



# Arabian Epigraphic Notes

<http://www.arabianepigraphicnotes.org>

ISSN: 2451-8875

**E-mail alerts:** To be notified by e-mail when a new article is published, write “subscribe” to [editor@arabianepigraphicnotes.org](mailto:editor@arabianepigraphicnotes.org).

**Twitter:** Subscribe to the Journal on Twitter for updates: @AENJournal.

**Terms of usage:** This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/4.0/>. © the author.



A Publication of the Leiden Center for the Study of Ancient Arabia  
<http://www.hum.leiden.edu/leicensaa/>

# The Language of the Taymanitic Inscriptions & its Classification

Fokelien Kootstra

Leiden University

Arabian Epigraphic Notes 2 (2016): 67–140.

Published online: 15 August 2016.

**Link to this article:** <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/42063>

# The Language of the Taymanitic Inscriptions & its Classification

Fokelien Kootstra (Leiden University)\*

## Abstract

This work comprises a linguistic survey of the Ancient North Arabian (ANA) epigraphic material from Taymā', conventionally known as Taymanitic (Macdonald 2000: 28-9). A grammatical sketch, based on the linguistic features in the Taymanitic corpus is presented, followed by a discussion of the linguistic features of Taymanitic that are relevant to its linguistic classification. After that, follows a compilation of all previously published inscriptions with grammatical content. Finally, an appendix with a glossary follows.

**Keywords:** Ancient North Arabian, Taymanitic, Classification

## 1 Introduction

Taymanitic<sup>1</sup> is the name given to an Ancient North Arabian (ANA) script employed in and around the northwestern Arabian oasis of Taymā'.<sup>2</sup> ANA is an umbrella term for all of the non-Ancient South Arabian manifestations of the South Semitic alphabet. It has been hypothesized that these form one group, descending parallel to Ancient South Arabian from a putative proto-South Semitic script. Nevertheless, a paleographic connection between all of the ANA scripts has yet to be demonstrated (Al-Jallad 2015: 10).

When the Taymanitic inscriptions were first discovered they were called Thamudic, together with several other, now separately distinguished, script types.<sup>3</sup> In the 1930s Winnett (1937) divided the Thamudic inscriptions into

---

\*I owe thanks to Jérôme Norris, Dr. Marijn van Putten, and Prof. dr. Hani Hayajneh for their extensive comments and corrections on an earlier version of this paper. I thank Dr. Ahmad Al-Jallad for his thorough comments and corrections on this paper and for advising the Master's Thesis upon which this is based. I owe a special thanks to Michael Macdonald for not only commenting on and correcting an earlier version of this paper, but for also kindly giving me access to his photographs and his personal database of the inscriptions of the Tayma survey prior to their publication for my MA thesis. Without his generosity, this project would have been impossible. I reference his notes and translations from the database with (db). All errors are my own.

<sup>1</sup>Michael Macdonald has kindly given me access to his photographs and his personal database of the inscriptions of the Tayma survey prior to their publication for my MA thesis, of which this is a reworked version. I would like to thank him very much for his generosity. Whenever translations or notes put forward in the database are used, these will be referenced as (db).

<sup>2</sup>The oasis was an important stopping point for the caravans travelling along the frankincense route. See Hausleiter (2010: 219-261) for a more detailed discussion of the ancient history of Taymā'.

<sup>3</sup>In this period, the term Thamudic encompassed Hismaic as well. The collection of Thamudic inscriptions started in the mid-19th century, when several travelers and scholars made copies of

5 subgroups based on script and content: Thamudic A, B, C, D and E. Since the features distinguishing Thamudic A consistently occur in the inscriptions found in the Taymāʾ region, Winnett coined the name Taymanite for this script type (Winnett & Reed 1970: 90 and Winnett 1980: 133). The name Taymanitic was later established by Macdonald in an effort to systemize the wide array of names that had been created by different scholars for the various corpora of ANA inscriptions<sup>4</sup> (Macdonald 2000: 33).

Even though it is impossible to determine when Taymanitic first started to be written, there are some historical references in the Taymanitic inscriptions that provide us with a clear time frame for at least part of the corpus. A few inscriptions found around Taymāʾ mention *nbnd mlk bbl* (Esk 169 and Esk 177) “Nabonidus king of Babylon” or *mlk bbl* (Esk 025<sup>5</sup>) “king of Babylon”,<sup>6</sup> placing the writing of these inscriptions sometime in the middle of the first millennium BCE, when Nabonidus occupied Taymāʾ for ten years of his rule (552-543 BC) (Beaulieu 1989: 150).<sup>7</sup>

The corpus of ANA inscriptions has generally been considered a relatively homogeneous group of linguistic varieties (e.g. Macdonald 2000: 31). This is primarily based on the scripts used, and not on linguistic features.<sup>8</sup> Even though some scholars have emphasized the difference between Arabic and ANA (e.g. Müller 1982, Macdonald 2008: 179), ANA as a whole is often considered to be either very closely related to, or even the direct predecessor of Arabic (e.g. Knauf 2010; Lipiński 1997; Müller 1982<sup>9</sup>). Until recently, the main linguistic feature used to distinguish ANA from Arabic was the definite article, which was identified as *h(n)*- for ANA as opposed to *ʾl*- for Arabic varieties.

---

some of the Thamudic inscriptions they found on the Arabian Peninsula (e.g. Wellsted 1838; Wallin 1850). Also larger collections of Ancient North Arabian inscriptions and graffiti found in the same area started to be published around that time (Doughty 1884; Huber 1884 and Huber 1891, Euting 1914; Jaussen & Savignac 1909-1922).

<sup>4</sup>Macdonald proposes to use *-ic* for languages and scripts, *-ite* for peoples and cultures; consistent with the way in which these morphemes are generally used in the English language (Macdonald 2000: 33).

<sup>5</sup>Esk 169 is certainly written in Taymanitic script, although the *f* in line three has a Safaitic shape. Esk 025 contains two non-Taymanitic letter shapes, but seems to have been written in the Taymanitic script otherwise. The *ʾ* in the personal name has a Safaitic shape, while the *ṭ* in *nṭrt* looks like two # signs glued together, closely resembling the *ṭ* sign proposed for “dispersed ONA” or in fact Taymanitic *ḏ* (Macdonald 2000: 34). For Esk 177 it is hard to determine exactly in which script it was written partly due to the angle at which the photograph was taken (Macdonald in comments, db).

<sup>6</sup>Several inscriptions mentioning Nabonidus in other scripts have also been found at the oasis: one fragmentary cuneiform inscription on stone with the name of Nabonidus was found during the Saudi-German excavations of Taymāʾ (Hausleiter 2010: 253, no. 101) and an Imperial Aramaic graffito the author of which said that he had accompanied Nabonidus king of Babylon has been found at al-Muqayil south of Taymāʾ (I would like to thank Michael Macdonald for pointing this out to me).

<sup>7</sup>The reason for Nabonidus’ presence at Taymāʾ has been a matter of debate; among the suggested reasons have been economic considerations, sickness, and political/religious tensions. The fact that he stayed at Taymāʾ during this period, however, has been accepted as an historical fact. Therefore, at least part of the Taymanitic corpus can safely be dated to the second half of the 6th century BCE. For more detailed discussions of the topic see e.g. Beaulieu 1989; D’Agostino 1994: 97-108 and Lambert 1972.

<sup>8</sup>This is largely due to the relative paucity of the material; since the short, formulaic inscriptions make it hard to get a clear grasp of the full grammar of any of these varieties.

<sup>9</sup>Müller does recognize that the use of Arabic for the interpretation of ANA texts might be one of the reasons the two look so alike (Müller 1982: 18).

Since the definite article is not a shared morphological innovation<sup>10</sup> for Arabic or for ANA,<sup>11</sup> this cannot be used as a feature to determine their linguistic affiliation.<sup>12</sup>

If we take an approach which focusses on morphological innovations to determine linguistic relationship (e.g. Hetzron 1976; Huehnergard & Rubin 2011) it can be established that Hismaic and Safaitic form a dialect continuum with Old Arabic (Al-Jallad 2015: 12). Based on our current knowledge it is impossible to establish what the affiliation of Dadanitic and the languages expressed in the Thamudic scripts would be. Even though several striking features of the Dadanitic grammar are known (e.g. both  $\text{ʔ}$ - and *h*- causatives are attested, and it uses independent 3rd person pronouns as anaphora (Al-Jallad, forthcoming)) our knowledge is too fragmented to be able to classify it at the moment.<sup>13</sup> This study will set out to establish the linguistic affiliation of the language of the Taymanitic inscriptions in relation to the Old Arabic dialect continuum and its surrounding Semitic languages.

When looking at possible cultural ties between ANA corpora, Taymanitic seems to have had its own script tradition. First of all, the content of the Taymanitic inscriptions is very different from, for example, Safaitic. This is partly due to the obvious fact that the Taymanitic inscriptions were written by a sedentary community, so there are no inscriptions mentioning nomadic activities such as pasturing like in Safaitic. However, other, more general topics, such as grieving or longing for a loved one, or funerary texts which are also common themes in Safaitic (Al-Jallad 2015: 22) are similarly unattested. Moreover, even when compared to inscriptions from other sedentary communities such as Dedan, Taymanitic remains clearly distinguishable. There are for example, no attestations of texts relating a specific religious ceremony called the *ʔll* ceremony for *dġbt* which features in many of the Dadanitic inscriptions (Sima 1999: 90-95); the only deity that is mentioned in the Taymanitic inscriptions is *ʕalm*;<sup>14</sup> there is no mention of *dġbt*, *rġw/y* or *lt* who appear often in other ANA corpora. Instead, Taymanitic mainly seems to discuss military activities: a few writers list their military ranks (e.g. Esk 031) and one of the common formulae is *nʕr l-ʕlm* ‘he gave aid on behalf of *ʕlm* (the main deity of the oasis)’ seems to refer to military service (for a complete discussion see 4.6 for *nʕr l-ʕlm* inscriptions). Other inscriptions are purely religious in nature and are also dedicated to *ʕlm* (e.g. HE 24).

Even though the formula used in the Taymanitic inscriptions generally follow the basic structure also used in other ANA varieties: ‘introductory particle - genealogy – statement’; there seems to be little overlap with other corpora oth-

<sup>10</sup>Cf. Hetzron 1976; Huehnergard & Rubin 2011

<sup>11</sup>The usage and relevance of the definite article for the classification of ANA is extensively discussed in Al-Jallad (2014: 5-6 and 2015: 11-12).

<sup>12</sup>When examining the evidence, it becomes clear that the situation is more complex than this: while Al-Jallad classifies the language varieties found in the Safaitic inscriptions as forms of *Old Arabic*” (Al-Jallad 2015: 11), a variety of different forms of the article is attested in the Safaitic inscriptions. The most frequently attested form of the article is *h*-, but *hm*- and  $\text{ʔ}(l)$ - articles have also been attested (Al-Jallad 2015: 11). This illustrates how the form of the article cannot be used to indicate how closely related any linguistic variety is to Arabic or any another Semitic language.

<sup>13</sup>In recent years, two extensive monographs have been published on Dadanitic: Sima’s MA thesis, which was published in 1999 and Farès-Drappeau’s (2005) study. However, Sima’s work does not cover the complete corpus and Farès-Drappeau’s study does not offer a reliable comparative approach.

<sup>14</sup>There is one exception to this:  $\text{ʔlht}$  ‘[the] goddess’ is mentioned in TM.T.020

erwise: there are no attestations of curse formula for example (e.g. in Safaitic KRS 1551 (part): ...*h lh rwh w mhltn l-d y'wr h-s<sup>1</sup> fr* '... O Lh, grant relief and dearth of pasture to him who would scratch out this inscription').<sup>15</sup> The fact that different scripts come with different composition formulae suggests that they were produced within independent writing traditions and cultural contexts. Therefore, the Taymanitic inscriptions will be considered as an independent corpus both culturally and linguistically and it will only be compared to other ANA corpora when relevant, since the semantics and grammar of other corpora can often not be used as a starting point for interpreting the Taymanitic inscriptions.

This paper will focus on the language represented in the Taymanitic inscriptions. It presents a grammatical sketch, based on the linguistic features in the Taymanitic corpus, followed by a discussion of the linguistic features of Taymanitic that are relevant to its linguistic classification. Two Appendices follow: a compilation of all previously published inscriptions with grammatical content, including a discussion of any new interpretations; and a glossary.

## 2 Grammatical sketch

In order to establish the relationship between Taymanitic and the other ANA varieties or Arabic, a better understanding of the Taymanitic grammar itself is required. Below, a grammatical sketch of Taymanitic will be offered, discussing the linguistic features that are most significant to answering the question 'what kind of Semitic language do the Taymanitic inscriptions express?' This means that some of the features it has in common with most Semitic languages, or for which we simply do not have evidence in the epigraphic material from Taymā', will not be discussed specifically.

### 2.1 Orthography

#### 2.1.1 Vowels and Diphthongs

Taymanitic is a consonantal script. Diphthongs were occasionally represented graphically, e.g. *'tw-t* /'atawt(u)/ 'I came' (Esk 169).

There are however, several examples of diphthongs going unrepresented, e.g. Taymā' written as *tm'* (Kim CIMG 0759 Tay. (unpublished)) and possibly: *tmnyt* \*/taymāniyyat/ 'Taymanite' (Liv. Tay1) (but cf. Macdonald 1992: 31). In the same inscription as in which the form *tm'* is attested however, we also find the form *b'ly* which was probably pronounced /ba'alay/ 'owners of' (Kim CIMG 0759 Tay.). This differentiation in spelling of diphthongs could be due to uncertainty on the part of the writers as to the interpretation of these sounds.<sup>16</sup> In the examples cited above it could also represent a difference in the orthographic representation of internal as opposed to word final diphthongs similar to that in Safaitic (Al-Jallad 2015: 38), the spelling of *'twt*, however seems to contradict this. When comparing the spelling of *tm'* /taymā'/ to that of *'twt*

<sup>15</sup>Translation following Al-Jallad (2015: 260).

<sup>16</sup>Most Dutch speakers would for example consider diphthongs *ee* [ej] and *oo* [ow] as single vowels. If some speakers treated diphthongs similarly as long vowels in the language represented by Taymanitic, these would have gone unrepresented in the orthography.

/ʔatáwtu/ one might suggest that only stressed diphthongs are represented orthographically. The presence of the *-y* in *b<sup>l</sup>y* (Kim CIMG 0759 Tay.) however, demonstrates that this is not the case, since *b<sup>l</sup>y* is in construct position and therefore unstressed. At the moment there are too few certain attestations of diphthongs to distinguish a pattern in their distribution with any certainty.

### 2.1.2 Word Dividers

Word dividers are used in many of the Taymanitic inscriptions,<sup>17</sup> but their usage seems to have been inconsistent. In some inscriptions they are used to separate every word, while in others the placement of word boundaries seems more phrase or stress-based; and finally there are inscriptions that do not use any word dividers at all. Two of the inscriptions that use word dividers to separate every word seem to have been more formal inscriptions, engraved deeply into a smooth and possibly prepared, surface.

**TA 09302:**

*ḥ{s<sup>3</sup>}y / f<sup>l</sup> / ḥmd / l-ḥdh / b-ym / blbd*

‘Ḥs<sup>3</sup>y attained glory by guarding the border in the battle of *blbd*’

**TA 09303:**

*----{l}y / f<sup>l</sup> / r{<sup>l</sup>}s<sup>1</sup> / ḥm{d}*

‘...(?) attained foremost glory’

There are also inscriptions that seem pegged or pounded on rocks in the desert that separate every word of an inscription.

**Esk 026:**

*l b<sup>m</sup> / b n{s<sup>l</sup>}dr / f<sup>l</sup> / nk*

‘by *B<sup>m</sup>* son of *N<sup>l</sup>dr* engaged in battle’

Other inscriptions that use word dividers seem to use them to separate phrases or stress units, like construct phrases, from each other. This would explain, for example, why *b* ‘son of’ is never separated from the following personal name in genealogies.

**Esk 023:**

*yf<sup>c</sup> / b b{s<sup>2</sup>}mt / {f}l {n}k*

‘Yf<sup>c</sup> son of *Bs<sup>2</sup>mt* engaged in battle’

**Esk 064:**

*šmd<sup>c</sup> / b s<sup>2</sup>mt / ʔl trdlt*

‘Šmd<sup>c</sup> son of *S<sup>2</sup>mt* of the tribe of *Trdlt*’

<sup>17</sup>Other ANA scripts that use word dividers are Dadanitic, Dumaitic (of which only three inscriptions are attested) (Macdonald 2008: 186) and occasionally Thamudic D (Ahmad Al-Jallad, pc.). Of these, only monumental Dadanitic uses them consistently (Macdonald 2008: 176).

**Esk 013:**

<l> l bʿrl / rḏw ṣlm<sup>18</sup>  
 ‘by Bʿrl, may Ṣalm be pleased’

**Esk 083 (part):**

ʿl / b-zy ṣlm  
 ‘Strength is with those of Ṣalm’

**WTay 3:**

nṣr / bʿgl / hlk / znk rfty /h- rkb  
 ‘nṣr son of ʿgl died, that is Rfty the riding camel’

**HE 41:**

lm {y}ʿzrl / b lrm / mn s<sup>l</sup>mʿ / l- ṣlm l twy  
 ‘by Yʿzrl son of Lrm, whoever obeys Ṣalm will not perish’

Some authors seem to have used word dividers mainly to separate their name from the rest of the inscription.

**WTay 2:**

lm / hbʿl b ʿgl / mn s<sup>l</sup>mʿ l- ṣlm l tw[y]  
 ‘by Hbʿl son of ʿgl, whoever obeys Ṣalm will not perish’

There are two inscriptions in which a clear construct chain is separated by a word divider.

**WTay 11 :**

fḥk b ḥgg nṣr l- {ṣ}lm // b-ḏr / nbyt  
 ‘Fḥk son of Ḥgg kept watch on behalf of Ṣalm in the war of Nbyt’

**Esk 169 (line 1):**

ʿn / mrdn / {ḥ}lm / nbnd /mlk / bbl  
 ‘I am Mrdn, servant of Nabonidus king of Babel’

A similar break within a probable construct chain can be found in the following inscriptions.

**Kim CIMG 0759. Tay (unpublished) (part):**

ʿs<sup>1</sup> bʿly / tmʿ  
 ‘The chief of the inhabitants of Taymā’

**Al-Anṣāry 35:**

lm wdd / b lḥm / ḥll/ b-zy s<sup>2</sup>nʿ /ʿm ṣlm  
 ‘by Wdd son of Lḥm he acted as a soldier against those of enmity of/against the people of Ṣalm’

---

<sup>18</sup>For the analysis of rḏw as a verbal form see section 2.4.2.



Finally, the majority (about 250 out of the 375) of Taymanitic inscriptions does not employ word dividers at all; these also include more elaborate inscriptions containing verbal phrases.

**Esk 059:**

*bmrt ḥl b {ʿ}ft*

‘Bmrt was a soldier at *ʿft*<sup>19</sup>’

**WTay 20:**

*bhs<sup>2</sup>rkt nṣr b- dr ddn yr{ḥ} l- ṣlm*

‘*Bhs<sup>2</sup>rkt* kept watch during the war of Dadan for a month on behalf of *Ṣalm*’

## 2.2 Phonology

### 2.2.1 Consonant system overview

Scholars have argued that Taymanitic employed at least 26 different letter shapes, which means it probably had at least 26 distinct phonemes. PS *\*d* and *\*z* have merged and are represented as *z*; Taymanitic does not distinguish a phoneme *\*z*, which seems to have merged with *\*ṣ*. There are several features in the inscriptions that could point to a merger of *\*s<sup>3</sup>* and *\*t*. As there are no bilingual inscriptions, loan-names and the interpretation of the inscriptions are key to our understanding of Taymanitic phonology. Below, only the phonemes of which the pronunciation is open to debate will be discussed.

<sup>19</sup>For a discussion of the verb *ḥl(l)* see 2.5.1.

THE TAYMANITIC LANGUAGE & CLASSIFICATION

---

| PS   | Transcription  | Taymanitic glyph |
|------|----------------|------------------|
| *ʔ   | ʔ              | 𐎧𐎧               |
| *ɸ   | ɸ              | ◊○               |
| *b   | b              | 𐎧𐎨               |
| *d   | d              | 𐎧𐎩               |
| *ɸ'  | ɸ'             | 𐎧𐎩               |
| *p   | f              | ◊◊σ□0            |
| *g   | g              | □□               |
| *ɸ   | ɸ              | 𐎧𐎩               |
| *h   | h              | ∨Υ               |
| *h   | h              | Υ∨∨              |
| *x   | h              | ∨                |
| *k   | k              | 𐎧𐎧               |
| *l   | l              | )11              |
| *m   | m              | 𐎧𐎩               |
| *n   | n              | ∨∨               |
| *k'  | q              | •φφ              |
| *r   | r              | ∨∨∨              |
| *s   | s <sup>1</sup> | 𐎧                |
| *ɸ   | s <sup>2</sup> | ∨{∨              |
| *ts  | s <sup>3</sup> | *ɸ* *ɸ' *ɸ''     |
| *ts' | ɸ              | 𐎧𐎩𐎩𐎩𐎩            |
| *t   | t              | ×+               |
| *t'  | t'             | ⊠                |
| *w   | w              | ⊖⊖               |
| *y   | y              | ı                |
| *dz  | z              | 𐎧                |

Table 1: script table<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>The script table is based on (Macdonald 2000: 34).

### 2.2.2 \*p

The reflex of \*p is traditionally transcribed as *f*. However, this is a transcription based on a sound change in Arabic. There is no reason to assume that Taymanitic had undergone the same sound change. Following convention however, this phoneme will be transcribed as *f*.

### 2.2.3 The interdental fricatives

In Taymanitic the interdental fricatives seem to have systematically merged with their sibilant (or affricate) counterparts.

$$\begin{array}{l} *d, *z > z \\ *t, *s^3 > s^3 \\ *t^{21}, *s > s \end{array}$$

After a discussion of the evidence pointing to a merger of these phonemes, several misspellings and loanwords or renderings of foreign words into Taymanitic script will be discussed to gain some insight into their possible phonetic realization. As the evidence is fragmentary and open to several interpretations the exact realization of the sibilants will remain uncertain however.

**d and z** The interdental fricative *d* [ð] merged with *z*.<sup>22</sup> They share the same sign, which is used to represent *z* in Hismaic, several varieties of Thamudic and Dadanitic as well; we find forms like the distal demonstrative *znk* < \**dnk* (WTay 3); and the personal name *z'b* < \**d'b* (e.g. WTay 1.2) and *z'bt* < \**d'bt* (e.g. Esk 018) in Taymanitic for example.

**t and s<sup>3</sup> = PS \* [ts]** The existence of a 27<sup>th</sup> letter, a separate sign for *s<sup>3</sup>*, is generally included in the Taymanitic script tables (e.g. Winnett & Reed 1970: 205) but it is often mentioned with some cautionary notes (e.g. Macdonald 1991: 25). Scholars have identified six glyphs, all occurring in personal names that could qualify as a separate letter signifying the independent reflex of *s<sup>3</sup>*. This glyph has a circular center as opposed to the star-like shape which was interpreted as *t*. The etymology of most of these names is problematic, but they seem point to a merging of the two phonemes. Knauf (2011) already proposed that *t* and *s<sup>3</sup>* had merged in Taymanitic, and that *t* was either realized as [tθ] (which would suggest a merger of *t* and *s<sup>3</sup>* to *t*), or [ts] (which would suggest a merger of *t* and *s<sup>3</sup>* to *s<sup>3</sup>*) (Knauf 2011).<sup>23</sup>

Based on the etymologies of the personal names; variation in attested letter shapes that have been interpreted as *t* and *s<sup>3</sup>*; several lexical items; and the

<sup>21</sup>This glyph is generally transcribed as *z*, the transcription *t* is used here to show its etymological relation to the interdental and sibilant series.

