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Foreword

The third volume of Arabian Epigraphic Notes contains a rich collection of studies, covering the diverse epigraphic landscape of Arabia. Z. Al-Salameen and Y. Shdaifat publish a new Nabataean inscription from the Moab plateau, dated to year 29 of Aretas IV. This is a precious addition to the small corpus of Nabataean texts from this region. S.A. Al-Zaidi shifts our attention to the late 2nd and early 1st millennium BCE. Studying cuneiform sources in the light of Arabian epigraphy, Zaidi makes a compelling argument that the term *udru* was the generic term for the dromedary, only shifting to mean ‘bactrian camel’ after extensive contact with North Arabians introduced the *Camelus dromedarius*. This article is the first published in *AEN* to deal with cuneiform sources, and underscores the importance of dialogue between different ancient corpora.

Part II of A.Q. Al-Housan’s series of Safaitic inscriptions from the Mafrak Museum edits a rich collection of texts: twenty-one previously unpublished inscriptions. Drawing on advances in epigraphy, combined with a sound historical linguistic approach, M. van Putten reconstructs the development of triphthongs in Arabic, from the earliest times to the dialect of the Qur’anic consonantal Text. His study sheds important light on how the Qur’an must have been pronounced before the canonization of the reading traditions, the so-called *qirāʾāt*. A. Al-Jallad publishes an important addendum to the *An Outline of the Grammar of the Safaitic Inscriptions* (2015), anticipating the appearance of the second edition in 2018.

M. Arbach takes us to ancient Yemen, where he gives an outline of the state of the paleographic dating of the South Arabian inscriptions, concluding that letter shapes alone do not suffice for establishing the chronology of texts. M.I. Ababneh publishes a new Safaitic square-script inscription from northeastern Jordan. The text further confirms that this hand was typical of the lineage group ‘mrt. L. Nehmé provides the final contribution of this volume: an edition of eighteen inscriptions from the region of al-Jawf in Saudi Arabia (ancient Dūmah). Seventeen of these texts are Nabataean and date to the 1st and 2nd centuries CE, while one is in the Arabic script proper and dates to the 6th century. It is the first pre-Islamic Arabic-script inscription from North Arabia and sheds revealing light on the understanding of the development of the Arabic alphabet from its Nabataean antecedent. The discovery of a 6th-century Arabic inscription in North Arabia fills an important lacuna in the distribution of the Arabic script, which was previously only attested in Syria and Najran, and suggests that many more related texts remain to be discovered in North and West Arabia. Arabian Epigraphic Notes 3 underscores the fact that Arabian Epigraphy as a field is in its infancy. Each year brings new discoveries that have the potential to change radically our understanding of Arabia’s history and languages.

AHMAD AL-JALLAD
A New Nabataean Inscription from the Moab Plateau*

Zeyad al-Salameen (Al-Hussein bin Talal University)
Younes Shdaifat (Mu’tah University)

Abstract

This paper deals with a new unpublished Nabataean inscription found in al-ʿAdnāniyah town, which is located to the north of Mu’tah in the Governorate of Karak in southern Jordan. The inscription represents a new addition to the corpus of Nabataean inscriptions from the Moab Plateau. The text, which is dated to the 29th year of Aretas IV, mentions the construction of Ḥabūʾ, a term that has not been attested previously in Nabataean.
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1 Introduction

The inscription dealt with here was found in al-ʿAdnāniyah town, which is located approximately 2 km to the north of Mu’tah in the Governorate of Karak in southern Jordan. The coordinates of the site, which lies about 1170 m above the sea level, are 31.122007 and 35.692656.

Al-ʿAdnāniyah, which was called Miḥna in the accounts of early travelers and explorers, was visited by several explorers such as Seetzen (1810: 416), Irby & Mangles (1823: 113), Mauss & Sauvaire (1867: 484), Tristram (1873: 117), Doughty (1888: 22), Brūnnow & von Domaszewski (1904–1909 I: 103), Musil (1907–1908: 19, 77, 152, 362, 365) and Glueck (1939: 99–100). The site has been referred to in these accounts as a large ruined village.

Several Nabataean graffiti and inscriptions have been found in the Moab plateau and these include short texts uncovered in Dhāṭ Rās (Zayadine 1970: 131–132; El-Maani 1996), al-Batra (El-Maani & Kareem 1999: 133) and in Zgaybeh to the west of al-Qaṣr (Worschech 1985: 171). The text that is dealt with in our current paper constitutes an important addition to the corpus of

*Many thanks are due to John Healey and Laïla Nehmé for reading the draft version of this paper and their valuable comments and suggestions.

1The ancient name was Miḥna but it has been changed recently by the local inhabitants because of its negative meaning in Arabic: “catastrophe, disaster” (Knauf 1991: 284).
known texts from the Nabataean period in Moab. Moreover, other inscriptions were found at the site and those were dated to the Byzantine and Islamic periods (Canova 1954: 281–284).

Miller’s archaeological survey in the Moab Plateau yielded about 967 pottery sherds from al-ʿAdnāniyah. These were dated to the period between the Late Bronze Age and the Ottoman period, including sherds dated to the Nabataean period (Miller 1991: 113). These indicate that the site was continuously and densely inhabited during these periods.

Figure 2: General view of the courtyard and the cave
2 The Text

The text was found in the courtyard of one of the traditional houses that were exposed by some treasure hunters (figure 2). We are thankful to Moawiyah Ad-Dhmour, a student in the Department of Archaeology and Tourism at Mu’tah University, for drawing our attention to this remarkable stone.

The stone was seemingly placed originally at the entrance of a nearby cave which might have been a tomb that was sealed by a side door built of soft, dressed limestone blocks approximately 70 cm in height and 45 cm in width. The cave was looted and partially damaged.

The text was incised on a hard and irregular limestone block that measures approximately 72 cm by 51 cm. Its thickness is about 23 cm. The surface of the stone is even and it is naturally flat.

The text consists of five lines and the length of the first line is about 46 cm and the average height of the letters is 7 cm. The letters are irregular in size and the spacing between them is not identical. They can be clearly read except in the last part, which has been defaced, and the part that bears the last word is seemingly broken.

As far as paleography is concerned, one point is worth mentioning here. The form of the letter τ, with a loop round the left stroke, is usually found in texts from the late 2nd to the 4th century AD and it is surprising to find it here in a text dated to the reign of Aretas IV, both in medial and final position (for discussion see Nehmé 2010). This confirms that a particular letter shape cannot be used as an absolute method to date a text but may only give a general and hypothetical indication.

The text reads as follows:
2.1 Transliteration

dʾ rbʿyʾ dy ʿbd
ḥbrw br ʾwšw ḫʾlḥ
gʾyʾ bšnt ʾṣryn
wtšʾ ḫḥʾt
mlk nbṭwk ṭḥm [ʾmh]

2.2 Translation

This is the “resting-place or (square) plaque” which ḥbrw son of ʾwšw con-
structed for the god of Gaia in the year twenty-nine of (the reign of) Aretas,
king of the Nabataeans, lover of his [people].

2.3 Commentary

rbʿyʾ: “resting-place” or “(square) plaque”.

This word is not found in this current form in Nabataean, but there are
other forms derived from the root rbʿ attested in Nabataean and they are found
in texts referring to religious constructions and dedications.

The root of the word is related to the Semitic root rbʿ that has different
meanings. The word rabaʿa ʿrabaʿa has different meanings in Arabic and one of
them is “remained, abode, dwelt”, while marbaʿ َمَرْبَع means “house” (Lane 2003: 128). Another meaning of this word is “four” and it may refer to structure with four corners. Nehmé linked the word with the Semitic root rbḍ “lie down” and concludes that the words ʾrbʿnʾ and rbʿtʾ mean “ritual couches” dedicated to gods (2003). ʾrbʿnʾ and rbʿtʾ are attested in inscriptions found in Sidon (CiS II 160), Cos (Levi Della Vida 1938), Tell esh-Shuqafiyyeh (Fiema & Jones 1990: 240), Kharabā (Dussaud & Macler 1903: 313), Boṣrā (Littmann 1914: 71), Umm as-Surāb (Littmann 1914: 2), Petra (Nehmé 2003: fig. 9) and ʿIrwāḥ in southern Arabia (Nebes 2006: 10).

The following table summarizes the Nabataean texts that contain rbʿtʾ and ʾrbʿnʾ:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rbʿtʾ</td>
<td>Kharabā</td>
<td>The name of the divinity to whom the text was dedicated is missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[r]bʿtʾ</td>
<td>Boṣrā</td>
<td>The name of the divinity to whom the text was dedicated is missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾrbʿnʾ</td>
<td>Umm as-Surāb</td>
<td>The name of the divinity to whom the text was dedicated is missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rbʿtʾ</td>
<td>Tell esh-Shuqafiyyeh</td>
<td>Records a dedication of a rbʿtʾ to Dushara of Daphne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rbʿtʾ</td>
<td>Sidon</td>
<td>Records a dedication of a rbʿtʾ to Al-ʿUzzā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rbʿtʾ</td>
<td>Petra</td>
<td>The name of the divinity to whom the text was dedicated is missing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rbʿtʾ</td>
<td>Cos</td>
<td>Records a dedication of a rbʿtʾ to Al-ʿUzzā.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rbʿtʾ</td>
<td>ʿIrwāḥ</td>
<td>Records a dedication of a rbʿtʾ to Dushara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**dy**: a well-known relative pronoun meaning “which, that”.

**bd**: “made, constructed”. This verb occurs frequently in Nabataean Aramaic, Hebrew, Palmyrene and Hatran (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 1029).

**ḥbrw**: This is the name of the dedicator. It is attested twice in two Nabataean inscriptions discovered in Sarmadāʾ in Saudi Arabia (Al-Theeb 2014: nos. 11, 76). It may be compared with ḥbr and ḥbrm that are found in pre-Islamic Arabian inscriptions (Harding 1971: 84).
This name is common in Nabataean inscriptions and occurs in Nabataean in other forms such as ʾwyšw and ʾwšʾlh (Negev 1991: 11). It occurs frequently in Pre-Islamic Arabian inscriptions (Harding 1971: 84).

lʾlh gʾyʾ: Gaia is to be identified with modern-day Wādī Mūsā. This toponym goes back to the Nabataean period and is attested in Nabataean in inscriptions uncovered in Oboda, al-Jawf, Wādī Rum and Wādī Mūsā (Negev 1963: 113–117; Savignac & Starcky 1957: 198; Savignac 1934: 574–575). It originated from the Semitic word gyʾ, which means "valley, a place where the waters flow together, low plain" (Gesenius 1844: 194). This name appears in different forms in Nabataean theophoric personal names such as ʾmtʾlgʾ, ʾbdʾlgʾ (Littmann 1914: n. 9, cis II 157, 173, 1205) and ʾbdʾlgʾ (cis II 3138), meaning "the servant of (the god) of Eljī" (Al-Khraysheh 1986: 127; Negev 1991: 788, 790). The word gy is attested also as a tribal name in Hismaic inscriptions (King 1990: nos. 42, 647). For more details about Gaia, see Al-Salameen & Falahat (2012).

Who was the “god of Gaia”?

Al-ʿUzzā and al-Kutbā are linked with Gaia, and their names appear in an inscription from ʿAyn esh-Shallaleh in Wādī Rum (Savignac 1934: 574–575, no. 17; Strugnell 1959: 29–31). The term “the god of Gaia” is mentioned three times in Nabataean:

1. In an inscription found in el-Mʿeiṣrehto the north of the Petra city centre. This refers to the dedication of an ʾgnʾ, “basin”, to ʾlh [ʾ]gʾ ʾlhʾ “Ilāh al-Gia, the god” (Dalman 1912: no. 35).

