident that it was at least incipient on the eve of the Islamic conquest in 711 CE.

Thus, while little is known for certain about the language situation of Al-Andalus during the period of Muslim rule, and scholarly consensus regarding the interpretation of the scant evidence at our disposal is far from being achieved (Zwartjes 2006),²⁹ we can establish with (relative) certainty that pre-711 CE, the inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula – Christians, Jews, and Berbers,

26 These early eighth to late tenth century CE instances of written Romance vernaculars constitute snippets (such as riddles, anecdotes, glossaries, lists, and marginalia) within Latin texts. It is not until the mid-twelfth century CE that Romance texts are available on a larger scale (Frank-Job & Selig 2016:24). On the important distinction between written and spoken manifestations of the language, see Clackson (2016); and Wright (2016).

27 Even the most conservative estimates regarding the development of the Romance dialects place them in the early ninth century (Ledgeway 2012:1, n.2).

28 The various iterations of the definite article – *el/la* (Catalan/Spanish); *le/la* (French); *il/la* (Italian), and so forth – are derived from the Latin demonstrative pronoun *ILLE* ‘that’ (Ledgeway 2016:765; for those Romance languages whose definite article derives from Latin *IPSE*, see Ledgeway 2012:89–105; Ramat & Ricca 2016:52–53; Ledgeway 2016:765).

29 It is also worth bearing in mind that of the extant evidence the majority pertains to the elite, be they Christian, Jewish, or Muslim.

alike – spoke early Romance dialect(s). The literate among them likely wrote Romance and Latin (Wasserstein 1991:4).

In 711 CE, the invading troops comprised Muslim Arabs, Jews from North Africa and the Arabian Peninsula, and – by far the largest component – Berbers.³⁰ As such, a multilingual situation arose in Al-Andalus, in which the conquering Muslim elite spoke Arabic (as a minority), Berber, and (perhaps) a Romance dialect, while the conquered Christians, Jews, and native Berbers spoke Romance dialect(s).³¹ This heterogeneous linguistic situation is partially reflected in the issuing of bilingual Arabic-Latin coins in the earliest years of the conquest (Gallego 2003:110–111) and that circulated for some time after the initial invasion (Thompson 1971:68 cited in Zwartjes 2006); the inclusion of Latin, a concession to the realities of the linguistic situation in which the vanquishers found themselves; the use of Arabic, a declaration of their intention that it would one day dominate.

How rapidly this ambition was realized remains uncertain. It is well-documented that no notable post-tenth century CE Latin texts survive (Wasserstein 1991:5; Gallego 2003:127) (and, by inference, may not have been produced, at all). That the Arabic language came to be held in high regard by the indigenous inhabitants of the Iberian Peninsula by the ninth and tenth centuries CE is evident from the translation into Arabic of the Psalms (pre c. 889 CE) and the Gospels (946 CE) (López-Morillas 2000:49); its mastery by eminent members of the Jewish community, such as the celebrated Isma'īl b. Naḡrīla (d. ca. 1056 CE) (Bennison and Gallego 2010:146), and, later, Ibrahīm b. Sahl al-Iṣbīlī (d. 1251 CE); and the extensive production of grammatical, philosophical, poetic, and scientific texts written in Arabic by Christians and Jews alike during the tenth to thirteenth centuries CE. Scattered references in primary sources, in which contemporaries bemoan the loss of Latin knowledge among the Christian inhabitants of Al-Andalus (see, for example, Alvarus of

30 As to whether the conquering Berbers spoke Arabic already, there is currently no definitive answer. Some scholars have suggested that, in addition to Berber, some of the conquering Berber tribes may have spoken a Romance dialect (Wasserstein 1991:4; Gallego 2003:119). However, few seem to suggest that the Berbers would have already been Arabic-speaking at the time of the invasion, and recent scholarship has challenged the assumption that they would have undergone the process of Arabization immediately after the conquest (see Kossmann 2013:76–85 for a survey of early Berber terminology produced to explain Islamic concepts. This terminology's existence implies that an immediate shift to Arabic by Berbers who converted to Islam cannot be assumed; see also López-Morillas 2000:40–41 for a brief summary of recent research in this area).

31 López-Morillas states that the Jews of Al-Andalus were quick to adopt Arabic, while simultaneously “retain[ing] their hold on Romance” (ibid.:42–43), although he offers no evidence for this assertion.

Cordoba's (d. 861 CE) frequently referenced passage in *Indiculus Luminosus* (cited in Wasserstein 1999:3, who expresses understandable reservations about this text's interpretation; see also Gallego 2003:127)) have been interpreted as confirmation of early Arabization (ibid.:131).

The lack of post-tenth-century Latin sources originating from Al-Andalus does not necessarily preclude the continued use of spoken and written Romance dialects, at least among some strata of society. There is evidence suggesting that Romance was spoken – or at least written – in areas of Al-Andalus throughout the tenth and eleventh centuries. The most oft-cited manifestation of the continued awareness and use of Romance in written form is the *muwašṣaḥ*, a manifestation of strophic poetry (the other being *zağal*, written in colloquial Arabic), for which Al-Andalus' Muslim and Jewish elite were famed (Gallego 2003:129–130; Rosen 2000:165–166). Within these final verses (referred to as the *ḵarğa* 'departure') of these CA or – in the case of some of the Jewish community – Hebrew poems, are found a couple of lines written in Andalusī Arabic, Romance, or a combination of the two languages (Barletta 2012:769; Rosen 2000:165). Another example of the inclusion of Romance vocabulary in an Arabic-language text is Ibn Baklarish's *Kitāb al-'adwiya 'l-mufrada li-'l-Isrā'īlī* (commonly referred to as *Kitāb 'al-Musta'īnī*) (see Khan 2008:95–96).³²

Suffice it to say,³³ that the Romance languages' definite articles' superficial similarity with the Arabic definite article (pronounced -'il in some dialects) is conspicuous. The pre-existing tendency in early JA texts to separate the definite article from its noun for text line justification (see above) may have emphasized its morphological distinctiveness, leading the erudite Jewish writers of JA texts to separate it consistently, irrespective of its place on the text line. As this fashion appears to have been prevalent among the Jewish elite, it is not surprising that it gained currency and was adopted among those who may not have had intimate, first-hand knowledge of Romance dialects.

However, it is clear from Tables 1–4 (see Appendix) that while some Mağribī merchants embraced this orthographic innovation, it was not prevalent among

32 The work is thought to have been composed ca. 1100 CE, and the earliest extant copy is a privately owned manuscript (referred to as the Arcadian Library manuscript), dated 1130 CE (Burnett 2008). For a discussion of the Romance and Latin elements in this text, see Villaverde Amieva 2008.

33 It is not my intention to resolve the issue of Al-Andalus' uncertain linguistic situation. Nor do I claim that the potential influence of Romance orthography on the representation of the definite article in JA as a separate entity should be regarded as evidence for the continued use of Romance languages in Al-Andalus. It is possible that the feature emerged during the tenth or even ninth century, during a period of bilingualism, and was retained by Jews long after they ceased to write or speak Romance dialects.

Egyptian Jews in the Middle Ages.³⁴ Therefore, we must keep searching for the reason(s) as to why it became a popular feature of post-seventeenth-century JA texts in the eastern regions of the Arabic-speaking world.