<sup>22</sup>This merger in Taymanitic has already been widely recognized. See for example, Winnett & Reed (1970: 94) and (Macdonald 2008: 191).

<sup>23</sup>In the same paragraph he argues that the *s<sup>3</sup>* and *t* merged in a similar fashion in Dadanitic. Based on the spelling of roots with etymological *s<sup>3</sup>* in Dadanitic however, it is clear that in Dadanitic *s<sup>3</sup>* merged with *s*, as it did in the other well understood ANA varieties (Safaitic and Hismaic) and Arabic as well (Compare for example Dadanitic *s<sup>1</sup>fr* (e.g. AH 123; AH 220) 'inscription' to Heb. *sēper* both from \**s<sup>3</sup>pr*).

general structure of the Taymanitic phoneme inventory, it will be argued that  $\underline{t}$  and  $s^3$  seem to have merged to  $s^3$  in Taymanitic.

|                         |                               |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| $\text{ʿ}bds^3r$        | (HU 501)                      |
| $s^3r\text{ṣ}$          | (WTay 4)                      |
| $s^3g^{\text{c}}dhd$    | on the Vienna seal (RES 2688) |
| $bys^3\text{ḥ}ls^{324}$ | (Esk 123)                     |
| $ys^3m$                 | (TM.T. 035)                   |
| $\text{ṣ}ms^3mk$        | (TM.T. 001B)                  |

Table 2: The attested personal names previously read with  $s^3$  and their sigla

Macdonald considers  $\text{ʿ}bds^3r$  (HU 501) to reflect  $*\text{ʿ}abd$  *Osiris* (Macdonald 1991: 17). He compares the name to other *Osiris* names in Phoenician inscriptions ( $\text{ʿ}bd^2sr$ ) and the the name *Pṭsry* with the theophoric element *Osiris* in Aramaic on the Louvre Stela in (Macdonald 1991: 17). Macdonald mentions that “the phoneme represented by  $s^3$  in South Semitic alphabets is cognate to Aramaic /s/” (ibid.) but since the name *Osiris* was an Egyptian goddess, the etymological correspondence is of less relevance than their pronunciation at the time the name was borrowed. Since  $s^1$  seems to have represented [s] in Taymanitic, which is based on a more certain borrowing (see paragraph 1.2.2.1  $s^1$  or  $*s$ ), it seems unlikely that *Osiris* would end up being represented with an  $s^3$  instead. Another issue is the loss of the glottal stop at the beginning of the theophoric element. This would only be possible if the name entered Taymanitic from another language which dropped the glottal stops in this position.<sup>25</sup> The name  $\text{ʿ}bds^3r$  (HU 501) may better be interpreted as a transcription of the name  $\text{ʿ}abd$  *dūšaray* instead; a theophoric name based on the Nabataean deity *dūšaray*.<sup>26</sup> The assimilation of the  $*d$  to the preceding  $*d$  in this name is also attested in Safaitic (e.g. Mu 836) and Greek (e.g. IGLS XIII 9266) in Taymanitic, the name was probably taken from a language in which this happened as well since Taymanitic  $d$  and  $z$  ( $< *d$ ) would probably not assimilate in the same way; we know that in *dūšaray* the lateral was preserved, because Safaitic used its lateral  $s^2$ , rather than its plain sibilant  $s^1$  to transcribe it (Macdonald 2000: 48). If the interpretation of the verb *bḥs*<sup>2</sup> (Kim CIMG0759 Tay (unpublished)) is correct, Taymanitic did not preserve a lateral pronunciation of  $s^2$  (see 2.2.4). Transcribing a lateral with a  $\underline{t}$  is not unlikely however as the two are phonetically very similar (Ball et al. 2001: 5).<sup>27</sup> This approximation may have a precedent in two cuneiform abecedaries in the *hlḥm* order discovered at

<sup>24</sup>Based on a very uncertain reading, unfortunately there is only a copy available of this inscription by Jaussen and Savignac, the photograph of the inscription in Eskoubi (1999) only shows the first three letters of the inscription. The copy by Jaussen and Savignac, shows the third letter, traditionally transcribed as  $\underline{t}$ , as a star-shaped sign  $\ast$  while the last letter, transcribed as  $s^3$  looks like a circle with four lines coming out of it  $\text{⊕}$ .

<sup>25</sup>There are many examples of personal names that entered Taymanitic without a glottal stop, e.g. Esk 290:  $s^1mrl$  (cf. 2.2.5)

<sup>26</sup>If we are indeed dealing with a theophoric name mentioning *dūšaray* this would either be a very early mention of the deity, or an indication that Taymanitic was written well after the sixth century BCE.

<sup>27</sup>Other approximations that were recorded were fricatives, including velar fricatives; and combinations of a (velar) fricative with a lateral (Ball et al. 2001: 4).

Ras-Šamra (RS 88.2215)<sup>28</sup> and Bēt Šemeš (KTU 5.24),<sup>29</sup> where the glyph for *t* occupies the position of the lateral *s*<sup>2</sup> [ʃ] which may indicate a similar phonetic confusion between the two (Al-Jallad & al Manaser 2015: 9-10).

Another name Macdonald discusses in his 1991 article is *s*<sup>3</sup>*r*š, which he compares to Aramaic *sršn*, generally assumed to come from *\*(w)sir šawn* ‘Osiris is protection’ (Macdonald 1991: 19). In this case it is more problematic to argue for the loss of the glottal stop as it is difficult to imagine why an initial vowel would *not* be represented as such in Taymanitic. Moreover, one would have to explain why the final *n* disappeared and we are still confronted with [s] being represented with *s*<sup>3</sup> rather than with *s*<sup>1</sup>. As *tr*š and *sr*š do not yield any plausible roots for a personal name it may be compared to CAR. *šuršūr* ‘cricket or roach’, after dissimilation of the first consonant, since the non-emphatic equivalent of *š* would have been *s*<sup>3</sup>. This of course leaves us again with a final consonant to get rid of, and a name that is not very common.<sup>30</sup>

After the discussion of the Osiris names Macdonald briefly discusses the name *s*<sup>3</sup>*g*<sup>3</sup>*dhd* (on the Vienna seal, RES 2688), but he concludes that there are so many uncertainties surrounding the interpretation of the text in which it occurs that it is unwise to base any conclusions on this name (Macdonald 1991: 21). The final three names can be interpreted with a little more certainty. Even though the reading of second part of the name *bys*<sup>3</sup>{*h*}{*l*{*s*<sup>3</sup>} (Esk 123) is unsure, based on the first half of the name it seems to represent a theophoric name with the deity *y*<sub>t</sub><sup>3</sup>.<sup>31</sup> In this case *s*<sup>3</sup> would represent *\*t*. It is difficult to be certain what the origin of the name *ys*<sup>3</sup>*m* is. It may be compared to CAR. *wasim*, ‘to be beautiful’ from *\*√ws*<sup>3</sup>*m* (compare Akk. (*w*)*asāmu(m)* ‘to be suitable’ or Ugaritic *ysm* ‘pleasant’ (Cohen 1976: 569)), with *\*w-* > *y-* which seems to have been active in Taymanitic (cf. paragraph *\*w-* > *y-* under sound changes).

In one of the inscriptions currently in the Tayma museum, the theophoric name *šms*<sup>3</sup>*mk* appears (TM.T. 001B). Macdonald (Macdonald & Al-Najem forthcoming) interprets the name as ‘Šalm supports’ and connects *s*<sup>3</sup>*mk* to Hebrew *sāmak*. In this case the Taymanitic form reflects the etymological *s*<sup>3</sup>. So, if the interpretations put forward are correct, the glyph under discussion represents etymological *\*s*<sup>3</sup> in some personal names (*ys*<sup>3</sup>*m*, *šms*<sup>3</sup>*mk*) but *\*t* in others (*bds*<sup>3</sup>*r*,<sup>32</sup> *bys*<sup>3</sup>{*h*}{*l*{*s*<sup>3</sup>}).

Even though the letter shapes seem clearly distinguishable in the ANA script charts (e.g. as published in Macdonald 2008: 187) their shapes seem to have merged in (at least some of) the actual inscriptions. The visual confusion between the two signs may be an indication that the two phonemes had merged or that there was some confusion as to the distinction of the two.

| <i>s</i> <sup>3</sup> | <i>t</i> as in the script charts | <i>t</i> as attested in several inscriptions |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| 𐤔 𐤕 𐤖                 | * *                              | * 33   𐤔 34                                  |

Table 3: contrasting the attested letter-forms with the reported forms.

<sup>28</sup>Cf. Bordreuil & Pardee 1995; Hayajneh & Tropper 1997; Sass 2005.

<sup>29</sup>For the most recent discussions of these inscriptions see Bordreuil & Pardee 1995; Hayajneh & Tropper 1997; Sass 2005.

<sup>30</sup>Harding (1971: 371) reports one attestation in Sabaic.

<sup>31</sup>compare for example *y*<sub>t</sub><sup>3</sup>*l*; *y*<sub>t</sub><sup>3</sup>*mr*; *y*<sub>t</sub><sup>3</sup>*kbr* (Harding 1971: 658-9).

<sup>32</sup>*t* here as an approximation of the foreign lateral.



Figure 1: tracing of  $s^3$  in Wtay 004



Figure 2: tracing of  $s^3$  in HU 501<sup>35</sup>



Figure 3: tracing of  $t̄$  in JSTham 508<sup>36</sup>



Figure 4: Tracing of  $t̄$  in Esk 020.1

The merger of  $s^3$  and  $t̄$  is found in other Arabian languages as well, e.g. Ḥadramitic and the Amiritic dialect of Sabaic; in Ḥadramitic interdentals and affricates/sibilants seem to have merged, suggesting the sound change [θ] > [t̄s] or [s]. In Amiritic  $s^3$  and  $s^1$  merged to  $s$  after which  $*t̄$  was written with the  $s^3$  glyph; this either indicates a sound change  $t̄ > [t̄s]$  or a reassignment of the  $s^3$  sign to  $t̄$  while it kept its phonetic value. The fact that in a newly discovered Thamudic B abecedary in the South Semitic *hlhm* order the glyph for  $t̄$  was written in the place of  $s^3$  may indicate that the latter explanation is what happened in Amiritic, especially since the abecedary was probably written after recitation of the values of the letters rather than being a transcription of the written form of the other alphabet (Al-Jallad & al Manaser 2015: 11-2).

There are no unambiguous attestations of etymological  $t̄$  in lexical items. The sign for  $s^3/t̄$  appears in two other inscriptions, Esk 272 and TA 09302. In Esk 272,  $'s^3r$  (written with the sign  $*$ ) (Esk 272) could possibly be read as  $*s^3r$ , 'captivity' (Esk 272), although  $*tr$  'place or trace' is also possible, while  $s^3g$  'to be accessible', which is attested in the same inscription with a similar sign (Esk 272) should probably be read with a  $*s^3$  ( $\sqrt{s^3wġ}$ ).

Another example of the rayed disk letter shape is the word  $hs^3y$  in TA 09302. The inscription is very clear and deeply inscribed on a prepared surface, giving it a much more formal appearance than most other Taymanitic inscriptions.

**TA 09302:**

$hs^3y / f'l / hmd / lhdh / b ym / blbd$

' $Hs^3y$  attained glory by guarding the border during the battle of  $blbd$ '

Macdonald (forthcoming) has tentatively suggested the translation 'honored be the deed of  $Hmd$  (done) by him alone in the day of the son of  $Lbd$ ', interpreting  $hmd$  as a tribal name and  $hs^3y$  as 'to show much honor' from the Arabic root  $\sqrt{hfy}$ . Based on an irregular sound change  $f > t̄$ .<sup>37</sup> This substitu-

<sup>33</sup>Esk 272, Esk 020.1, JSTham 508

<sup>34</sup>Esk 272

<sup>35</sup>For the complete tracing of the photograph of the inscription see Macdonald (1991: 13).

<sup>36</sup>The trace was made based on a photograph taken during the Tayma survey; Michael Macdonald has kindly granted me permission to use these photographs.

<sup>37</sup>There are examples of such substitutions, Macdonald gives Classical Arabic *dafa'iyy* and ANA *dt'* 'season of the later rains' (Macdonald forthcoming).

tion would require *\*p* to have become *f* in Taymanitic, but so far it is unclear whether this sound change has taken place. If the new interpretation offered above is correct (TA 09302), *ḥs<sup>3</sup>y* should probably be interpreted as a personal name. Unfortunately it is unclear what the etymology of *ḥs<sup>3</sup>y* would be as a personal name.

Finally there is a structural argument for the merger of *ṭ* and *s<sup>3</sup>* since *z* and the voiced fricative interdental *ḏ* have clearly merged in Taymanitic, it would naturally follow that the loss of the interdentals would have affected the voiceless series as well.

**ṭ = PS \* [θ'] and ṣ = PS \* [ts']** As demonstrated in the previous discussion the voiced and unvoiced interdental fricatives in Taymanitic seem to have merged with their sibilant (or affricate) counterparts. It therefore stands to reason that the same process would have affected the emphatic series as well, resulting in a phonological system very similar to Canaanite.

The only lexical items in which *ṣ* appears in the Taymanitic corpus are *ṣlm*, the main deity of the oasis (e.g. Esk 013; JSTham 352; WTay 1.2) and the verb *nṣr* (e.g. WTay 9.1; WTay 11; WTay 14). Otherwise it only occurs in personal names (e.g. *ṣby* (e.g. Esk 012), *ṣḥm* (Esk 024) and *ṣwq* (JSTham 541)).

The verb *nṣr* occurs in the formula *nṣr l-ṣlm b-ḏr Ddn*<sup>38</sup> (WTay 20; HE 32; WTay 33.1; WTay 11) which has generally been translated as 'he gave assistance to Ṣalm in the war against Dadan' (Winnett & Reed 1970: 99) and taken to be related to for example CAr. *našara* 'to aid or assist' (*Lane*: 2802c) or Sabaic *nṣr* 'to provide support' (Beeston et al. 1982: 100).<sup>39</sup>

If we consider the merging of *z* (*\*ṭ*) and *ṣ* however, *nṣr* could represent *\*nṣr* 'to watch, to guard' (cf. CAr. *nažara* 'to look at' (*Lane*: 2810c); Old Aramaic *nṣr* 'watch, protect'; Off. Aramaic, Nab. *nṣr* 'to watch, to protect' (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 754-5); Heb. *nṣr* (HALOT: 718)). We find reflexes of this verb in several other ANA corpora (e.g. Safaitic (e.g. C49; BHT 228) and Dadanitic (e.g. AH 312; JSLih 007; JaL 158)).

There is one Taymanitic inscription in which the form *nṣrt* 'I kept watch' is attested.

**Esk 025:**

{ }n ṣ{n/r}ds<sup>1</sup> / s<sup>1</sup>{ s<sup>1</sup>}n / mlk / bbl / n{t}rt  
 'I am ṣnds<sup>1</sup> official of the king of Babylon, I kept watch'<sup>40</sup>

This could be taken as an argument against reading *nṣr* as 'to guard'. Hayajneh (2001: 89) interpreted *nṣr* as an Aramaicized form, but also noted that the absence of a glyph for *z* in Taymanitic might point to the fact that both *ṭ* and *z* were represented by the same glyph in Taymanitic orthography.<sup>41</sup> Given

<sup>38</sup>Variations with *b-ḏr Ms*' or *b-ḏr Nbyt* are also attested: WTay 16 and WTay 11; WTay 13; WTay 15 respectively.

<sup>39</sup>If *Ṣalm* was indeed the deification of Nabonidus at the oasis (Winnett & Reed 1970: 92-3), this could be compared to ASA inscriptions in which chieftains recorded that they aided their lords in wars as suggested by Beeston in Winnett & Reed (1970: 99). However, Dalley (1986: 86) argued convincingly against this interpretation.

<sup>40</sup>Hayajneh (2001: 89) reads the word following the personal name as *s<sup>1</sup>dn*, which he translates as 'overseer, guardian'.

<sup>41</sup>Müller and Said propose a reading *ns<sup>3</sup>rt*, which they connect to Sabaic *mns<sup>3</sup>rt* 'vanguard'

the fact that the author of this inscription identifies himself as being close to the king of Babylon, influence from Aramaic would not be surprising. In addition to that, the unusual formula used in this inscription is very similar to another inscription in which the author also identifies himself as affiliated with the court of Nabonidus (Esk 169). A merger of *z* and *t* in Taymanitic seems unlikely however, since no Semitic languages merge the plain interdentals to the sibilant, while merging the emphatic one to the stop.

**Esk 169 (line 1 and 2):**

*ʾn / mrdn / {h}lm / nbnd / mlk / bbl // ʾtwt / m<sup>c</sup> / rbs<sup>1</sup>rs<sup>1</sup> / kyt*

‘I am *Mrdn* servant of Nabonidus king of Babylon, I came with chief *Kyt*’

Since Aramaic and Neo-Babylonian were most likely the main languages that were in use at the court of Nabonidus, it is likely that *ntr* is a loan from Aramaic in which \**t* (the origin of CAr. *z*) and *t* merged to *t*. The form *ntr* possibly came to indicate a specific kind of guard or guarding in this neo-Babylonian setting as opposed to guarding in general for which the local *nsr* was still in use.

**the phonetic realization of *ʃ* and *s<sup>3</sup>*** Below, alternative spellings of *nsr* and *s<sup>1</sup>m<sup>c</sup>* will be discussed in light of their relevance to our understanding of the pronunciation of *ʃ*. A hypothesis about the realization of *ʃ* will also impact our assumptions about the values of the other sibilants; therefore the realization of *s<sup>3</sup>* and *ʃ* will be discussed together. Since the examples are open to several explanations it remains unclear what the exact phonetic realization of *ʃ* and *s<sup>3</sup>* was.

There is one instance in which *ʃ* seems to be confused with *s<sup>3</sup>* (WTay 17). This may indicate that *ʃ* still represented an affricate [tʃ] or [tʃ<sup>1</sup>] in Taymanitic.

**WTay 17:**

*ʾl b ʾs<sup>1</sup>gt ns<sup>3</sup>r b-ḏr ---k---*

‘*ʾl* son of *ʾs<sup>1</sup>gt* kept watch during the war ---?---’

The verb *ns<sup>3</sup>r* was translated ‘he fell in battle...’ by Winnett, from the root \**ntr* (Winnett & Reed 1970: 102). Based on the frequency of the formula *nsr* *b-ḏr* it seems more likely however, that this is a misspelling of some sort. The confusion of *s<sup>3</sup>* for *ʃ* could indicate that the reflex of *s<sup>3</sup>* was in some way similar to that of *ʃ*.

If *ʃ* was indeed still realized as an affricate, it may suggest that *s<sup>3</sup>* still represented an affricate as well, in which case only the feature of emphasis would have been misinterpreted in the inscription.<sup>42</sup> As we will discuss below however there is some evidence that seems to rule out an affricated realization of *ʃ* and *s<sup>3</sup>*.

It should be noted however, that only a copy is available for this inscription. Winnett indicates in his commentary that he might have miscopied the

---

(Müller & Al-Said 2001: 113). Given the clear reference to the king of Babylon in the inscription however, assuming Aramaic influence seems preferable.

<sup>42</sup>This could also be interpreted to indicate that *ʃ* was still realized as an affricate [tʃ] or [tʃ<sup>1</sup>] in Taymanitic, which was confused with the fricative [θ]. The merger of *s<sup>3</sup>* and *t* to an interdental *t* seems unlikely however, as the voiced counterpart merged with the sibilant, *d* > *z*.



inscription (Winnett & Reed 1970: 102). Adding one line at the bottom of the letter could make it into a  $\mathfrak{s}$  ( $\mathfrak{*} > \mathfrak{*}$ ). He might have doubted his copy because he was expecting to find a  $\mathfrak{s}$  instead of a  $s^3$ .

In another inscription,  $\mathfrak{s}$  seems to have been confused with  $s^1$ . In this inscription the form  $\mathfrak{sm}^c$  appears (Facey unpublished 00856). It is unclear what the verb  $\mathfrak{sm}^c$  means in this inscription. In *Lane*,  $\mathfrak{sm}^c$  is recorded to mean ‘to be small, compact, slender’. It is also used to mean courageous ‘because the courageous is described as compact in heart’ (*Lane*: 1728). Another option is that the author confused  $s^1$  and  $\mathfrak{s}$ . This may be preferable, as it would turn this unique and difficult to interpret inscription into one of the regular Taymanitic formulae. A confusion between  $s^1$  and  $\mathfrak{s}$  could indicate a de-affrication of emphatic  $\mathfrak{s}$ , as the author would only need to misinterpret one phonological feature (pharyngialization or glottalization, depending on how the emphatics were realized) to get from  $s^1$  to  $\mathfrak{s}$ . Reading  $\mathfrak{s}$  as  $s^1$  would give us the very common verb in the Taymanitic corpus  $s^1m^c$  ‘he listened’.

It is difficult to combine the attestation of the confusion between  $s^3$  and  $\mathfrak{s}$  (WTay 17) and that of  $\mathfrak{s}$  and  $s^1$  (Facey unpublished 00856, 00806); while the first could point to an affricated realization of  $\mathfrak{s}$ , the confusion of  $\mathfrak{s}$  and  $s^1$  seems to point to the loss of affrication in the realization of  $\mathfrak{s}$ . Moreover, assuming that the sibilants and fricatives had been de-affricated would point to a realization of [s] for  $\mathfrak{t}$  and  $s^3$ . This would seem to indicate that  $s^3$  and  $s^1$  had merged, which begs the question why they were still distinguished in the orthography, especially since there is no evidence for any confusion between  $s^1$  and  $s^3$  in Taymanitic. Therefore, if affrication was not the distinguishing feature, it seems they differed in some other way (for example dental as opposed to alveolar sibilants). If  $\mathfrak{s}$  and  $s^3$  were indeed no longer affricates, the form  $ns^3r$  should probably be considered a writing, or copying error. It is not entirely clear what the spelling of the personal name  $\mathfrak{bds}^3r$  tells us about the realization of  $s^3$ . It seems to indicate that  $s^2$  was no longer realized as a lateral fricative, but borrowing a lateral fricative with [s] does not seem the most obvious choice either. Possibly the name was adopted into the Taymanitic onomasticon before  $\mathfrak{t}$  and  $s^3$  merged. Based on the data available at the moment it is impossible to determine the exact values for the complete sibilant and fricative series.

#### 2.2.4 Realization of the plain sibilants

$s^1 = \text{PS} * [\text{s}]$  The pronunciation of  $s^1$  was probably close to a plain sibilant [s]. In the inscription Esk 169,  $s^1$  occurs in the word  $rbs^1rs^1$ .<sup>43</sup> This is identified as a compound of *rab ša rašī* by Hayajneh (2001) and Müller & Al-Said (2001) which was borrowed from Neo-Assyrian into Aramaic as *srs* (Hayajneh 2001: 83).<sup>44</sup> Aramaic likely formed the source of the form in the Taymanitic text (Hayajneh 2001: 83). This indicates that  $s^1$  was the closest equivalent to the plain sibilant [s] available to the writer of this inscription.<sup>45</sup>

<sup>43</sup>Regardless of whether this word is an actual borrowing into Taymanitic or not, the fact that the author of the text rendered a foreign word in the Taymanitic script can tell us something about the realization of the glyphs.

<sup>44</sup>In borrowings into Aramaic, the Neo-Assyrian glyph  $\mathfrak{s}$  would be written with *simkat*, indicating that it was pronounced as [s].

<sup>45</sup>There is one personal name which looks like a phrasal name, which could shed more light on the realization of  $s^1$ :  $bhs^1l^1mnt$  (HU 413). Unfortunately the etymology of the name is currently unclear.