2. In a dedicatory inscription from al-Jawf which confirms that there was a sanctuary, mḥrmtʾ, dedicated to Dushara the god of Gaia, ʾdwšrʾ ʾlh gʾyʾ" (Savignac & Starcky 1957: 196–217).

3. In a dedicatory inscription from Oboda that refers to the members of the mrzḥʾ of Dushara the god of Gaia, ʾdwšrʾ ʾlh gʾyʾ" (Negev 1963: no. 10).

It appears that Dushara, who was the major Nabataean deity, was the god of Gaia. He was given many titles and described as “Lord of the House (temple)”, “Lord of heaven and earth”, “God of our Lord (the king)” and “the one who separates night from day” (Zayadine 2003: 59).

bšnt ṣʾryn wtšʿ: bšnt “in the year of”. ṣnt is a feminine singular noun “year” which appears frequently in dated Nabataean texts. The word is followed then by the year when the text was written: ṣʾryn wtš “in the year twenty-nine” of Aretas IV, which is AD 20.

lḥrtt mlk nbṭw rḥm ['mh]: “of (the reign of) Aretas, king of the Nabataeans, lover of his [people]”. This formula is common in Nabataean.

3 Conclusion

This article discussed a new Nabataean inscription found in Moab (southern Jordan), dated to the 29th year of Aretas IV (AD 20). It mentions the construc-
tion of ṭrbʾyʿ, a term that has not been attested previously in Nabataean. The text represents a new additional supplement to the previously known Nabataean inscriptions from the Moab Plateau.

Addresses for Correspondence:
zeyad.mahdi@gmail.com, younis777@yahoo.com
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CIS II Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, Pars Secunda, Inscriptio-nes Aramaicas Continens, 1889.
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Betwixt and Between the Bactrian Camel and the Dromedary: The Semantic Evolution of the Lexeme udru during the 11th to 8th Centuries BCE

Sayyid-Ali Al-Zaidi (York University)

Abstract
This paper strives to overturn the general consensus that has formed over the past three decades on the identification of the Akkadian lexeme udru as exclusively designating the Bactrian camel (Camelus bactrianus). This general opinion does not appreciate the semantic evolution of the lexeme udru during the Iron Age. By examining references to udru in Mesopotamian texts from a diachronic perspective, we can outline the semantic evolution of the lexeme. It will be demonstrated that the lexeme udru without any qualifications designated the camel in general and the dromedary in particular during the 11th to 9th centuries BCE. Only after the Assyrians defeated the Arabians in the 8th century BCE and became better acquainted with the dromedary (Camelus dromedarius), did the lexeme udru start to designate the Bactrian camel in particular.

Keywords: Akkadian Assyria Camel Animal names Animal husbandry

1 Introduction

Over the past three decades, there has been a trend to associate the Indo-Iranian loanword udru1 solely with the Bactrian camel (Camelus bactrianus) in Akkadian (Heide 2010: 349; CAD U/W: 22). Ever since Wolfgang Heimpel’s (1980: 331) *My deepest gratitude goes to Michael C.A. Macdonald of the University of Oxford, Carl S. Ehrlich of York University, and Ed J. Keall of the Royal Ontario Museum for taking the time to read the drafts to this paper and for providing their invaluable criticisms. I would like to thank K. Martin Heide of Philippus-Universitit Marburg for his notes, corrections and comments on this paper. I would also like to thank Piotr Michalowski of the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor for his encouraging comments in publishing this paper.

1Plu. udru, fem. udratī, masc. udru, udūrī. Although we don’t know from which Indo-Iranian language the Akkadian lexeme udru was borrowed, the word for camel in the Avesta and the Rig Veda is uṣṭra/uṣtra (उष्ट्र). However, it is difficult to derive udru from uṣṭra (Bulliet 1975: 154–155, 304 n. 32). It is possible that udru was borrowed from an Indo-Iranian people that used a cognate of Sanskrit voḍhr (वोढ़ ‘drawing, bearing, carrying, bringing, or one who bears or carries; draught horse or bull’, Avestan vaḍhr ‘pulling’ to derive their word for camel (cf. Bulliet 1975).
identification of *udru* as *Trampeltier*, the ‘Bactrian camel’, many scholars have followed Heimpel’s lead, such as Wolfram von Soden (1965–1981 3: 1401), Daniel Potts (2004: 153, 161), who states that the translation of *udrate* as dromedaries “is surely wrong”, and Martin Heide (2010: 348–349), who went so far as to declare that *udru* “exclusively designated the Bactrian camel”. Unlike the consensus that has evolved on the identification of the Sumerian terms *AM.SI.KUR.RA* ‘elephant of the mountain(-land)’ and *AM.SI.HAR.RA.AN* ‘elephant of the road’ as designations for the Bactrian camel, and *ANŠE.A.AB.BA* ‘donkey of the sea’ as the dromedary (*Camelus dromedarius*) (Heide 2010: 348; Magee 2015: 267), the growing consensus on the identification of *udru* as exclusively designating the Bactrian camel in Akkadian, irrespective of the time period, is problematic because it does not appreciate the semantic evolution of the lexeme *udru* during the Iron Age.

2 11th to mid-9th Centuries BCE

The earliest attestation of the lexeme *udru* appears on the Broken Obelisk (11th century BCE), which states that Aššur-bēl-kala (1074/3–1057/6 BCE) dispatched merchants who acquired *ud-ra-a-te*₅₄. He bred herds of *ud-ra-a-te* and displayed them to the people of his land (Grayson 1991: 103–104). Later, Tukulti-Ninurta II (890-884 BCE) received 30 *ud-ra-te* from Hindanu, a city on the Middle Euphrates river in Iraq (Grayson 1991: 175). Ashurnasirpal II (883-859 BCE) also received *ud-ra-a-te* from Hindanu (Grayson 1991: 200). Whether the camels of Aššur-bēl-kala and Hindanu were dromedaries or Bactrians depends on the identification of *udru*.

3 9th century BCE

The lexical evolutions during the reigns of Shalmaneser III (859–824 BCE) and Šamši-Adad V (824–811 BCE) can facilitate the identification of *udru*. Assyrian scribes referred to Bactrian camels from Gilzānu, which was located west/southwest of Lake Urmia in northwestern Iran, in the following man-

---

2 However, in a personal communication (October 9, 2016) Heide has since overturned his opinion: “I changed my opinion about the ‘udru.’ E.g., I do not think any more that ‘udru’ is a term for ‘Bactrian camel;’ I rather think it is a term for ‘camel’ generally, comprising both dromedaries and Bactrian camels” (cf. Sad, ‘udru’).

3 This is a reference to the Zagros Mountains (Heide 2010: 348).

4 Heide notes, “In *am.si.har.ra.an*, the Akkadian word *harrānum* ‘way; road’ or ‘journey; caravan’ seems to refer primarily to the use of the Bactrian camel in caravan trading” (Heide 2010: 348). With the exception of the appearance of *AM.SI.HAR.RA.AN* in the Sumerian love song Dumuzi-Inanna P, col. iii, lines 24-25, (restored in *CAd I/J*: 2), the terms *AM.SI.HAR.RA.AN* and *AM.SI.KUR.RA* seem to occur only in lexical texts, cf. the Sumerian term *gū.gur* (camel?) (see Steinkeller 2009; Yuhong 2010).

5 However, in a personal communication (October 10, 2016) Heide now views these terms as “possible designations,” and notes, “Both terms, similarly as *udru*, are never explicitly identified as Bactrian camels by the Assyrian scribes.”
Based on the fact that the dromedary was never referred to in any text as an anše a.ab.ba, am.si.kur.ra, am.si.ḫar.ra.an, udru, ibilu with ‘one hump’, Heide (2010; 2011: 348-50, 360) rightly concludes that the dromedary was seen as the usual form of the camel, whilst the Bactrian camel was seen as a special form of the camel.

This notion that the Assyrian scribes saw the dromedary as the usual form of the camel is supported by inscriptions on the Black Obelisk (9th century BCE), where the Bactrian is referred to as an anše a.ab.ba (dromedary) with two humps, as well as an inscription from Calah (Nimrud) (9th century BCE), which states that Šamsi-Adad V brought ANŠE ud-ra-a-ti ša 2.TA.ÂM iš-qu-ib-ti ‘camels with two humps’ from the mountain fortifications of Mēsu, a mountain city in northwestern Iran (Grayson 1996: 149–150, 185). The inscription from Calah displays the full semantic value of udru: first, it employs the word ud-ra-a-ti with the qualification ‘with two humps’ for the Bactrian, and second, it adds ANŠE (donkey) to ud-ra-a-ti as in the case of ANŠE A.B.A.BA. The term ANŠE ‘donkey’ was used for the domesticated dromedary, which was controlled by a strap around the muzzle like a donkey (ANŠE), hence ANŠE A.B.A.BA ‘donkey of the sea’, whereas the Bactrian, which was controlled by a nose peg, was referred to as an elephant (AM.SI) as in AM.SI.KUR.RA ‘elephant of the mountain(-land)’ and AM.SI.HAR.RA.AN ‘elephant of the road’.10

8 Streck notes that the alleged spelling ta-ma-ra-te is conspicuous and should be read clearly as ú-du-ri (SAD, ‘udru’).

9 Streck argues that this was probably a scribal error in which the scribe did not understand the foreign word udru in a vorlage and misread ú-du- as ta-ma-=tam(a)- (SAD, ‘udru’, ‘tamru’). In a personal communication (October 10, 2016) Heide supports this theory in lieu of his previous suggestion that it was possibly a typo for tam-ra(-a)-te, which in turn should be read as ud-ra-a-ti because tam is the same sign as ud (Heide 2010: 349). Heide’s previous interpretation seems more plausible given that ú-du- and ta-ma- are completely different signs.

10 The earliest use of the West Semitic loanword gammalu/gamlu ANŠE GAM.MAL for the camel appears on the Kurkh Stele of Shalmaneser III in reference to the Battle of Qarqar in 853 BCE to which Gindibu the Arab brought 1 LIM ANŠE gam-ma-lu (1,000 camels) (Grayson 1996: 23). Of note is a ration list (tablet 269) discovered at Alalakh (level VII) and dated to the 18th century BCE. According to Wiseman, line 59 Ǧ bağlıנאא ANŠE GAM.MAL* (NIP), ‘one (measure) as fodder for the camel’. However, Lambert challenged this reading, stating that GAM.MAL is not attested until later Assyrian texts, and ANŠE GAM.MAL* should be read ĐARA.MAŠ ‘stag’. Alternatively, Wolfram von Soden has suggested ANŠE.GUR.NUM.[NA] (= kūdana(m)) ‘mule’. In a personal communication (October 10, 2016) Heide noted that von Soden’s suggestion “not only respects the actual cuneiform signs that were collated by Wiseman in 1959, but also proposes an animal that fits better into the general context” (Wiseman 1953: plate XXXII; Wiseman 1959: 29, 33; Bulliet 1975: 64; Lambert 1960: 42; Von Soden 1965–1981: 498–499).