The Expulsion of Sephardi Jews from Spain

The expulsion of Muslims and Jews from the Castilian and Aragonese Spanish kingdoms in 1492 CE led to a large influx of Spanish-speaking refugees in North Africa, Egypt, and Palestine – estimates vary between 40,000 to 100,000 Sephardi Jewish refugees who arrived in Morocco and then dispersed across the Maḡrib towards Egypt and Palestine.³⁵ It is thought that the majority of Sephardi Jewish refugees hailed from the Catholic province of Toledo (conquered in 1085 CE) rather than the Muslim kingdom of Granada (which fell only in 1492 CE). Thus, it is likely that many of them spoke a Spanish or Castilian dialect rather than the Andalusī Arabic dialect prevalent in Granada (Heath 2002:10–11). Spanish, or JS, continued to be spoken among these refugees for at least two centuries after they arrived in the Maḡrib, Egypt, and Palestine (Kraemer 1991:246). It is even recorded that some Jewish families in northern Morocco carried on using JS amongst themselves until the early twentieth century (Heath 2002:11). As for evidence of written JS (i.e., Spanish written in the Hebrew script), this exists both pre-and post-1492 CE (see Minervini 1992; Penny 2000; Schwarzwald 2004; and Bunis 2011, 2016).³⁶ The Cairo Genizah collections alone comprise JS letters, legal documents, responsa, medical texts, *piyyūṭ*, and biblical commentaries.³⁷ Although slight in number, these texts,

34 Or at the very least, that this feature was not prevalent among those eastern educated Jews whose texts were deposited in the Ben 'Ezra synagogue's genizah.

35 Prior to the 1492 CE Edict of Expulsion, Jews had already begun to travel from Spain to Arabic-speaking lands due to persecution at the Catholic authorities' hands (Beinart 2002:2).

36 While pre-1492 CE JS texts contain Hebrew and Aramaic vocabulary and are written in Hebrew script, it has been demonstrated that the language (morphology, syntax, lexicon, and limited phonology) did not differ from the dialectal varieties of Christians (see Minervini 1992). It is only after the expulsion of the Jews from the Iberian Peninsula that JS developed its own characteristics: retaining archaic features that ceased to be used elsewhere in Spanish-speaking societies; innovating; and dialect-mixing among Sephardi Jewish refugees from different areas of Spain settling in new regions with one another (see Penny 2000:176–192).

37 This observation is based on a brief survey of JS material in the Cairo Genizah collections on the Friedberg site. A more comprehensive search of the Genizah's contents would, I'm sure, reveal more variety, and perhaps even a greater number of JS texts.

dating from the late fifteenth to eighteenth centuries, attest to the continued use of written JS among Sephardi Jewish refugees in a variety of genres for several centuries after their expulsion from the Iberian Peninsula (Gutwirth 1990:113).

Considering this prolonged period of contact, it is not unreasonable to presume that the customs of written Spanish, or at least written JS, may have influenced the writing practices of JA.³⁸ In Spanish, the m.sg. definite article *el* is always separate from the noun it modifies, e.g., *el día* 'the day.' In JS texts written in the fourteenth/fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (and later), *el* is transcribed אֵל; its independent form is retained in JS, e.g., אֵל קִטְאָדוֹ 'the aforementioned' (Spanish: *el citado*) (Penn. CAJS Halper 408, 1 recto, line 3, ca. 1400–1499 CE); אֵל דִּי־אָה 'the day' (Spanish: *el día*) (Penn. CAJS Halper 409, 1 recto, line 6, ca. 1400–1700 CE);³⁹ אֵל גִּי 'the gentile' (Yoreh Deah 53, line 25, Salonica 1595); and אֵל פֶּאנְדִּירוֹ 'the tambourine' (Spanish: *el pandero*) (Bet Yosef 8, line 5) (the latter two examples are taken from Benaim's work (2012:192–193; 407–408) on sixteenth-century responsa); אֵל קוּדְאָדוֹ 'the caution' (Spanish: *el cuidado*) (CUL Or. 1080J194, 1 recto, line 15) (see Gutwirth 1986:212–213; Kraemer 1991:257).

Conclusion

In this article, I have traced the orthographic representation of the definite article in written JA folk tales and letters from pre-modern Egypt to medieval-era Al-Andalus in an effort to resolve the question of why the definite article is written as a separate entity in post-seventeenth-century Egyptian JA texts. In the course of this exploration, I have demonstrated that medieval-era manifestations of this orthographic phenomenon may be viewed as the result of JA's contact with Romance, or at least, as a result of pre-tenth-century Romance-JA language contact, the consequences of which were retained as a stylistic feature in post-tenth-century JA writings. By tracing the representation of the definite article in medieval JA texts written by (i) Andalusī and Sicilian, (ii) Maġribī, (iii) Alexandrian, and (iv) Egyptian, Palestinian, and Iraqi Jews, I have shown that this orthographic feature was limited predominantly to Jews of Andalusī, Sicilian, and Maġribī origins during this period. It was not until after

38 The Sephardi Jews who fled to the Maġrib, Egypt, and Palestine were generally considered to be more erudite and socially and economically well-off than the Jews living in Arab lands prior to 1492 CE (Heath 2002:10). This social prestige may have contributed to the assimilation of some of their customs and practices, including in the realm of writing.

39 These manuscripts may be found on the Friedberg Genizah Project website under the classmarks listed here.

the expulsion of Jews from the Iberian Peninsula that the feature also became widespread in Egyptian JA writings. In this later period, the feature arose from analogy with the writing of the m.sg. definite article in JS.

These findings attest to the significant role orthography may play in disentangling the historical circumstances of language contact, and they challenge and develop the widespread understanding of late written JA as predominantly 'Hebraized.'

References

- Ackerman-Lieberman, Philip. 2014. "The Disappearance of the Early Phonetic Judeo-Arabic Spelling and Sa'adya Gaon's Translation of the Bible." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 41: 137–172.
- Adams, James N. 2013. *Social Variation and the Latin Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arad, Dotan & Esther-Miriam Wagner. *Wisdom and Greatness in One Place: The 15th c. Alexandrian Trader Moses ben Judah and his Circle*. Leiden: Brill (forthcoming).
- Ashur, Amir & Tamar Zewi, 2019. "A Genizah Fragment of Saadya Gaon's Bible Translation Copied by Mevōrākh b. Nāthān in the 12th Century." *Estudios del Oriente Próximo y el Mediterráneo* 2: 113–120.
- Avishur, Yitzhak. 1986. *Tales of Women: The Folk Tales of the Jews of Iraq*. Or Yehudah, Israel: Iraqi Jews Traditional Culture Centre (in Hebrew).
- Bareket, Elinoar. 1999. *Fustat on the Nile: The Jewish Elite in Medieval Egypt*. Leiden: Brill.
- Barletta, Vincent. 2012. "Kharja." In *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics: Fourth Edition*, eds. Roland Greene et al. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 769–770.
- Beinart, Haim. 2002. *The Expulsion of the Jews from Spain*. Oxford: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilisation.
- Benaim, Annette. 2012. *Sixteenth-Century Judeo-Spanish Testimonies: An Edition of Eighty-Four Testimonies from the Sephardic Responsa in the Ottoman Empire*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bennison, Amira K. & Maria Angeles Gallego. 2010. "Religious Minorities under the Almohads: An Introduction." *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies* 2.2: 143–154.
- Ben-Sasson, Haim Hillel. 1976. *A History of the Jewish People*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Blau, Joshua. [1961] 1980. *A Grammar of Medieval Judaeo-Arabic*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press (in Hebrew).
- Blau, Joshua & Simon Hopkins. 1984. "On Early Judaeo-Arabic Orthography." *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 12: 9–27.