$s^2 = \text{PS}^* [\text{ʃ}]$  The interpretation of the phonetic realization of  $s^2$  is dependent on the interpretation of the etymology of the verb  $bhs^2$  (Kim CIMG0759 Tay (unpublished)). Since  $bhs^2$  does not seem to be a productive root in Semitic, the Taymanitic form probably comes from the root  $*\sqrt{bht}$  ‘to search’. This verb is attested as  $bhs̄$  in Aramaic (Cohen 1976: 57).<sup>46</sup> If this were a native Taymanitic verb one would expect it to appear with  $s^3$  (cf. 2.2.3, pg. 75) but not with  $s^2$ . The  $s^2$  can be explained if one assumes that  $bhs^2$  is a borrowing from Aramaic or Canaanite, and  $s^2$  was the closest equivalent to Aramaic  $\text{š}$ , pointing to a possible realization of  $s^2$  as a palato-alveolar fricative in Taymanitic.<sup>47</sup>

### 2.2.5 Glottal stop

Outside of the onomasticon, the glottal stop was preserved in all positions in Taymanitic. In some  $\text{ʔ}\bar{\text{E}}\text{l}$ -based theophoric names, the glottal stop has been elided e.g. Esk 290:  $s^1mrl$ . This seems to suggest that at least the theophoric part of the name was drawn from a language in which the initial glottal stop was dropped, like Akkadian *ilum* for example. There are several names attested in which the /ʔ/ in the name of the deity  $\text{ʔ}l$  is gone, but it is preserved in the first part of the name:  $b^{\text{ʔ}}rl$  (Esk 013),  $y^{\text{ʔ}}ws^1l$  (e.g. Esk 076),  $y^{\text{ʔ}}rs^2l$  (e.g. Esk 068 + 069) indicating that the loss of the glottal stop was probably conditioned in the source language. There are also theophoric names with  $\text{ʔ}\bar{\text{E}}\text{l}$  as a compound attested that do preserve the  $\text{ʔ}$  for example:  $kfr^{\text{ʔ}}l$  (e.g. Esk 001; JSTham 521),  $yd^{\text{ʔ}}l$  (Esk 079 and Esk 237) and  $wdd^{\text{ʔ}}l$  (Esk 087).

Since the theophoric  $\text{ʔ}\bar{\text{E}}\text{l}$  names without the glottal stop must be considered loans, they may be helpful in determining the phonetic values of, for example, the sibilants in these names. So far 5 different ‘non-native’ theophoric names with  $\text{ʔ}\bar{\text{E}}\text{l}$  containing a sibilant have been attested in Taymanitic.

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| $y^{\text{ʔ}}ws^1l$ <sup>48</sup> | (Esk 076; Esk 081; Esk 178)                      |
| $ys^1m^{\text{ʔ}}l$               | (Esk 183)  |
| $s^1mrl$                          | (Esk 290)  |
| $y^{\text{ʔ}}rs^2l$               | (Esk 068 + 069; Esk 072; JSTham 431; JSTham 530) |
| $n\text{š}bl$                     | (JSTham 411)                                     |

An accurate understanding of the phonology of these names in their source language is required before they can contribute to our reconstruction of Taymanitic phonology. Unfortunately it is difficult to determine which language this was, given the small set of forms available to us. Since both the  $\text{ʔ}$  and the  $\text{ʕ}$  are still represented in the first part of the names (e.g.  $y^{\text{ʔ}}ws^1l$  and  $ys^1m^{\text{ʔ}}l$ ), they could not have come from Akkadian names. The name  $y^{\text{ʔ}}rs^2l$  probably comes from a C-stem of the root  $*\sqrt{wrt}$  ‘to inherit’ (compare CAR. *warīta* ‘he inherited’ (Lane: 2934a) or Hebr. *yrš* (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 471)). This could not have been the source of a form such as  $ys^1m^{\text{ʔ}}l$  however, which one would expect

<sup>46</sup>Since Aramaic merged its interdental with its stops, the expected reflect of  $*\sqrt{bht}$  would be  $*\sqrt{bht}$ , therefore the form  $bhs̄$  in Aramaic is likely a loan from Hebrew or another Canaanite language.

<sup>47</sup>If the personal name  $\text{ʕ}bd\text{s}^3r$  indeed represents  $\text{ʕ}abdu\text{s}aray$  it seems that the lateral [ʃ] in Nabataean *dūsaray* was borrowed into Taymanitic with  $s^3$ , in which case a lateral pronunciation of  $s^2$  in Taymanitic can probably be ruled out (cf.  $t$  and  $s^3 = \text{PS}^* [\text{ʃ}]$  above).

<sup>48</sup>The name  $Y^{\text{ʔ}}ws^1l$ , with the glottal stop in the  $\text{ʔ}\bar{\text{E}}\text{l}$  element, occurs in Minaic in and several times in Sabaic as a personal name (e.g. as-Sawdāʔ 37 = M 293A = RES 3306A; YM 18344).

to have been borrowed with the same sibilant as  $y^{\prime}rs^2l$ , given the merging of  $*s^1$  and  $*\underline{t}$  to  $\check{s}$  in Hebrew, in addition to that, Hebrew does not have a  $\prime$ -causative.

Another option could be to consider a language in which the  $\underline{t}$  obtained as the source of  $y^{\prime}rs^2l$ :  $*y^{\prime}r\underline{t}l$ . Since  $\underline{t}$  seems to have merged with  $s^3$  in Taymanitic,  $s^2$  may have been perceived as the closest equivalent to an interdental  $\underline{t}$ . It has to be kept in mind however, that we do not have written evidence of all linguistic varieties that were spoken in the area, and these names might have come from a language unknown to us. It is also a possibility of course that not all names containing an  $\prime\bar{E}l$  element and lacking the glottal stop in the theophoric part, come from the same source.

### 2.2.6 Sound changes

**N-assimilation** One of the characteristic features of Taymanitic is the writing of the word ‘son’ as  $b$  instead of more common  $bn$ . This orthographic feature seems to be an example of n-assimilation, a conditioned phonological sound change common in other ANA corpora and NWS. However, there is one clear example in which this does not happen:  $ntnt$  /natantu/ ‘I gave’ (JSTham 352) in which the /n/ is clearly directly followed by the stop /t/.<sup>49</sup>

If this inscription is representative of the language of the rest of the corpus, this seems to indicate that /n/ does not assimilate to a following consonant in all environments, but only in proclitic position in which it is per definition unstressed. This hypothesis could also explain the difference between  $m$  ‘from’ and  $mn$  ‘who’; since  $m$  never occurs without an object it may have been treated as a proclitic similar to the prepositions  $b$ - and  $l$ -.

**WTay 9.2:**  
*m- s<sup>1</sup>mw*  
 ‘from *S<sup>1</sup>mw*’

**TA 02669.1:**  
*m-lmq*  
 ‘from *Lmq*’

*Mn* ‘who’, is not proclitic and is always written with the  $n$ .

**WTay 2; WTay 1.2; HE 31:**  
*mn s<sup>1</sup>m<sup>c</sup> l-šlm*  
 ‘whoever obeys *šalm*’

While the examples are limited it seems safe to suggest that /n/ assimilates to any directly following consonant when it is the coda of an unstressed syllable.

<sup>49</sup>If Winnett’s reading of *šlm*  $\prime nkd$  (JSTham 546) as ‘(Oh) *šalm* (grant) offspring’ (unpublished, Study I: 6) is correct, this form would be another example of an unassimilated /n/ in stressed position.

**L-assimilation** The assimilation of *l* in theophoric names with the element *šlm* suggests a similar pattern of assimilation to that of *n*: when it is used in proclitic position the *l* assimilates to the following *m*. For example in the names: *šmn'm* (Esk 058), *šmntn* (Esk 004), *šmr<sup>c</sup>* (Esk 050). There are other names with a *šlm* element in which the *l* does not assimilate, but there *šlm* is the second part of the name e.g.: *ʾmršlm* (TM.T. 024) and *lšlm* (WTay 30). All other occurrences of *šlm* refer to the deity, in which case it is usually a prepositional object and has its own stress: *b šlm ntnt* 'by Šalm I gave' (JSTham 352; BIT p.336), *nšr l-šlm* 'he he kept watch on behalf of Šalm' (WTay 32).<sup>50</sup> Winnett (1937: 23) already suggested that the element *šm-* in the Taymanitic personal names came from the theophoric name *Šalm*, but he does not connect the assimilation of the *l* in these names to the assimilation of *l* and *n* in the rest of the inscriptions.

The assimilation of the *l* in *šalm* additionally indicates that CvCC nouns probably did not undergo epenthesis, as the *l* of *šlm* could only have assimilated if the consonant cluster remained.

**\*w- > y-** Taymanitic seems to have undergone the Northwest Semitic sound change *\*w- > y-*. There are several lexical items in the Taymanitic inscriptions with initial *y-* which come from forms with an initial *w-* originally: *yrh* 'month' (WTay 20); *yd<sup>c</sup>* 'he knew' (Kim CIMG 0759. Tay, unpublished) and the verb *yrr* 'he guarded' (compare CAR. *warwara* 'to guard, to watch and modern Arabic *wry* 'to show, to let s.o. see' (Kurpershoek 2005: 349) (Esk 052)).

Words with initial *w-* are attested in the corpus, but they are all personal names, e.g.: *ʾl wn<sup>c</sup>* 'the tribe of *Wn<sup>c</sup>*' (Esk 272), *wdd* (e.g. JSTham 552), and *wtr* (Esk 233). Since personal names are often borrowed along with their phonology (cf. 2.2.5), or reflect archaic pronunciations, this cannot be used as proof against a sound change *\*w- > y-*.

**Reduction of final triphthongs** In Taymanitic final triphthongs had probably not collapsed completely. There is one attestation of a final weak verb in *-w* which preserves its final weak root consonant in the suffixing conjugation: *rḏw* 'may he please' (Esk 013). Since Taymanitic did not make use of matres lectiones, this form suggests a pronunciation /raḏiwa/. The form *rḏw* additionally shows that the sequence *-iwa* did not shift to *-iya* as it did in Arabic. Since vowels are not represented in Taymanitic, the final triphthong could have collapsed to a diphthong in Taymanitic. There are no clear attestations of other triphthong sequences in Taymanitic.

**\*-at > -ah** Two possible feminine *nisbah* forms ending in *-t* seem to indicate that Taymanitic did not undergo the sound change of final *-at* to *-ah* (cf. section 2.3.3 for the gentilic suffix (pg. 88 and the morpheme *-t* (pg. 87)). It should be noted however, that both these forms occur in genealogies.<sup>51</sup> Therefore they

<sup>50</sup>CvCC nouns probably did not undergo epenthesis, because the *l* of *šlm* could only have assimilated if the cluster remained. However, it cannot be ruled out that epenthesis emerged following the assimilation rule (*šalm > šamm*). *šamm* would not be affected anymore in this case, as the *l*-assimilation rule was no longer active, and *šamm* was realized with a geminate.

<sup>51</sup>The beginning of WTay 37 is broken, therefore it is not entirely sure that *h-mšryt* is part of a genealogy, however since it has the same form as *ḥdryt* (HE 17; 40) and is also preceded by the

may not have been perceived as actual *nisbah* forms, but simply as personal names, possibly representing an archaic form.

**WTay 37:***h-mšr-y-t*‘the Egyptian woman<sup>52</sup>’**HE 17 and HE 40:***h-ḥḍr-y-t*‘the settled woman/the woman from *Ḥḍr*’**2.3 Nominal Morphology****2.3.1 Number**

**Plural** There are no attestations of an unbound plural suffix in Taymanitic. There is one possible attestation of a bound plural suffix *-y*, which will be discussed in more detail below in the paragraph 2.3.2. There is one possible attestation of a broken plural, but it can be explained equally in many other ways (on which see section 2.4.4):

**WTay 22:**----*lm b-ḍrr ddn*‘...*lm* in the **wars** of Dadan/ by **waging war** against Dadan’

The phrase *b-ḍr ddn* (e.g. WTay 20, and WTay 33.1) ‘in the war of Dadan’ occurs in four other inscriptions (Wtay 20; WTay 21; WTay 33.1 and WTay 33.2), so this single occurrence might be better explained as a writing error. Moreover, the present form could still reflect an external plural in the construct state /ḍararē Dadān/ ‘the wars of Dadan’ (compare for example Heb. *malkē* ‘kings of’ (Gzella 2011: 440)) (cf. section 2.3.2). This reading would additionally suggest a process of /a/ insertion, typical in the plural formation of CvCC nouns in NWS (e.g. Hebrew *keleb* < \**kalb* ‘dog’; pl. *kəlābîm* < \**kalab-îma* (Huehnergard 1995: 2129)), to explain the fact that both *r*’s are represented. Another possibility is to interpret it as an infinitive or participle denoting a simultaneous action. Given the formulaic nature of most of the inscriptions mentioning *ḍr Ddn*, the most likely scenario seems to be that it is a dittography.

**2.3.2 State**

**Definite article** A prefixed definite article *h-* marks definiteness in substantives.

letters *bh-* it seems to be a similar type of inscription.

<sup>52</sup>Slaves were often named after the place they came from, in PPII (17.66) we find, for example a female slave called ΑΛ-μασια (from *al-mašīyya*). If the author of this inscription was indeed the son of a slave this could explain why he identifies himself by his mother rather than his father, as he would have no right to inheritance (Macdonald, pc) and his status would be determined by that of his mother (Koenen 2013: 114).

**Philby 279 ay:**

*kfr'l b t'n h-rm h-ġlm*

'Kfr'l son of T'n, the lancer, **the junior**'

**Esk 031:**

*h-đ{b}' / {h/h}{r}{'}{y}*

'**the soldier**, the chief'

It is used substantivize verbal forms.

**WTay 3:**

*Znk rfty h-rkb*

'that is Rfty **the riding camel**'

If the following examples are indeed *nisbah* forms referring to the mothers of the authors of the texts, they illustrate the use of the article to substantivize adjectives. It could be the case however; that the *h-* has become a part of the personal name and its usage here does not reflect the grammatical usage of the article.

**WTay 37:**

*---bdwd b h-mšryt*

'{PN} son of **the Egyptian woman**'

**HE 17:**

*Ns<sup>2</sup>w b h-ḥdryt*

'Ns<sup>2</sup>w son of **the sedentary woman/the woman from ḥḍr**'

**HE 40:**

*ḥkrn b ns<sup>2</sup>w b h-ḥdryt*

'Ḥkrn son of Ns<sup>2</sup>w son of **the sedentary woman/the woman from ḥḍr**'

**Construct chains** In Taymanitic construct chains consisting of as many as three nouns have been attested. There are no attestations of analytical genitive constructions.

**Al-Anšāry 35 [part]**

*ḥll / b-zy s<sup>2</sup>n' / 'm ṣlm*

be.a.soldier.SC.3MS WD against-REL.MP enmity.CNST WD people.CNST Ṣalm

'he was a soldier against those of enmity of/against the people of Ṣalm'

**Esk 169 [line 1]<sup>53</sup>**

*ʿn / mrdn / {h}lm / nbnd / mlk / bbl*

IPRO.1CS WD Mrdn WD servant.CNST WD Nband WD king.CNST WD Babel

'I am Mrdn, servant of Nabonidus king of Babel'

There is one attestation of a construct chain that suggests that in Taymanitic bound masculine plural nouns could be marked by a suffix *-y*, like in Aramaic and Hebrew (Gzella 2011: 440) or like Sabaic masculine nouns in the oblique case with a plural suffix (Stein 2003: 82).

**Kim CIMG 0759. Tay (unpublished):**

ʾ[s<sup>1</sup>] // b<sup>ʿ</sup>ly tmʾ

‘chief of the of landowners/residents of Taymāʾ’

There is damage above the first letter of the second line which makes it impossible to tell for sure whether there were any lines coming out on top of it, causing the uncertainty in reading a ʾ, *b* or *s*<sup>1</sup>. Reading ʾly as a broken plural form of the root √*ʿlw* ‘the nobles’ (suggested by Macdonald in comments, db) is tempting; however, this is an Arabic form in which *\*-iwa* > *-iya*. Since *rḏw* does not become *rḏy* in Taymanitic the expected reflex of ʾ*ʿlw* would not be ʾly. Therefore *b<sup>ʿ</sup>ly* ‘the inhabitants or landowners’, forms a more likely reading. A similar phrase with the construction ‘*b<sup>ʿ</sup>ly* + place name’ occurs in the Aramaic part of the trilingual Lycian, Greek, Aramaic inscription found at Xanthos (dated 358 B.C.) (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 183-4). There it can be translated as ‘landowners’ (Teixidor 1978: 182). The same formula occurs half a century earlier (408 B.C.) in a petition to the governor of Judaea (Cowley 1923: No.30<sup>22</sup>) in which the phrase *b<sup>ʿ</sup>ly yb* can be translated similarly, as ‘the inhabitants of Yeb’ (Ibid. 114).<sup>54</sup>

As was already mentioned in the section on the assimilation of *l* and *n*, it seems that all bound forms were marked by a change in stress pattern. It is unclear what impact this might have had on possible vowel reduction.

### 2.3.3 Nominal derivation

**Morpheme -t** It is not certain whether the following forms represent feminine personal names or feminine *nisbah* forms. Either way, they are clearly derived from *nisbah* forms with a feminine *-t* (see the section on the gentilic suffix below, pg. 88).

**WTay 37:**

*h-mṣr-y-t*

‘the Egyptian woman’

**HE17 and HE40:**

*h-ḥḏr-y-t*

‘the settled woman/the woman from *Ḥḏr*’

<sup>53</sup>See also Hayajneh (2001) for a discussion on this inscription.

<sup>54</sup>The form *b<sup>ʿ</sup>ly*, followed by a toponym also occurs in Sabaic inscriptions but *b<sup>ʿ</sup>ly* is always a dual form in these (e.g. C 155; 457; Ja 559). I would like to thank Michael Macdonald for pointing out the difference in number between the forms.

Aside from the feminine marker *-t*, the suffix can also be found on masculine names. This means that the gender of the bearer of a particular name can only be determined by features such as the patronyms (*b* ‘son’ or *bt* ‘daughter’) and verbal agreement. Taymanitic masculine names with *-t* endings include:

**JSTham 426:**

*mṣrt b*  
‘*Mṣrt* son of’

**IMA 2:**

*z’bt b*  
‘*Z’bt* son of’

**TM.T. 042:**

*ḥnkt b*  
‘*Ḥnkt* son of’

**WTay 33.1:**

*mntt nṣr*  
‘*Mntt* kept watch’

**Gentilic suffix -y** The use of the gentilic suffix *-y* is attested in two personal names probably indicating the mother of the author of the text. The women who are mentioned seem to have been named after the place from which they came. Since there are only three examples of such names in the corpus, these forms might have been personal names, not directly referencing a place of origin anymore.

**WTay 037:**

---*bdbwd b h-mṣr-y-t* /ha-miṣriyyat/  
‘{PN} son of the Egyptian woman’

**HE 17; 40:**

*PN b h-ḥdr-y-t*  
‘son of the settled woman/from *ḥdr*’

**qattāl pattern** In Esk 031 the noun *r’y* ‘leader/shepherd’ seems to reflect the agentive *qattāl* pattern, /ra“āy/.

**Esk 031:**

<sup>ʔ</sup>*s*<sup>1</sup> *b dmḡ* / l <sup>ʔ</sup>*ṣ*{*r/n*} / *hḏ*{*b*}<sup>ʔ</sup> / {*h/h*}{*r*}{<sup>ʔ</sup>*y*}

‘<sup>ʔ</sup>*s*<sup>1</sup> son of *Dmḡ* to/for <sup>ʔ</sup>*ṣr* the soldier **the chief**’

The presence of the *-y* on *h-r’y* indicates that it cannot have been the nominal form *rā’i* ‘leader’ since Taymanitic orthography does not represent final vowels.



**Hypocoristic names** All examples of diminutive forms in Taymanitic are only attested in personal names, this makes it uncertain what the active linguistic devices to construct diminutives were in Taymanitic.

**Suffix -n** The suffix *-n* is commonly attested on personal names and could have functioned as a diminutive.<sup>55</sup>

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>rtn</i> (Esk 049)                                 | < * <i>rtt</i>                             |
| <i>s<sup>1</sup>lmn</i> (e.g. Esk 271)               | < * <i>s<sup>1</sup>lm</i>                 |
| <i>ḡnmn</i> (Esk 017.2)                              | < * <i>ḡnm</i>                             |
| <i>s<sup>2</sup>btn</i> (Esk 006 and Esk 067)        | < * <i>s<sup>2</sup>bt</i>                 |
| <i>r<sup>2</sup>s<sup>1</sup>n</i> (e.g. Esk 081)    | < * <i>r<sup>2</sup>s<sup>1</sup></i>      |
| <i>s<sup>3</sup>r<sup>1</sup>bn</i> (e.g. Esk 166.1) | < * <i>s<sup>3</sup>rb</i> or * <i>trb</i> |

**Suffix -y** There is one attestation of a suffix *-y* on the name of an animal: *rfty* (W Tay 3).

This name is not attested elsewhere, but *rft* is (Harding 1971). The form *rfty* is probably a hypocoristic name. Compare for example other personal names with a hypocoristic *-y*: Phoen. *klby*, *šlmy* (Benz 1972: 235) Ug. *pdry*, *rḥmy*, *ʾarsy*<sup>56</sup> (Tropper 2000: 283).

There may be one example of the diminutive *fuʿayl* pattern.

**Esk 049:**

*kfr<sup>2</sup>l / b ʾrs<sup>2</sup> / bny hsy / b rb{.} // b rtn*  
 ‘*kfr<sup>2</sup>l* son of *ʾrs<sup>2</sup>* little son of(?) *Hsy* son of *rb*. son of *Rtn*’

The form *bny* might be a diminutive, but this reading is very uncertain. It looks like part of the genealogy, however, there are no names attested with the root *hsy* (Harding 1971). Even if such names were attested we would still be looking at an aberrant form *bn* for son in Taymanitic in the middle of a genealogy in which the usual *b* forms are also used. Its position in the middle of the genealogy also seems to rule out a possible reading as a tribal name, *bani*, or a verb */banaya/* ‘to build’. Therefore the most plausible interpretation of *bny* seems to be a diminutive form of *b* ‘son’, which could have been used to indicate ‘little’ or ‘youngest’ son. This interpretation also faces some issues; even though formerly unattested names are encountered every now and again, a diminutive form of ‘son’ to indicate ‘youngest son of’ would be unique in the widely attested phraseology of genealogies, to my knowledge.

<sup>55</sup>Enclitic *-n*'s are also commonly found on personal names in the Aramaic inscriptions from the Taymā' area. For the use of *-n* as a diminutive in other Semitic languages see Brockelmann (1908-1913: 394). Hayajneh (1998: 21) mentions several other possible functions of *-n* on personal names: the creation of concrete nouns out of abstract ones; the markation of singulatives as opposed to collective; and ascribing the quality of an adjective to a specific individual, following Goetze (1946: 130).

<sup>56</sup>Even though Tropper considers it likely that these are hypocoristic feminine names, he discusses the *-y* suffix as a feminine marker (Tropper 2000: 282-283).

## 2.4 Verbs

### 2.4.1 Form of the Suffix Conjugation

The Taymanitic corpus is relatively small and the inscriptions are generally short, therefore no full verbal paradigm is attested in the inscriptions. Most inscriptions are written in the third person masculine singular. There are four attestations of the first person singular with a suffix *-t* (Esk 169; JSTham 352); Esk 052 and JSTham 403.

#### Esk 052<sup>57</sup>

*lm hkd / b s<sup>3</sup>rbn / b lb / b ‘rt{m}’ /*  
 LmA Hkd WD son.CST S<sup>3</sup>rbn WD son.CST Lb WD son.CST ‘rt{m}’ WD  
**{y}rrt**  
 guard.SC-1CS

‘by *hkd* son of *S<sup>3</sup>rbn* son of *lb* son of ‘fy’, I guarded.’