Akin to the Sumerian term for the horse, ANŠE.KUR.RA ‘donkey of the mountain(-land)’, for the scribes to employ ANŠE ‘donkey’ to describe the dromedary reveals their understanding of the animal: the dromedary’s condition in the Mesopotamian context was similar to that of the donkey.
4 8th century BCE

During the mid-8th century BCE there was another lexical evolution. In the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III (745–727 BCE) there was an expansion in the Assyrian lexicon on camel typology. In reference to Bactrian camels brought from the mountains and lands east of Assyria, the scribes employed ANŠE ud-ra-a-te like the Calah Stele of Šamši-Adad V but dropped the qualification ‘with two humps’ (Tadmor 1994: 108). When the Assyrians received tribute from cities, peoples and tribes in Arabia, such as the Sabaeans, Tayma, and Qedar, the scribes referred to the male dromedary as ANŠE A.AB.BA or ibilē, the she-camel as SAL/MUNUL ANŠE a-na-q-a-a-te, and their young as ANŠE ba-ak-ka-ri (Tadmor 1994: 88, 108). It appears that these terms are Arabian loanwords appropriated by Assyrian scribes after Tiglath-Pileser III defeated the Arabians (Livingstone 1997: 260). It is clear that as the Mesopotamians became more familiar with the camel their terminology was refined to the point of technical precision.

5 Conclusion

The technical terminology found in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III is a mid-late 8th century BCE phenomenon. To transpose mid-late 8th century BCE semantics to 11th to 9th centuries BCE usage is anachronistic given that the camel was an animal with two distinct species, at times interbred (Potts 2004: 160–161), and was foreign to the Mesopotamians. The dromedary did not become commonplace until the 8th century BCE. This anachronistic reading is responsible for leading Heide to declare that udru exclusively designated the Bactrian even though he noticed that “even when the Assyrian scribe employed the term udru for the Bactrian camel, he pointed sometimes in a tautological fashion to the fact that it was two-humped” (2010: 349). The qualification ‘two-humped’ would only seem tautological if one assumed the 8th century BCE semantics for udru. Had the qualification appeared in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III, it may be regarded as tautological given the precise terminology used therein. However, the qualification does not appear in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser III. Therefore, it stands to reason that from the 11th to 9th centuries BCE, udru had a similar meaning to our contemporary understanding of the word ‘camel’, i.e. it may refer to either the dromedary or the Bactrian, or camels in general but it is most often culturally associated with the dromedary. Therefore, when explicitly expressing the Bactrian, the scribes employed the qualification ‘with two humps’, a point which can be demonstrated by mining through the Sumerian-Akkadian urra (ḫubullu) and

First, a muzzle strap was used for the dromedary like the donkey rather than the nose peg for the Bactrian (Bulliet 1975: 149–150). Second, the dromedary was seen as a mount and beast of burden in a role akin to that of the donkey. Both characteristics demonstrate a domesticated animal. Either or both of these features may have inspired the scribes to refer to the dromedary as ANŠE. For an analysis of the references to ANŠE A.AB.BA in a domesticated context in 14th to 13th century BCE texts see Heide (2010: 346–348, 351–354, 359–360).
urgud lexical series and other lists containing fauna.\footnote{Heide (2010: 350) concludes, “The dromedary was not regarded as a novelty which had to be defined by its relative, the Bactrian camel, which had been domesticated already in the 3rd millennium, but vice versa: the Bactrian camel was in the lexical lists and sometimes also in campaign reports and in contract-letters defined by going back to the common terms used for the dromedary in the 2nd millennium.”} This also explains why udru was never assigned to AM.SI.KUR.RA ‘elephant of the mountain(-land)’ and AM.SI.HAR.RA.AN ‘elephant of the road’ in the urra and urgud lexical series (cf. Heide 2010: 349).\footnote{In a personal communication (October 10, 2016), Heide said, “I think now that the reason why udru was never assigned to am.si.kur.ra and am.si.ḥar.ra.an has to do with the fact that both am-si-kur-ra and am-si-ḥar-ra.an came out of use in the 1st millennium, they were only copied in lexical lists, whereas udru is not known from any text before the 11th century BCE. In short, these terms were not contemporary in practical use.”} However, Anše ud-ra-a-ti is equated with ga-ma-[la]-ti ‘female dromedaries’ in a 7th century BCE Sultantepe tablet (Landsberger & Gurney 1957–1958: 332; Gurney 1981–1982: 98; Horowitz 2008: 599).

In conclusion, it is no longer tenable to identify udru as exclusively designating the Bactrian camel. It is my contention that the usage of udru in the 11th to 9th centuries BCE without the qualification ‘with two humps’ referred to the camel in general and the dromedary in particular, and it was not until the mid-late 8th century BCE that udru without the qualification ‘with two humps’ would start to designate the Bactrian camel in particular. However, even as late as the 7th century BCE, udru without the qualification ‘with two humps’ was still equated with the dromedary.
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Abstract

This paper sheds light on twenty-one new Ancient North Arabian (Safaitic) inscriptions discovered in 2015 in Jordan, one of which mentions the Nabataean Damași.
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1 Introduction

The stones on which these inscriptions were found are located about 35 km from the town of al-Azraq in north-eastern Jordan. The precise location of the site where the inscriptions were found is called Wādī wa-Ġadīr Asḫīm (see figure 1), an area in which Byzantine and Islamic architecture can also be found. Specifically, there is an abundance of Ayyubid ceramics and a great number of other Islamic inscriptions, although these are admittedly short inscriptions consisting mostly of genealogies. There are also a number of Safaitic inscriptions in this area, most of which remain in situ. Some of the stones have been relocated to the Mafrak museum on account of their significance. These inscriptions were found in September 2015 by the author.
Figure 1: Map of Jordan showing the location of Wādī wa-Ġadir Ashīm (Source: Google Earth)
2 Inscriptions 1–20

Figure 2: Inscriptions no. 1–3

INS-NO-1:
l bḥṭ(n) bn ‘ḏ bn klbʾl bn ’sḍ bn ġ(r) mrġm w ḡwb ḥbb
‘By ḏṭn son of ḏ son of Klbʾl son of ṣḍ son of ġ(r) son of Mrġm and he grieved for a loved one’

A portion of stone and therefore inscription missing. The stone is currently located in the Al-Mafraq Antiquities Office and Museum.

INS-NO-2:
l bṣln bn glm
‘By Bṣln son of Glm’

INS-NO-3:
l rhy bn ‘mrʾl
‘By Rhy son of ‘mrʾl’
INS-NO-4:

\[ l \text{ms}^2\text{dt} w ts\text{\‘wq} \ verifying \ ‘\text{\‘ks}^1\text{t} \]

‘By Ms²dt and he longed for ‘ks¹t’

The letter \( s^1 \) is not clear, but we can infer from other inscriptions that it is the name \( \text{\‘k}s^1\text{t} \). The stone is currently located in the Al-Mafraq Antiquities Office and Museum.
INS-NO-5:
l tm bn znʾl bn ʿbd bn ngm ḏ-ʾl kn w rʿy h-ʾglm f h lt sʾlm
‘By Tm son of Znʾl son of ʿbd son of Ngm of the lineage of Kn and he pastured
the camels and so O Lt [grant] security’

The stone is currently located in the Al-Mafraq Antiquities Office and Mu-
seum.
Figure 5: Inscription no. 6

**INS-NO-6:**

\[ l\, s\, l\, b\, '\, b n\, w\, n y\, b n\, s\, ' d\, b n\, s\, k r\, b n\, m f n y\, b n\, n' m n \]

‘By S’b’ son of Wny son of S’d son of S’kr son of Mfny son of N’mn’

The stone is currently located in the Al-Mafraq Antiquities Office and Museum.
Figure 6: Inscription no. 7

INS-NO-7:

\[ l \text{ mḥrn } bn \ 'ts¹ bn s¹wr \]

‘By Mḥrn son of ‘ts¹ son of S¹wr’
INS-NO-8:

\[ l\ s\ 'wr\ bn\ qdm\ h\ -\ gml \]

‘By S'wr son of Qdm is the camel’

The stone is currently located in the Al-Mafraq Antiquities Office and Museum.
Figure 8: Inscription no. 9

INS-NO-9:
* l rmʾl
    ‘By Rmʾl’
INS-NO-10:

*l mṛṭ bn ys²kr w bʿr m hṛt*

‘By Mrṭ son of Ys²kr and he went with camels from the Harrah’

The verb *bʿr* has been found only four times in Safaitic inscriptions and there is not yet an agreed translation for this word. One possible translation of this inscription is that ‘he went through the desert with the camels’, another ‘he rode the camels from the desert’.
INS-NO-11:
{l }bg{r} bn ṣ bn ḫlf bn ṣ d-ʾl ʿmrt
‘By ṣgr son of ṣ son of ḫlf son of ṣ of the tribe of ʿmrt

The author of this inscription made a mistake on the last letter of the first name ṣgr and wrote m instead of r, then corrected the error below.
INS-NO-12:

\[ l \text{ ns}^{2}\text{ḥ} \text{ bn } \text{ hknf bn yd}^{c} \]
‘By \text{ ns}^{2}\text{ḥ} \text{ son of Hknf son of Yd}^{c}’

INS-NO-13:

\[ l \text{ ʾḥḥt bn ns}^{2}\text{ḥ} \text{ bn hknf} \]
‘By \text{ ʾḥḥt son of ns}^{2}\text{ḥ} \text{ son of Hknf}’

INS-NO-14:

\[ l \text{ Ṣḥr bn hknf bn yd}^{c} \text{ w rmy gdd} \]
‘By \text{ Ṣḥr son of Hknf son of Yd}^{c} \text{ and he went to a level plain}’
Figure 12: Inscriptions no. 15–16

**INS-NO-15:**

\[ l \overset{s}{r}k \text{ bn } q̇ṡn \text{ bn } nẓr \text{ w qsf f h lt rwh } \]

‘By S²rk son of Qʿṣn son of Nẓr and he was sad, so O Lt [grant] ease’

The inscription includes a drawing of a man and a camel. This depiction is rarely seen in Safaitic inscriptions; instead it is usual for inscription from northwest Saudi Arabia. The author put a point between the two fs to delineate the two different words.

**INS-NO-16:**

\[ l \overset{qrb}{m′} \text{ bn } ġzt \text{ bn } s²rk \]

‘By qrb son of (M′) son of ġzlt son of S²rk’
INS-NO-17:
\[\text{lfṭ bn ṣbḥ h-bkrt}\]
‘By Flṭ son of Ṣbḥ is the young she-camel’

The stone is currently located in the Al-Mafraq Antiquities Office and Museum.
Figure 14: Inscriptions no. 18–19

**INS-NO-18:**

\[ l \ {gz}k \ bn \ s^Zk \ bn \ gmm \ bn \ qn’l \ bn \ y̱m’l \ bn \ mr’t \ bn \ gryt \ bn \ ‘zn \ bn \ ḥr(n)tt \ bn \ tmn \ bn \ ‘dr \ bn \ ḫb \ bn \ zm’ \]

‘By Gzk son of S^Zk son of Gmm son of Qn’l son of Y̱m’l son of Mr’t son of Gryt son of ‘zn son of ḥr(n)tt son of Tmn son of ‘dr son of ḫb son of zm’

**INS-NO-19:**

\[ l \ rs^Zḥ \ bn \ wqf \]

‘By Rs^Zḥ son of Wqf’
INS-NO-20:

lʾs¹lm bn khl bn ws²kʿt

‘By ṣ¹lm son of Khl son of Ws²kʿt’

The stone is currently located in the Al-Mafraq Antiquities Office and Museum.
3 An inscription mentioning Damaṣī

**Figure 16: Inscription no. 21**

**INS-NO-21:**

&ns²l bn ṁn bn ṁṭl ḏ- ṭm w ṅzr ‘l- dmsy b- ḫms¹ mʾt frs¹ sʾnt ḥrb ʿmm

‘By Ns²l son of ṁn son of ṁṭl of the lineage of ṭm and he was on the lookout for Dmsy with five cavalry units in the year of the war of ‘mm’
3.1 Commentary

The inscription is easily legible, with clear letters written in a ‘square’ script that is considered to be a stylistic feature in Safaitic inscriptions, occurring in only a minority of inscriptions. There are a number of oddities in the letter-forms however. The second letter could be read either as $s^2$ or as $f$, and it is difficult to decide which should be preferred since the resulting word, a personal name, could be either $ns^2l$ or $nfl$, both of which are attested as personal names in Safaitic. We might prefer the reading with $s^2$ since there is a $f$ at the end of the inscription which does not have the same unusual shape. The letter $ḏ$- in the formulaic expression $ḏ-ʾl$ is interestingly adorned with a flick at the extremity of the letter, as can be seen in figure 17. We consider this to be a form of decoration, which can perhaps support the hypothesis that the use of the square script is decorative as well. The letter $d$ in the personal name $dmsy$ is also unusual, having a form that at first glance could be mistaken for the letter $q$. This appears to be on account of the uneven surface of the stone, which is not flat and in face quite indented, especially in the area where the name occurs. Finally, the last word is ‘$mn$ in the phrase $ḥrb ‘mn$, in which the penultimate letter (the first $m$) is unusually filled in with additional lines. While the resulting form bears no resemblance to any particular Safaitic letter, it could perhaps be misread as a $w$; this is impossible however since there is one other occurrence of $w$ in the text which is written normally. Furthermore, decoration of this type is not unprecedented in Safaitic inscriptions, with even whole inscriptions being written in this ‘stripy’ script style. It is impossible to
say why the author chose to adorn only this \( m \) in this way, and why he did not write the following \( m \) in the same way.