- Blau, Joshua & Simon Hopkins. 1987. "Judaean-Arabic Papyri: Collected, Edited, Translated, and Analysed." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 9: 87–160.
- Bunis, David M. 2011. "Judezmo: The Jewish Language of the Ottoman Sephardim." *European Judaism* 44.1: 22–35.
- Bunis, David M. 2016. "Judezmo (Ladino)." In *The Handbook of Jewish Languages*, eds. Lily Kahn & Aaron Rubin. Leiden: Brill, 366–451.
- Burnett, Charles. 2008. *Ibn Baklarish's Book of Simples: Medical Remedies between Three Faiths in Twelfth-Century Spain*. London: The Arcadian Library in association with Oxford University Press.
- Clackson, James. 2016. "Latin as a Source for the Romance Languages." In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, eds. Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3–13.
- Cohen, Mark R. 1980. *Jewish Self-Government in Medieval Egypt: The Origins of the Office of Head of the Jews, ca. 1065–1126*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Connolly, Magdalen M. 2018. *Linguistic Variation in Egyptian Judaean-Arabic Folk Tales and Letters from the Ottoman Period*. PhD. Thesis, University of Cambridge.
- Connolly, Magdalen M. 2020. "'The Tale of the Cairene and the Countryman': A Late Judaean-Arabic Narrative Revisited." *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies* (online pre-print: <https://journals.uio.no/JAIS/article/view/7948>).
- Corriente, Federico. 2006. "Andalusi Arabic." In *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, eds. Kees Versteegh et al. Leiden: Brill, 1, 101–111.
- Fischer, Wolf Dietrich. 2002. *A Grammar of Classical Arabic*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Frank-Job, Barbara & Maria Selig. 2016. "Early Evidence and Sources." In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, eds. Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 24–34.
- Gacek, Adam. 2012. *Arabic Manuscripts. A Vademecum for Readers*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gallego, María Ángeles. 2003. "The Languages of Medieval Iberia and Their Religious Dimension." *Medieval Encounters* 9.1: 107–139.
- Gil, Moshe. 1992. *A History of Palestine, 634–1099*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gil, Moshe. 1997. *In the Kingdom of Ishmael: Texts from the Cairo Geniza*. Jerusalem: Mosad Byalik (in Hebrew).
- Gil, Moshe. 2003. "The Jewish Merchants in the Light of Eleventh-Century Geniza Documents." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 46.3: 273–319.
- Goldberg, Jessica L. 2012. *Trade and Institutions in the Medieval Mediterranean: The Geniza Merchants and Their Business World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giusti, Giuliana. 2016. "The Structure of the Nominal Group." In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, eds. Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 541–555.

- Gutwirth, Eleazer. 1986. "The Family in Judeo-Spanish Genizah Letters of Cairo (XVIth–XVIIIth C)." *Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 73.2: 210–215.
- Gutwirth, Eleazer. 1990–1993. "A Judeo-Spanish *endecha* from the Cairo Genizah." *Mediterranean Language Review* 6–7: 113–120.
- Hary, Benjamin H. 1992. *Multiglossia in Judaeo-Arabic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hary, Benjamin H. 1996. "Adaptations of Hebrew Script." In *The World's Writing Systems*, eds. Peter T. Daniels & William Bright. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 727–734.
- Hary, Benjamin H. 1997. "The Impact of the Cairo Genizah Documents on the Study of the History of Arabic." *Bulletin of the Israeli Academic Center in Cairo* 21: 35–40.
- Hary, Benjamin H. 2009. *Translating Religion: Linguistic Analysis of Judaeo-Arabic Sacred Texts from Egypt*. Leiden: Brill.
- Heath, Jeffrey. 2002. *Jewish and Muslim Dialects of Moroccan Arabic*. London: Curzon.
- Herman, József. 1996. "The End of the History of Latin." *Romance Philology* 49.4: 364–382.
- Heselwood, Barry & Janet C. E. Watson. 2013. "The Arabic Definite Article Does Not Assimilate." *LWPLP* 18: 34–53.
- Khan, Geoffrey. 1992. "Notes on the Grammar of a Late Judaeo-Arabic Text." *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 15: 220–239.
- Khan, Geoffrey. 2006. "A Judaeo-Arabic Commercial Letter from Early Nineteenth-Century Egypt." *Ginzei Qedem* 2: 37–58.
- Khan, Geoffrey. 2007. "Judaeo-Arabic." In *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, eds. Kees Versteegh et al. Leiden: Brill, 11, 526–536.
- Khan, Geoffrey. 2008. "The Syriac Words in the *Kitāb al-Mustaʿīn* in the Arcadian Library Manuscript." In *Ibn Baklarish's Book of Simples: Medical Remedies Between Three Faiths in Twelfth-Century Spain*, ed. Charles Burnett. London: The Arcadian Library in association with Oxford University Press, 95–104.
- Khan, Geoffrey. 2010. "Vocalized Judaeo-Arabic manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah." In *From a Sacred Source: Genizah Studies in Honour of Professor Stefan C. Reif*, eds. Ben Outhwaite & Siam Bhayro. Leiden: Brill, 201–217.
- Khan, Geoffrey. 2016. "Judaeo-Arabic." In *The Handbook of Jewish Languages*, eds. Lily Kahn & Aaron Rubin. Leiden: Brill, 22–63.
- Khan, Geoffrey. 2018. "Judaeo-Arabic." In *Arabic Historical Dialectology: Linguistic and Sociolinguistic Approaches*, ed. Clive Holes. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 148–169.
- Kossmann, Maartin. 2013. *Arabic Influence on Northern Berber*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kraemer, Joel L. 1991. "Spanish Ladies from the Cairo Geniza." *Mediterranean Historical Review* 6.2: 237–267.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2012. *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2016. "Functional Categories." In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, eds. Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 761–771.

- López-Morillas, Consuelo. 2000. "Language." In *The Literature of Al-Andalus*, eds. María Rosa Menocal et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 33–59.
- Minervini, Laura. 1992. *Testi guideospagnoli medievali (Castiglia e Aragona)*. Naples: Liguori (in Italian).
- Penny, Ralph. 2000. "Variation in Judeo-Spanish." In *Variation and Change in Spanish*, ed. Ralph Penny. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 174–193.
- Ramat, Paolo & Davide Ricca. 2016. "Romance: A Typological Approach." In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, eds. Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 50–62.
- Rosen, Tova. 2000. "The Muwashshah." In *The Literature of Al-Andalus*, eds. María Rosa Menocal et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 163–189.
- Rustow, Marina. 2008. *Heresy and the Politics of Community: The Jews of the Fatimid Caliphate*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Schippers, Arie. 2002. "A Muwashshah from the Genizah." *Zutot* 2.1: 56–64.
- Schwarzwald, Ora (Rodrigue). 2004. "Judeo-Spanish Studies." In *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Studies*, ed. Martin Goodman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 572–600.
- Simonsohn, Shlomo. 1997. *The Jews in Sicily: 383–1300*. Leiden: Brill.
- Stillman, Norman A. 1973. "The Eleventh-Century Merchant House of Ibn 'Awkal: A Geniza Study." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 16.1: 1–87.
- Villaverde Amieva, Juan Carlos. 2008. "Towards a Study of the Romance Languages in the *Kitāb al-Mustaʿīn*." In *Ibn Baklarish's Book of Simples: Medical Remedies Between Three Faiths in Twelfth-Century Spain*, ed. Charles Burnett. London: The Arcadian Library in association with Oxford University Press, 43–74.
- Wagner, Esther-Miriam. 2010. *Linguistic Variety of Judaeo-Arabic in Letters from the Cairo Genizah*. Leiden: Brill.
- Wasserstein, David J. 1991. "The Language Situation in al-Andalus." In *Studies on the Muwashshah and the Kharja: Proceedings of the Exeter International Colloquium*, eds., Alan Jones & Richard Hitchcock. Reading: Ithaca Press, 1–15.
- Wright, Roger. 1976. "Speaking, Reading and Writing Late Latin and Early Romance." *Neophilologus* 60.2: 178–189.
- Wright, Roger. "Latin and Romance in the Medieval Period: A Sociophilological Approach." In *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, eds. Adam Ledgeway & Martin Maiden. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 14–23.
- Zemánek, Petr. 2006. "Assimilation." In *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, eds. Kees Versteegh et al. Leiden: Brill, 1, 204–206.
- Zwarjtes, Otto. 2006. "Andalus." In *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, eds. Kees Versteegh et al. Leiden: Brill, 1, 96–101.