#### Esk 169 [part]

*’n / mrdn / {h}lm / nbnd / mlk /*  
 IPRO.1CS WD Mrdn WD servant.CNST WD Nabonidus WD king.CNST WD  
*bb / ’tw-t / m’ / rbs<sup>1</sup>rs<sup>1</sup> / Kyt*  
 Babel LB come-SC.1CS WD with WD rbs<sup>1</sup>rs<sup>1</sup> WD Kyt

‘I am *Mrdn* servant of Nabonidus king of Babylon, I **came** with chief *Kyt*’

#### JSTham 352

*b-šlm ntn-t*  
 by-šlm give-SC.1CS

‘on behalf/by means of *šlm*, I **have made an offering**’

**II w/y** In R<sup>2</sup>-weak verbs, the middle triphthong is not represented. Therefore it seems that it collapsed to a long vowel: *s<sup>3</sup>g* ‘he opened’ (Esk 272) from the root  $\sqrt{s^3w\dot{g}}$ ; *hl* (e.g. Esk 055) from the root  $\sqrt{hwl}$  (cf. section 2.5.1, pg. 94).

There is one attestation of a first person singular form of the G-stem form of *hl*.

#### JSTham 403:

*Mr{l}{s} // hlt*  
 ‘Mr<sup>1</sup>š, I **was a soldier**’

**III w/y** In R<sup>3</sup>-weak verbs, the final glide is preserved in the G-stem (cf. paragraph 2.2.6 on final triphthongs): *rđw* ‘he was pleased’ (Esk 013).

<sup>57</sup>For a discussion of the verb *yrr* ‘to guard, to watch’ see paragraph \*w- > y- under Sound changes.

$R^2 = R^3$  It is unclear whether forms like *ḍrr* (HE 39) and *yrr-t* (Esk 052) reflect the G-stem or the D-stem of these verbs, making it impossible to tell whether Taymanitic treated its verbs from geminate roots as regular verbs from strong roots, or whether the final syllable was metathesized to create forms like for example in CAr. ( $C^1vC^2C^2v$ ).

#### 2.4.2 Function of the Suffix Conjugation

There are a few instances in Taymanitic in which the perfective is used with an optative mood (For the ending *-w* in *rdw* see section 2.2.6).

**Esk 013:**

*rdw ṣlm*<sup>58</sup>

‘May Ṣalm be pleased’

#### 2.4.3 Prefix conjugation

There is only one attestation of a verb in the prefix conjugation.

**JSTham 549:**

*f ys<sup>2</sup>hd*

‘so that it/he will bear witness (?)’

The form *ys<sup>2</sup>hd* occurs in a very short inscription, consisting of only a personal name and the phrase *f ys<sup>2</sup>hd* (the third line of JSTham 545 + 546 + 549), providing no context to help determine the function or exact TAM features of the verb.

All other attestations of forms that could formally be interpreted as prefix-conjugated verbs are personal names. Examples include *yfr<sup>c</sup>* (e.g. JSTham 426) *y<sup>r</sup>nl* (Esk 014) and *ykfrl* (e.g. Esk 044.2).

#### 2.4.4 Infinitive

There seem to be only three possible attestations of an infinitive in Taymanitic, one of which is attested in an uncertain context.

**Form** Most of the attested forms of the infinitive are not distinguishable from the third masculine singular perfective form in the consonantal script of Taymanitic. In these cases, the infinitive has to be deduced from its syntactic context.

It seems that the infinitive could be used to denote a simultaneous action, but the reading of the following text is open to several other interpretations (cf. section 2.3.1).

<sup>58</sup>*Rdw* might also be interpreted as a nominal form (I would like to thank one of the anonymous reviewers for pointing this out); this seems less likely however, given the general structure of the Taymanitic inscriptions, and the lack of a preposition or vocative particle in the inscription.



## TA 09302

$h\{s^3\}y / f^l \quad / \quad hmd \quad / \quad l-hd-h \quad /$   
 PN WD do.SC.3MS WD glory.INF WD for-guard.INF-CPRO.3MS WD  
 $b-ym \quad / \quad blbd$   
 in-battle.CST WD  $blbd(?)$

‘ $Hs^3y$  attained **glory** by guarding the border during the battle of  $blbd$ ’

Comparing the phrase  $f^l hmd$  to  $f^l nk$  ‘he engaged in battle’ in Esk 023 and Esk 026, it would seem that  $f^l hmd$  belongs to a similar light verb construction ‘he did X’. The second element  $hmd$  is an infinitive or verbal noun of the common root,  $hmd$  ‘praise’ or ‘glory’ (e.g. Sab.  $hmd$  ‘praise, thankfulness, glory’ (Beeston et al. 1982: 68) or CAR.  $hamd$  ‘praise, eulogy, commendation’ (Lane 639b)). I would then suggest the translation ‘he attained glory’ (lit. he made glory).

TA 09303<sup>59</sup>

---{l}y /  $f^l \quad / \quad r\{s^1\} \quad / \quad hm\{d\}$   
 ... WD do.SC.3MS WD first.CNST WD glory.INF  
 ‘... attained foremost glory’

**twy** The form *twy* occurs five times in the Taymanitic corpus as part of the phrase  $mn s^1m^c l-Slm l twy$  ‘whoever obeys *Šalm* will not perish’ (WTay 1.2; WTay 2; HE 24; HE 31; HE 41). Knauf (2011) already proposed the translation ‘whoever listens/is obedient to *Šalm* will not perish’, but does not offer further discussion on its grammatical structure.

Since the second root-consonant of middle weak verbs was not represented in the Taymanitic G-stem of the suffix conjugation (see paragraph on II *w/y* verbs in section 2.4.1, pg. 90), *twy* probably represents a nominal form; possibly /*tiwāy*/. Compare for the construction  $lā +$  infinitive for example CAR. “*lā tawā ‘alā māli ‘amriyyin muslimin*” ‘there shall be no perishing of the property of a man that is a Muslim’ (Lane: 323c).

## 2.5 Verb stems

### 2.5.1 D-stem of geminate roots

The only verbs in which a D-stem could be visible are verbs with a weak second consonant and in geminate verbs (cf. 2.4.1, pg. 91).

HE 39<sup>60</sup>

{z} **ḏrr** *ddn*  
 {z} war.SC.3MS *Ddn*  
 ‘{z} **went to war** (against) Dadan’

There are two other forms which could be interpreted as D-stem verbs; the form *ḥdd* (WTay 12) and the widely attested form *ḥll* (16 times, e.g. Eskoubi 2007: no. 234; Esk 289; Esk 167).

<sup>59</sup>For a complete discussion of the inscription see section 4.1.

<sup>60</sup>Cf. section 2.3.1 for other possible interpretations of this form.

**ḥdd** The form *ḥdd* appears once in the corpus as a verbal form (but see note on inscription TA 09302 in section 2.8.1, pg. 99). It should probably be read as a D-stem of the verb in the suffixing conjugation /ḥaddada/.

**WTay 12**

*yʿzrl b*                      *ḥ{g}{g} ḥdd*    *l-šlm*  
*Yʿzrl son.CNST Ḥgg*                      be.a.border.guard.SC.3MS for-*Šalm*  
 ‘*Yʿzrl* son of *Ḥgg* was a border guard for *Šalm*’

Winnett offers the interpretation ‘*Yʿzrl* son of *Ḥgg* is keen for *Šalm*’ (Winnett & Reed 1970: 100). The Translation ‘keen’ can be found in the Arabic lexicon (compare also Heb. *ḥdd* ‘sharp’ and Akk. *edēdu* ‘to be sharp, pointed’ (HALOT: 291)). Given the military character of the rest of the corpus, I would suggest a translation ‘to act as border guard/patrol’, based on the meaning ‘boundary or edge’ of *ḥdd* (e.g. in Arabic, *Lane*: 524-526) seems more fitting. If this interpretation is correct this inscription would be similar to the *nšr l-Šlm* ‘he kept watch on behalf of *Šalm*’ inscriptions.

**II-weak roots - ḥll** Generally *ḥll* is translated with its Arabic cognate *ḥalla* ‘to take up abode or settle somewhere’ (*Lane*: 620) or ‘to camp’ probably from its primary meaning ‘to untie’ (cf. *Lane*) based on the idea of unpacking your animals before settling for the night (e.g. Eskoubi 1999: 115). While it may be argued that *ḥll* should be taken as a reference to an army setting up camp, this meaning generally does not seem to fit the sedentary environments of either Taymā’ or Dadan.

Even if we bleach the meaning of *ḥll* ‘to camp’ to ‘to stay’ the translation seems problematic. The inscriptions do not work as the typical ‘X was here’ type of graffiti, since we do not find these inscriptions at Dadan. People seem to have written them when they were close to Taymā’ *after ḥll-ing* at Dadan.

It seems that a different root should be considered for the interpretation of *ḥll*. I would suggest that the term derives from the root  $\sqrt{ḥwl}$ , cognate to Hebrew *ḥayl* ‘armed forces, strength’ (HALOT: 311) (cf. CAR. *ḥawl* ‘strenth’ (*Lane*: 675c), and Off. Aramaic and Palm. ‘force; armed foce, army’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 369); Eth. *ḥayala* ‘to strengthen’ (HALOT: 311) from *\*ḥyl*). The verb *ḥll* could then be interpreted as a denominal verb in the D-stem ‘to serve in the army, to be a soldier’. This meaning works well in the different environments in which it is attested and it would place this phrase into the same tradition as the inscriptions mentioning military ranks (e.g. Esk 031), and military duties like *nšr* ‘to guard’ (e.g. HE 32) and *ḥdd* ‘to guard the border’ (Wtay 12).<sup>61</sup>

Considering the use of Aramaic among the ruling elite of Taymā’, *ḥll* might be considered a loan formation from Aramaic, along with other military terms such as *ntr* (Esk 025) and the rendering of the military term *rbsʿrsʿ* in the Taymanitic script (Esk 169). This would explain why the root appears in Taymanitic as *ḥyl* instead of *\*ḥyl*. If this interpretation is correct, Taymanitic seems to have formed the D-stem forms of its II-weak roots by reduplicating its final consonant, instead of the middle weak one, similar to Hebrew. Compare for example Heb. *qômēm* ‘he raised up’ (from  $\sqrt{qwm}$ ) (Joüion & Muraoka 2009: 198) to

<sup>61</sup>For a complete discussion of the interpretation of the *ḥll* forms see section 4.7.

CAr. *qawwama-hu* ‘he made it straight’ (from  $\sqrt{qwm}$ ) (Lane: 2995b). The reduplication in the D-stem formation could have been a native feature if only the noun *ḥwl* ‘army’ was borrowed, which then formed the base for a denominal verb formation following native morphological processes.

The semantic difference between the G-stem form of this verb (*ḥl*) and the D-stem (*ḥll*) remains unclear. Both *ḥl* and *ḥll* forms appear in identical contexts.

**Esk 055:**

*lm ṛḥml / b bs<sup>1</sup>rt / ḥl / b ddn*

‘by *Rḥml* son of *Bs<sup>1</sup>rt* **he was a soldier** at/against Dadan’

**Esk 104:**

*lm ṣ<sup>2</sup>{w/t} [sign] b d b lḥd // ḥll b-ddn*

‘by ṣ<sup>2</sup>{w/t} [sign] b d son of *Lḥd* **he was a soldier** at/against Dadan’

The D-stem could possibly have an intensive meaning ‘to be a soldier for a longer period of time/repeatedly’ or there could be no semantic difference between them at all (compare CAr. *balaha* and *ballaha* ‘to be weary, tired’ or *jadala* and *jaddala* ‘to throw out, topple’ (Corriente 2004: 40-41 after Kazimirski 1860)).

## 2.6 Adverbs

The most common adverbial forms in Taymanitic are nouns used as temporal adverbs: *s<sup>1</sup>nt* ‘year’ and *yrḥ* ‘month’. One adverbial phrase is attested.

### 2.6.1 Temporal adverbs

**WTay 20<sup>62</sup>**

*bhs<sup>2</sup>rkt nṣr                      b-ḏr                      ddn yr{ḥ}                      l-ṣlm*  
*Bhs<sup>2</sup>rkt* keep.watch.SC.3MS in-war.CNST Ddn month.ADV for-*Ṣalm*

‘*Bhs<sup>2</sup>rkt* kept watch during the war of Dadan **for a month** on behalf of *Ṣalm*’

**HE 32<sup>63</sup>**

*S<sup>3</sup>q / b                      ḥlw / nṣr                      / s<sup>1</sup>nt                      / l-ṣlm*  
*S<sup>3</sup>q* WD son.CNST ḥlw WD keep.watch.SC.3MS WD year.ADV WD for-*Ṣalm*

‘*S<sup>3</sup>q* son of ḥlw kept watch **for a year** on behalf of *Ṣalm*’

<sup>62</sup>For the interpretation of the verb *nṣr* as ‘to guard’ see paragraph 2.2.3.

<sup>63</sup>Since battles would likely not have lasted a whole month or even a year, these inscriptions might indicate that there was some sort of military service in Taymā’ for which one could serve set periods of time. On the other hand, all *nṣr* inscriptions are found either at an ancient watch tower called Bani Maṣṣar ‘Atiyah, or at a place called Jabal Ghunaym, which would also have made a good look out place. This could mean that the periods of time mentioned in the inscriptions refer to the time someone would be stationed at one of these watch posts (I would like to thank Michael Macdonald for pointing this out to me).





### 2.7.2 Demonstrative/Relative pronouns

**Demonstrative** A distal form of the demonstrative *znk* is attested in the following inscription:

#### WTay 3

*nṣr* / *b*            *ʿgl* / *hlk*            /    *znk*            *rfty* /  
*nṣr* WD son.CNST *ʿgl* WD go.SC.3MS WD DEM.SG.DIST *rfty* WD  
*h-rkb*  
 DEF.ART-riding.camel  
 ‘*Nṣr* son of *ʿgl* died, **that** is *Rfty* the riding camel’

If the phrase *znkrfty* would be parsed as *zn krfty* this would be the only attestation of a *zn* demonstrative. Instead, based on the name following it, this should probably be read as a distal form *znk* ‘that’ rather than ‘this’. Compare other demonstratives with a *-k* element: Biblical Aramaic (*dēk*), Ge’ez (*zeku*) (Hasselbach 2007: 1). Moreover, the name *krfty* would be very difficult to parse, whereas the name *rft* is an attested name in Taymanitic and Qatabanic (Harding 1971), probably from the word *riḥ* ‘countryside’ (CAr.). The final *-y* could be a diminutive (see section 2.3.3, pg. 89).

**Relative** Taymanitic had a *z*-based relative pronoun. The relative seems to decline for number; there is no evidence for a feminine relative. Relative pronouns are mostly attested in combination with the locative preposition *b-* ‘here; in these, with these’ or in combination with the verb *ḥll* ‘against these’.

The plural form *zy* is attested in the following inscriptions:

#### Esk 083 [part]

*ʿl*            /    *b-zy*                            *ṣlm*  
 strength WD with-REL.PL.CNST *Ṣalm*  
 ‘Strength is with **those** of *Ṣalm*’

#### Esk 058

*lm ṣmdʿ* / *b*                            *ṣmnʿm* / *b*                            *s<sup>3</sup>rbn* /  
 LA *ṣmdʿ* WD son.CNST *ṣmnʿm* WD son.CNST *S<sup>3</sup>rbn* WD  
*ḥll*    *b-zy*    *ḥyr* {*l*}-*ddn*  
 be.a.soldier.SC.3M.SG against-REL.PL.CNST good in-Dadan  
 ‘by *Ṣmdʿ* son of *Ṣmnʿm* son of *S<sup>3</sup>rbn* he acted as a soldier against **those** who aided Dadan’

#### Al-Anṣāry 35

*lm wdd* / *b*                            *lḥm* / *ḥll*    /  
 LA *Wdd* WD son.CNST *Lḥm* WD be.a.soldier.SC.3MS WD  
*b-z{y}*    *s<sup>2</sup>n*    /    *ʿm*    *ṣlm*  
 against-REL.PL.CNST enmity.CNST WD people .CNST *Ṣalm*  
 ‘by *Wdd* son of *Lḥm* he acted as a soldier against **those** of enmity of/against the people of *Ṣalm*’



**Comitative** Close to the locative function, when used referring to people *b-* may have a comitative meaning. The interpretation of the last part of the phrase is very unsure however.

**TA 02669.1 [part]**

*{ḥ}{l}{l}* / *b-hm* *m-lmq*  
 be.a.soldier.SC.3MS WD with-CPRO.3MP(?) from-Lmq(?)  
 ‘he was as a soldier **with** them(?) from Lmq(?)’

**Temporal** The reading of the following two examples is unsure in places, but they both seem to use *b-* followed by a noun to indicate ‘at a time’.

**TA 09302**

*ḥ{s<sup>3</sup>}y* / *f<sup>l</sup>* / *ḥmd* / *l-ḥd-h* /  
*Ḥs<sup>3</sup>y* WD make.SC.3MS WD glory WD by-border.guard-CPRO.3MS WD  
*b-ym* / *blbd*  
 in-battle WD *blbd*(?)  
 ‘*Ḥs<sup>3</sup>y* attained glory by guarding the border **during** the battle of *blbd*’

**TM.T. 041**

*ḥll* *b-s<sup>1</sup>nt* // ...  
 be.a.soldier.SC.3MS in-year LB ...  
 ‘he was a soldier **in** (the) year...(?)’

**Benefactive or instrumental** In the following inscription the exact meaning of *b-* remains open to interpretation. It could be used as a benefactive, to express doing something for, or on behalf of someone else, or possibly as an instrumental to indicate that the deity made the offering possible.

**JSTham 352**

*b-ṣlm* *ntn-t*  
 for-Ṣalm give-.SC.1CS  
 ‘**by** Ṣalm I have made an offering’

**2.8.2 *m-***

The preposition *m-*, which is probably an assimilated form of the preposition *\*mn* ‘from’, is only attested twice and both times in an unsure context.

**TA 02669.1 [part]**

*{ḥ}{l}{l}* / *b-hm* *m-lmq*  
 be.a.soldier.SC.3MS WD with-CPRO.3MP(?) from-Lmq(?)  
 ‘he was a soldier with them(?) **from** Lmq(?)’

**WTay 9.2 [part]**

---*m* *m-s<sup>1</sup>mw*  
 ...*m* from-S<sup>1</sup>mw(?)  
 ‘... **from** S<sup>1</sup>mw ((tribal) name)(?)’

### 2.8.3 *l-*

The preposition *l-* is used both as a benefactive when used with the verb *nšr* ‘to guard’ and it can be used to introduce a dative. It is also attested introducing a dative in combination with the transitive verb *s<sup>1</sup>m<sup>c</sup>* ‘to listen’. In TA 09302 *l-* is used with an instrumental meaning.

#### Benefactive

##### HE 25

*nšr*                      *l-šlm*  
 keep.watch.SC.3MS for-*šalm*  
 ‘he kept watch **on behalf of** *šalm*’

#### Dative

##### WTay 2

*mn*      *s<sup>1</sup>m<sup>c</sup>*      *l-šlm*  
 REL.INDF listen.SC.3MS to-*šalm*  
 ‘Whoever obeys *šalm*’

#### Instrumental

##### TA 09302

*ḥ{s<sup>3</sup>}y* / *f<sup>l</sup>*                      / *ḥmd* / *l-ḥd-h*                      /  
*Ḥs<sup>3</sup>y*    WD make.SC.3MS WD glory WD by-border.guard-CPRO.3MS WD  
*b-ym*    / *blbd*  
 in-battle WD *blbd*(?)  
 ‘*Ḥs<sup>3</sup>y* attained glory **by** guarding the border during the battle of *blbd*’

### 2.8.4 *k-*

The preposition *k-* seems to have been used as an instrumental. It is only attested once, in the following inscription, where it is used to indicate ‘by means of surrounding (it)’

#### Esk 272 [part]:

*n<sup>c</sup>ml* / *b lbd* // *hrg* / *ddn* {/} *l wn<sup>c</sup>* // *s<sup>3</sup>ḡ* {*b*}-*h k-dwrt*  
 ‘*N<sup>c</sup>ml* son of *Lbd* the destroyer of Dadan<sup>66</sup> of the lineage of *Wn<sup>c</sup>*; he took the town **by** surrounding (it)’

---

<sup>66</sup>The translation of this phrase ‘destroyer of Dedan’ was proposed by Macdonald (Macdonald & Al-Najem forthcoming: appendix 1).

### 2.8.5 *m*<sup>c</sup>

This preposition is only attested once in the following inscription with a comitative meaning.

#### Esk 169 (line 2)

ʿtw-t            *m*<sup>c</sup> rbs<sup>1</sup>rs<sup>1</sup> kyt  
 come-.SC.1CS with chief kyt  
 ‘I came **with** chief Kyt’

Note that the Taymanitic preposition *m*<sup>c</sup> resembles CAR. *maʿa* ‘with’ and not the more commonly found form *ʿm* (e.g. Sab. *ʿm*; Heb. *ʿim*; Aramaic *ʿim*; Syr. *ʿam* (Brockelmann 1908-1913: vol. I, 498) Ug. *ʿm* (Pardee 2008: 27)). It is unclear how these forms relate to each other exactly.<sup>67</sup>

### 2.8.6 *l(m) auctoris*

Many of the Taymanitic inscriptions begin with an introductory particle *l-* or *lm-*, also called the *lam auctoris* (LA or LmA respectively in glosses). Almost all Safaitic inscriptions and some Hismaic inscriptions also begin with this particle (Macdonald 2008: 209-2010). The *lm-* variant is unique to Taymanitic (Winnett 1980: 135-136).

The introductory particle has been connected to the preposition *l-*, which can also indicate authorship ‘by’ in Arabic (Macdonald 2008: 209). It has been suggested that the characteristic *m* of the Taymanitic variant might be connected to Hebrew *lāmō* (< \*/li-mā/(?)) which occurs in the book of Job, a text often connected to Northern Arabia because of its many linguistic oddities (Guillaume 1963 and Hoffman 1996). The *m* is probably an enclitic *-m* also found in other Semitic languages (e.g. Wright & Caspari 1859: vol. I paragraph 70 Rem F, paragraph 84 Rem a; Gianto 2011: 37).

There is some uncertainty about the meaning of this particle *l(m)-*. It is generally interpreted as a *lam auctoris* to indicate authorship, and translated as ‘by’ (e.g. Macdonald 2008: 209; Winnett & Reed 1970: 96). However, there are contexts in which a translation ‘by’ does not work; inscriptions that are part of burial cairns (e.g. WH 329, 938, 1936, 3420) and tomb inscriptions (e.g. the tomb inscriptions at Dayr al-Kahf, Macdonald 2006) are also introduced by a particle *l-* (Macdonald 2006: 294-295). In these cases it is unlikely that the name on the inscription was also its author, as this type of texts is more likely to commemorate the deceased for whom the grave was built than its builder (Eksell 2002: 115). In these cases a translation ‘for’ seems more appropriate. Based on examples from bilingual Safaitic-Greek inscriptions and a longer narrative Safaitic inscription, Al-Jallad (2015) demonstrates how the introductory particle can be used for different purposes; sometimes with a clear commemorative function, yet other times simply as a reference to the author of the inscription (Al-Jallad 2015: 5-6). Given the range of meanings in different contexts Macdonald (2006: 294-5) proposed to leave the particle untranslated in the cases where it is mainly introducing the subject of the inscription.

<sup>67</sup>It has been proposed that the *ʿm* forms come from *ʿam(m)* ‘people’ or *ʿamma* ‘to be common’ (Lipiński 1997: 465-466) or possibly Akkadian /ʿimm/ ‘*gemeinschaft*’ (Tropper 2000: 263) and that the Arabic preposition is a metathesized form (Lipiński 1997: 465-466).

Currently there are six known Taymanitic burial inscriptions (TM.T 016; 019; 025; 028; 037 and 042) all of which begin with *l-*,<sup>68</sup> while inscriptions that do not mention the name or subject of the inscription consistently occur without an introductory particle. On top of that, one inscription with an introductory particle has been attested, which was probably written by the person giving his name at the beginning. It is an inscription with a verb in the first person singular which starts with *lm* (Esk 052). Therefore it would seem that in Taymanitic indication of authorship seems to have been the main function of the *lam auctoris*. On the other hand, all types of inscriptions that do start with a personal name also occur without *lam auctoris*. This seems to indicate that it can also be left untranslated (as suggested by Macdonald 2006: 295). For the sake of completion however, I would propose to translate the introductory particles that are expressed in the inscriptions as ‘by’, except in cases where the author clearly could not have been the person mentioned in the inscription, as would be the case for the burial inscriptions mentioned above.