### 3.2 Genealogy

As is customary in Safaitic inscriptions, this text starts with the letter \( l \), understood conventionally as a \textit{lam auctoris} which introduces the author of the text. This \( l \) is always followed by a personal name, which usually takes the form of a genealogy containing anything from two to ten names, and in many cases more. Here the genealogy traces three generations, all the names of which are known already from the Safaitic corpus (although see the comment on the first name, \( ns²l \), above). After the genealogy comes the tribal affiliation, introduced by the formula \( ḍ-ʾl \). Here the tribe name is Tm, which is also a known tribe from the Safaitic corpus (e.g. HCH 130, WH 711, CSNS 633, etc.).

### 3.3 Narrative

The narrative content of the inscription opens with the verb phrase, \( w \ ngṛ \ ʾː l{-}dmsy \), ‘and he was on the lookout for Dmṣy’. The verb is interesting because it is a well attested verb but only occurs one other time in the known corpus with the preposition \( ʾː l \); the verb \( ngṛ \) usually takes an object without a preposition (LP 1263; ISB 90). The verb is also interesting because it has several forms, also appearing frequently as \( w \ mse \), and also as \( ṭṣr \) which demonstrates assimilation of the \( n \) in the \( t \)-stem (see Al-Jallad 2015: 132). The other inscription containing \( ngṛ \ ʾː l \) is HaNSB 305. The name Dmṣy is known as a personal name from three other inscriptions (SIJ 287; SIJ 823; SIAM 36) and now in this inscription; in only one of the four inscriptions there is a genealogy, so it is impossible to prove that they do or do not refer to the same person.

The following two clauses are supplementary to the narrative. The first is \( b{-}ẖms¹ \ mʿt \ frs¹ \), “with five hundred horses”. It is interesting to note that we do not find the number five hundred elsewhere in Safaitic except in this inscription. There are, however, a number of inscriptions which exhibit parallels to this:

- In C 320\(^1\) the author writes \( w \ s¹rt \ mʿ \ {b-}h \ (b-)mʿt \ frs¹ \), ‘and he served with his father in a cavalry unit’.
- C 2076\(^2\) has \( b{-}ṣf \ rgl \ w \ mʿt \ f \ [r]s¹ \), ‘with one thousand foot soldiers and \( (a \)

\(^1\) C 320:
\[ l \ wḥhlh \ bn \ ʾḥrb \ bn \ ʾḥrb \ bn \ ʾḥrb \ bn \ ḍ- ʾl \ kkb \ w \ bḥt \ kkb \ w \ ḍ- l t h m ṭ s ṭr \ y ʾl \ w \ jrs n ml \ ‘bd \ w \ sṛt \ mʿ \ {b-}b \ (b-) \ mʿt \ frs \]

‘By Whhlh son of Ṭḥrb son of Ṭḥrb son of Ṭḥrb of the lineage of Ḫkb and he rejoiced at Brkt because there was fresh herbage, and returned from a place of water the year the lineage of Ṯḏ pastured the livestock of the lineage of Ṭbd; and he served with his father in a cavalry unit’

\(^2\) C 2076:
\[ l \ ṭṣf y ḡd \ bn \ ṭbṣn \ w \ sṛt \ ′l{-}ḥdq \ ṭbg \ b{-}ṣf \ rgl \ w \ mʿt \ f \ [r]s¹ \ w \ ṭṣr \ b{-}ṣf \ s ṭy \ b{-}ḥ \ d \ (r) \ f h \ r \ w \ h \ blysm \ (m) fn \]

‘By Ṭṣf slave boy of Ǧd son of Ṭbṣn and he served in a troop against the walled enclosure of Ṭbg with one thousand foot soldiers and (a cavalry unit); and he waited for the rains near this place’
cavalry unit').

- KRS 1468\textsuperscript{3} reads \textit{w qṣṣ b-mʾt frs¹}, ‘and he tracked with a cavalry unit’.

It could be that the author was on the lookout for Dmṣy accompanied by five hundred riders, or five cavalry units. Of course, the syntax is not lucid and it might equally be possible that it is Dmsy who is coming with the horses.

The inscription employs a well-known Safaitic dating formula, namely, the pattern \textit{sʾnt} followed by the occurrence, which took place in that year (C 2577; LP 360; SIJ 705; WH 2113). In this case it is \textit{sʾnt ḥrb ʿmm} ‘the year of the war of ‘mm’. Given that this stone was discovered in the vicinity of inscription which reads \textit{l ḥrb bn ʿmm}, ‘By Ḥrb son of ‘mm’, it seems plausible to understand this as a personal name (see figure 18)\textsuperscript{4}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{safaiticinscription.png}
\caption{The Safaitic inscription with the personal name ‘mm}
\end{figure}

\subsection{The historical figure of Dmsy}

As discussed above, the name \textit{dmsy} appears in four Safaitic inscriptions, but unfortunately without enough evidence to shed much light on the identity of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{l mlk bn bls¹ bn yṣʾmʾl bn ṣʾd bn ṣʾ w qṣṣ b- mʾt frs¹ bʾd ṭ l ḍf f h gdḍf sʾl}
\end{itemize}

\textit{‘By Mlk son of Bls¹ son of Yṣʾmʾl son of Ṣʾd son of ṣʾ and he tracked with a hundred horsemen after the ṭ Ḍf and so O Gdḍf may he be secure’}

\textsuperscript{3}KRS 1468:

\textsuperscript{4}Present location: Al-Mafraq Antiquities Office and Museum.
the person, or persons, referred to. There is also one occurrence of a dmṣ (WH 908) and one dmṣn (WH 1964) in the known corpus; the name is clearly very rare in Safaitic and not in any way well known. Since only one inscription furnishes Dmsy with a genealogy, there is no way to securely identify all these instances as references to the same person. On account of the relatively small number of references to him in the Safaitic inscriptions, it is impossible to say even whether he was an important character; naturally this is an argument ex silentio. Two, however, do make reference to a revolt (mrd) by a Dmsy who must be the same person. The first (SIJ 287) was found in Jawa (Jordan), and reads as follows:

\[\text{SIJ 287:} \]
\[l \, ḫr \, bn \, ʾs¹ \, bn \, ḫr \, ḏ-ʾl \, ms¹kt \, w \, wld \, b-h-dr \, sʾnt \, mrd \, mḥrb \, w \, sʾnt \, mrd \, dmṣy \, w \, ḫrṣ \, h-s²nʾ \, f \, h \, lt \, s¹ln \, w \, mwgd\]
\[\text{‘By Ḫr son of ʾs¹ son of Ḫr of the tribe of Ms¹kt. He was born in this place [Jawa] the year of the rebellion of Mḥrb and the year of the rebellion of Dmṣy. He is on the watch for the enemy, so, o Lt and Ds²r, [grant] security and [continued] existence.’}\]

The second inscription to refer to the revolt of Dmṣy is from Tell al-ʿabd in Jordan and reads as follows:

\[\text{Figure 19: SIJ 823}^5\]

\[\text{5}^5\text{I would like to thank the OCIANA project for permission to use this image.}\]
SIJ 823:
\[ l\ mgd\ bn\ zd\ bn\ qdm\ bn\ mr\ 'dl\ df\ w\ q(ṣ)ṣ\ b'd\ ḍ(f)\ s'nt\ mrd\ dmsy\ lhtm(—)\ 's'lm\ f\ f\ (—)\ (—) \]
‘By Mgd son of Zd son of Qdm son of Mr of the tribe of Ḍf and he followed after Ḍf the year of the revolt of Dmsy…’

Figure 20: The Safaitic inscription bearing the name Dmsy, presently situated in the Irbid museum

---

6I would like to thank the OCIANA project for permission to use this image.
We may compare the localities where these inscriptions mentioning Dmsy have been found: Jawa, Tell al-ʿabd and now Wādī wa-Ġadīr Asḥīm (unfortunately the provenance of the fourth example is unknown, since the rock has been moved to the Irbid Museum). It can be seen that these three places are all located in the Jordanian Badia, in relatively close proximity to each other.

There is a known Nabataean inscription mentioning a character called dmsy who has long been associated with this Dmṣy of the Safaitic inscriptions (see, for example, Winnett 1973). This inscription (C II no. 287; JS I: 224 no. 84) is from Ḥegrā (Medāin-Ṣāleḥ) and consists of only one line. It reads:

C II 287:

dkyr dmsy br rbybʾl ‘ṣrtgʾ bṭb

‘In memory of Dmsy, son of Rbybʾl, the strategos, for good.’

It will be immediately noticed that the Nabataean inscriptions uses the letter s (samekh / semkath) where the Safaitic has ş, but this is possible to reconcile since, as Winnett writes, “the name DMSY is of Greek origin and Greek sigma might well be reproduced by ş in Safaitic and by s in Nabataean” (1973: 55). The name Winnett is referring to is the Greek Damasippos (hypocoristic of dmps, Greek Δαμάσιππος), of which the Nabataean form Dmsy is an apparent hypocoristic. Hackl et al. (2003: 342) suggest that the Dmsy of the Nabataean inscription is “wahrscheinlich identisch mit Damaṣi”, an assertion which is
perhaps more indicative of the uncertainty than it is of the identification itself.

The Nabataean Dmsy was, as the above inscriptions shows, the son of a strategos from Ḥegrā. His grandfather was the aforementioned Damasippos, whose sons were Ganimu and Rabîbʾel, the latter being the father of Damasi and a certain Maliku (see Winnett 1973: 55; Graf 1997: 199). Winnett’s hypothesis is that Dmsy revolted on account of his father overlooking him as a successor, in spite of his seniority, and promoting his younger brother Maliku as governor of Hegra in his place. This contention is based on the face that JS 34nab refers to Maliku as strategos but, as is clearly evident, the term is absent from the above memorial inscription to Dmsy.