Appendix (Tables 1–4)

TABLE 1 Representation of the definite article in Andalusī and Sicilian Jewish writers' documents

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
1	(Abū Ya'qūb) Ishāq b. Yūsuf al-Andalusī	JTS ENA 2805.24	ca. 1050 CE	Yes
2	Isma'īl b. Ishāq al-Andalusī, b. Toledo ⁴⁰	CUL T-S 10J5.12 CUL T-S 8J25.6 CUL T-S 13J23.22 CUL T-S 13J28.11 Bodl. Ms Heb.d.75/20	ca. 1065 CE	Yes
3	Ibrahīm b. Ishāq al-Andalusī	AIU VII E.4 CUL T-S 10J16.10		Tendency towards separation
4	Yahūda b. Isma'īl al-Andalusī	CUL T-S 10J5.24 CUL T-S Misc.28.37 (Two different hands)	1062 CE	No Yes
5	Ya'qūb b. Isma'īl al-Andalusī	CUL T-S 16.7 CUL T-S 8J41.2 CUL T-S 20.76 (Goldberg 2012:131) CUL T-S 10J20.10	ca. 1050 CE 1060 CE	CUL T-S 16.7 CUL T-S 8J41.2 are written in the same hand (with separation); addresses of CUL T-S 16.7, CUL T-S 8J41.2, and CUL T-S 20.76 are written in the same hand, but the main texts of CUL T-S 20.76 and CUL T-S 10J20.10 are in a different hand, and the definite article is attached to the noun in these two letters.

⁴⁰ (Goldberg 2012:318–319.)

TABLE 1 Representation of the definite article in Andalusī and Sicilian Jewish (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
6	Isma'īl b. Ya'qūb al-Andalusī	CUL T-S 20.127	1064 CE	Slight tendency towards separation, but generally attached.
7	Ya'qūb b. Isma'īl al-Andalusī	CUL T-S Misc 28.199		Yes
8	Mevoraḳ b. Isrā'īl b. Ḡanūnī, Palermo	CUL T-S 10J10.25	1052 CE	Yes
9	Ibrahīm b. Yiṣḥaq b. al-Zūlāfī	CUL T-S 13J28.1		Yes
10	ʿAṭā b. Zakarī	CUL T-S 12.371		Slight tendency towards separation, but generally attached.
11	Ḥayyim b. ʿAmmār Madīnī	CUL T-S 20.122 JTS ENA NS 2.30	ca. 1055 CE	Tendency towards separation, most noticeable when definite article is preceded by a bound-morpheme preposition.
12	Zakarī b. ʿAmmār Madīnī	CUL T-S 16.13 ⁴¹	ca. 1069 CE	Tendency towards separation, but generally attached.
13	Da'ūd b. ʿAmmār Madīnī	CUL T-S 8J26.15 JTS ENA 2805.18 Bodl. Heb.d.68/108 (Possibly two different hands)	ca. 1065 CE	Yes No Yes
14	Yahūda ha-Levi	CUL T-S 8J18.5 CUL T-S 10J15.1 CUL T-S 13J17.22	12th century	Yes

41 Gil (1997) attributes this letter to Ḥayyim b. ʿAmmār, while Ben-Sasson (1976) ascribes it to Zakarī b. ʿAmmār. It is certainly written in a different hand to that associated with Ḥayyim b. ʿAmmār (see, for example, CUL T-S 20.122).

TABLE 1 Representation of the definite article in Andalusi and Sicilian Jewish (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
15	Mūsā b. Yūsuf Yijū	CUL T-S 13J20.7 CUL T-S 10J14.16	ca. 1155 CE	Yes Yes
16	Peraḥya b. Yūsuf b. Yijū ⁴²	CUL T-S 8J36.3 CUL T-S 8J16.10 CUL T-S 8J20.25 CUL T-S 8J17.20 CUL T-S 8J23.2	ca. 1154 CE	Yes
17	Yūsuf b. Peraḥya b. Yijū	CUL T-S 13J6.15	ca. 1154 CE	Yes
18	Samuel b. Yūsuf Yijū	Bodl. Ms Heb. b. 11/15		Yes
19	Mūsā b. Maimon	CUL T-S Ka4.1 CUL T-S 16.290 CUL T-S Ar.21.112		Yes
20	Mūsā ha-Sefardi	CUL T-S 8J41.7		Yes, but sometimes attached.
21	Yūsuf b. Šešet ha-Sefardi	CUL T-S Misc.37.5 recto		Yes (first two lines in JA)
22	Samḥūn d. Da'ūd b. al-Siqilli	Budapest DK 327		Yes
23	Ḳallūf b. Mūsā b. al-Šā'īg al-Barqī (lived in Palermo, but birthplace unknown)	Bodl. Ms Heb.a.3/13		No
24	Yahūda ha-Kohen b. Yūsuf (Italy/Maḡrib) ⁴³	CUL T-S 16.235 CUL T-S 16.150 CUL T-S 12.657		No
25	Sicilian rental deed	JTS ENA NS 16.27	ca. 1136 CE	Yes

42 CUL T-S 13J27.10 is addressed from this sender but is in a different hand to the other manuscripts.

43 Where exactly Yahūda ha-Kohen b. Yūsuf hailed from remains uncertain – Goitein suggests that he was of Palestinian descent, while Cohen cites details from a manuscript (CUL T-S Box G1.74) which suggest that he was born and raised in Italy (see Cohen 1980:105–107). Bareket claims he was from the Maḡrib (1999:20).

TABLE 1 Representation of the definite article in Andalusi and Sicilian Jewish (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
26	Legal document	CUL T-S 8J8.17 (recto)		Yes
27	Letter of an individual who had moved from Sicily to Tyre	CUL T-S 13J13.27		Yes
28	Letter sent from Sicily by a mother to her son	CUL T-S 8.9		Yes
29	Unidentified sender	CUL T-S 12.218		Yes
30	Sicilian man to his wife in Sicily	Moss. VII.162.3		Yes
31	Letter to Ismaʿil al-Andalusi informing him of his mother's death	CUL T-S 13J22.1		Yes

TABLE 2 Representation of the definite article in Maġribī Jewish writers' documents.

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
32	(Abū Ishaq)	Bodl. MS Heb.d.66/93	11th century	Yes
	Ibrahīm b. ʿAṭā ⁴⁴	CUL T-S 10J9.26	CE	Yes
	(a.k.a. Abraham b. Natan)	(Possibly two different hands)		

44 Identified as a Tunisian court physician in Cohen (1980:30). Bodl. MS Heb.d.66/93 is written from one Abraham b. Natan in a different hand to that found in CUL T-S 10J9.26. In Bodl. MS Heb.d.66/93, the definite article is written as a separate entity.

TABLE 2 Representation of the definite article in Maġribī Jewish writers' documents (*cont.*)

Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
33 Yūsuf and Nissīm b. Berekyā	Bodl. ms Heb.d.65/9		Yes; CUL T-S 10J9.26, Bodl. ms Heb.d.65/9, CUL T-S 16.64, CUL T-S 13J36.1 and CUL T-S 8J28.9 are all written by the same scribe
	CUL T-S 16.64		
	CUL T-S 13J36.1	1015 CE	
	CUL T-S 8J28.9	1020 CE	
34 Šelomo b. Yahūda (al-Fāsī)	CUL T-S 13J36.5		Yes
	CUL T-S 16.275 verso	1028 CE	
	Moss. Ia.20.1	1029 CE	
	Moss. Ia.20.2		
	CUL T-S NS J14	1033 CE	
	Bodl. Heb.a.3/3		
	Bodl. Heb.c.28/44		
35 Nahray b. Nissīm al-Maġribī (see CUL T-S 8J19.11)	Bodl. Heb.c.28/67		No
	Moss. IV.80		
	Moss. II.188.2	ca. 1053 CE	
	CUL T-S 8J29.11	ca. 1055 CE	
	L-G Misc.100	1053 CE	
	Bodl. ms Heb.c.28/33		
	Bodl. ms Heb.d.66/41	ca. 1050 CE	
	CUL T-S 13J19.27	ca. 1045 CE	
36 (Abū l-Faraġ) Nissīm b. Nahray b. Nissīm	CUL T-S 8J22.10		No Inconsistent
	CUL T-S 10J12.26		
	Bodl. ms heb.d.66/46		
	CUL T-S Ar.48.42		
	(two different hands)		