The particles *l-* and *lm-* seem to exist in free variation in Taymanitic. Both introductory particles (*l-* and *lm-*) and the lack of an introductory particle do not seem to be restricted to specific contexts. As an exception to this, there are two types of inscriptions which systematically occur without an introductory particle: those that do not mention a personal name; and the *nsr l-šlm* inscriptions, regardless of whether a name is given or not and in what position in the inscription the name is mentioned.

## 2.9 Conjunctions

### 2.9.1 w-

The conjunction *w-* ‘and’ can be used to introduce verbal clauses after the statement of the author’s name.

#### TM.T. 012

----{b/s<sup>1</sup>/k} ‘d b tyr / w-šm<sup>c</sup>  
 ...s<sup>1</sup>d son tyr WD CONJ-listen(?).SC.3MS  
 ‘... s<sup>1</sup>d son of *Tyr*, **and** he listened’

### 2.9.2 f-

Conjunction *f-* signifies a resultative relation, similar to its usage in, for example, CAr (*Lane*: 2321b).

#### Kim CIMG 0759, line 3

*w bhs<sup>2</sup>* / *f yd<sup>c</sup>* / *{?}ns<sup>1</sup>*  
 and examine.SC.3MS WD and know.SC.3MS WD Mankind  
 ‘... and he examined **and (so)** he knew mankind’

---

<sup>68</sup>I would like to thank Michael Macdonald for pointing out these important inscriptions to me.

## 2.10 Syntax

### 2.10.1 Nominal sentences

Equational sentences can be expressed by a verbless clause, as in most Semitic languages.

**Esk 169 (line 1):**

*ʾn / mrdn / {h}lm / nbnd / mlk / bbl*  
 ‘I am *Mrdn*, servant of Nabonidus king of Babel’

**WTay 3 (part):**

*znk rfty /h- rkb*  
 ‘that is *Rfty* the riding camel’

Nominal sentences can also be used to express existential clauses.

**Esk 083 (part):**

*ʾl / b-zy šlm*  
 ‘Strength is with those of *Šalm*’

### 2.10.2 Verbal sentences

**Basic word-order** Most Taymanitic inscriptions have an SVO word order.

**HE 39**

*{ʾ}z drr ddn {w}*  
*ʾz war.SC.3MS Ddn CONJ(?)*  
 ‘*ʾz* went to war (against) Dadan and(?)’

This seems to be the result of the structure of the inscriptions, which usually begin by stating authorship. There is one inscription in which the subject of the verb is mentioned separately from the author, in which VS order is used, hinting that this was probably the unmarked word order in Taymanitic.

**Esk 013<sup>69</sup>**

<l> *l bʾrl rđw šlm*  
 <1> LA *Bʾrl* please.SC.3MS *Šalm*  
 ‘By *Bʾrl*, may *Šalm* be pleased’

**Topicalization** Aside from the topicalization of the subject when it is equal to the author, there is one common formula in which the subject is consistently fronted.

<sup>69</sup>Translation as proposed by Macdonald (db).

**WTay 2**

*lm / hbʿl b*      *ʿgl / mn*      *sʿmʿ*      *l-*      *šlm*  
 LA WD Hbʿl son.CNST ʿgl WD REL.INDF listen.SC.3MS to-Šalm NEG  
*l*      *tw[y]*  
 perish.INF  
 ‘by *Hbʿl* son of *ʿgl*, **whoever** obeys *Šalm* will not perish’

Generally Taymanitic is relatively free in its word order and it seems that any constituent can be fronted. Compare the following two inscriptions, each with a prepositional phrase.

**WTay 12**

*yʿzrl b*      *h{g}{g} hdd*      *l-šlm*  
*Yʿzrl* son.CNST *Ḥgg*      be.a.border.guard.SC.3MS for-*Šalm*  
 ‘*yʿzrl* son of *Ḥgg* was a border guard **for Šalm**’

**JSTham 352**

*b-šlm ntn-t*  
 for-*Šalm* give-.SC.1CS  
 ‘**on behalf of Šalm** I gave’

There are other examples in which different parts of the more regular formula are mixed up. The following example might actually represent the spoken word order more closely.

**Esk 013**<sup>70</sup>

<1> *l bʿrl rdw*      *šlm*  
 <1> LA Bʿrl please.SC.3MS *Šalm*  
 ‘By Bʿrl may *Šalm* be pleased’

The following inscription is another example in which even parts of a formula are interrupted by the name of the author.

**WTay 15**

*nšr*      *l-šlm*      *ʿrm b*      *fsʿh b-*      *dr nbyt*  
 keep.watch.SC.3MS for-*Šalm* *ʿrm* son.CNST *Fsʿh* in-war.CNST *Nbyt*  
 ‘he kept watch on behalf of *Šalm*, **ʿrm son of *Fsʿh***, in the war of Nabaioth’

### 3 Taymanitic in its Semitic context

#### 3.1 Discussion

In the following, Taymanitic will be defined based on a set of linguistic features specific to the language of the Taymanitic inscriptions. Taymanitic’s relevant linguistic features will then be placed in a wider Semitic context and an attempt will be made to determine the relation between Taymanitic and its surrounding

---

<sup>70</sup>Translation as proposed by Macdonald (db).



languages. Special attention will be given to the relation between Taymanitic and other ANA varieties in order to review some of the general assumptions concerning the linguistic make-up of ANA.

### 3.1.1 Taymanitic innovations

**Merging of the fricatives** There are a few phonological traits which distinguish Taymanitic from other linguistic varieties written in ANA scripts. Most descriptions of Taymanitic mention that it uses all three PS non-emphatic sibilants (Macdonald 1991: 16-17; Winnett & Reed 1970: 96). These are generally transcribed as  $s^1$  for PS \*[s],  $s^2$  for PS \*[ʃ] and  $s^3$  for PS \*[ts]. Instead, the dental fricative series seems to have merged with their sibilant counterparts, giving Taymanitic a system in which  $s^3$  represents both  $*t$  and  $*s^3$ .

$$\begin{array}{l} \underline{d}; z > z \\ \underline{t}; s^3 > s^3 \\ \underline{z} (*\underline{t}); \text{ʃ} > \text{ʃ} \end{array}$$

Regardless of the phonetic value of  $s^3$  and  $\underline{t}$ , their merger sets the phonemic inventory of Taymanitic apart from both NWS and Arabic; Arabic merged  $s^1$  and  $s^3$ , Ugaritic  $s^1$  and  $s^2$ , and Aramaic  $s^2$  and  $s^3$  (Gzella 2011: 433). The same applies to the merger of  $\underline{t}$  and  $\text{ʃ}$ ; Arabic kept both apart, Ugaritic merged the emphatic counterparts of  $*s^2$  ( $*\text{ʃ}$ ) and  $*s^3$  ( $*\underline{t}$ ) to  $\text{ʃ}$ , whereas Hebrew merged the entire emphatic series ( $*\text{ʃ}$ ,  $*\underline{t}$  and  $*\underline{t}$ ) to  $\text{ʃ}$ .

**Conditioned assimilation of l and n to following consonants** Another feature that characterizes Taymanitic is the conditioned assimilation of l and n to following consonants in unstressed position (see paragraph 2.2.6 on N-assimilation (pg. 83) and L-assimilation (pg. 84). This sound change gives Taymanitic its characteristic *b* form (instead of *bn*) for ‘son’, for example. One of the minor features of NWS is a general assimilation of *n* to any following consonant (e.g. Gzella 2011: 432).

### 3.1.2 Taymanitic and Northwest Semitic

Aside from the features discussed above, which are specifically Taymanitic, there are three linguistic features that could connect Taymanitic to NWS. The first is the sound change of word-initial  $*w-$  > *y-*, with the exclusion of the conjunction /*wa-*/ ‘and’ (Gzella 2011: 432). This sound change is attested in three lexical items: *Yrh* (W Tay 20) ‘month’ <  $*wrh$ ; the verb *yd*<sup>c</sup> (Kim CIMG 0759. Tay (unpublished)) ‘he knew’ <  $*wd$ <sup>c</sup> and *yrr* (Esk 053) ‘he guarded’ <  $*wry$ .

One form might even point towards a shared morphological innovation between NWS and Taymanitic. The phrase  $\text{ʔ}s^1\} \{b\}^{\text{ʔ}}\text{ly } tm$  (Kim CIMG 0759. Tay (unpublished)) ‘chief of the residents of Taymā’ seems to contain a construct plural similar to that in Canaanite and Aramaic which replaced their bound masculine plural ending  $-\bar{i}$  with  $-ay$  (>  $-\bar{e}$  in Hebrew and Aramaic) as in Hebrew *malkē* ‘kings of’ (Gzella 2011: 440). The phrase ‘*b*<sup>ʔ</sup>ly + place name’ is also found in two Aramaic inscriptions (Cowley 1923: No. 30<sup>22</sup> and Teixidor

1978: 182). The fact that a similar phrase occurs elsewhere and that it may have had a legal function to do with ownership rights,<sup>71</sup> could indicate that this is a loan-phrase in Taymanitic, as the language used for official purposes at the oasis, at least during Nabonidus' stay, seems to have been Aramaic (Macdonald 2010: 11). Finally, *b<sup>q</sup>ly* could also reflect a plural ending *-āy* and simply reflect a Taymanitic plural suffix. This may be compared to Sabaic, where the masculine plural suffix on oblique forms is *-y* (Stein 2003: 82), giving us a construction which looks orthographically the same.

Lastly, if my interpretation of *hll* is correct, then Taymanitic forms the D-stems of II-w/y roots by reduplicating the third consonant of the root as can be seen in the form *hll* 'to be or act as a soldier' from the root  $\sqrt{hw}l$  (e.g. Esk 104). This strategy is similar to that used in Hebrew (Joüon & Muraoka 2009: 198).

These three isoglosses are the only features which could be used to establish a genetic affiliation between Taymanitic and any of its surrounding languages. As there are no further distinguishable features to be found in Taymanitic that would establish such a connection more closely, a discussion of some features that could disprove a close affiliation between Taymanitic and NWS is in order.

One of the NWS innovations is its system of plural formation in which nouns with the form CVCC (*qitl*, *qatl*, *qutl*) get an *a* inserted between the two last consonants and a plural suffix, leaving them essentially doubly marked (Huehnergard 1995: 2129). The innovation of this system of plural marking also entailed the loss of broken plurals (Huehnergard 1995: 2129). As the Taymanitic script is purely consonantal, it is impossible to see whether it had the same type of doubly marked plural formation as NWS, but among the few plural nouns that are found in the corpus, there are no clear examples of any broken plurals. The form *ḡrr*, which is attested in WTay 22 and He39, could be interpreted as a broken plural /ḡrūr/ 'wars' in WTay 22. However, it occurs in one of the standard Taymanitic formulae which in all other cases reads: *b-ḡr ddn* (e.g. WTay 20 and WTay 21) 'in the war of Dadan'. Because of the formulaic nature of the texts, the form *ḡrr* is likely a writing error. Even if *ḡrr* was written deliberately there are many explanations other than a broken plural to account for its form. As we do not know the word's vocalization, it might have been an infinitive 'while/by warring Dadan', or even another construct plural, with /a/ insertion, as diphthongs do not seem to have been written consistently: /bi-dararay Dadān/ 'in the wars of Dadan' (see section 2.1.1).

Another obstacle to connecting Taymanitic to NWS that has been suggested is the lack of general *n*-assimilation to following consonants, which is sometimes mentioned as one of the shared features of NWS (e.g. Gzella 2011: 432). However, since the core-NWS languages were in close geographic contact, it is impossible to say if *n*-assimilation was in fact a feature of Proto-NWS, or simply an areal feature that spread after the diversification of the branch. If Taymanitic was a variety of NWS, then it could have separated rather early and may not have been affected by the spread of this feature.

---

<sup>71</sup>Land ownership and the status as resident of a city often came with certain rights and privileges in ancient Mesopotamian cities (Oppenheim 1969: 15)

### 3.1.3 Taymanitic in relation to Old Arabic<sup>72</sup>

As all of ANA has traditionally been closely associated with Arabic, the features Taymanitic shares with NWS are quite unexpected. Moreover, there are several Arabic innovations that Taymanitic clearly did not undergo. It did not undergo the final *-at* > *-ah* shift which Arabic did, in its unbound forms. In addition to this, Taymanitic seems to have preserved the *-iwa* ending in its stative verbs and did not change them into *-iya* as happened in Arabic (cf. *rdw* ‘may he please’ e.g. Esk 13). Other Arabic isoglosses are difficult to evaluate, as there is no context in the Taymanitic inscriptions for most of them.<sup>73</sup>

## 3.2 Conclusion

To sum up, Taymanitic underwent two very typical phonological innovations, the merger of the dental fricatives with their sibilant counterparts and a stress-based assimilation of *l* and *n* to following consonants. These indicate that the language expressed in the Taymanitic script can be regarded as an independent language variety. Three linguistic features attested in Taymanitic could point to an affiliation with NWS; one of which (the sound change *\*w- > y-*) forms the primary argument for the classification of Amorite as part of the NWS branch. Even though none of these features are conclusive, there is no evidence which rules out a NWS affiliation. Moreover, there are several (Proto-)Arabic innovations that Taymanitic did not undergo, which seems to rule out a close affiliation with Arabic and the other two better understood ANA varieties, Hismaic and Safaitic. Also, Taymanitic has some features that rule out considering it a form of proto-Arabic despite its early attestation, such as its merging of the sibilant and interdental series; the changing of initial *w-* to *y-* and several other innovations that Arabic did not undergo.

It has to be kept in mind that a linguistic comparison is complicated by the fact that not all defining features of either Arabic or NWS can be found in Taymanitic, and that the NWS features found in Taymanitic could also be explained as contact induced changes (if we were to interpret the sound-change *\*w- > y-* as an areal feature, and the one clear example of a construct plural with *-y* as a loan phrase), so all these data should be evaluated with caution. Even though the data are not conclusive, it is clear that Taymanitic script expressed a distinct linguistic variety that is not Arabic and not closely related to Hismaic or Safaitic, while it can tentatively be suggested that it was more closely related to NWS.

<sup>72</sup>Hismaic and Safaitic are considered to be forms of Old Arabic here, following Al-Jallad (2015: 11) see the discussion of internal ANA relations in section 1. Introduction (note 7).

<sup>73</sup>For an overview of Arabic isoglosses see: Huehnergard (forthcoming) and Al-Jallad (2015: 12).

## 4 Inscriptions

### 4.1 Monumental Inscriptions

**TA 09302:**

$\dot{h}\{s^3\}y / f^l / \dot{h}md / l\text{-}hd\text{-}h / b\text{-}ym / blbd$

' $Hs^3y$  attained glory by guarding the border in the battle of *blbd*'

This inscription should probably be read in relation to two other inscriptions, TA 09303 and TA 02669.1 + 02669.2. TA 09303 was found in the same wall of a building as TA 09302 in which they were probably used secondarily as building material (Macdonald forthcoming); all three inscriptions were deeply inscribed on what seem to be smooth prepared surfaces, which is quite rare for Taymanitic inscriptions. Given their strong similarity in style it may not be a coincidence that all three contain the word *ḥmd* which occurs only in two other inscriptions as a personal name in the corpus, and that in two of the three inscriptions *ḥmd* seems to be part of the phrase *f<sup>l</sup> ḥmd* which seems to mean 'to attain praise/glory'.

For a discussion of the phrase *f<sup>l</sup> ḥmd* see the paragraph on *f<sup>l</sup> + infinitive* 2.4.4, pg. 92.

The form *ḥd* is interpreted here as a nominal form from the root *ḥdd*, which we find in WTay 12 as a verb 'to act as a border guard' (compare CAR. *ḥadd* 'limit or boundary of a land or territory' (*Lane*: 525b)). The suffixed pronoun specifies that the author of the inscription attained glory through his actions as a border guard (lit. his guarding of the border). The preposition *l-* should be interpreted as an instrumental here. For the discussion of the verb *ḥdd* see section 2.5.1, pg. 94.

Given the content of the rest of the inscription, and the general military character of the Taymanitic inscriptions, I would suggest to interpret *ym* as 'battle' here (see also Macdonald forthcoming). Compare for example CAR. *yawm* 'battle' or *'ayyāmu l-'arabi* 'conflicts of the Arabs' (*Lane*: 3064c).

**TA 09303:**

$---\{l\}y / f^l / r[ʔ]s^1 / \dot{h}m\{d\}$

'...(?) attained foremost glory'

The form *r[ʔ]s<sup>1</sup>* is interpreted here as standing in construct with the infinitive *ḥmd*, indicating that the author or dedicant of the inscription achieved 'first or foremost glory'. Compare e.g. the usage of *ra's* in CAR. as 'the principal or most essential part of something' or *ra'su s-sanati* 'the beginning or first day of the year' (*Lane*: 995c).

The lack of the *ʔ* in the inscription is likely a writing error, as the glottal stop is generally represented in the orthography. If this inscription is compared to the similar phrase *f<sup>l</sup> ḥmd* in TA 09302, an interpretation of *r[ʔ]s<sup>1</sup>* in construct with *ḥmd*, qualifying the kind of praise or glory seems to work very well. If the glottal stop was really dropped in this position it might indicate that there was a conditioned environment in which this happened in Taymanitic. Based on the available evidence at the moment it is not clear what this conditioning environment would be.

## TA 02669.1 + 02669.2

{----} *hmd* / 'ḥ}r ḥ}rt {h}{l}{l} /  
 --- glory.INF WD end.CST posterity. <LB> Be.a.soldier.SC.3MS? WD  
*b-hm* *m-lmq*  
 against-CPRO.3MP(?) from-lmq  
 '{----} glory until the end of posterity {having performed his duties as  
 a soldier} against them from *Lmq*(?)'

Macdonald (forthcoming) reads the first line and the first two letters of the second line as a separate inscription from the rest of line 2, based on the difference in carving technique. The middle line of the ḥ is deeply incised like all the letters before it however, the two small lines coming out of the middle are not as deeply carved, similar to the rest of the following glyphs. This seems to suggest that the shallow lines were the draft of the inscription, which was simply not finished for some reason. The fact that the ḥ contains both techniques seems to support this idea.

Following the unfinished ḥ two vertical lines are clearly visible, each with a hook on its top. The first vertical line might have a zigzag at its bottom, but this might be damage. Since the glyph following the word divider is a *b*, a reading *hll b...* seems appropriate, as this is one of the well known formulae used in the Taymanitic inscriptions.

For a discussion of the phrase 'ḥr ḥrt and a possible alternative interpretation see the paragraph on cognate infinitive constructions in section 2.4.4, pg. 92.

The translation of the final phrase is very unsure. For the interpretation of *hll* see section 2.5.1, pg. 94.

## 4.2 *fl nk* inscriptions

### Esk 026:

*Lb{/s<sup>1</sup>}m / b n{/}dr / fl / nk*  
 'Lb{/s<sup>1</sup>}m son of N{/}dr engaged in battle'

The left leg of the ' in the second personal name in Esk 026 *n'dr* is curved and sticks out above the horizontal stroke of the letter, rendering its interpretation somewhat unsure.

The inscriptions with the phrase *fl nk* have previously been translated as 'he had intercourse' (Eskoubi 1999: 72 and 75). A seemingly similar phrase is attested in the Hismaic inscriptions (transcription and translation following King 1990).

### KJA 24:

*L-ḡtlh w rb s<sup>1</sup>qm s<sup>2</sup>rr b-ḡlmt f nkh s<sup>1</sup>rr*  
 'by ḡtlh; and a young girl feels sickness of happiness and he had sex with her happily'

**KJA 6:**

*Nk rhs<sup>1</sup> 'zz w nyk*

'*Rhs<sup>1</sup>* had sex with 'zz (or a loved one) and made love repeatedly'

In these inscriptions, however, the woman involved is often explicitly mentioned as well, whereas they are completely missing in the Taymanitic context. In addition to this, there are several formulae in Hismaic expressing emotions and loving people, e.g. *wdd* 'to love' (e.g. KJC 120) and inscriptions mentioning *s<sup>1</sup>qm* 'sickness' (e.g. KJC 45; KJC 79) and *s<sup>1</sup>rr* 'happiness' (e.g. KJA 46), while there are no such Taymanitic inscriptions. Given the general content of the Taymanitic inscriptions, which mainly include military context, the original meaning of the root  $\sqrt{nk}$  'to hit; to smite' may fit better. Compare for example the Aramaic usage of the root: 'blow, hit' (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 730).

**Esk 023:**

*yf<sup>c</sup> / b b{s<sup>2</sup>}mt / {f}l {n}k*

'*Yf<sup>c</sup>* son of *Bs<sup>2</sup>mt* engaged in battle'

### 4.3 Military ranks

**Esk 031:**

*'s<sup>1</sup> b dmg / l 's{r/n} / h-d{b}' / {h/h}{r}{'}{y}*

'*s<sup>1</sup>* son of *Dmg* to/for 'sr the soldier the chief'

The forms *hd{b}'* and *{h/h}{r}{'}{y}* should probably be interpreted as nouns with a definite article *h-* in apposition to the personal name, similar to the use of nicknames. In that case I would propose to read them as 'the soldier, the chief'. A similar construction is found in another inscription (Philby 279 ay) in which the personal name is followed by the words *h-rm h-ġlm* 'the lancer, the youth/junior'. *db'* is attested in NWS with the meaning 'army' (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 955). The Akkadian equivalent *šābu* could be used to indicate a group of people in general, workers, or soldiers (CAD, vol.16, 46).

The root  $\sqrt{r'y}$  means 'to pasture' in Arabic (Lane: 1103); it is also used with the meaning shepherd in Hebrew (Clines 1993) and in Amorite names (Knudsen 1991: 870, the name *i-la-ra-ġi-a* < *ila-rā'yā* 'Ēl is my shepherd'). In Akkadian,  $r'y$  could be used to refer not just to shepherding cattle, but it could also be metaphorically extended to mean guiding or leading people (CAD, vol.14, 309). In combination with the word *šābu* it could be used to refer to a 'foreman of the team, shepherd of the team', *re-šā-bi* (CAD, vol.16, 46b). In this light it seems most likely that the author of the text gave his military class (*h-db'* 'the soldier'), which may have referred to a specific type of soldier, and his rank (*h-r'y* 'the chief').<sup>74</sup>

**Philby 279 ay:**

*kfr'l b t'n h-rm h-ġlm*

'*Kfr'l* son of *T'n*, the lancer, the junior'

---

<sup>74</sup>For a complete discussion of the form of  $r'y$  see the paragraph 2.3.3, pg. 88.



However the context of these words is damaged (Macdonald 1997: 336, note 12), so we do not know exactly what happened to the king of Dadan. The reason it is assumed that there was a conflict is that the general content of the inscription relates military activities (Macdonald 1997: 336, note 12). Winnett rightly points out that an oasis and trading station such as Taymā' would have been dependent on peace in the area to allow traders to pass safely, making it unlikely that the inhabitants would go on military campaigns in the region "unless the circumstances were very unusual" (Winnett & Reed 1970: 90-1). He concludes that the coming of Nabonidus from Babylon might have provided such an unusual situation, as Nabonidus would have tried to establish himself in the region by going on military campaigns (Winnett & Reed 1970: 90-1). Eph'al adds to this that the 'wars' mentioned in the inscriptions might simply refer to competition between the two oases, as they were situated on competing routes of the frankincense trading route (Eph'al 1982: 184). It should also be kept in mind that the basic meaning of *ḏr*, in Arabic, is not war, but more generally 'affliction, necessity, want' (Lane: 1775-1777).