Scholars have attempted to produce evidence connecting the apparent rebellion of Dmṣy as recorded in the Safaitic examples with what can be reconstructed of the narrative of Dmṣy from the Nabataean sources. Al-Otaibi remarks that “Damasī’s revolt was serious enough to be taken as a basis for dating in Nabataea (snt mrd dmsy)”, (2011: 91) although this reasoning is less convincing when one considers that the same dating formula in Safaitic usually references far more banal (although, in all likelihood, just as serious to the writers) occurrences, such as the arrival of rains or hyenas. Bowersock (1983: 156) cites a title, given to the last Nabataean king Rabibʾel II (70–106 CE, a contemporary of Dmsy), of dyʾḥy wšyzb ʿmh, ‘he who brought life and deliverance to his people’; he suggests that this description is an open reference to the “crisis of his accession” (1983: 156), characterized by the rebellion of nomadic leaders such as Dmsy. Al-Otaibi takes this even further, suggesting that it is a specific reference to the success of the former in putting down the revolt of Dmsy (2011: 91). As outlined by Graf (1997: 363), the Safaitic inscriptions give evidence of Dmsy being supported by nomadic tribes, the names of which are known from Safaitic inscriptions generally: ḃf, Msʾkt, Mḥrb. The evidence is not wholly compelling, however; if Dmsy was truly an important figure interacting on a large scale with the nomadic tribes, some of whom apparently carved Safaitic inscriptions, when why should there be so few references to him in the corpus?

The scene has therefore been reconstructed of Dmsy, as an influential Nabataean, involving the nomadic tribes in the vicinity of southern Nabataea in the political affairs of the kingdom and even using them in a revolt which he started against the northern part of the kingdom. The implication is that the Nabataeans before Dmsy had also formed alliances with the desert nomads and that Dmsy incited them to join his rebellion; the Nabataean approach is summarized by Bowersock as “a reasonable, if occasionally risky policy of using nomadic groups as allies of the government of the sedentary nation at the edge of the desert” (1983: 156).

3.5 Conclusion

This importance of this inscription lies in its being the fourth attestation of the name Dmsy in Safaitic, and therefore sheds light on the so-called revolt
of Dmṣy as known from the other three instances. It could be the case that Dmṣy came to the area, as this inscription suggests, with an entourage of five hundred riders; alternatively, it could merely be Dmṣy with five hundred horses or, as we discussed, the horses could already have been at this location. The inscription cannot prove the theories already circulating in scholarly literature about the connection between Safaitic Dmṣy and the Nabataean kingdom; it should, however, inform all future consideration of this topic as new evidence is eagerly awaited.
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## Index of personal names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʾbgr</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾḥḥt</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾsʿd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾšl</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾšl’m</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bḥtn</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bsln</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tm</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmn</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gryt</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gzk</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glm</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gmm</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrntt</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫb</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ḫlf</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dmṣy</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rs²ḥ</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rmʾl</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zmʾ</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sʾbʾc</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sʾkr</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sʾwr</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sʾzr</td>
<td>15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şbb</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şhr</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şʾd</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Znʾl</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍbd</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍʾ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍʿdr</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḍʿzn</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Index of lineage names

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kn</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿmrt</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tm</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Index of divine names

Lt 5

Index of vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḡml</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>‘camels’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bʿr</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>‘he rode’ (3MS suffix conjugation verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bkrt</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>‘young she-camel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsʿwq</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>‘he longed (for)’ (3MS suffix conjugation verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḡml</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>‘camel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥbb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>‘a loved one’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥrt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>‘the Harrah’ (place name)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥrb</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>‘war’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḫms mʾt</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>‘five hundred’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṛʿy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>‘he pastured’ (3MS suffix conjugation verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṛmy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(3MS suffix conjugation verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṛwḥ</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>‘relief’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sʿlm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>‘security’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sʿnt</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>‘year’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frs¹</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>‘horse’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qṣf</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>‘he was sad’ (3MS suffix conjugation verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nṣr</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>‘he was on the lookout’ (3MS suffix conjugation verb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṳgm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>‘he grieved’ (3MS suffix conjugation verb)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sigla


CSNS: Clark (1979)

HaNSB: Ḥarāḥšah (2010)

HCH: Harding (1953)

ISB: Oxtoby (1968)

JS: Jaussen & Savignac (1909–1922)

KRS: Safaitic inscriptions recorded by G.M.H. King on the Basalt Desert Rescue Survey (now published in OCIANA)

LP: Littmann (1943)

OCIANA: The Online Corpus of the Inscriptions of Ancient North Arabia project at the Khalili Research Centre, University of Oxford (http://krc.orient.ox.ac.uk/ociana/index.php)
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The development of the triphthongs in Quranic and Classical Arabic
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Abstract

The original Proto-Semitic triphthongs have developed in a variety of ways in the history of Arabic. Employing data from Old Arabic and the Quranic Consonantal Text, this paper examines the developments of these triphthongs in Classical Arabic and the language of the Quran. It describes the development in hollow and defective roots and shows that Quranic Arabic developed a new long vowels /ē/ and /ō/ in positions where Classical Arabic merges triphthongs with ʿā.

Keywords: Quranic Consonantal Text Old Arabic Nabataeo-Arabic Triphthongs Historical Linguistics

1 Introduction

This study will look at the development of the triphthongs in the language of the Quranic Consonantal Text and by extension also its developments in Classical Arabic, and it will examine in what way they deviate from one another. “Triphthong” in its Semitic context has a slightly different meaning than in the general linguistic context. We take triphthong to have the Semitic meaning of a sequence of a short vowel–glide–short vowel.¹

1.1 On the study of the QCT

This study aims to use the evidence found in the Quranic Consonantal Text (henceforth QCT) to study the language of the Quran. The QCT is defined as the text reflected in the consonantal skeleton of the Quran, the form in which it

---

¹The author would like to thank Almog Kasher, Sean Anthony, Ahmad Al-Jallad, Daniel Beck, Maarten Kossmann, Benjamin Suchard and Fokelien Kootstra for giving useful comments on an early draft of this paper.

¹Formal sound laws will be expressed in a schematic way in this paper. W stand for a glide w or y. v stands for any short vowel, and ̄v for any long vowel. An x above a vowel (̄v) means the vowel is unaccented while an acute (v́) means it is accented. $ marks a syllable boundary and # marks a word boundary. Arabic script will be reproduced without dots if the specific source under discussion lacks them. The tāʾ marbūṭah is not distinguished from the regular tāʾ. ʾ is transcribed with ʾ, while the hamzah is transcribed with ʔ. Classical Arabic will be transcribed in italics, while reconstructed pronunciation of the QCT will be placed within slashes /.../.
was first written down, without the countless additional clarifying vocalisation marks. The concept of the QCT is roughly equivalent to that of the rasm, the purely undotted consonantal skeleton of the Quranic text, but there is an important distinction. The concept of QCT ultimately assumes that not only the letter shapes, but also the consonantal values are identical to the Quranic text as we find it today. As such, when ambiguities arise, for example in medial ـيـ, ـنـ, ـبـ, ـتـ, ـثـ, etc., the original value is taken to be identical to the form as it is found in the Quranic reading traditions today. This assumption is not completely unfounded. From the very earliest Quranic documents onwards, we already find occasional cases of consonantal dotting (Déroche 2014: 20).

While the choice when a consonant is dotted and when it is not seems highly haphazard, there are no vast disagreements with the modern Cairo Edition of the Quran when the dots are present.

The way Arabic is written in the QCT deviates in many ways from the Classical Arabic norm, and needs to be supplied with a large number of vocalisation markings to yield the forms of the contemporary reading traditions of the Quran. As these markings are not originally part of the Quranic text, and we do not know the origins or exact age of these reading traditions, the study of the QCT aims to look at what the QCT itself can tell us about the language of the Quran.

1.2 The ى, و, and ا for Classical Arabic /ā/ in the QCT

The QCT contains many examples where the reading tradition today reads ā, which have rather different representations in the common Classical Arabic orthography.

In Classical Arabic, ā is written in the vast majority of the cases with ى only word-finally can it be represented with ى as well as with ।:

- َقَامَ qāma ‘he stood up’
- َمَاتَ māta ‘he died’
- َدَعا daʕā ‘he called’
- َنَجَا najā ‘salvation’
- َتَقَى tuqāh ‘precaution’
- َرَمَى ramā ‘he threw’
- َرَمَى-hu ramā-hu ‘he threw it’
- َهَدَى (in context hudan) hudā ‘guidance’
- َهَدَى-hu hudā-hu ‘his guidance’

If we look at the way these words are written in the QCT, we find that the situation is more complex. Both ى and ى are used word-internally in several of these words, e.g. َنَجَى najāh, َتَقَى tuqāh, َرَمَى-hu ramā-hu, َهَدَى-hu hudā-hu. This paper
aims to to show that such spellings are rooted in a phonetic reality and are not simply the result of an arbitrary spelling practice for writing ā.

In the following sections we will first discuss the collapse of the triphthongs in hollow roots, a development shared between Classical Arabic and the language of the QCT, and seemingly one of the earliest developments. After that we will discuss the development of the triphthongs in defective roots.

2 *\(aWv\) in hollow roots

The hollow roots have occasionally been reconstructed with already contracted medial vowels at a Proto-Semitic stage, e.g. Huehnergard (2005a: 177, n. 75). However, in light of Old Arabic\(^2\) evidence, which at least occasionally retains the glide (Al-Jallad 2015: 119), and the fact that the development of Hebrew suggests that the triphthong had not yet collapsed at the Proto-Northwest-Semitic stage (Suchard 2016a: §5.3), we must assume that the hollow verbs had not yet collapsed at the Proto-Arabic stage either.

Several other languages retain evidence of the original triphthong in hollow roots. Ancient South Arabian, at least at its earliest stage, shows forms of hollow verbs without a collapsed triphthong, e.g. \(\text{kwn} \text{‘he was’}, \text{mwt} \text{‘he died’}\). Likewise, Suchard (2016b) argues that Gašaz forms like \(\text{qoma} \text{‘he stood’}, \text{mota} \text{‘he died’} \text{and } \text{ṣema} \text{‘he set in order}; \text{he put in place}’ can be explained as coming from the same *\(\text{mawita}, \text{gawuma} \text{and *ṣayima} \text{with the regular loss of high short vowels in open syllables that we find in strong verbs as well, e.g. } \text{labsa} \text{‘he clothed himself’ < *labisa and subsequent shift of } \text{aw} \text{to o and ay to e}.^3\)

In Voigt’s compelling defense of a triradical analysis of the weak verbs, he formulates two rules for the collapse of the triphthong in the hollow verbs (1988: 142; cf. also Bauer 1912; Suchard 2016b: 319; and Al-Jallad 2015: 119f):

1. \(\text{dWv} > ā\)
2. \(\text{aWv} > ū (>) ū)^4\)

With these rules we arrive at all the Arabic hollow verb types:

---

\(^2\)I use here the definition of Old Arabic as employed by epigraphists: the documentary evidence of Pre-Islamic Arabic as attested in the epigraphic record, rather than the literary evidence found in the so-called Pre-Islamic poetry. For a definition and outline of the Old Arabic corpus see Macdonald (2008) and Al-Jallad (forthcoming b).

\(^3\)Huehnergard (2005b: 30–35) suggests that the diphthong \(*\text{ay}\) in Gašaz only collapses in front of coronal obstruents. This rather unusual conditioning is only supported by four clear examples (and one loanword and one form that is attested both with and without collapsed diphthong). Accepting Suchard’s (2016b) analysis, this would mean that there are many more examples of \(*\text{ay} > e\) than previously thought. Many of the words with uncontracted ay which certainly cannot be taken as loanwords start with a guttural, which also blocks the collapse of the \(\text{aw} > o\) shift.