TABLE 2 Representation of the definite article in Mağribī Jewish writers' documents (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
37	Natan b. Nahray (b. Natan)	Moss. IV.18 CUL T-S 8.17 (recto) CUL T-S 10J14.26 CUL T-S 8J27.5 CUL T-S 10J16.17 CUL T-S 10J16.18 CUL T-S 10J20.17 CUL T-S 10J20.18 CUL T-S NS J187 BL Or.5566.D.3 Bodl. ms Heb.d.66/79 Bodl. ms Heb.d.66/91 CUL T-S 12.610 CUL T-S 8J26.17	1064 CE ca. 1061 CE ca. 1065 CE ca. 1062 CE ca. 1062 CE ca. 1062 CE ca. 1063 CE ca. 1063 CE	Tendency towards separation, but inconsistent
38	Benāyā b. Mūsā l-Mağribī	CUL T-S 8J17.32 CUL T-S 10J19.10 CUL T-S 13J23.3 Bodl. ms Heb.c.28/50 CUL T-S 10J6.2	 1080 CE	Yes; most evident in CUL T-S 13J23.3 and CUL T-S 10J19.10; CUL T-S 10J6.2 is in a different hand (with some separation)
39	(Abū Zikri) Yahūda b. Mūsā b. Sigmār, Tunisia ⁴⁵	Moss. II.191 CUL T-S 8J24.5		Yes
40	(Abū l-Ḥasan) Labrāṭ b. Mūsā b. Sigmār, Tunisia	CUL T-S AS 151.10 Bodl. ms Heb.b.13/49 Moss. II. 133 CUL T-S 16.179 JTS ENA NS 18.35	1056 CE	Inconsistent
41	Mūsā b. Labrāṭ b. Sigmār	CUL T-S 16.262	1100 CE	No

45 Yahūda b. Mūsā b. Sigmār studied under Yahūda ha-kohen b. Yūsuf (see CUL T-S 16.179) (Cohen 1980:116).

TABLE 2 Representation of the definite article in Maġribī Jewish writers' documents (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
42	Labrāṭ b. Yiṣḥaq b. Sigmār	CUL T-S 13J29.1 (possibly also Bodl. ms Heb.d.65/18 and CUL T-S 12.391)		Yes
43	Iṣḥaq b. Da'ūd b. Sigmār	Budapest DK 237.2		No
44	(Abū l-Faraġ) Nissīm b. Ḥalfūn b. Banāyā ⁴⁶	CUL T-S 8J39.12 CUL T-S 8J18.33? CUL T-S 10J10.29 CUL T-S 10J10.30 CUL T-S 10J20.16? CUL T-S 13J25.14 CUL T-S 8.18 CUL T-S 12.246 CUL T-S NS J13 CUL T-S Misc. 25.68 CUL Or. 1080 J166 Moss. IV 37.3 Bodl. ms Heb. e.98/74 CUL T-S 8J19.11 CUL T-S 13J28.6	1055 CE ca a. 1066 CE 11th century CE 1053 CE 1046 CE 1055 CE 1055 CE 1065 CE 1046 CE	Tends towards separation, but is inconsistent
45	Mūsā b. Yahyā l-Maġġānī I	CUL T-S 12.566	1029 CE	Yes
46	Yahyā b. Mūsā l-Maġġānī	CUL T-S 10J15.33 Bodl. ms Heb.a.2/17 (Two different hands)	ca. 1045 CE 1040 CE	Yes

46 Nissīm b. Ḥalfūn has previously been categorized as an Egyptian merchant (see Wagner 2010:17–18). However, in CUL T-S 10J6.2, a letter from Banāyā b. Mūsā, he is clearly addressed as 'Nissīm b. Ḥalfūn al-Maġribī' (verso, line 2). It is possible that he was born and raised in the Maġrib, before moving to Egypt, in much the same way as Nissīm b. Nahrāy and (Abū Imrān) Mūsā b. Abī l-Ḥayy Kalīla (see n. 50). This is more in keeping with his close ties to, and frequent correspondence with, the Maġribī merchants of this era.

TABLE 2 Representation of the definite article in Maġribī Jewish writers' documents (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
47	Mūsā b. Yahyā l-Maġġānī II	CUL T-S 13J29.11		Yes
48	Iṣḥaq b. 'Alī Maġġānī	CUL T-S 8J25.3	1039 CE	Yes
49	Abūn b. Ṣadaqa l-Maġribī	CUL T-S 8J19.23 CUL T-S 10J5.10 CUL T-S 8.257 CUL T-S 10J11.13 CUL T-S 13J25.12 CUL T-S Ar.18.(1).165	1064 CE	Yes
50	'Ayyāš b. Ṣadaqa l-Maġribī	CUL T-S 8J36.4 CUL T-S 10J17.24 CUL T-S 13J13.11 ⁴⁷ CUL T-S NS J129 CUL T-S AS 145.16	1050 CE	Slight tendency towards separation, but generally attached
51	Ṣadaqa b. 'Ayyāš	Bodl. ms Heb.d.66/15		Slight tendency towards separation, but generally attached
52	Sahl b. Mavesser b. Naḥūm	CUL T-S 13J16.3 CUL T-S 13J17.5 JTS ENA 4020.59 JTS ENA 2740.3 CUL T-S 16.24		No
53	Yahūda b. Sahl	CUL T-S AS 152.156 Moss. Ia.12.2 CUL T-S 6J3.19	ca. 1050 CE	Tendency towards separation, particularly when preceded by a bound morpheme preposition; more frequent separation in CUL T-S 6J3.19

47 See Goldberg (2012:58–62) for a translation and discussion of this letter's contents.

TABLE 2 Representation of the definite article in Mağribī Jewish writers' documents (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
54	Yūsuf b. Sahl al-Baradānī ⁴⁸	CUL T-S 10J15.5 Bodl. MS Heb.c.28.20		Yes
55	Mūsā b. Ishāq al-Safāquṣī, Tunisia	CUL T-S 13J29.8 CUL T-S NS J563	ca. 1059 CE	Slight tendency towards separation, but generally attached
56	Salāma b. Mūsā al-Safāquṣī, Tunisia	CUL T-S 10J4.2 Moss. IV.36.3 Penn. Halper 389	ca. 1059 CE 1064 CE	Slight tendency towards separation, more noticeable in Moss. IV.36.3 (e.g., see lines 6 and 12)
57	Salāma b. Nissīm b. Ishāq al-Barqī	CUL T-S 13J27.18 CUL T-S 8J22.8 CUL T-S 12.793 Bodl. MS Heb.c.28/36	1053 CE ca. 1055 CE	Separation more noticeable in CUL T-S 13J27.18
58	Yahūda b. Yūsuf b. Simḥa	CUL Or. 1080 J35		No
59	Yūsuf b. Yahūda b. Simḥa	JTS ENA 3793.6		Yes
60	Ishāq b. Simḥa al-Naysābūrī	CUL T-S 8J13.3 CUL T-S 13J21.26 CUL T-S 13J22.30 CUL T-S Ar.18(1).51 CUL T-S 18J4.6 CUL T-S AS 149.12 Bodl. MS Heb.a.3/23	ca. 11th–12th century CE ca. 1080 CE	Yes
61	Isma'īl b. Barhūn al-Tihertī	CUL T-S 8.265 CUL T-S 10J11.23	Early 11th century CE	Yes
62	Ṣāliḥ b. Barhūn al-Tihertī	CUL T-S 13J29.6		Yes

48 Yūsuf b. Sahl al-Baradānī appears to be the great grandson of the Baghdadi cantor Joseph al-Baradani, whose son Nahūm emigrated to Qayrawan. Nahūm's son (Yannai/Sahl) and grandsons (Nahūm and Yūsuf) emigrated to Tyre, when the latter two had already reached maturity (see Gil 1992:186–187, n. 64).