**WTay 13:**

*y'zrl b ḥgg ---- b ḏr nbyt*  
 'Y'zrl son of Ḥgg ... in the war of Nabaioth'

The *nbyt* can probably be identified with the Nabayoth (Winnett & Reed 1970: 99), who are mentioned in Assyrian inscriptions as Nabayati (<sup>KUR</sup>*Na-ba-a-ti*<sup>76</sup>) (Eph'al 1982: 183). The Old Testament similarly mentions a people called the *Nəbāyōt* (Nebaioth<sup>77</sup>). Winnett and Reed propose that the *nbyt* mentioned here and in WTay 13 and WTay 15 are the same people. The *nbyt* mentioned here cannot be equated with the Nabataeans (*nbt(w)* CAr. *nabaṭ*, 'anbāt) (Winnett & Reed 1970: 99 and (Eph'al 1982: 222)) for one would have to explain both the loss of the *y* and the change from *t > ṭ*.<sup>78</sup>

**WTay 22:**

*----lm b-ḏrr ddn*  
 '...lm in the wars of Dadan/by waging war against Dadan'

See section 2.3.1 for a discussion of the possible interpretation of *ḏrr* as a plural form rendering the first proposed translation, and section 2.4.4, pg. 91 for a discussion of the alternative interpretation.

**HE 39:**

*{ }z ḏrr ddn*  
 '{ }z served in the war of Dadan'

See section 2.5.1 for a discussion of the verb *ḏrr*.

---

<sup>76</sup>In the annals of Ashurbanipal (Oppenheim 1969: 298-300).

<sup>77</sup>Gen 25:11 (= chron. 1:29), 28:9, 36:3; Isa. 60:7.

<sup>78</sup>For more on the possible location of the Nabaioth in ancient times see Winnett & Reed (1970: 100).



**WTay 21:**

----{y}{ʔ} b- // *ḏr dd[n]*  
 ‘... in the war of Dadan’

**WTay 23.1:**

*ḏr ddn*  
 ‘the war of Dadan’

**4.6 *nṣr l-Ṣlm* inscriptions****HE 17:**

*{n}s<sup>2</sup>w b h-ḥdryt nṣr l- ṣlm*  
 ‘Ns<sup>2</sup>w son of the sedentary woman/the woman from *Hḏr* kept watch for *Ṣalm*’

For a complete discussion of interpretation of the verb *nṣr* see section 2.2.3, pg. 79.

**Esk 025:**

*{ʔ}n ʔ{n/r}ds<sup>1</sup> / s<sup>1</sup>{s<sup>1</sup>}n / mlk / bbl / n{t}rt*  
 ‘I am ʔnds<sup>1</sup> official of(?) the king of Babylon, I kept watch’

The word *s<sup>1</sup>s<sup>1</sup>n* can probably be compared to Akk. *šušānu* which means ‘horse trainer or groom’ but more likely in the meaning of ‘title of deputies of the king or of other officials’ (CAD), possibly referring to a cavalierist. Compare also CAR. *Sā’is* ‘groom who has the care and management of a horse’ (Lane: 1466). The term likely followed a similar path as *rbs<sup>1</sup>rs<sup>1</sup>* (Esk 017) which was probably borrowed from Neo-Assyrian into Aramaic and into Taymanitic from there (see section 2.2.4, pg. 81 for the complete discussion of *rbs<sup>1</sup>rs<sup>1</sup>*).

For a discussion of the interpretation of *nṣr* as the equivalent of *nṣr* ‘to keep watch’ see section 2.2.3, pg. 79.

**WTay 17:**

*ʔl b ʔs<sup>1</sup>gt ns<sup>3</sup>r b-ḏr ----k----*  
 ‘ʔl son of ʔs<sup>1</sup>gt kept watch during the war ---?---’

**HE 40:**

*ḥkrn b ns<sup>2</sup>w b h-ḥdryt nṣr l-ṣlm*  
 ‘Ḥkrn son of Ns<sup>2</sup>w son of the sedentary woman/the woman from *Hḏr* kept watch for *Ṣalm*’

**WTay 32:**

*b----ᶜ nṣr l- ṣ[l] // {m} nṣr hzb*  
 ‘b...ᶜ kept watch vigilantly on behalf of *Ṣalm*’

For the discussion of the syntax of the inscription see section 2.6.2. The adverb *hzb* can be compared to CAR. *hayzab* ‘strong, fiery’ (Cohen & Cantineau 1999; Lane: 2893).

The *n* and the *r* of each line are facing in the same direction, which might suggest that the text of both lines is running in the same direction as well.<sup>79</sup> This could have been a decision made on aesthetic grounds however, as the *nṣr* forms are written right above each other. Since *nṣr* is part of the common formulae of the Taymanitic inscriptions, while reading the top line from right to left would yield a phrase that is more difficult to interpret, the reading proposed above seems preferable.

**WTay 20:**

*bhs<sup>2</sup>rkt nṣr b-ḏr ddn yr{ḥ} l-ṣlm*

‘*Bhs<sup>2</sup>rkt* kept watch during the war of Dadan for a month on behalf of *Ṣalm*’

**HE 34:**

*bhs<sup>2</sup>rkt nṣr l- ṣlm*

‘*Bhs<sup>2</sup>rkt* kept watch on behalf of *Ṣalm*’

**HE32:**

*S<sup>3</sup>l b ṭw nṣr s<sup>1</sup>nt /l- ṣlm*

‘*S<sup>3</sup>l* son of *ṭw* kept watch for a year on behalf of *Ṣalm*’

**WTay 11:**

*fḥk b ḥgg nṣr l- {ṣ}lm // b-ḏr / nbyt*

‘*Fḥk* son of *Ḥgg* kept watch on behalf of *Ṣalm* in the war of *Nbyt*’

**HE 25:**

*nṣr l-ṣlm*

‘he kept watch on behalf of *Ṣalm*’

**WTay 15:**

*nṣr l-ṣlm ṛm b fs<sup>1</sup>ḥ b- ḏr nbyt*

‘he kept watch on behalf of *Ṣalm*, *ṛm* son of *Fs<sup>1</sup>ḥ*, in the war of *Nabaioth*’

**WTay 33.1:**

*mntt nṣr b- ḏ[r] // ddn*

‘*Mntt* kept watch in the war of Dadan’

**WTay 16:**

*sr nṣr b- ḏ[r] // ms<sup>1</sup>{ṣ}*

‘*Sr* kept watch in the war of *Massā*’

---

<sup>79</sup>I would like to thank Michael Macdonald for pointing this out to me.

Winnett identifies the *ms*<sup>1)</sup> mentioned here with the *Massā* mentioned in Gen. 25:14, he connects it to a town *Mas'a* mentioned in an inscription of Tiglath-pileser III as URU *Ma-as-'a-a-a* (Winnett & Reed 1970: 101).<sup>80</sup>

**WTay 9.1:**

*fhk b hgg nšr l- šlm*  
 'Fhk son of Hgg kept watch on behalf of Šalm'

**WTay 14:**

*šmrf b hgg nšr {l-}š{l}m*  
 'Šmrf son of Hgg kept watch on behalf of Šalm'

**WTay 35:**

*hkdl b mk'l nšr // l-šlm*  
 'Hkdl son of Mk'l kept watch on behalf of Šalm'

**WTay 42:**

*{.}hm nš // r l-šlm //*  
 '.hm kept watch on behalf of Šalm'

**HE 21:**

*šmkfr / b 'gl {/} nšr // l- šlm*  
 'Šmkfr son of 'gl kept watch on behalf of Šalm'

## 4.7 *hl(l)* inscriptions

**JSTham 403:**

*Mr{'}l{š} // hl-t*  
 'Mr'lš, I was a soldier'

For a complete discussion of the form of the verb see the paragraph on II-weak roots - *hll* under section 2.5.1, pg. 94. For the inflection of the verb *hl(l)* see the paragraph on inflection of II *w/y* roots under 2.4.1, 90.

The verb *hll* occurs in several variations of a similar phrase. The most common phrase containing *hll* mentions *ddn*, the oasis Dadan (e.g. JSTham 513; Esk 167). Other places are mentioned sporadically, all such variations occur only once. Other forms that are mentioned in the same position as Dadan are: *'ft* (JSTham 511); *m* (possibly an unfinished inscription) (JSTham 343); *'dd* (TS\_13\_Al-Mushayrifah Tay 1) and *'t{m}{m}* (TS\_13\_Al-Mushayrifah Tay 2).

Even though the above mentioned phrases could work with an interpretation of *hll* as 'to stay', or even 'to be encamped', if one wants to pull the meaning closer to that of the inscriptions mentioning *hdd* 'to act as a border

<sup>80</sup>For an extensive survey of the Biblical and Akkadian sources mentioning the *Massā* see Eph'al (1982).

guard' and *nšr* to guard', the following examples have a much clearer sense when interpreting *ḥll* as 'to be a soldier'.

**Al-Anṣāry 35:**

*lm wdd / b ḥm / ḥll // b-z{y} s<sup>2</sup>n' / 'm ṣlm*

'By *Wdd* son of *Lḥm* he was a soldier against those of enmity of/against the people of *Ṣalm*'

For a discussion of *zy* as a plural relative pronoun see the paragraph on relative pronouns in section 2.7.2, pg. 97.

The *y* of *b-z{y}* is carefully hammered over, obliterating the circle at the top, but preserving the outline of the letter, leaving it still recognizable. This could indicate that the author was not sure on how to write what he wanted to express. This could be due to the ambivalent nature of diphthongs, if we assume a vocalized form /zay/ for the plural relative.

*B-zy s<sup>2</sup>n'* seems to form a headless relative clause similar to, for example, the name of the deity *dū-šara* (lit. that/he of the Šarā mountain range). If this interpretation is correct, the phrase can be interpreted as '(he served as a soldier) against those of enmity (of/against *Ṣalm*)'. This phrase in turn, seems to stand in construct with the following phrase '*m Ṣlm* 'the people of *Ṣalm*' (compare CAR. '*amm* 'a company of men, or of a tribe, a numerous company'; Off. Aramaic '*mm* 'world population, mankind' (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 865)).

**JSTham 517 + 512:**

*lm ṣmd<sup>c</sup> / b ṣmn<sup>c</sup>m / b s<sup>3</sup>r<sup>b</sup>n / ḥll b-z // y ḥyr {l}-ddn*

'by *Ṣmd<sup>c</sup>* son of *Ṣmn<sup>c</sup>m* son of *Ṭr<sup>b</sup>n* he acted as a soldier against those who aided Dadan'

This inscription is very similar in structure to Al-Anṣāry 35. In this inscription the *y* was not hammered over. The phrase *b-zy ḥyr* should be read as a headless relative clause; with *b-* indicating opposition together with the verb *ḥll* 'to serve as a soldier against' (see section 2.5.1, pg. 94) and *zy* as a plural relative pronoun. If this interpretation is correct the phrase could be interpreted as 'he served as a soldier against those who aided Dadan' lit. 'those of goodness to Dadan'. This interpretation has the benefit of fitting the content of the other inscriptions mentioning the war at Dadan (e.g. WTay 33.2) and being a soldier at/against Dadan (e.g. Esk 055).

There is some uncertainty concerning the reading of the *l* before *ddn*: in between the *l-* and *Ddn* in the final line, the top of the *l* and the *d* are connected to each other and seem to form a ligature together. In writing the name of his grandfather *s<sup>3</sup>r<sup>b</sup>n*, in the first line, the author connected the *b* and the *n* in a sort of ligature as well.

**Esk 059:**

*bmrt ḥl b-{'}ft*

'*Bmrt* was a soldier at *ft*'

**Esk 055:**

*lm rḥml / b bs<sup>1</sup>rt / ḥl / b-ddn*

‘by *Rḥml* son of *Bs<sup>1</sup>rt* he was a soldier at/against *Dadan*’

**Esk 104:**

*lm ṣ<sup>2</sup>{w/t} [sign] b d b lḥd // ḥll b-ddn*

‘by ṣ<sup>2</sup>{w/t} [sign] b d son of *Lḥd* he was a soldier at/against *Dadan*’

Even though it is a little curious that the author chose to write a sign in between the *b*- and his father’s name, his father was probably called *bd*. This name is attested abundantly in Safaitic (Harding 1971).

**WTay 9.2:**

*w-ḥr b nml b m ----m m s<sup>1</sup>mw*

‘and *Ḥr* son of *Nml* son of *m...* from *S<sup>1</sup>mw* ((tribal) name)(?)’

**Esk 020:**

*Lm fl{t} ḥl{l} b-{n}dr {b/ʿ}{ḥ/s<sup>2</sup>}r h-ḥwl*

‘by *Flt* he was a soldier at/against *Ndr* in the last part of the year (?)’

The *n* in *{n}dr* seems damaged, but given how narrow the letter is and the angle that is clearly visible on the left side of the glyph it should probably be interpreted as *n*. Based on the context of the inscription *Ndr* should probably be interpreted as a toponym or a tribal name. The penultimate word as *ḥr* appears to stand in construct with the *h-ḥwl* ‘the year, or cycle’ (cf. Esk 272). The root *ḥr* (CAR. *ḥur*) means ‘the back, latter part’ or ‘the last part’ (Lane: 31b). This could render ‘the last part of the year’ (Hayajneh 2011: 765). As seen in the *nṣr b-dr* inscriptions it is common in Taymanitic to add a temporal clause without a preposition (HE 32 and WTay 20).

**JSTham 343:**

*ḥll bm*

‘he was a soldier *bm*’

In most inscriptions the verb *ḥll* is followed by the preposition *b*-, the only exception to this is JSTham 403 and possibly the inscription at hand. The inscription seems to be complete so *m* is probably not the remnant of a damaged place-name; unless the author did not finish the inscription. Since most inscriptions include at least a personal name, it could be that the author of this text chose to diverge from the standard formula and wrote his name after the statement, similar to the author of the Esk 289.

**Esk 289:**

*ḥll b-ddn lm yws<sup>1</sup>l*

‘he was a soldier at/against *Dadan* by *Yws<sup>1</sup>l*’

**Esk 185:**

*lm s<sup>1</sup>mh / b qny / hl---*

‘by *S<sup>1</sup>mh* son of *Qny* he was a soldier...’

**Esk 167:**

*hl b-ddn*

‘he was a soldier at/against *Dadan*’

**Esk 054:**

*lm y<sup>z</sup>n hl b ddn*

‘by *Y<sup>z</sup>n* he was a soldier at/against *Dadan*’

**Esk 055 :**

*lm rhml / b bs<sup>1</sup>rt / hl / b ddn*

‘by *Rhml* son of *Bs<sup>1</sup>rt*, he was a soldier at/against *Dadan*’

## 4.8 *l twy* inscriptions

**HE 41:**

*lm {y}<sup>z</sup>rl / b lrm / mn s<sup>1</sup>m<sup>c</sup> / l- šlm l twy*

‘by *Y<sup>z</sup>rl* son of *Lrm*, whoever obeys *Šalm* will not perish<sup>81</sup>’

For the discussion of the form of *twy* see section 2.4.4, pg. 93.

**WTay 2:**

*lm / hb<sup>l</sup> b ‘gl / mn s<sup>1</sup>m<sup>c</sup> l- šlm l tw[y]*

‘by *Hb<sup>l</sup>* son of ‘*gl*, whoever obeys *Šalm* will not perish’

**HE 24:**

*w mn s<sup>1</sup>m<sup>c</sup> l-šlm l twy*

‘and whoever obeys *Šalm* will not perish’

**WTay 1.2:**

*lm z<sup>b</sup> mn s<sup>1</sup>m<sup>c</sup> l- šlm l twy*

‘by *Z<sup>b</sup>*, whoever obeys *Šalm* will not perish’

**HE 31:**

*b<sup>r</sup>l b klb // mn s<sup>1</sup>m<sup>c</sup> l šlm l twy*

‘*B<sup>r</sup>l* son of *Klb* whoever obeys *Šalm* will not perish’

---

<sup>81</sup>This translation was first proposed by Knauf (2011).

## 4.9 Assorted inscriptions containing verbal sentences

### TM.T. 020:

---kfrl b zbd // [n]šb [b-]yd-h ʾlht

‘... Kfrl son of Zbd set up a stele with his (own) hand [representing the] goddess<sup>82</sup>’

Even though there is a chip at the beginning of the second line, the edge of the *n* seems to be visible.

The *y* following *nšb* in the second line is written up side down, with its leg coming out the top of the circle instead of the bottom. While this is unusual for Taymanitic, there is one other example, similarly carved onto what seems to be a prepared surface (TM.T 013 *s<sup>1</sup>m{s<sup>3</sup>}/ b ḥry [wasm]*). The *y* in *znk rfty* (WTay 3) can also be interpreted as ‘up side down’ but since the inscription coils around the rock, this might have more to do with the position of the inscriber in relation to what he was writing, making it difficult to determine what would be ‘right side up’. On top of this, the proportion of the letter seems a little odd – a little short with a big circle and the circular base is very much in the middle of the line instead of to the bottom – but these are probably stylistic choices of the author of the inscription.

The translation proposed here largely follows that proposed by Macdonald (Macdonald & Al-Najem forthcoming) and interprets the verb as a third person masculine singular in the suffix conjugation, with the author of the text as its subject. The verb *nšb* seems to have been a transitive verb, taking the deity for/of which the stele was being set up as its direct object (compare Wadi al-Zaydāniyyah Tay 020). In order to understand the function of *yd-h* one may need to amend an instrumental proposition *b-* ‘by or with his hand’.<sup>83</sup> If it really needs to be amended I would consider it a writing error. The preceding *b* of *nšb* may seem to suggest a word boundary spelling, in which the preposition assimilated to the previous word, but there is no evidence for this practice in any ANA corpus outside of Safaitic.<sup>84</sup> Another option might be that the instrumental was marked by case, but since prepositions are used for this in the other Taymanitic inscriptions, this seems unlikely as well.

### WAMT 59:

*s<sup>1</sup>q<sup>c</sup> / s<sup>1</sup>l šl // m f {w}ʿl b mkʿl*

‘*S<sup>1</sup>q<sup>c</sup>* asked *Šalm* and *W<sup>c</sup>l* son of *Mkʿl* (too)’

*s<sup>1</sup>q<sup>c</sup>* is attested as a personal name in two other inscriptions (HE 36 and WTay 36). Although no other inscriptions with this form are attested, *f* should probably be interpreted as a conjunction and *w<sup>c</sup>l b mkʿl* as a personal name, meaning that they petitioned *Šlm* together.

<sup>82</sup>The translation follows Macdonald (Macdonald & Al-Najem forthcoming).

<sup>83</sup>I would like to thank Michael Macdonald for this suggestion (pc.).

<sup>84</sup>Al-Jallad, pc.

**JSTham 545 + 546 + 549 :**

*lm s<sup>1</sup>o<sup>s</sup>1 / b ns<sup>2</sup>{/}t // šlm / ʾnkd // {f} ys<sup>2</sup>hd*

‘by S<sup>1</sup>o<sup>s</sup>1 son of ns<sup>2</sup>t, may Šalm provide offspring (so) that it/he (posterity?) will bear witness(?)’

Winnett connects ʾnkd with Hebrew *nkd* ‘progeny, posterity, grandson’ (Winnett, unpublished, Study I: 6), in which case ʾnkd can be interpreted as a C-stem verb with an optative meaning ‘may he make/provide offspring’.

Hayajneh (2009b) proposes to connect ʾnkd with CAR. *nakad* ‘misfortune, to bring evil upon someone’ and *nakida* ‘to give sparingly, to be hard’ and to translate *šlm ʾnkd* as ‘Šalm did evil’ (*šlm tat unheil*) (Hayajneh 2009b: 80). Given the content of the other Taymanitic inscriptions, in which Šalm seems to function as the main deity of the oasis, it seems unlikely that someone would express their grief with him in such a public way.

Hayajneh (2009b: 76) reads the second part of Esk 083 (= JSTham 548) ʾl b-zy *šlm* as part of this inscription,<sup>85</sup> but the second part of the line seems to have been carved by a different author (see commentary on Esk 083 (part) in section 4.10).

The form *ys<sup>2</sup>hd* looks like a prefix conjugation of the root *s<sup>2</sup>hd* ‘to witness’ (compare CAR. *šahada* ‘to bear witness’; Sab. *s<sup>2</sup>hd* (Beeston et al. 1982: 132); *šhd* ‘to give testimony’ Imp. Aramaic and Palm. (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 1112)). It is not entirely clear what this would mean in this inscription.

**Esk 013:**

*<l> l bʾrl / rḏw šlm*

‘by Bʾrl, may Šalm be pleased’

For the meaning of *rḏw* as ‘may he be pleased’ compare other ANA corpora e.g. Hismaic (Tdr 9 (King 1990)); Heb. *ršy* and Off. Aramaic *rʿy* (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 1082); CAR. *raḏiya* ‘to be pleased, content’ (Lane: 1099b). See the paragraph on the reduction of final triphthongs in section 2.2.6, pg. 84 and section 2.4.2, for more on the form and function of *rḏw*. For the meaning of *rḏw* as ‘may he be pleased’ compare other ANA corpora e.g. Hismaic (Tdr 9 (King 1990)); Heb. *ršy* and Off. Aramaic *rʿy* (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 1082); CAR. *raḏiya* ‘to be pleased, content’ (Lane: 1099b). See the paragraph on the reduction of final triphthongs in section 2.2.6, pg. 84 and section 2.4.2, for more on the form and function of *rḏw*.

**WTay 3:**

*nšr / bʿgl / hlk / znk rfty /h- rkb*

‘Nšr son of ʿgl died, that is Rfty the riding camel’

Even though *hlk* seems to be used more neutrally as ‘to go’ in Esk 272 (see 2.2.3, pg. 75) using the specific meaning ‘to die’ (cf. *hlk* ‘to die’ in CAR. for example) seems to fit this inscription better, as it would be difficult to understand

<sup>85</sup>Hayajneh proposes either ‘so may god witness this Šalm’ (und daraufhin möge Gott in diesem *šlm* Zeuge sein) or ‘so may god ʾil (as judge) be a witness (in the matter of) Šalm’ (und daraufhin möge Gott ʾil (im Sinne von Richter) in der (angelegenheit) des *šlm* Zeuge sein) Hayajneh (2009b: 83) for the combined lines: *f-ys<sup>2</sup>hd ʾl b-zy šlm*.



why someone would leave without his camel. If *hlk* is indeed to be interpreted as ‘to die’ here, the camel may have been left as a burial offering, known as *baliyyah* (CAr.) or *bly* in Safaitic (Al-Jallad 2014: 222). The inscription is found on top of a rubble hill, which the camel would not have been able to reach. This might explain the distal demonstrative even if the camel was left as an offering.

There is also a drawing of a camel next to the inscription. In most cases inscriptions referring to drawings on the same rock use the basic form of the demonstrative for this. The usage of a distal demonstrative for this is not unique however (e.g. in Safaitic WH 516).

**Esk 272:**

*nʿml / b lbd // hrg / ddn {/} ʿl wnʿ // sʰg {b}-h k-dwrt / {f} hl // k / b{ʿ}sʰr-h / hwl[-h]*

‘*Nʿml* son of *Lbd* the destroyer of Dadan of the lineage of *Wnʿ*; he took the town by surrounding it, and (so) and [its] army was destroyed during its capture/ it remained in his captivity for a year’

The translation of the phrase *hrg ddn* as ‘destroyer of Dadan’ was first proposed by Macdonald (forthcoming: appendix 1).

The form *sʰg* in line 3 should probably be interpreted as a third person singular verb in the suffixing conjugation. Taymanitic *sʰg* from the root *\*√sʰwg* is comparable to Arabic *sāga* which can signify ease of entrance, thus *suḡ fī l-ʿarḍi mā waḡadta masāgan* ‘Enter thou into the land while thou findest a place of entrance’ (Lane: 1468b). In this inscription, the verb is transitive with the preposition *b-* introducing the direct object (compare e.g. *gzy b-X* (e.g. C2732) or *gzz b-X* (C 4452) ‘he raided X’ in Saf.). The difference in transitivity between the CAr. form and the Taymanitic form is probably due to the underlying stem-vowel; while the intransitive form probably came from a form *\*sʰayiga*, the form underlying the transitive form was likely *\*sʰayaḡa*. Due to the collapse of the triphthong in middle-weak verbs in both languages the formal distinction between the two was lost. The subject of the verb in this inscription would be the author of the inscription. The suffixed pronoun *-h* refers back to the city of Dadan, which was already mentioned in line 2.