\(^4\)Note that this rule is technically unable to explain the 3pl.f. and 2pl.f. impf. of stem VIII hollow roots, e.g. \(\text{yaḥtarna} \text{‘they (f.) choose’}, \text{taḥtarna} \text{‘you (f.) choose’ < *y/taḥtayrāna}. Considering how such a form with the expected \(i\) vowel would be completely isolated within the paradigm, an analogical replacement of \(i\) with \(a\) seems unproblematic.
Proto-Arabic | Classical Arabic | meaning
--- | --- | ---
*máwita | máta | ‘he died’
*qáwuma | qáma | ‘he stood up’
*šáyima | šáma | ‘he put away; put in’
*mawíttu | mittu | ‘I died’
*qawúmtu | qúmtu | ‘I stood up’
*šayímtu | šímtu | ‘I put away; put in’

In this model, the vowel that follows the medial glide is what determines the quality of the vowel that we see in the closed syllable reflex. As there are no hollow verbs that have a form like **CaCtu, this would suggest that Proto-Arabic did not have *CawaCa verbs, while it did have a large number of *CawuCa verbs. This is unexpected, as regular triradical fientive roots have a vocalism *CaCaCa.  

The existence of such forms as Safaitic myt */mayeta/ < *mawita ‘he died’ and sqw */sawoqa/ ‘he drove the animals’ seem to show that, at some point, these verbs still had a true triphthong, as neither a diphthong, as in **/mayta/, nor a long vowel, e.g. **/mēta/, would be written with a glide in the Safaitic orthography (Al-Jallad 2015: 37f). Presumably, at some point in the history of Safaitic, these triphthongs (but not the triphthongs of defective verbs) collapse, giving forms like mt */māta/ ‘he died’ and sq */sāqa/.

The medial triphthong does not collapse if it is followed by another glide, e.g. dawā ‘to be sick’ < *dāwaya, not **dāya (cf. Safaitic dwy */dawaya/ ‘id.’, Al-Jallad 2015: 311).

### 3 *aWv in defective roots: introduction

In the previous section we saw that both Classical Arabic and the language of the QCT undergo the same developments in hollow roots. For defective roots, however, we see that orthographically the two varieties diverge. I will argue that this orthographic divergence is best interpreted as a linguistic difference.

In Classical Arabic, both unstressed *-awa and *-aya collapse to ā, e.g. *dāsawa > dašā ‘to call’ and *ramaya > ramā ‘to throw’. In the QCT, as well as in Classical Arabic orthography, these etymologically different triphthongs remain orthographically distinct, as verbs with a *w as the final root consonant are written with ḍ, whereas verbs with *y as their final root consonant are written with ḫ. This suggests that the triphthong *awa has collapsed to ā and that *aya had a different phonetic value than ā in the dialect on which the orthography is based.

Classical Arabic writes etymological ḫ, despite pronouncing it as ā; this is the so-called ʔalif maqṣūrah. Whenever a verb of this type is followed by a

---

5 Note that Gəʕəz also lacks any sign of CaWaCa verbs, whereas CoCa, CoCa < *Ca-w/yv[ + high]Ca is common.

6 Voigt (1988: 143f) suggests that the unexpected u and i vowel in his reconstruction of fientive hollow verbs is to be derived by analogy from the imperfective stem vowel.
object clitic, the ā is written as ا, e.g. ّاتا اني ‘he came’ but ّاتاه اني ‘he came to him’. This practice differs from the orthography of the QCT, where final ى verbs simply always retain ى in this position, e.g. اني ‘he came’ and اني ‘he came to him’.

The Classical Arabic ّالیف ماقسورة is clearly a case of historical spelling. However, as both Nöldeke et al. (2013 [1836–1930]: iii/37) and Rabin (1951: 115ff) point out, the consistent spelling with ى in the QCT and absence of alternation with ا suggests that this difference in spelling represents a phonetic reality.

Based primarily on the orthography of Arabic material in Nabatean Aramaic, Diem (1979: §§10–15) argues however, that the writing of ّالیف ماقسورة is a purely orthographic practice in the QCT, Classical Arabic and Arabic material in Nabatean Aramaic. Diem (1979: §10) bases this assertion on the fact that there are several examples of words that would in later Arabic orthography be written with ّالیف ماقسورة are written with both ا and ا in Nabatean Aramaic, e.g. ّنهدا اني ‘one’, اني ایسی ‘personal name’, اني ایس ‘personal name’, ئاشفا اني ‘personal name’ but الاشندل ئاشفا ‘personal name’, ئافسا اني ‘personal name’ and ئافسا الاشندل (name of deity)’. He observes that the forms with the spellings with ا appear most prominently in the peripheral (and mostly later) inscriptions from Sinai and Hijaz, and from this concludes that such a spelling must be a later innovation.

While Diem (1979: §13) admits that it is possible that, rather than an orthographic device, we are dealing with a practice that reflects the dialectal pronunciation of the Sinai and Hijaz, he says that this is unlikely for two reasons:

1. It is not reflected in any of the modern dialects;
2. It is not reflected in the reading traditions.

Neither of these assertions are true, as will be shown in Section 5. In light of Old Arabic evidence, as well as comparative evidence from other Semitic languages, it is clear that ّالیف ماقسورة is of a different etymological origin than the ّالیف مامدد. Moreover, there are linguistic clues in the QCT that show that the two sounds are phonetically distinct.

4 Refuting the “orthographic practice” explanation

Diem (1979: §14, §46) argues that ّالیف ماقسورة in the orthography of the QCT is a purely orthographic device to write final /ā/ and that it is chosen over ّالیف مامدد due to paradigmatic pressure. Because parts of the paradigm of words with ّالیف ماقسورة have forms where the /ā/ alternates...
with /ay/ (e.g. ītaytu ‘I came’ but also ʕalā ‘on’, ʕalayka ‘on’), the /ā/ would be written pseudo-etymologically with ى.

While this orthographic device might not be altogether impossible if it had originated in the context of a well-developed Arabic scribal tradition, where some rudimentary grammatical theory may have aided in writing this pseudo-etymological ى, Diem envisions this orthographic practice to have already developed in the Nabatean Aramaic period.

Although we find many example of Arabic names and words in Nabatean Aramaic texts, there is no evidence indicating that Arabic had become a chanceller language at the time of the Nabatean Kingdom. The few examples that we have of Arabic being written are often rather late and ad hoc attempts at writing Arabic (e.g. the En Avdat inscription and the Nemah inscription) and do not give the impression of a well-developed scribal tradition. Without such a scribal tradition, it seems unlikely that such a sophisticated systematized non-intuitive orthographic practice would have developed.

There are also several other reasons why such an explanation fails to convince. First, by Diem’s rationale, we would, as Nöldeke et al. (2013 [1836–1930]: iii/37) have already pointed out, expect ىدا to be spelled **ｳّ as it alternates with ىدا. Diem (1979: §15) addresses this point. His argument rests on the fact that the orthographic practice developed from the writing of Arabic nouns and particles, as Arabic conjugated verbs would not usually occur in Nabatean. When the orthography was adapted for writing verbs, the possibility to introduce a mater lectionis ى for ى was still understood and in active use to be applied to verbs, that this practice would not have been adapted for ى, especially if we accept Diem’s argument that ى is a mater lectionis for ى in other positions (1979: §§17–18).

Moreover, as Behnstedt (1987: 135) points out, Diem’s theory fails to explain why several words that do not alternate /ā/ with /ay/ paradigmatically are nevertheless consistently written with ى, e.g. ىحتى ‘until’, ىمتى ‘when’, ىبلى ‘yes (fr. si)’ etc. Diem (1979: §14) recognises this problem, but his counter-argument is unconvincing. He suggests that, as ى is now a way of marking ى, this sign can analogically be spread to words that are not in derivational relation to forms where a phoneme /y/ appears. The implication of this argument is that such an analogy would have already have taken place extremely early in the development of ى as an orthographic device for writing ى, as e.g. ىبلى is already commonly written in Nabatean as ىبلى (Cantineau 1978: 71). If the pseudo-etymological function of the mater lectionis ى was already forgotten before the Nabatean script came to be used primarily for writing Arabic, it is difficult to believe that scribes were able to adapt this etymological orthographic practice to the verbal system, as Diem suggests that they did.

Finally, Diem’s approach would not easily apply to perhaps the largest category of words in Nabatean that show this final ى, namely, personal names like ىفبدالىف sân, where there is no context where a *y would show up
in its paradigm. There is strong evidence that there was phonetic variation in names with this final alternation א and י in other Semitic languages of Arabia as well. For example, the deity ʕuzzā is attested in the Dadanitic script in two different forms: the name ‘female servant of ʕuzzā’ is attested both as ʿmtʿzh (U 019) and ʿmtʿzy (Al-ʿUḏayb 071). The Dadanitic script only used h as a mater lectionis, which represents /ā/, whereas y can only be interpreted as a consonantal /y/ (Fokelien Kootstra, pers. comm.). These names must be two separate phonetic variants, /ʔamatʕuzzā/ and /ʔamatʕuzzay/ respectively. This then calls into question whether alternations between final א and י found in Nabatean should be understood as two different ways of writing the same sound or rather actual phonetic alternation within the Arabic dialects of the speakers who wrote the Nabatean texts.\footnote{These inscriptions were accessed through the OCIANA database, http://krcfm.orient.ox.ac.uk/fni/web#ociana (accessed 29 september 2016). I wish to thank Ahmad Al-Jallad for pointing this out to me.}

The “orthographic practice” explanation of the ʔalif maqṣūrah is thus rather strained. The possibility that the alternation between final א and י within Nabatean – especially considering its geographical distribution – represents dialectal differences in the Arabic recorded in Nabatean writing, is prima facie the more likely scenario.

\section{Distinction not attested in dialects and reading traditions}

Diem’s main reason to discredit the possibility that we are looking at dialectal variation within Arabic when examining the alternation between final א and י in Nabatean appears to be that different reflexes of the final vowels do not occur in the modern dialects, nor in the reading traditions (1979: §13). As it turns out, neither of these statements is correct, although in the former case, this was not yet known at the time Diem wrote his article. For the second point, Diem cites Nöldeke et al. (2013 [1836–1930]: iii/37) who say that there is no clear relation between ʔimalah and the writing of ʔ or ʔ.

Researching the dialects of the Ṣaʿdah region in the North of Yemen, Behnstedt (1987: 133f) discovered that the Rāziḥ dialect has the reflex ē for ʔalif maqṣūrah, but a reflex ā for ʔalif mamdūdah, e.g. ramē ‘he threw’, matē ‘when’, versus ʔillā ‘except’, -nā ‘our’, -hā ‘her’. The phonemic difference between ē and ā in this dialect corresponds perfectly to ʔalif maqṣūrah and ʔalif mamdūdah respectively (as pointed by Behnstedt himself). It should be noted that, as in other modern dialects, III-w verbs have merged completely with the III-y verbs, e.g. 3sg.m. daʕē ‘he called’, 2pl.m. daʕēkum ‘you called’ (cf. CAr. daʕā, daʕawtum), but this ē still remains fully distinct from original final *ā as shown in the examples above.