TABLE 2 Representation of the definite article in Mağribī Jewish writers' documents (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
63	Mūsā b. Barhūn al-Tihertī	CUL T-S AS 152.148 CUL T-S 12.171 (different hand)		Yes. CUL T-S 12.171 is written in the same hand as CUL T-S 10J9.26, Bodl. MS Heb.d.65/9, CUL T-S 16.64, CUL T-S 13J36.1 and CUL T-S 8J28.9 (see numbers 32 and 33).
64	Barhūn b. Ishāq al-Tihertī	CUL T-S 8J18.16 CUL T-S 20.180 CUL T-S 13J14.9	1045 CE	Tendency towards separation, most evident in CUL T-S 20.180 and 13J14.9
65	Nissīm b. Isaac al-Tihertī	CUL T-S 10J19.9 CUL T-S 13J8.13	1057 CE	Yes
66	Barhūn b. Šāliḥ al-Tihertī	CUL T-S 13J18.8 CUL T-S 10J29.10 CUL T-S 8J19.32	1056 CE 1050 CE	Yes
67	Barhūn b. Mūsā l- Tihertī	CUL T-S AS 147.136 CUL T-S 10J20.4 Moss. IV.28.I CUL T-S K2.32 CUL T-S 13J20.19 CUL T-S Misc.28.225	1060 CE	Yes
68	Yūsuf b. Mūsā b. Barhūn l- Tāhertī	CUL T-S 8J24.10 CUL T-S 16.263 CUL T-S 8J25.11 CUL T-S 8J16.31 CUL T-S 20.71 CUL T-S 8J19.1 CUL T-S 13J8.5 CUL T-S 13J25.9 CUL T-S 16.161 CUL T-S 16.264 CUL T-S Ar.53.51	1057 CE 1057 CE 1061 CE 1056 CE 1061 CE 1059 CE 1062 CE	Yes

TABLE 2 Representation of the definite article in Maġribī Jewish writers' documents (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
69	Abū l-Ḥayy b. Barhūn Ḳalīla	CUL T-S 10J9.18	ca. 1046 CE	Yes
		CUL T-S 12.402 ⁴⁹	ca. 1045 CE	
70	(Abū Imrān) Mūsā b. Abī l-Ḥayy Ḳalīla, ⁵⁰ b. Qayrawan	CUL T-S 8J19.26	1062 CE	Yes
		CUL T-S 8J27.2	1057 CE	
		CUL T-S 8J21.29	1063 CE	
		Moss. II.128	1065 CE	
		CUL T-S 8J18.11	1055 CE	
		CUL T-S 10J19.2		
		CUL T-S 10J19.5	ca. 1055 CE	
		Bodl. MS Heb.c.28/34		
71	Ibrāhīm b. Abī l-Ḥayy Ḳalīla	CUL T-S Misc.25.70		No
		CUL Or.1080 J271		
		Bodl. MS Heb.c.28/52	ca. 1075 CE	
		Bodl. MS Heb.d.66/40		
		CUL T-S 8J24.15		
72	Ismaʿīl b. Yūsuf b. Abī ʿUqba ⁵¹	CUL T-S 13J29.9	ca. 1030 CE	No
		(verso)	1036 CE	
		CUL T-S Ar.18(1).101	ca. 1030s CE	
		JTS ENA 3786.1		

49 Gil (1997) attributed this letter to Mūsā b. Abī l-Ḥayy Ḳalīla, but it is written in Abū l-Ḥayy b. Barhūn Ḳalīla's hand.

50 (Abū Imrān) Mūsā b. Abī l-Ḥayy Ḳalīla was born in Qayrawan and emigrated to Alexandria as a young man. Alexandria remained his main residence until his death (Goldberg 2012:248).

51 A nephew of Yūsuf b. ʿAwkal (Stillman 1973:25, 30; Goldberg 2012:136). Yūsuf b. Yaʿqūb b. ʿAwkal's (active in Genizah documents between 990 and 1030 CE) family hailed from Iraq (Rustow 2008:138) or Iran (Stillman 1973:17). The family moved to Tunisia during the mid-tenth century, remaining there until the late tenth century, when they settled in Egypt (ibid.; Stillman 1973:17). The family appear to have maintained ties with relations in Iraq throughout this period (Rustow 2008:138–139). Yūsuf b. Yaʿqūb b. ʿAwkal's date of birth is unknown, but it is likely that he was born before 970 CE (on the basis that in 1008 CE he is known to have had two adult sons (see Wagner 2010:17)). Stillman suggests that he was likely to have been educated in the Maġrib (1973:17), before moving to Egypt and setting himself up as a merchant (in a fashion reminiscent of other Maġribī merchants' career trajectories, such as Nahray b. Nissīm, Nissīm b. Ḥalfūn (see n. 46), and Mūsā b. Abī l-Ḥayy Ḳalīla (see n. 50).

TABLE 2 Representation of the definite article in Maġribī Jewish writers' documents (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
73	Faraj, freed slave of Taherti family	CUL T-S 8.12		Slight tendency towards separation, but generally attached
74	Isrā'īl b. Natan, b. Qayrawan	CUL T-S NS J388 CUL T-S 10J10.24 CUL T-S 6J5.8 CUL T-S 13J14.18 CUL T-S 13J16.4 CUL T-S 13J16.7 CUL T-S 13J26.4 CUL T-S 13J29.7 CUL T-S 8J19.9 CUL T-S 10J15.6 CUL T-S 10J15.12 CUL T-S 10J15.19 Bodl. ms Heb.a.2/18 CUL T-S 12.362		Often separated, but occasionally attached
75	'Amram b. Mūsā l-Barqī, Libya	CUL T-S 10J11.2	11th century CE	Slight tendency towards separation, but generally attached.
76	Ibrahīm b. Ya'qūb al-Dar'ī ⁵²	CUL T-S 20.177	ca. 1100 CE	No
77	Hārūn b. Yūsuf al-Ġazzāl 'the Spinner'	CUL T-S 13J29.2 CUL T-S NS J388	1027 CE	Yes
78	Isma'īl b. Farah al-Qābiṣī	CUL T-S 8.66 CUL T-S 10J20.12 CUL T-S 10J15.15 CUL T-S 8J20.2 CUL T-S 10J15.4 CUL T-S 8.25 BL Or.5542.9	1056 CE	Yes

52 Ibrahīm b. Ya'qūb al-Dar'ī is identified as being of North African descent by Cohen (1980:241).

TABLE 2 Representation of the definite article in Mağribī Jewish writers' documents (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
79	Yūsuf b. Farah al-Qābisī	CUL T-S 8.26 CUL T-S 8J20.6 CUL T-S 8J20.18 JTS ENA 1822 A.67		Yes
80	Farah b. Isma'īl b. Farah al-Qābisī	L-G Ar.1.31 CUL T-S 13J19.9 CUL T-S 18J3.13 CUL T-S 8.255 CUL T-S 8J19.4 CUL T-S 8J21.2 CUL T-S 8J21.7 JTS ENA 4020.43	1056 CE 1065 CE ca. 1050s	Tendency towards separation, but often attached
81	Farah b. Yūsuf b. Farah al-Qābisī	CUL T-S 8.20 CUL T-S 8J26.5 CUL T-S 8J27.13 CUL T-S 10J14.17 CUL T-S 13J28.2 Bodl. MS Heb.d.76/59		Inconsistent, but tending towards separation; several different hands
82	Mūsā b. Ishāq b. Ḥisdā ⁵³	CUL T-S NS 308.119 CUL T-S 12.227 AIU VII.E.130 Bodl. MS Heb.c.27/82	11th century CE	Yes
83	Farah b. Ibrahīm	CUL T-S 12.367		Yes
84	Daniel b. al-Šāma	CUL T-S 12.291 (as scribe for Ibrahīm b. Yūsuf)	11th century CE	Yes

53 Goldberg identifies Mūsā b. Ishāq b. Ḥisdā as a nephew of Yūsuf b. Ya'qūb b. 'Awkal (2012:287). Although Mūsā b. Ishāq b. Ḥisdā is mentioned by Stillman (1973:70, n. 3), he does not make this familial connection. Wagner included Mūsā b. Ishāq b. Ḥisdā's letters in her Egyptian corpus (2010:19).