The preposition *k-* would be used as an instrumental ‘by means of’. The form *dwrt* could be taken as a noun meaning ‘surrounding’ indicating that they took the city by means of surrounding (it), from the root *√dwr* ‘to turn, to revolve, to circle’ in CAr. (Lane: 930a) or ‘cycle’ in Heb. (HALOT 2028).

If the city of Dadan remains the subject of the verb *hlk* ‘to go’ (cf. Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 280-3), the following word *ʿsʰr* could be interpreted as a nominal form ‘captivity’ from the root *\*√sʰr* meaning ‘to take captive, be bound’ (CAr. Lane: 57-58; Sab. Beeston et al. 1982: 8) or ‘prisoner’ (e.g. KAI 181<sup>25f</sup>). The suffixed pronoun *-h* would in this case refer to the author in whose captivity the city was. For the verb *hlk* to fit into this interpretation it would have had to have undergone some kind of grammaticalization in this context, to go from meaning ‘to go’ to indicate being in a prolonged state of something ‘to go on’ or ‘to continue’ to end up in this context with the meaning ‘to remain’. The final word *hwl* ‘year’ can be interpreted as a temporal adverb, indicating for how long he had control over Dadan (compare CAr. *hawl* ‘year’ (Lane: 675c)).

Another option would be to interpret *hwl* as the subject of the verb *hlk*. In this case *hwl* is interpreted as ‘army’ and taken to have a meaning comparable to that in CAR. *ḥawl* ‘strength’ (*Lane*: 675c) and Off. Aramaic and Palm ‘force; armed force, army’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 369). In this case *hwl* would be connected to the verbs *hl* and *hll* in Taymanitic. Interpreting *hlk hwl[-h]* as ‘its army was destroyed’ would require the restoration of a suffixed pronoun *-h* however, at the end of the inscription, referring back to Dadan and making the army definite. The interpretation of *b-ʿsʳ-h* remains the same in both interpretations.

**Esk 169:**

ʿn / mrdn / {h}lm / nbnd / mlk / bbl // ʿtwt / m<sup>c</sup> / rbs<sup>1</sup>rs<sup>1</sup> / kyt // {.}{'}nm /  
 b- {f}l / tlw / b{d}t / l<sup>c</sup>  
 ‘I am *Mrdn* servant of Nabonidus king of Babylon, I came with chief  
 kyt.????<sup>86</sup>’

The inscription starts with a first person singular personal pronoun ʿn ‘I’. Thus far, there is only one other Taymanitic inscription known which starts like this (Esk 025). Such an introduction to an inscription is relatively rare in ANA in general (Müller & Al-Said 2001: 106). However, this is also attested in Safaitic (WH 1403b), Hismaic (KJC 646) and Thamudic C (e.g. Esk 2007 no. 095) and D (JSTham 637) (Hayajneh 2001: 82).<sup>87</sup> The fact that the author used this different introductory particle and does not follow any of the known Taymanitic formulae, together with his association with Nabonidus could be an indication that he was not from Taymāʿ.

Müller & Al-Said (2001), and Eskoubi (1999) propose to translate *hlm* as ‘friend’.<sup>88</sup> According to Müller & Al-Said (2001: 107) this meaning is attested in Arabic (*Lisān*: s.v.) and Ḥadramitic. In CAR. the semantics of the word are restricted to ‘friend of women’ however, and the attestation in Ḥadramitic seems to be a personal name on a pendant, which is not helpful for our understanding of the lexical item in Taymanitic. Hayajneh proposes to translate *hlm* as *glm* ‘youth, servant’ based on the usage of the glyph *h* to represent foreign *g* in Akkadian (Hayajneh 2001: 82-83). While this confusion does not seem to occur in any other Taymanitic inscription, it is not unlikely that this is also the origin of the CAR. meaning of the word *hlm* as ‘friend of women’, if we connect this to *glm* ‘youth’ or ‘boy slave’ with a possible semantic shift to eunuch. Therefore I will follow Hayajneh’s translation of this word.

The verb ʿtwt /ʿatawt(u)/ means ‘to come’ (*Lane*: 14) and is probably a first person singular suffixing form. The final weak root letter *w* is written out, in addition to forming evidence for the orthographic representation of diphthongs in certain environments, this also shows us that the verb was still ʿtw and not ʿty

<sup>86</sup>Reading of the final line is doubtful cf. Hayajneh (2001: 82-86) and Müller & Al-Said (2001: 106-109).

<sup>87</sup>For a comparison to this practice in Babylonian and Syriac inscriptions see Müller & Al-Said (2001: 106).

<sup>88</sup>As additional evidence for the translation of ‘friend’ for *hlm* Müller & Al-Said (2001: 107) mention an Old Sabaic title ‘Friend of X’ with the name of a king using the word *mwd*. This was in a different cultural context however, and as the author of this text presents himself as a friend of a Babylonian king, one would expect him to rather use a calque of a Babylonian title, than a Sabaic one.

as attested in Thamudic (Euting 306 = Hub 267), in late Sabaic and in Arabic (Müller & Al-Said 2001: 108).

For a discussion of the form *rbs<sup>1</sup>rs<sup>1</sup>* see section 2.2.4, pg. 81.

**Esk 052:**

*lm hkdl / b trbn / b lb / b 'rt{m}' / {y}rrt*  
 'by *hkdl* son of *trbn* son of *lb* son of 'rt{m}', I guarded'

For the interpretation of *yrr* as 'to guard' see section 2.2.6, pg. 84.

**JSTham 352:**

*b-šlm ntn-t*  
 'By *šalm*, I have made an offering'

Winnett (unpublished: Study I, 6) translated this inscription as 'Oh *šalm*, thou hast given'. It seems to have been quite rare however to refer to a person, mentioned within the inscription in the second person however. Most often *šalm* would be the subject of the inscription. On top of that, the preposition *b-* has not been attested elsewhere in the Taymanitic corpus with a vocative meaning. In Safaitic a number of vocative particles are attested: *h-*; *ʿy*; *hy*; *ʿyh*; *y* (Al-Jallad 2015: 158-9) CAR. uses a vocative *wā* (Fischer 2001: 96), but *b-* does not seem to have been used as such. There are other inscriptions that start with the preposition *b-* followed by a Theonym, but these are mostly interpreted as instrumental or benefactive: e.g. *b-rḏw ʿz bn Bhmt* (Esk 098) '(may) ʿz son of *Bhmt* be (entrusted) by *Rḏw*' or *b-Nhy h-s'rr* (Eskoubi 2007: 178) 'By (the power of) *Nhy* is the happiness' (Hayajneh 2011: 770).

**WTay 12:**

*y'zrl b ḥ{g}{g} ḥdd l-šlm*  
 'Y'zrl son of *Hgg* was a border guard for *šalm*'

For a discussion on the interpretation of *ḥdd* as 'to guard the border' and the form of the verb see section 2.5.1, pg. 94.

#### 4.10 Assorted inscriptions containing nominal sentences

**Esk 083 (part):**

*ʿl / b-zy šlm*  
 'Strength is with those of *šalm*'

Eskoubi (1999) reads this as part of Esk 083, Hayajneh (2009b) proposes to link all of Esk 083 to JSTham 545 and 546 to form one long inscription. Even though the technique of the beginning of Esk 083 is close to that of JSTham 545 and 546 and could be read together, JSTham 548 was inscribed using a very different technique from the other lines, and should therefore probably be considered a separate inscription (Macdonald, commentary db).

In order for the inscription to form a complete sentence *ʿl* should be read as a noun or a verb here. Translating *ʿl* as ‘strength, might’ like Hebrew *ʿel* (HALOT: 48) fits very well with the role *Ṣalm* had, as main deity of the oasis.<sup>89</sup>

For more on the plural relative *zy* see the paragraph on relative pronouns in section 2.7.2, pg. 97.

**WTay 37:**

---bdbwd // b h-mṣryt Wasm [?]

‘---(PN?) son of/with the Egyptian woman *Wasm*’

See section 2.3.3, pg. 88: *h-mṣryt* may have been a personal name.

**Esk 049:**

kfrʿl / b ʿrs<sup>2</sup> / bny hṣy / b rb{.} // b rttn

‘kfrʿl son of ʿrs<sup>2</sup> youngest son of(?) *Hṣy* son of *Rb.* son of *Rttn*’

See the section 2.3.3, pg. 89 for a discussion on *bny* as a diminutive form.

**WTay 9.2:**

w ḥrḏn mlk m ---m m s<sup>1</sup>mw

‘and *Ḥrḏn* king/PN(?) m ---m from *S<sup>1</sup>mw(?)*’

Address for Correspondence: f.kootstra@hum.leidenuniv.nl

---

<sup>89</sup>This translation was first suggested to me by Adam Strich (pc.)

## Appendix: Glossary

ᵛ

- ᵛhr** *noun.* end, last part. *sig:* Esk 020.  
 CAR. *ᵛḥūr* ‘the back, latter part, last part’ (*Lane:* 31b) or *ᵛāḥir* ‘the last’ (*Lane:* 32a). See also Hayajneh (2011: 765) for the translation ‘last part of the year’ for *ᵛhr h-ḥwl*.
- ᵛhrt** *noun.* posterity, offspring. *sig:* TA 02669.2 = DAI Tayma I.3.  
 Compare Dadanitic *ᵛhrt* ‘offspring’ (e.g. U6 Sima, 1999: 7) or Nab. *ᵛhr* ‘posterity’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 38).
- ᵛl** *noun.* strength. *sig:* Esk 083 (part).  
 Heb. *ᵛel* ‘might, strength’ (HALOT: 48)
- ᵛl** *noun.* family, lineage. *sig:* Esk 083 (part); Esk 272; DAI Tayma II.3; JSTham 426; Esk 111; Esk 128; JSTham 521.  
 CAR. *ᵛahl* ‘family’ (*Lane:* 121a); Saf. *ᵛhl* ‘family’ (e.g. AbaNS 1128; C 88; HaNSB 307 cf. Al-Jallad 2015)
- ᵛns<sup>1</sup>** *noun.* mankind. *sig:* Kim CIMG 0759. Tay (unpublished); TM.T.024.  
 CAR. *nās* ‘men, mankind’ (*Lane:* 113); Aramaic *ᵛnš* (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 85).
- ᵛs<sup>1</sup>** *noun.* chief. *sig:* Kim CIMG 0759. Tay (unpublished); TS 13 Al-Khabu al-Sharqi Tay unpub 1; TM.T.011; Esk. 044.2; Esk. 263; TM.T.023; Esk. 147.  
 Heb. *ᵛš*; Sab. *ᵛys*. This translation was first suggested by Macdonald (1992: 31) see his article for an elaborate discussion (cf. Hayajneh 2009a: 78-80 for an alternative interpretation).
- ᵛs<sup>3</sup>r** *infinitive or noun.* (to be) captive; or trace, place. *etymological root:* *\*ᵛsr* or *\*ᵛtr*. *sig:* Esk 272.  
 CAR. *ᵛasara* ‘to take captive, be bound’ (*Lane:* 57-58); Sab. *ᵛs<sup>3</sup>r* ‘to take captive, be bound’ (Beeston et al. 1982: 8); Ug. *ᵛasr*; Can. *ᵛāsar* ‘to capture’; Aramaic *ᵛsr* ‘to capture’ (Cohen & Cantineau 1999: 28). OR Off. Aramaic *ᵛtr*, Pun. *ᵛšr* ‘place; trace’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 125-127); Sab. *ᵛtr* ‘on (b-) the track of someone’ (Beeston et al. 1982: 9).
- ᵛtw** *verb.* to come. *sig:* Esk 169.  
 CAR. *ᵛatā* the root *ᵛtw* (marked as a dialectal variation of *ᵛty*) (*Lane:* 14b) and *ᵛty* (*Lane:* 15c) are both attested; Tham. *ᵛty* (Eut 306 = Hub 167); Also *ᵛty* in late Sabaic (Müller & Al-Said 2001: 108).

c

- ᵛft** *toponym.* ᵛft. *sig:* Esk. 059.  
 The reading of the first letter of the toponym is uncertain

- ‘m** *noun.* people. *etymological root:* \*‘**mm.** *sig:* Al-Anṣāry 35.  
 CAR. ‘*amm* ‘a company of men, or of a tribe, a numerous company’; Off. Aramaic ‘*mm* ‘world population, mankind’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 865).
- B**
- b** *noun.* son. *etymological root:* \***bn.** *sig:* e.g. TA. 09302; WTay 37; Esk 052.  
 CAR. ʾ**ibn**; Heb. *bin*; Aramaic *bar*.
- bʿl** *noun.* (land) owner. *sig:* Kim CIMG 0759. Tay (unpublished).  
 In this inscription *bʿl* occurs in a specific construction *bʿly Tm* ‘landowners of Taymā’. The construction ‘*bʿly* + place name’ occurs in the Aramaic part of the trilingual Lycian, Greek, Aramaic inscription found at Xanthos (dated 358 B.C.) (Teixidor 1978: 182) and in a petition to the governor of Judaea (Cowley 1923: No.30<sup>22</sup>) in which it can be translated as ‘landowners’ or ‘inhabitants’. The phrase *bʿly* + toponym also occurs in Sabaic (e.g. C 155; 457; Ja 559).
- bḥs<sup>2</sup>** *verb.* to examine? *sig:* Kim CIMG 0759. Tay (unpublished).  
 probably a borrowing from Aramaic *bḥš* ‘to examine’ (cf. 2.2.4, pg. 82) compare CAR. *baḥaṭa* ‘to search for, or after something’ (Lane: 155bc)
- bny** *noun.* little son? *etymological root:* \***bn.** *sig:* Esk 049. See: **b**.
- D**
- ddn** *toponym.* name of the ancient oasis of Dadan - modern-day ʾal-ʿUlāʾ, near Tayma. *sig:* Esk 017.1; WTay 20; HE 39; WTay 22; WTay 21; WTay 23.1; WTay 33.1; WTay 33.2; Esk 104; Esk 289; Esk. 054; TM.T.024; Esk. 055.
- dwr** *noun.* surrounding *etymological root:* \***dwr.** *sig:* Esk 272.  
 CAR. √*dwr* ‘to turn, to revolve, to cycle’ (Lane: 930a); Heb. √*dwr* ‘cycle’ (Koehler et al. 1995-2000: 2028).
- Ḍ**
- ḍbʾ** *noun.* soldier. *sig:* Esk 031.  
 Heb. *šāvāʾ* ‘to go forth to battle, to wage war’ (HALOT: 994), *šbʾ* ‘army’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 955); In Akkadian *šābu* could be used to indicate a group of people in general, workers, or soldiers (CAD, vol.16, 46).
- ḍr** *noun.* war, affliction. *etymological root:* \***ḍrr.** *sig:* WTay 20; WTay 21; WTay 23.1; WTay 33.1; WTay 33.2; WTay 11; WTay 13; WTay 15; WTay 16; WTay 17.  
 CAR. *ḍarrah* ‘necessity, need; hardness, distressfulness, or afflictiveness of a state or condition’ (Lane: 1776b) *Variant:* **ḍrr?** (WTay 22).

**ḍrr** *verb.* Go to war. *sig:* HE 39.  
D-stem See: **ḍr**.

**F**

**fʿl** *verb.* do. *sig:* Esk 023; Esk 026; TA. 09303; TA 09302.  
CAr. *faʿala* ‘to do’

**Ġ**

**ġlm** *noun.* junior, youth. *sig:* Philby 279 ay; Esk 001.  
CAr. *ġlām* ‘a young boy, youth, boy, or male child’ (*Lane:* 2286b)

**H**

**hlk** *verb.* die, go. *sig:* WTay 3; Esk 272.  
CAr. *halaka* ‘to die’ Arabic is the only language in which *halaka* came to mean solely ‘to die’ a euphemism based on its original meaning ‘to go’. Compare e.g. Nabataean, Phoenician, Palmyrene where both meanings ‘to go (away)’ and ‘to die’ are attested (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 282).

**hrg** *participle.* destroyer. *sig:* Esk 272.  
Uncertain interpretation CAr. *haraga* ‘to kill’ (*Lisān:* s.v.); Sabaic *hrg* ‘to kill’; Old Aramaic *hrg* ‘to kill’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 293). Reading proposed by Macdonald (Macdonald & Al-Najem forthcoming).

**hzb** *adverb.* strongly, zealously. *sig:* WTay 32.  
CAr. *hayzab* ‘strong, fiery’ (Cohen & Cantineau 1999; *Lane:* 2893).

**Ḥ**

**ḥlm** *noun.* servant *sig:* Esk 169.  
CAr. *ḥilm* ‘friend of women’ (*Lisān:* s.v.); probably connected to \**ġlm* ‘youth, servant’ (see Hayajneh 2001: 82-83). For an alternative interpretation of *ḥlm* see Müller & Al-Said (2001: 107)

**ḥyr** *noun.* good. *sig:* Esk. 058.  
CAr. *ḥayr* ‘good’

**Ḥ**

**ḥdd** *verb, D-stem.* act as border guard. *sig:* WTay 12.  
CAr. *ḥadd* ‘a limit or boundary of a land or territory’ (*Lane:* 525b, c)

- ḥdryt** *noun.* the settled woman, the woman from *ḥḍr*. *sig:* HE 17; HE 40.  
 Could be a personal name instead of a proper noun. Feminine *nisbah* form. CAR. *ḥaḍariy* ‘urban, settled’ is the opposite of *badawiy* ‘nomad, desert dweller’ (*Lisān: s.v.*); Heb. *ḥṣr* ‘enclosed area or pasture, village’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 400). Note that *ḥṣr* occurs in Teixidor (1962) he read it as *ḥṣry* ‘settlers’ but changed this in 1963, when he read *ḥṣdy* (line 2) as ‘the harvesters’ after the root *ḥṣd* ‘to harvest’, but there is nothing in the text to suggest that this should be read as harvesters rather than as settlers (<√*ḥṣr*). His argument is based on the fact that the inscription was found in a very fertile area, but this would encourage settling as well. Therefore the original interpretation seems preferable. *Ḥḍr* is also used as name for towns, so it could refer to a woman from a specific town called *Ḥḍr*. There are two places in Yemen that are called al-Ḥaḍra’, one in Jawf area and the other in Ibb. There is also one in Egypt in the Alexandria region (Ḥaḍrah) (*geonames.org*, accessed on 13-4-2014).
- ḥl** *verb, G-stem.* to be a soldier. *etymological root: \*ḥwl.* *sig:* TA 02669.1 = DAI Tayma I.3.  
 CAR. *ḥawl* ‘strength’; Off. Aramaic and Palm. ‘force; armed force, army’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 369) See: **ḥll**.
- ḥll** *verb, D-stem.* to be a soldier. *etymological root: \*ḥwl.* *sig:* Esk 104; Esk 020; Al-Anṣāry 35; JSTham 403; JSTham 343; Esk 289; Esk 185; Esk 167; Esk. 059; Esk. 054; Philby 279 ap; TM.T.024; TM.T.041; Esk. 055.  
 CAR. *ḥawl* ‘strength’ e.g. *lā ḥawla wa-lā quwwata ʾillā bi-llāhi l-ʿalliyi l-ʿaẓimi* ‘there is no strength or power but in (or by means of) God, the High, the Great’ (*Lane: 675c*); Off. Aramaic and Palm. ‘force; armed force, army’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 369). See: **ḥl**.
- ḥwl** *noun.* year. *sig:* Esk 272; Esk 020.  
 CAR. *ḥawl* ‘year’ (*Lane: 675c*)
- L**
- lmq** *toponym(?).* *lmq.* *sig:* TA 02669.1.  
 uncertain interpretation
- M**
- mlk** *noun.* king. *sig:* WTay 9.2; Esk 169.  
 CAR. *Mālik*; Heb. *Malk*.
- ms<sup>1)</sup>** *proper name.* Massā’. *sig:* WTay 16.  
 Winnett identifies the *ms<sup>1)</sup>* mentioned here with the Massā’ mentioned in Gen. 25:14, he connects it to a town Mas’a mentioned in an inscription of Tiglath-pileser III as <sup>URU</sup>*Ma-as-ʾa-a-a* (Winnett & Reed 1970: 101) (For an extensive survey of the Biblical and Akkadian sources mentioning the Massā’ see Eph’al 1982).
- mṣr** *toponym.* Egypt. See: **mṣryt**.



**mšryt** *feminine adjective, nisbah*. Egyptian (woman). *sig*: WTay 37.

Could be a personal name. See: **Mšr**.

## N

**nby** *proper name*. Nebaioth. *sig*: WTay 11; WTay 13; WTay 15.

This form cannot be a reference to the Nabataeans (*nbṭ(w)* CAr. *nabaṭ*, *ʿanbāṭ*) for one would have to explain both the loss of the *y* and the change *ṭ* > *t*. (For more on the possible location of the Nabaioth in ancient times see Winnett & Reed 1970: 100).

**ndr** *toponym*. Or tribal name {N}dr. *sig*: Esk 020.

**nk** *verb*. smite. *etymological root*: \***nky**. *sig*: Esk 023 ; Esk 026.

in NWS Semitic commonly ‘to hit’, or ‘to smite’ e.g. Old Aramaic *nky* ‘to strike, to hit’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 730).

**nšb** *verb*. set up a stele. *sig*: TM.T 020.

Off. Aramaic *nšb*; Nab. *nšb*; Palm. *nšb* ‘to erect, to raise’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 749)

**nšr** *infinitive*. watch; guard. *etymological root*: \***nṯr**. *sig*: WTay 32.

CAr. *naṣara* ‘to look at’ (*Lane*: 2810c); Old Aramaic *nšr* ‘watch, protect’; Off. Aramaic, Nab. *nṯr* ‘to watch, to protect’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 754-755). See: **nṯr**; **nšr**.

**nšr** *verb*. guard, watch. *etymological root*: \***nṯr**. *sig*: WTay 20; HE 32; WTay 33.1; WTay 11; WTay 15; WTay 16; WTay 9.1; WTay 14; WTay 32; WTay 35; WTay 42; HE 17; HE 40; HE 21; HE 25; HE 34.

CAr. *naṣara* ‘to look at’ (*Lane*: 2810c); Old Aramaic *nšr* ‘watch, protect’; Off. Aramaic, Nab. *nṯr* ‘to watch, to protect’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 754-755). See: **nṯr**; **nšr**. Variant: **nṯr** (WTay 17).

Given the formulaic nature of the inscriptions it seems that the author was intending to write *nšr*. The *ṯ* could be a misreading of a *š*, especially since only a copy is available of this inscription (see Winnett & Reed 1970: 102). If we should indeed read a *ṯ*, the confusion of *ṯ* and *š* could indicate that *š* was still realized as an affricate [tʃ] in Taymanitic, which was confused with the fricative [θ]; or that the reflex of *ṯ* had the same pronunciation as that of *š*.

**ntn** *verb*. give. *sig*: JSTham 352; Philby 279 ap.

Heb. *ntn* ‘to give’

## R

**rʿy** *noun*. chief. *sig*: Esk 031.

CAr. *ri'y* 'pasture' (*Lane*: 1109b); the root can also be used with the meaning shepherd in Hebrew (Clines 1993) and in Amorite names (Knudsen 1991: 870, the name *i-la-ra-ḥi-a* < *ila-rā'īya* 'el is my shepherd'). In Akkadian, *r'y* could be used to refer not just to shepherding cattle, but also metaphorically extended to mean guiding or leading people (CAD, vol.14, 309). In combination with the word *šābu* it could be used to refer to a 'foreman of the team, shepherd of the team' (CAD, vol.16, 46) (*re-' šā-bi* (Lu II, iii, 11'f)).