\footnote{It is clear that the Arabic onomasticon in Nabatean shows a certain amount of linguistic variation, pointing to, presumably, several dialects of Arabic being reflected in the material, cf. for example by-forms such as ʕabdu-ʔallahī/ ʕabdu-ʔallāhī/ besides ʕabdu-ʔallahī/ ʕabdu-ʔallāhī/.}
As for the reading traditions, ʔalif maqṣūrah is consistently pronounced as [ē]\(^{10}\) rather than [ā] in the Warš Ṣan Nāfiʕ recitation.\(^ {11}\) This is distinct from the ʔalif mamdūdah, so ramā رما is read as /ramē/ (marked with a dot under the preceding consonant in Warš mushafs), whereas daʕā داع is read as /daʕā/. While Nödeke et al. (2013 [1836–1930]: iii/37) are right to point out that the relation between orthography and reading of ʔimālah is not one-to-one, this is in part related to a conflation of several different processes all called ʔimālah by the Arabic grammarians to whom it is a purely phonetic description, and in part related to the fact that the Warš Ṣan Nāfiʕ recitation has a phonemic vowel /ē/ which follows a slightly different developmental path from the orthography of the QCT.

There are some examples of an [ē] for etymological *ā*, written with Ⲣ, that are purely phonetically conditioned, e.g. stem-final -ār- followed by the genitive -i is read as [ēri]: nāri ناري ‘light’, gāri [gēri] جار ‘neighbor’, etc.; this is essentially a form of conditioned i-umlaut. Nouns and verbs that end in ʔalif maqṣūrah, on the other hand, undergo a form of unconditioned ʔimālah where the /ē/ must be considered phonemic, e.g. /hade/ ‘he leads’, /yardē/ ‘he likes’, /mūsē/ ‘Moses’, /al-mawtē/ ‘the dead’. Using the term ʔimālah indifferently for these different processes gives the false impression that a problem is solved, while in fact it has only been given a name.

There are a few examples where the Warš Ṣan Nāfiʕ tradition has an unconditioned /ē/ that does not align with the orthography of the QCT; moreover, it reads a few cases of ʔalif maqṣūrah as /ā/, despite the orthography. Rather than considering this a counter-argument, this should probably considered an argument in favour of the archaic nature of the Warš Ṣan Nāfiʕ tradition, as the tradition is clearly not deriving its reading of /ē/ from the orthography. Some words that are spelled with Ⲩ pronounced as /ē/ are nouns and verbs with a final sequence -yā, e.g. ad-dunyā الدنيا ‘the world’ and naḥyā نحيا ‘we may live’, which goes back to an original final sequence *q-yār*, as we will see in Section 7.1.

The Warš Ṣan Nāfiʕ tradition reads ʔalif maqṣūrah as /ā/ rather than /ē/ for a few particles: ʔalā علي ‘on’, ʔilā الي ‘to’, ladā لد ‘at, by’ and hattā حت ‘until’.\(^{12}\) These words are isolated particles, and it is not obvious that their final vowel has the same etymological origin as the ʔalif maqṣūrah of nouns.

\(^{10}\)The symbol ̂ is meant to represent the sound described by the Arab grammarians as ʔimālah. Its exact phonetic details are open to discussion, but it certainly represents a more fronted and/or raised vowel than ā.

\(^{11}\)Among other traditions, e.g. ʔabū Ḥāriṯ ʕanal-Kisāʔiyy.

\(^{12}\) Puin (2011: 166) erroneously states that the Warš Ṣan Nāfiʕ tradition reads ٍلا with ā, citing /ile:/ (sic, in fact: [ʔilā]) and with pronominal suffixes /ileka, ilechu, ilehum/ (sic, in fact: [ʔilayəka, ʔilayhi, ʔilayhim]). Moreover, Puin points out that in Kufic manuscripts ʔalā and ʔattī are regularly spelled Ⲩ and Ⲩ respectively. To this we may also add the spelling Ⲩ for ladā which is attested in the Cairo Edition (Q12:25) for one of the two attestations. The other (Q40:18) is often spelled as Ⲩ in early manuscripts as well. Puin considers the reason for these variants unclear. It seems to me that these must be attributed to reading traditions such as Warš Ṣan Nāfiʕ which pronounce these words as [ʕalā], [ʔattī] and [ladā], while other cases of ʔalif maqṣūrah are generally pronounced with [ē]. ʔilā is seemingly never written Ⲩ, perhaps to avoid even further homophony of the sequence of these letters, which already stand for, e.g. ʔilā, ʔa-lā, ʔal-lā.
and verbs. Those in nouns and verbs certainly stem from triphthongs (see Section 9), whereas it is possible, and in the case of the prepositions ʕalā and ʔilā even likely, that the come from original word-final diphthongs: *ʕalay, *ʔilay, *laday and *ḥattay.

As shown above, neither of Diem’s arguments for taking the Nabatean alternation of final ʕ and ʔ as secondary can be maintained. A larger criticism, however, is of methodological nature. Neither the modern dialects nor the reading traditions are under any obligation to reflect dialectal diversity of the Pre-Islamic and early Islamic period. The fact that such features would be absent in either source cannot in any way prove that such a feature was absent in the language of the QCT. The modern dialects and reading traditions should not be taken as representative for the full linguistic variation that we find in the Pre-Islamic period.

That one cannot take the dialectal variation as filtered through the lens of the Arabic grammatical tradition has become abundantly clear through recent advancements in our knowledge of Arabic of the Pre-Islamic period. Al-Jallad (forthcoming b; 2015: 10ff) has convincingly shown that the language of the Safaitic and Hismaic inscriptions as well as some other inscriptions are undeniably a form of Arabic but are also vastly different from Classical Arabic and the modern dialects, and retain linguistic features completely lost in both.

6 Comparative evidence

Graeco-Arabic material from the Early Islamic period leaves little doubt about the pronunciation as /ē/ instead of /ā/ for the ʔalif maqṣūrah. Al-Jallad (forthcoming a: §4.6) identifies three examples of the ʔalif maqṣūrah represented with word-final ֶ: μαυλέ /mawlē/ = mawlā مولى ‘client/patron’ and the personal names ϖαυ /yahyē/ = yahyē يحيى and ναυ /yaʕlē/ = yaslā يعلى.13

Besides this evidence, it is clear that words with an ʔalif maqṣūrah are etymologically distinct from those with ʔalif mamdūdah, where the former corresponds to an original final root consonants y and the latter to root-final w. Compare the following:14

- maḥawnā محونا (Q17:12) ‘we erased’, cf. Gz maḥawa ‘uproot, pull out’.
- banaynā بنينا ‘we built’ (Q78:12), cf. Safaitic bny ‘to build’, Gz banaya ‘id.’, ASA bny.

13 Al-Jallad (forthcoming c: §5.1.1) shows several clear examples from the Pre-Islamic period where names with ʔalif maqṣūrah are written with a final η or ης which he interprets as representing diphthongs /ey/, comparing it to the Safaitic evidence where it is clearly a diphthong, e.g. αλσουφλη /al-sufley/ = as-suflā السفلى and οσνης /ḥosney/ = ḥusnā حسن.
14 Throughout this paper, several sources are used for comparative lexical data. These sources are: Safaitic (Al-Jallad 2015); Ancient South Arabian (ASA) (Beeston et al. 1982); Gəʕəz (Gz) (Leslau 1987).
• *hadā* هدى ‘he lead’ (Q16:36), cf. Safaitic *hdy* ‘id.’
• *ramā* رد ‘he threw’ (Q8:17), cf. Safaitic *rmy* ‘id.’

From the Safaitic spellings, we can see that the final triphthongs *āya* and *awa* had not yet collapsed in Proto-Arabic. Safaitic does not make use of *matres lectionis*, and only spells consonantal *y* and *w* (Al-Jallad 2015: 37). The fact that the *y* is written here therefore confirms that the triphthong had not collapsed. That the *y* and *w* truly represent triphthongs and not *matres lectionis* has recently been confirmed by Al-Jallad & al-Manaser (2015) who describe a Graeco-Arabic inscription that contains the verb /ʔatawa/ ‘he came’ spelled as αθαοα, leaving no doubt about the triphthongal pronunciation of the final *w* for the verbs of this type. The same verb is attested in Safaitic script both as ṭw and ṭy (Al-Jallad 2015: 301).

Not all cases of *ā* in Arabic come from triphthongs with root-final *w*. There are also several examples of word final *ā* which can be reconstructed as final *ā* for Proto-Semitic. These are always written with *ʔalif mamdūdah* and are never found written with *y* in Old Arabic of the Safaitic inscriptions, e.g.:

• 3sg.f. clitic -ha ạ, cf. Safaitic -h; Gz -(h)ā (Weninger 2011: 1130); ASA -h (Stein 2011: 1055); Hebr. ְניקא < *-hā (Suchard 2016a: §8.3.5)
• 1pl. clitic/perfective suffix -nā ạ, cf. Hebr. ְניקא < *-nā (Suchard 2016a: §8.3.2); BAram. ְניקא < *-nā (Suchard 2016a: §8.3.2); ASA -n.
• 3du.m. perfective suffix -ā ạ, cf. (early) Sabaic -Ø (Stein 2011: 1059f).
• Negator lā ạ, cf. Hebr. ְניקא < *lā (Suchard 2016a: §3.3); Aramaic lā (Suchard 2016a: §3.3).

The comparative data shows that root final *w* and *y* align with verbs with *ʔalif mamdūdah* and *ʔalif maqsūrah* respectively. Moreover we see that word-final *َا* is always written with *ʔalif mamdūdah*. This cannot be attributed to a chance correspondence. We must conclude that the distribution of *ʔalif mamdūdah* and *ʔalif maqsūrah* is based not on pseudo-etymological derivational grounds, but on a true etymological origins.

While an etymological spelling may of course imply a historical spelling, rather than a true phonemic distinction, it is important to consider the practical environments in which historical spellings develop. Consider, for example Hebrew *raš* ‘head’, spelled רָק. From comparative evidence, we know that the otiose medial *k* in this word is a historical spelling (cf. Ar. rašs ‘id.’). However in the linguistic history of Hebrew, *אʔC* has shifted to *אC* and subsequently *ā* has shifted to *ō* (Suchard 2016a: 83f). The only way that such a historical spelling could have come to be is that, when the spelling of this word was first established, it was still pronounced with the lost *ʔ*. In the same way, Arabic must – at some point – have had a sound corresponding to the *ʔalif maqsūrah* that
was distinct from the ʔalif mamdūdah. If this were not the case in the language of the QCT, it is hard to imagine when this historical phase must have taken place, as the Quran is one of the earliest Arabic texts committed to writing in the Arabic script.

7 Evidence for /ē/ in the rhyme

We need not rely on the argument of the origin of the historical spelling to suggest that ʔalif maqṣūrah was pronounced distinct from ʔalif mamdūdah in the language of the QCT. Nöldeke et al. (2013 [1836–1930]: iii/37) convincingly argue that there is positive evidence for such a reading in the rhyme of the Quran. Large portions of the Quran rhyme in ى /ē/,[15] and other portions rhyme in ٌ /ā/.[16] These rhymes do not overlap, which strongly suggests that their pronunciation was different.

There are some examples of the ʔalif maqṣūrah where it rhymes either with /i/ or with /ā/, which suggests that the pronunciation was phonetically in between the two, as /ē/ would be.

/ē/ is rhymed with /ā/ twice. Both times it occurs in a complex rhyming scheme:

- Q65:6: ʔuḫrāاخرى‘another’, rest of the Surah has the rhyming scheme [vCCā].
- Q99:5 ʔawḥā lahāاوحىلها‘he commanded it’ in Q99:1-6, rhyming scheme: [āRahā].