TABLE 3 Representation of the definite article in merchants' letters, the writers of which lived in Alexandria

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
85	Efrayim b. Isma'īl al-Ġawharī ⁵⁴	CUL T-S 10J19.19 CUL T-S 13J17.3 CUL T-S 13J19.29 Bodl. MS Heb. d.47/62 BL Or.5563 C.19	ca. 1030 CE 1030 CE	Tendency towards separation in CUL T-S 10J19.19 and CUL T-S 13J17.3, but much more markedly separated in Bodl. MS Heb.d.47/62
86	Ibrahīm b. Farah al-Iskandarānī	CUL T-S 8J18.10 CUL T-S 8J18.13 CUL T-S 10J11.9 CUL T-S 10J19.3 CUL T-S 10J31.8 CUL T-S 13J15.9 CUL T-S 13J17.15 CUL T-S 13J26.8 Moss. VII.153 CUL T-S 12.524 CUL T-S 8J20.17 (as scribe for Mardūk b. Mūsā) JTS ENA 2805.21 (as scribe for Mardūk b. Mūsā)	ca. 1055 CE 1050 CE ca. 1056 CE ca. 1050 CE 1045 CE 1053 CE ca. 1050 CE 1066 CE	Yes

54 Efrayim b. Isma'īl al-Ġawharī is known to have lived and worked in Alexandria as an adult. However, there is scant information concerning his place of birth and upbringing. In one letter (CUL T-S 13J19.29) he refers to 'my (maternal) uncle' Mūsā in Qayrawan (see Stillman 1973:26; Goldberg 2012:88). This, when coupled with his close association with the Maġribī merchants, suggests that he may not have been a native Egyptian (see Wagner 2010:18 who included Efrayim's letters in her Egyptian corpus).

TABLE 3 Representation of the definite article in merchants' letters, the writers (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
87	Yešū'a b. Isma'īl al-Maḥmūrī, active in Alexandria until his death in 1090 CE (see Goldberg 2012:120–123).	BL Or.5542.27 Moss. II.131.2 CUL T-S 13J19.20 JTS ENA 2727.6b JTS ENA 2805.23 CUL T-S 12.389 (possibly several different hands)	1062 CE 1080 CE	Occasional separation, but generally attached
88	Mardūk b. Mūsa l-Aṭrābulī (see Penn. Halper 385) is known to have lived and worked in Alexandria.	BL Or.5566 B.31 CUL T-S 12.254 CUL T-S 12.373 (as scribe) CUL T-S 13J15.19 CUL T-S 13J17.1 Moss. II.154.2 JTS ENA 2805.5b JTS ENA 4010.21 JTS ENA 4100.24b Penn. Halper 385 (possibly several different hands)	1065 CE 1048 CE 1066 CE	Tends towards separation, but sometimes attached
89	Raḥamīm b. 'Imrān	CUL T-S 8J26.13	1055 CE	Yes
90	Ḥayyim b. 'Eli ha-Kohen b. Ḥayyim, writing from Alexandria.	CUL T-S 13J16.2	ca. 1080 CE	Slight tendency towards separation, but generally attached
91	'Awād b. Ḥananāl, known to have lived and worked in Alexandria as an adult.	CUL T-S 16.302 CUL T-S 10J17.21 CUL T-S 12.721	1060 CE 1060 CE	Generally attached, only occasionally separated (see CUL T-S 12.721 verso, lines 2–3)

TABLE 3 Representation of the definite article in merchants' letters, the writers (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date (if known)	Separated definite article (yes/no)
92	Abū l-Ḳayr b. 'Awād b. Ḥananāl	CUL T-S 10J18.16 (as scribe for his father) CUL T-S 10J10.27 (as scribe for his father?) CUL T-S Misc.25.62		Yes

TABLE 4 Representation of the definite article in Egyptian, Palestinian, and Iraqi Jewish writers' documents

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date	Separated definite article (yes/no)
93	Hai b. Širīra (a.k.a. Hai Gaon)	CUL T-S 10J27.10 Moss. VII.157 Moss. Ia.5 (Two – three different hands)	1018 CE 1037 CE 1037 CE	? No No
94	(Abū Zikrī) Yahūda b. Sa'adya ha-Rofe ⁵⁵	Bodl. Ms Heb.11/9		No
95	Mevoraḳ b. Sa'adya ⁵⁶	CUL T-S 13J16.21	11th century CE	No

55 (Abū Zikrī) Yahūda b. Sa'adya ha-Rofe (b. ca. 1025 CE and d. ca. 1077–1079 CE) (see Cohen 1980:155).

56 According to Cohen (1980:155), Mevoraḳ b. Sa'adya was the son of Sa'adya ('the physician') b. Mevoraḳ, and half-brother to Yahūda b. Sa'adya.

TABLE 4 Representation of the definite article in Egyptian, Palestinian, and Iraqi (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date	Separated definite article (yes/no)
96	Natan ha-Kohen b. Mevorak	CUL T-S 13J14.13 CUL T-S 10J5.21 CUL T-S 8J39.1 CUL T-S 18J2.3 (scribe for Abraham b. Ḥalfon b. Naḥūm) BL Or. 5544.3 Bodl. MS Heb.c.28/65 ⁵⁷ CUL Or.1081J18 JTS ENA 2727.35	ca. 1090 CE ca. 1110 CE	No
97	Mevorak b. Natan	CUL T-S 12.60 CUL T-S AS 145.6 CUL T-S 13J20.6 JTS ENA NS 69.12 ⁵⁸	1180 CE	No
98	Yūsuf ha-Kohen b. Šelomo Goan, Palestine	CUL T-S 13J8.30	1050 CE	No
99	Elijah ha-Kohen b. Šelomo (brother of Yūsuf)	CUL T-S 13J18.28	1030 CE	No
100	Abiathar ha-Kohen	CUL T-S 24.49	1070 CE	No
101	Ibrahīm b. Šelomo b. Yahūda	CUL T-S NS J91	1050 CE	No

57 See Cohen (1980:316–321) for a translation of this letter.

58 This fragment has been recently identified by Ashur & Zewi as a fragment of Sa'adya's translation of the Pentateuch (Numbers 27:18–22, 28:2–7) (2019:113). Ashur & Zewi also identify the scribe as Mevorak b. Natan (*ibid.*) and note b. Natan's tendency to separate the definite article from the noun/adjective at the end of a textline (see *ibid.*:117, n. 9 and n. 26). I am grateful to one of this article's anonymous reviewers for directing me to Ashur & Zewi's article and for pointing out this feature of b. Natan's writing, noted by Ashur & Zewi.

TABLE 4 Representation of the definite article in Egyptian, Palestinian, and Iraqi (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date	Separated definite article (yes/no)
102	‘Eli ha-Kohen b. Ezekiel, Palestine	CUL T-S AS 147.2 CUL T-S 10J19.16 CUL T-S 13J15.23 CUL T-S 10J29.5 CUL T-S 13J36.6	ca. 1055 CE 1060 CE 1071 CE ca. 1060 CE	No
103	Abraham b. Natan (b. Abraham) Av, Palestine ⁵⁹	CUL T-S 10J13.11 CUL T-S 10J27.11 CUL T-S 10J27.3 CUL T-S 18J1.17 CUL T-S 20.121 JTS ENA 1822a.44 JTS ENA 1822a.45 JTS ENA NS 2.9 Moss. II.152.2 Moss. VII.74.1 Stras. 4038/10 CUL T-S 10J9.33 CUL T-S AS 145.8	1089 CE 1108 CE 1105 CE 1102 CE	No
104	Arah b. Natan (a.k.a. Musāfir b. Wahb; brother of Abraham b. Natan ‘the seventh’)	CUL T-S NS J24a; CUL T-S NS J24b CUL T-S 13J22.23	ca. 1100 CE	No
105	Šelomo b. Yešū‘a, ha-Haver of Damīra ⁶⁰	Bodl. ms Heb.d.66/29	11th – 12th century CE	No