**rbs<sup>1</sup>rs<sup>1</sup>** *noun*. chief. *sig*: Esk 169.

originally a compound noun from Akkadian *rab ša rāši* which referred to a high administrative and military official in Assyrian and Babylonian. This title was borrowed from Neo Assyrian into Aramaic with a simkat as srs. It is also attested in Biblical Hebrew as *rab sārīs* (Hayajneh 2001: 83).

**rḏw** *verb*. to please, to be pleased. *sig*: Esk 013.

In other ANA corpora e.g. Hismaic (Tdr 9 (King 1990)); Heb. *ršy* and Off. Aramaic *r'y* (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 1082); CAr. *raḏiya* 'to be pleased, content' (*Lane*: 1099b)

**rkb** *noun*. riding camel. *sig*: WTay 3.

CAr. *rukūb* can refer to any animal that one rides, but in particular to a she-camel (*Lane*: 1144a).

**rm** *noun*. lancer. *etymological root*: \*rmy. *sig*: Philby 279 ay.

CAr. *ramā* 'to throw'

**r[ʔ]s<sup>1</sup>** *noun*. chief. *etymological root*: \*r's<sup>1</sup>. *sig*: TA 09303.

An alif should probably be amended in the inscription: *r[ʔ]s<sup>1</sup>*. CAr. *ra's* 'head' and *ra'īs* 'head, chief, commander' (*Lane*: 996a)

**S<sup>1</sup>**

**s<sup>1</sup>l** *verb*. ask. *sig*: WAMT 59; TM.T.039; TM.T.027.

**s<sup>1</sup>m<sup>c</sup>** *verb*. listen. *sig*: WTay 2; WTay 1.2; HE 41; HE 31; HE 24.

**s<sup>1</sup>nt** *noun*. year. *sig*: HE 32; TM.T.041.

**S<sup>2</sup>**

**s<sup>2</sup>bt** *noun*. Saturday? *sig*: Philby 279 ap.  
uncertain context

**s<sup>2</sup>n<sup>ʔ</sup>** *noun*. enmity. *sig*: Al-Anšāry 35.

Hayajneh (2011: 765) first suggested this interpretation.

**S<sup>3</sup>**

**s<sup>3</sup>ḡ (b-)** *verb*. to open (it). *etymological root*: \*s<sup>3</sup>wḡ. *sig*: Esk 272.

Compare CAR. *sāga* ‘to be easy, accessible, lawful’ (*Lane*: 1468b). The Taymanitic form is probably derived from a transitive base *\*sawağa*, as opposed to the intransitive Arabic form from *\*sayiğa*.

## Ş

**şlm** *proper name*. Şalm, the main deity of Taymā<sup>3</sup>. *sig*: Esk 083 (part); JSTham 352; Esk 013; WTay 20; HE 32; WTay 11; WTay 15; WTay 9.1; WTay 14; WTay 35; WTay 42; HE 17; HE 40; HE 21; HE 25; HE 34; Al-Anşāry 35; Philby 279 ap; WTay 2; WTay 1.2; HE 41; HE 31; HE 24; WAMT 59; TM.T.039.

## T

**tm<sup>3</sup>** *toponym*. Taymā<sup>3</sup>. *sig*: Kim CIMG 0759. Tay (unpublished).

**twy** *noun*. perishing. *sig*: WTay 2; WTay 1.2; HE 41; HE 31; HE 24.  
CAR.: compare the phrase *lā tawā ‘alā māli ‘amriyyin muslimin* ‘there shall be no perishing of the property of a man that is a Muslim’ in a tradition (Mgh.) (*Lane*: 323c). This translation was first proposed by Knauf (2011).

## Y

**yd<sup>c</sup>** *verb*. know. *etymological root*: *\*wd<sup>c</sup>*. *sig*: Kim CIMG 0759. Tay (unpublished).  
CAR. *wada‘a* ‘to know’ ; Heb. *yāda<sup>c</sup>* ‘to know’

**yrḥ** *noun*. month. *etymological root*: *\*wrḥ*. *sig*: WTay 20.  
Heb. *yereaḥ* (HALOT: 437-8); Sab. *wrḥ* ‘month’ (Beeston et al. 1982: 162).

**yrr** *verb*. guard. *etymological root*: *\*wrr*. *sig*: Esk 052.  
CAR. *Warwara* ‘to watch, to stand guard’ (*Lisān*: s.v.); Mod. Ar. *waraya* ‘to show, to let s.o. see’ (Kurpershoek 2005: 349).

## Sigla

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| AH          | Taymanitic inscriptions in Abū al-Ḥasan (2002).  |
| Al-Anṣāry   | Taymanitic inscriptions in Al-Anṣāry & Abū al-Ḥasan (1423/2002).   |
| BHT         | Van den Branden (1960).  |
| BIT         | Inscriptions in Van den Branden (1950).  |
| BM 34167    | Royal Chronical, published by Lambert (1968/1969).   |
| C           | Ryckmans (1950-1951).  |
| CAD         | Roth et al. (1956-2010).   |
| EALL        | Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics (electroning edition).   |
| Esk         | Eskoubi (1999).  |
| Euting      | Euting (1914).   |
| Facey       | Inscriptions discovered in and around Tayma before 1985 and photographed by William Facey during the construction of the Tayma Museum. |
| HALOT       | Koehler et al. (1995-2000).  |
| HCH         | Harding (1953).  |
| HE          | Inscriptions published in Parr, Harding, & Dayton (1970).  |
| HU          | Inscriptions copied by C. Huber and re-numbered in Van den Branden (1950).   |
| Hub         | Huber (1891).  |
| IGLS        | Sartre (1982).   |
| IMA         | Institut du Monde Arabe. An exhibition held there in which two unpublished Taymanitic inscriptions were exhibited.                     |
| Ja          | Jamme (1962)   |
| JaL         | Dadanitic (formerly Liḥyanite) inscriptions published by Jamme.  |
| JSTham      | Thamudic inscriptions in Jaussen & Savignac (1909-1922).   |
| JSLih       | Dadanitic (former Liḥyanite) inscriptions in Jaussen & Savignac (1909-1922).   |
| KAI         | Donner & Röllig (1996)   |
| Kim CIMG    | Photographs taken in and around Taymā' by Dr Kim. The photos were subsequently sent to M.C.A. Macdonald.                               |
| KJC         | The Hismaic inscriptions from site C in King (1990).   |
| KTU         | Dietrich et al. (1976).  |
| <i>Lane</i> | Lane (1863-1893).  |
| Liv.        | Inscriptions from Tayma published by Alasdair Livingstone in Livingstone et al. (1983)   |
| Mu          | Inscriptions recorded on the SESP surveys 1996–2003 (to appear on OCIANA).   |
| Philby      | Philby (1957).   |
| RES         | See RES in bibliography.   |

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| TA            | The registration numbers of the inscriptions discovered during the Saudi-German excavations at Tayma (Macdonald forthcoming). |
| TM.T +<br>no. | The number of the inscription in the Catalogue of the Inscriptions in the Tayma Museum (Macdonald & Al-Najem forthcoming).    |
| TS            | Inscriptions in Jamme (1967).   |
| U             | Inscriptions from al-Uḏayb in Sima (1999)   |
| WAMT          | Taymanitic, Hismaic, and "Thamudic" inscriptions in Winnett (1971)  |
| WH            | Winnett & Harding (1978).   |
| WTay          | Taymanitic inscriptions in Winnett & Reed (1970).   |
| ZeWa          | Zeinaddin, F. (2002). Unpublished inscriptions on fax to M.C.A. Macdonald.  |

## References

- Abū al-Ḥasan, A. 2002. *Nuqūš Liḥyāniyyah min Miṭṭaqat al-ʿUlā*, Riyadh: Ministry of information, Department of antiquity and museums.
- Al-Anṣāry, A. & Abū al-Ḥasan, A. 1423/2002. *Taymāʿ. Muṭṭaqā al-ḥaḍārāt*, Riyadh: Dār al-qawāfil.
- Al-Jallad, A. 2014. On the genetic background of the ʿgl bn hfʿm grave inscriptions at Qaryat al-Faw, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 77 (3): 1–21.
- 2015. *An Outline of the Grammar of the Safaitic Inscriptions*, (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 80), Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Al-Jallad, A. & al Manaser, M. 2015. New Epigraphica from Jordan I: a pre-Islamic Arabic inscription in Greek letters and a Greek inscription from north-eastern Jordan, *Arabian Epigraphic Notes*, 1: 51–70.
- Ball, M.J., Müller, N., & Munro, S. 2001. Patterns in the acquisition of the Welsh lateral fricative, *Clinical linguistics and Phonetics*, 15 (1): 3–7.
- Beaulieu, P. 1989. *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon, 556–539 B.C.*, Yale Near Eastern researches 10, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Beeston, A.F.L., Ghul, M.A., Müller, W.W., & Ryckmans, J. 1982. *Sabaic Dictionary (English-French-Arabic)*, Louvain-la-Neuve: Peeters.
- Benz, F.L. 1972. *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions*, Rome: Biblical Institute.
- Bordreuil, P. & Pardee, D. 1995. Un Abécédaire du type sud-sémitique découvert en 1988 dans les fouilles archéologiques françaises de Ras Shamra-Ougarit, *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 139 (3): 855–860.
- Van den Branden, A. 1950. *Les inscriptions thamoudéennes*, (Bibliothèque du Muséon 25), Louvain: Institut Orientaliste de l'Université de Louvain.

- 1960. *Histoire de Thamoud*, Beirut: al-Jamiah al-Lubnaniyah.
- Brockelmann, C. 1908-1913. *Grundriss der vergleichende Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, Berlin: Reuther & Reichard.
- Clines, D.J. 1993. *The dictionary of classical Hebrew*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Cohen, D. 1976. *Dictionnaire des Racines Sémitiques; ou attestés dan les langues sémitiques*, Paris: Mouton.
- Cohen, D. & Cantineau, J. 1999. *Dictionnaire Des Racines Sémitiques Ou Attestées Dans Les Langues Sémitiques*, Leuven: Peeters.
- Corriente, F. 2004. Geminata imperfectives in Arabic masked as intencice stems of the verb, *Estudios de dialectología nortefricana y andalusí*, 8: 33–57.
- Cowley, A.E. 1923. *Aramaic papyri of the fifth century B.C.*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- D'Agostino, F. 1994. *Nabonedo, Adda Guppi, il deserto e il dio Luna : storia, ideologia e propaganda nella Babilonia del VI sec. a.C.*, (Quaderni di orientalistica, 2), Pisa: Giardini.
- Dalley, S. 1986. The God Salmu and the Winged Disk, *Iraq*, 48: 85–101.
- Dietrich, M., Loretz, O., & Sanmartín, J. 1976. *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit: Einschlieslich der keilalphabetischen Texte ausserhalb Ugarits. Teil 1. Transkription*, (Alter Orient und Altes Testament, 24), Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Verlag Butzon und Bercker/Neukirchener Verlag.
- Donner, H. & Röllig, W. 1996. *Kanaanaische und Aramaische Inschriften*, Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.
- Doughty, C.M. 1884. *Documents épigraphiques recueillis dans le Nord de l'Arabie par M. Charles Doughty*, edited by R. Ernest, Paris: Imprimerie nationale.
- Eksell, K. 2002. *Meaning in Ancient North Arabian carvings*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell international.
- Eph'al, I. 1982. *The Ancient Arabs : Nomads on the Borders of the Fertile Crescent, 9th-5th Centuries B.C.*, Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- Eskoubi, K.M.A. 1999. *Dirāsah Taḥliyyah Muqārinah li-Nuqūš min Miṇṭaqat (Ramm) Ġanūb Ġarb Taymā'*, Riyadh: Wazārat al-Ma'ārif.
- 2007. *Dirāsa Taḥliyyah Muqārinah li-Nuqūš min Miṇṭaqat Ramm bayna Tlētūwwāt wa-Qī'an al-Šanī'*, Riyadh: Dārat al-Malik 'Abdal'aziz.
- Euting, J. 1914. *Tagebuch einer Reise in Inner-Arabien*, Hamburg: SOLDI-Verlag.
- Farès-Drappeau, S. 2005. *Dédan et Lihyan: histoire des Arabes aux confins des pouvoirs perse et hellénistique, IVe–Ile s. avant l'ère chrétienne*, (Travaux de la Maison de l' Orient 42), Lyon: Maison de l' Orient et de la Méditerranée.

- Fischer, W. 2001. *A Grammar of Classical Arabic: Third Revised Edition*. Translated by Jonathan Rodgers, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Gianto, A. 2011. Ugaritic, in: *Languages from the world of the Bible*, H. Gzella, ed., Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, pp. 28–54.
- Goetze, A. 1946. The Akkadian Masculine Plural in –ānū/ī and its Semitic Background, *Language*, 22: 120–130.
- Guillaume, A. 1963. The Arabic Background of the Book of Job, in: *Promise and Fulfilment: Essays Presented to Professor S.H. Hooke*, F.F. Bruce, ed., Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, pp. 106–127.
- Gzella, H. 2011. North West Semitic in general, in: *Languages from the world of the Bible*, H. Gzella, ed., Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, pp. 425–451.
- Hayajneh, H. 2001. First evidence of Nabonidus in the Ancient North Arabian inscriptions from the region of Taymāʿ, *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies*, 31: 81–95.
- Harding, G.L. 1953. The Cairn of Haniʿ, *Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan*, 2: 8–56.
- 1971. *An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions*, (Near and Middle East 8), Toronto: Toronto University Press.
- Hasselbach, R. 2007. Demonstratives in Semitic, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 127 (1): 1–27.
- Hausleiter, A. 2010. The Oasis of Tayma, in: *Roads of Arabia; Archaeology and History of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*, A.I. Al-Ghabban, B. André-Salvini, F. Demange, C. Juvin, & M. Cotty, eds., Paris: Musée du Louvre, pp. 219–261.
- Hayajneh, H. 1998. *Die Personennamen in den qatabānischen Inschriften*, (Texte und Studien zur Orientalistik 10)., Hildesheim/Zürich/New York: Olms.
- 2009a. Ancient North Arabian-Nabataean bilingual inscriptions from southern Jordan, *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies*, 39: 203–222.
- 2009b. Die frühnordarabischen taymānischen Inschriften und die Frage der Antipathie gegen den Gott Ṣlm in der Region von Taymāʿ, in: *Philologisches und Historisches zwischen Anatolien un Sokotra; Analecta Semitica In Memoriam Alexander Sima*, W. Arnold, M. Jursa, W. Müller, & S. Procházka, eds., Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, pp. 73–104.
- 2011. Ancient North Arabian, in: *The Semitic languages: an international handbook*, S. Weninger, ed., Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, pp. 756–781.
- Hayajneh, H. & Tropper, J. 1997. De Genese Des Altsudarabischen Alphabets, *Ugarit Forschungen*, 29: 183–198.
- Hetzron, R. 1976. Two principles of genetic reconstruction, *Lingua*, 38 (2): 89–108.

- Hoffman, Y. 1996. *A Blemished Perfection. The Book of Job in Context*, (Journal for the Study of Old Testament Supplement Series, 213), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Hoftijzer, J. & Jongeling, K. 1995. *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions I-II, with Appendices by R.C. Stein, A. Mosak Moshave and B. Porten*, (Handbuch der Orientalistik. I. Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 21), Leiden: Brill.
- Huber, C. 1884. Inscriptions Recueillies Dans L' Arabie Centrale, *Bulletin de la Société de Géographie*, 7 (5): 289–303.
- 1891. *Journal d'un voyage en Arabie, 1883-84*, Imprimerie Nationale: Paris.
- Huehnergard, J. 1995. Semitic languages, in: *Civilizations of the ancient near east*, J.M. Sasson, ed., New York: Simon & Schuster, pp. 2117–2134.
- forthcoming. Arabic in its Semitic context, in: *Arabic in Context*, A. Al-Jallad, ed., Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Huehnergard, J. & Rubin, A. 2011. Phyla and waves: Models of classification of the Semitic languages, in: *The Semitic languages: an international handbook*, S. Weninger, ed., Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, pp. 259–278.
- Jamme, A. 1962. *Sabaeen Inscriptions from Mahram Bilqîs (Mârib)*, (Publications of the American Foundation for the Study of Man 3), Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.
- 1967. *Thamudic Studies*, Washington, D.C.
- Jaussen, A. & Savignac, M.R. 1909-1922. *Mission archéologique en Arabie*, vol. 1-5, Paris: Leroux/Geuthner.
- Joüon, P. & Muraoka, T. 2009. *A grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, Rome: Biblical Institute.
- Kazimirski, A. 1860. *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français, contenant toutes les racines de la langue arabe, leurs dérivés, tant dans l'idiome vulgaire que dans l'idiome littéral, ainsi que les dialectes d'Alger et de Maroc*, 2 vols, Paris: Maissonneuve.
- King, G.H.M. 1990. *Early North Arabian Ḥismaic. A Preliminary Description Based on a New Corpus of Inscriptions from the Ḥismā Desert of Southern Jordan and Published material*, Ph.D. thesis, School of Oriental and African Studies.
- Knauf, E.A. 2010. Arabo-Aramaic and 'Arabiyya: from Ancient Arabic to Early Standard Arabic, 200 CE – 600 CE, in: *The Qur'ān in context: Hisotirical and literary investigations into the Qur'ānic milieu*, A. Neuwirth, N. Sinai, & M. Marx, eds., Leiden/Boston: Brill, pp. 197–254.
- 2011. Thamudic, in: *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, L. Edzard & R. de Jong, eds., Leiden/Boston: Brill, vol. 4, pp. 477–483.
- Knudsen, E.E. 1991. Amorite grammar. A comparative statement, in: *Semitic Studies in Honor of Wolf Leslau on the Occasion of his Eighty-Fifth Birthday*, A.S. Kaye, ed., Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 866–885.



- Koehler, L., Baumgartners, W., Richardson, M.E.J., & Stamm, J.J. 1995-2000. *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament I–V*, Leiden: Brill.
- Koenen, L. (ed.) 2013. *The Petra papyri II*, Amman: American Center of Oriental Research.
- Kurpershoek, M.P. 2005. *Oral poetry and narratives from central Arabia, vol. 5; Voices from the desert*, Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Lambert, W.G. 1968/1969. A New Source for the Reign of Nabonidus, *Archiv für Orientforschung*, 22: 1–8.
- 1972. Nabonidus in Arabia, *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian Studies*, 5: 53–64.
- Lane, E.W. 1863-1893. *An Arabic-English Lexicon*, London: Williams & Norgate.
- Lipiński, E. 1997. *Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar*, (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 80), Leuven: Peeters.
- Livingstone, A., Spaie, B., Ibrahim, M., Kamal, M., & Taimani, S. 1983. Taimā': Recent Soundings and New Inscribed Material (1402 AH — 1982 AD), *Atlat*, 7: 102–116.
- Macdonald, M. & Al-Najem, M. forthcoming. Catalogue of the inscriptions in the Taymā' Museum; I: Inscriptions not found in the Saudi-German excavations.
- Macdonald, M.C.A. 1991. HU 501 and the use of *s*<sup>3</sup> in Taymanite, *Journal of Semitic studies*, 36 (1): 11–25.
- 1992. North Arabian epigraphic notes – I, *Arabic archaeology and epigraphy*, 3: 23–43.
- 1997. Trade routes and trade goods at the northern end of the 'incense road' in the first millennium B.C., in: *Profumi d'Arabia*, A. Avanzini, ed., Roma: L'Erma' di Bretschneider, pp. 333–349.
- 2000. Reflections on the linguistic map of pre-Islamic Arabia, *Arabian Archaeology and Epigraphy*, 11: 28–79.
- 2006. Burial between the Desert and the Sown: Cave-Tombs and Inscriptions near Dayr Al-Kahf in Jordan, *Damaszener Mitteilungen*, 15: 273–301.
- 2008. Ancient North Arabian, in: *The Ancient Languages of Syria-Palestine and Arabia*, R.D. Woodard, ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 179–224.
- 2010. Ancient Arabia and the written word, in: *The development of Arabic as a written language*, M.C.A. Macdonald, ed., Oxford: Archaeopress, pp. 5–28.
- forthcoming. *Taymā' Aramaic, Nabataean, Dadanitic, and Taymanitic inscriptions from the Saudi-German excavations at Taymā' 2004–2015*.

- Müller, W.W. 1982. Das Altarabische und Klassisch Arabisch, in: *Grundriss der arabischen Philologie*, W. Fischer, ed., Wiesbaden: Reichert, pp. 19–29.
- Müller, W.W. & Al-Said, S.F. 2001. Der babylonische König Nabonid in Taymā'nischen Inschriften, *Biblische Notizen*, 107: 109–119.
- Oppenheim, A.L. 1969. Mesopotamia – Land of many cities, in: *Middle Eastern cities*, I.M. Lapidus, ed., Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press, pp. 3–18.
- Pardee, D. 2008. Ugaritic, in: *The ancient languages of Syria-Palestine and Arabia.*, D. Woodard, ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 5–35.
- Parr, P.J., Harding, G.L., & Dayton, J.E. 1970. *Preliminary Survey in NW Arabia, 1968*, London: Institute of Archaeology.
- Philby, H.S.J.B. 1957. *The land of Midian*, Ernest Benn Limited: London.
- RES 1900-1968. *Répertoire d'Épigraphie Sémitique*, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Roth, M.T., Biggs, R.D., Brinkman, J.A., Civil, M., Farber, W., Reiner, E., Stolper, M.W., Gelb, I.J., Landsberger, B., Oppenheim, A.L., & Jacobson, T. (eds.) 1956-2010. *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, vol. 1-21, Chicago/Glückstadt: Oriental Institute/J.J. Augustin Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Ryckmans, J. (ed.) 1950-1951. *Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum Pars V*, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Sartre, M. 1982. *Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie. tome XIII, fasc. 1. Bostra, no 9001 à 9472*, (Bibliothèque archéologique et historique, 113), Paris: Geuthner.
- Sass, B. 2005. *The Alphabet at the Turn of the Millennium. The West Semitic Alphabet ca. 1150-850 BCE. The Antiquity of the Arabian, Greek and Phrygian Alphabets*, (Tel Aviv. Occasional Publications 4), Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology.
- Sima, A. 1999. *Die lihyanischen Inschriften von al-Udayb (Saudi-Arabien)*, (Epigraphische Forschungen auf der Arabischen Halbinsel 1), Leidorf: Rahden/Westf.
- Stein, P. 2003. *Untersuchungen zur Phonologie und Morphologie des Sabäischen*, (Epigraphische Forschungen auf der Arabischen Halbinsel, 3), Rahden/Westf.: Marie Leidorf GmbH.
- Teixidor, J. 1962. The Syriac Incantation Bowls in the Iraq Museum, *Sumer*, 18 (1): 63–64.
- 1978. The Aramaic text in the trilingual stele from Xanthus, *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 37 (2): 181–185.
- Tropper, J. 2000. *Ugaritische Grammatic*, Münster: Ugarit Verlag.
- Wallin, G.A. 1850. Notes Taken during a Journey through Part of Northern Arabia, *Journal of the Royal Geographical Society*, 20: 293–344.

- Wellsted, J.R. 1838. *Travels in Arabia*, London: John Murray.
- Winnett, F.V. 1937. *A Study of the Lihyanite and Thamudic Inscriptions*, (University of Toronto Studies — Oriental Series 3), Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- 1971. An Arabian Miscellany, *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli*, 31 [N.S. 21]: 443–454.
- 1980. A reconsideration of some inscriptions from the Tayma area, *Proceedings of the Seminar for Arabian studies*, 10: 133–140.
- unpublished. *Studies in Thamudic*.
- Winnett, F.V. & Harding, G.L. 1978. *Inscriptions from Fifty Safaitic Cairns*, (Near and Middle East Series 9), Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Winnett, F.V. & Reed, W.L. 1970. *Ancient Records from North Arabia*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Wright, W. & Caspari, C. 1859. *A grammar of the Arabic language: translated from the German of Caspari*, London/Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate.