59 See Cohen 1980:121–126. For a comparison of handwriting and autograph, see the legal document CUL T-S 8J4.12.

60 Identified as a Palestinian refugee by Cohen (1980:235).

TABLE 4 Representation of the definite article in Egyptian, Palestinian, and Iraqi (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date	Separated definite article (yes/no)
106	Daniel b. 'Azariah ⁶¹	CUL T-S 12.109 CUL T-S 16.30 CUL T-S 24.56 CUL T-S 8J19.10 CUL T-S 10J5.22 CUL T-S 10J9.20 CUL T-S 10J9.28 CUL T-S 10J18.18 CUL T-S 10J20.8 CUL T-S 10J25.2 CUL T-S 13J8.8 CUL T-S 13J25.3 CUL T-S 13J26.2 CUL T-S 13J26.18 CUL T-S AS 148.3 CUL T-S 18.Ar(1).135	11th century CE 1038 CE 1054–1055 CE	No
107	Samuel b. Daniel b. 'Azariah	CUL T-S 13J17.21		No
108	Mūsā b. Ya'qūb al-Miṣrī	CUL T-S 13J18.16 CUL T-S 13J23.6 CUL T-S 13J23.16	1056 CE	Yes
109	Efrayim b. Šemarya	CUL T-S 16.134 (recto) CUL T-S 20.89 CUL T-S 8J26.3 CUL T-S 13J13.13 CUL T-S 13J16.20 CUL T-S 13J26.24 CUL T-S 13J27.5 (verso) CUL T-S 13J27.14		No

61 Although signed with Daniel b. 'Azariah's autograph, the main text of the letter CUL T-S 13J23.4 appears to be written in a different hand. The palaeographical differences are clearest in the writing of the definite article ligature and the grapheme *'alef*. In this letter, there is a tendency towards separation of the definite article from the noun.

TABLE 4 Representation of the definite article in Egyptian, Palestinian, and Iraqi (*cont.*)

Name & place of birth (if known)		Classmark	Date	Separated definite article (yes/no)
110	Elḥanan b. Šemarya ⁶⁵	CUL T-S 13J27.16 ⁶²	ca. 1030 CE	No
		CUL T-S 18J2.12		
		CUL T-S AS 145.94		
		CUL T-S AS 147.90		
		CUL T-S AS 151.4 ⁶³		
		CUL T-S NS 98.64 ⁶⁴		
		Moss. V.366.1		
		L-G Glass 39		
		CUL T-S 16.134 (verso)		
		CUL T-S 8J7.13		
111	Yefet b. David b. Šekanya	CUL T-S 8J22.14 (verso)	ca. 1007–1010 CE	No
		CUL T-S 20.40 (recto)		
		CUL T-S 12.74		
		CUL T-S 16.45		
		CUL T-S 8J29.12		
		CUL T-S 13J6.23		
		CUL T-S 13J27.5 (recto)		
		CUL T-S 13J35.2		
112	‘Eli ha-Mumḥe b. Abraham	CUL T-S NS J51	1011 CE	No
		Moss. II.137.1	1027 CE	
			1054 CE	
		CUL T-S 13J27.6	ca. 1045 CE	

62 CUL T-S 13J27.16 is attributed to ‘Eli ha-Kohen b. Ezekiel by Goitein and to Yefet b. David by Bareket. However, I think it might be in Efrayim b. Šemarya’s hand.

63 Previously assigned to Yefet b. David.

64 Previously (tentatively) attributed to Yefet b. David.

65 See the Hebrew letter CUL T-S 18J4.5 for a further example of Elḥanan b. Šemarya’s autograph.

TABLE 4 Representation of the definite article in Egyptian, Palestinian, and Iraqi (*cont.*)

[illegible]

TABLE 4 Representation of the definite article in Egyptian, Palestinian, and Iraqi (*cont.*)

Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date	Separated definite article (yes/no)
¹¹⁶ Yefet b. Menašše b. al-Qaṭāʾif	Moss.VII.135.1	1123 CE	
	Moss. VII.138.2		
	CUL T-S 8J5.2		
	CUL T-S 8J5.7		
	CUL T-S 8J22.16	1127 CE	
	CUL T-S 8J29.15		
	CUL T-S 13J20.22		
	(scribe)		
	CUL T-S 13J25.6		Slight separation
	CUL T-S AS 150.23		
	CUL T-S AS 152.64		
	Moss. Ia.29	12th century	No
	Moss. II.123.1.1	CE	
	Moss. II.123.1.2		
	Moss. II.165.1		
	Moss. IV.27.3		
	Moss. IV.60.1		
	Moss. IV.65.2		
	Moss. VII.147.1		
	Moss. VII.168		
	CUL TS 6J4.3		
	CUL T-S 8J11.10		
	CUL T-S 8J17.31		
	CUL T-S 8J25.2		
	CUL T-S 10J13.12 ⁶⁶		
	CUL T-S 13J22.29		
	CUL T-S AS 145.44		
CUL T-S AS 146.36			
CUL T-S AS 147.211			
CUL T-S AS 148.52			

⁶⁶ In the writing of his name on verso, Yefet b. Menašše b. al-Qaṭāʾif slightly separates the definite article from his family name al-Qaṭāʾif. This is the only instance in which al-Qaṭāʾif does this that I have encountered.

TABLE 4 Representation of the definite article in Egyptian, Palestinian, and Iraqi (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date	Separated definite article (yes/no)
		CUL T-S AS 148.202		
		CUL T-S AS 149.69		
		CUL T-S AS 149.78		
		CUL T-S AS 152.6		
		CUL T-S AS 153.235		
		JTS ENA 2738.10		
117	Abraham al-Dimašqī	CUL T-S 10J20.20		No
118	Yūsuf b. Yishʿaq Yerušalmī	CUL T-S 12.266		No
119	Natan ha-Kohen b. Šelomo	CUL T-S 12.789 CUL T-S 8J16.27 Moss. II.100.1		No
120	Evyatar b. ha-Kohen b. Elijah	CUL T-S 10J24.1 CUL T-S 24.49	1091 CE	No
121	Abraham b. Sāʿdya ha-Ḥaver ha-Ḥebroni	CUL T-S 13J15.23 CUL T-S 8J18.32 CUL T-S Ar.8(2).4		Slight tendency towards separation
122	Toviyya ha-Kohen b. ʿEli	CUL T-S 13J18.6 CUL T-S 13J19.2		Yes
123	Elijah the Judge ⁶⁷	CUL T-S 13J20.15 CUL T-S 8J23.20 (Šelomo as scribe?) CUL T-S 13J18.7 CUL T-S 13J22.15 CUL T-S 13J16.5	ca. 1130 CE 13th century CE	No

67 Elijah the Judge is addressed as al-Iskandarānī by his brother-in-law Maṣṣūr b. Sālīm (see CUL T-S 10J14.12 verso).

TABLE 4 Representation of the definite article in Egyptian, Palestinian, and Iraqi (*cont.*)

	Name & place of birth (if known)	Classmark	Date	Separated definite article (yes/no)
124	Šelomo b. Elijah the Judge	CUL T-S 8J13.24 CUL T-S 8J23.18 CUL T-S 8J41.8 CUL T-S 13J7.26 CUL T-S 13J22.5 CUL T-S 13J22.34 CUL T-S 13J28.19 Moss. II.135.1 recto Moss. II.155.2 verso Moss. VII.139.1 CUL T-S AS 151.198 verso CUL T-S AS 149.176 recto CUL T-S AS 145.78 recto CUL T-S NS J45 recto CUL T-S NS J102	13th century CE	No
125	Manṣūr b. Sālīm	CUL T-S 10J13.10 CUL T-S 10J14.10 CUL T-S Ar.18(1).137	13th century CE	No

Magdalen Connolly

is a Leverhulme Early Career Fellow at FAMES, University of Cambridge, where she researches written linguistic features of Egyptian Jewish, Muslim, and Christian folk tales from the pre-modern era. She gained a first-class degree in Arabic and Theology at the University of Exeter (2013). After completing her MPhil (2013–2014) and PhD (2014–2018) in Judeo-Arabic philology, under the supervision of Prof. Geoffrey Khan at Emmanuel College, Magdalen became a part-time Research Associate at the Genizah Research Unit.