/ī/ occasionally rhymes in sections that are otherwise completely rhymed in /ē/; this is more common than /ē/ rhyming with /ā/:

- Q20:2–24 is completely rhymed in /ē/ being interrupted once by Q20:14 li-ḏikr-ʔاذاذكرى‘for my remembrance’.
- Q20:36–84 is completely rhymed with /ē/ only being interrupted by Q20:39 Ṣayn-ʔاظى‘my eye’, 41 li-nafs-ʔifiantى‘for myself’, 42 ḏikr-ʔاذى‘my remembrance’.
- Q20:90 ʔamr-ʔامري‘my order’ is rhymed with Q20:91 mūsāموسى‘Moses’.
- Q89:24 li-ḥayāt-ʔاذاحياتى‘for my life’ is rhymed with Q89:23 ʔaddikrāاذذكرى‘the remembrance’.

Diem (1979) does not comment on the rhyme argument at all. To my mind, however, it is the strongest argument in favour of a contrast between ʔalif maqṣūrah and ʔalif mamdūdah. Diem does however point to one problem

---


[16]Among others all of Q4, Q17.
(1979: §46): there are some roots which have w as their final root consonant in Classical Arabic which are written with a ى. These would be ‘mistakes’ in the QCT, that would serve as evidence that ʔalif maqṣūrah actually denotes /ā/. As already pointed out by Nöldeke et al. (2013 [1836–1930]: iii/40), however, this argument evaporates when we examine which verbs he has identified with such spellings and the context in which they are found:

- Q79:30 daḥā-hā دحها ‘he expanded it’
- Q91:6 ṣaḥā-hā ضحها ‘he expanded it’
- Q93:2 sağa سح ‘he was quiet’
- Q91:2 talā-hā تلها ‘he followed it’ (but Q10:16 talawtu-hū تلوته)

These four examples all stand in an /ē/ or /ē-hā/ rhyme, and are explained as a poetic license for the sake of the rhyme by Nöldeke et al. (2013 [1836–1930]: iii/40). Moreover, as Nöldeke et al. point out, the roots of daḥā دحى and ṣaḥā ضحى and talā تلها are attested in Classical Arabic with either w or ی as final root consonants, and might therefore not even be genuine counterexamples (neither of the forms are attested in any other place in the Quran).

There is some amount of confusion between final-w and final-y roots already in Old Arabic (Al-Jallad 2015: 50) and some of these confusions have become become standard in Classical Arabic, e.g. ʔatā أتى, ʔataytu أتبت ‘he came; I came’, despite clearly having an etymological final ‘w, as confirmed by ASA ʔtw ‘come’, Gz ʔatawa ‘id.’. Confusion of this root is already attested in Old Arabic, Safaitic ʔtw, ṭyw ‘he came’. It seems possible that the composer of the QCT exploited this variation within the Arabic dialect continuum to suit the rhyme in these cases.

The final word that Diem cites in favour of this evidence is Q24:21 zakā زكى ‘he was clean’. For this word, a rhyme cannot be invoked. There is however no reason to think that this verb has not merged in the language of the QCT with the III-y verbs, and in fact, it is attested in Classical Arabic with a root final y as well (see Lane 1863–1893 s.v. zk). There are no conjugations or derivations of this root that show a consonant w in the Quran, so there is no reason to think that the root was zk in the language of the QCT.

7.1  ad-dunyā and ʔaḥyā

Both ad-dunyā الدنيا and ʔaḥyā أحياء ‘he gives life’ are rhymed in /ē/ rhyme contexts (Q19:72; Q53:29,44; Q79:38). This is somewhat unexpected, as the

71Diem (1979: n. 72) explicitly recognises this possibility.
82Note also that a complete merger of the III-w verbs towards the III-y verbs has taken place in (probably) all modern Arabic dialects (Versteegh 1989: 20).
93Interestingly, this word is read as /za:kā/ in the Warš ſan Nāfiʕ reading tradition, despite its orthography. To my knowledge, this is the only verb that ends in ʔalif maqṣūrah for which this is the case.
10The word zakāh زكوه ‘alms’, while seemingly from the same root, is obviously a loanword from Aramaic, as Diem (1979: §51) also recognises, and says nothing about the root of the verb as being final w. See the discussion in Section 8 below.
spelling seems to suggest that the final syllable has /ā/.

These words etymologically had a final *-ayv triphthong. *ad-dunyā is a feminine elative formation. These are normally written with an ʔalif maqsūrah, e.g. کبْرِی kibrī, and must be reconstructed for Proto-Arabic as *duny-ay-u/a. In Classical Arabic, only when the last root consonant is y, it is spelled with ِ instead, cf. also ُعْلَیا علیا ‘higher; highest’ (considered by Rabin 1951: 115ff to be a dissimilation of the sequence /yē/ > /yā/).

Likewise, ُعْلَیا ُعْلَیا is a C-stem of the root ḥyy,21 which would be reconstructed as *ʔahyaya. Other sequences of original word-final, post-consonantal *yayv are consistently written ٰ in Classical Arabic orthography, as well as in the Cairo Edition of the Quran, with the exception of the name yahyā and the homophonous verb ‘he lives’ which is spelled يحيى (Q20:74; Q87:13, which would be spelled يحيى in Classical Arabic orthography).

If we examine the spellings of words of this type in the early Codex Parisino-Petropolitanis (Déroche 2009; henceforth CPP), we find a different situation. Here, except in the case of the feminine/plural suffix -ā, the spelling is يى, not ٰ:

• Q5:32; Q45:5 ُعْلَیا ُعْلَیا ‘he was made to live; saved’
• Q37:37; Q45:24 ُعْلَیا ُعْلَیا ‘we live’
• Q6:146 al-ḥawāyā ‘the entrails’
• Q9:40 al-ʕulyā ‘the upper’
• (passim) *ad-dunyā ‘the world’

This then solves the rhyme of Q53:44, which should be read as /ʔahyē/, as suggested by the spelling احمى in two different locations in the CPP.

The question one has to ask subsequently is why *ad-dunyā is spelled the way it is, while it rhymes as if it ends in /ē/. The dissimilation suggested by the orthography is absent in the rhyme. This absence of dissimilation is also attested in the Warš Yan Nāfīy reading tradition which reads /ad-dunyē/, /al-ʕulyē/ and /al-hawāyē/.22 The difference in spelling practice that we find in the CPP is therefore difficult to understand; but it seems that such spellings have started spreading to verbs in the orthography of Classical Arabic, where this was not yet the case in the orthography of early Quran documents.

21Ultimately from ِḥyw, but all final *-iwa verbs shifted to *-iya at an early point in time, e.g. ُعْلَیا, ُعْلَیا > يحيى, يحيى. The *w resurfaces in some nominal derivations, e.g. ُعْلَیا ‘animals’.

22In a vocalised Judeo-Arabic text, Khan (2010: 204) cites an example of a vocalised *ad-dunyā: يَدْ وَعْلَیا. While the spelling perfectly calques the Classical Arabic orthography, the vocalisation implies that the final vowel was pronounced /ē/. Khan identifies ُعْلَیا in this form, as well as in ُعْلَیا ‘on’ and ُعْلَیا ‘and the highest’. As all of these examples are clearly from an original *ay(v) sequence, which in the QCT has been retained as /ē/, it seems better to consider this a retention of the original vocalism with /ē/, rather than an unconditioned spontaneous raising of the vowel /ā/.
8 Examples of ʔalif mamdūdah for ʔalif maqṣūrah

Diem (1979: §46) cites several examples where ʔalif mamdūdah is written where ʔalif maqṣūrah is expected. These are intended to prove that they represent one and the same sound: al-aqṣā ‘farthest’, taḡā ‘it overflowed’, ladā (besides) ‘at’, tawallā-hu (besides tawallā ‘he took him as a friend’, hudā-ya ‘my guidance’, tatrā ‘in succession’ and siṃā-hum سبئهم ‘their signs’.

The first three of these are explained by Nöldeke et al. (2013 [1836–1930]: iii/38) as variants that appear in front of a CC cluster of the following word. This would represent a shortening of ē to a in a closed syllable. Diem (1979: fn. 73) recognises this phonetic solution but labels it unconvincing without further explanation. While it is not necessarily obvious why ʔalif maqṣūrah would have to be shortened in these contexts it is clearly attested in the reading traditions. Whenever an ʔalif maqṣūrah appears before a wasl, it is read as /a/, not as /ē/, in the Warš ʕan Nāfīf reading tradition and all others that have /ē/ for ʔalif maqṣūrah, e.g.:

- Q40:54 mūsā l-hudā /mūsa l-hudeh/
- Q40:76 muṯwā l-mutakabbirīna /muṯwa l-mutakabbirin/
- Q41:39 tarā l-ʔarḍi /tara l-ʔardî/

But even if we do not accept this explanation, most of the examples posited by Diem can be explained. We will look at the words individually.

8.1 al-aqṣā ‘farthest’ (Q17:1; Q28:20; Q36:20)

In Classical Arabic, III-w and III-y roots are usually both treated as III-y when forming the elative, e.g. ʔaslā ‘highest’ (√ʕlw)، ʔadnā ‘lowest’ (√dnw). However, the feminine elative of the root √qṣw did not neutralize to III-y: Q8:42 al-quṣwā ‘the farther’. It then stands to reason that this neutralization did not happen in the masculine elative either, in which case the spelling as we find it in the QCT would be regular as the word would go back to an original final triphthong with *w.\(^{23}\)

8.2 taḡā ‘it overflowed’ (Q69:11)

taḡā ‘it overflowed’ occurs besides the more commonly attested طغأ ‘overflow’. It seems to me that we might be dealing with two different roots of different meanings. In all other attestations in the Quran taḡā means ‘to transgress; err’. While a semantic development from ‘to overflow’ to ‘to transgress’ seems possible, ‘to overflow’ would have to be the primary meaning. The other Semitic languages show no sign of such a meaning, and only the meaning ‘to transgress’ is present,

\(^{23}\)I wish to thank Phillip Stokes for this original suggestion.
e.g. Aram. ṭnū ‘to wander; to err’ (CAL²⁴ s.v.); Hebr. ṭāḇā ‘to err; wander about’ (Koehler & Baumgartner 1967–1990 s.v.). Even if these words ultimately go back to the same root, it seems plausible that ṭagā ‘to overflow’ represents the native root, while ṭāḡā ﻁغا is a loanword from Aramaic. A related nominal form ṭāḡūṭ ﻁغوت ‘idolatry’ (cf. also Gz ṭāʕot ‘idol’) must come from Aramaic ṭāʕū emph. ṭāʕūṯā ‘error, idol’ (CAL s.v.) as already pointed out by Jeffery (2007: 203).

8.3  tatrā تفرا ‘in succession’ (Q23:44)

tatrā تفرا ‘in succession’ is a hapax legemenon. The interpretation of the final ی as the feminine ending -ā (for which we would expect an ḫalif maqṣūrah) is far from certain. In fact, several reading traditions read the adverbial indefinite accusative ṭatrān instead. Moreover, this word has an irregular formation, as it has an initial t where we would expect w, if it is indeed derived from the verb watara ‘to string’.

Ahmad Al-Jallad (pers. comm.) suggests that the initial ت could be read as a ى, and that we are dealing with a loan from a North-West Semitic language that has undergone a shift of initial ِ ِ ى > ی. An obvious donor would be Aramaic, which has a word ṣṭar emph. yatrā ‘rope; bowstring’ (CAL s.v.). This form, in the indefinite accusative ‘yatr-an yields a semantically plausible reading ‘as a rope/line’ to mean ‘in succession’. Whatever the exact analysis of this word, it can hardly be taken as evidence that ḫalif maqṣūrah was pronounced /ā/ in the language of the QCT.

8.4  simā-hum ‘their sign’ (Q48:29) and بسيماهم (Q7:47, 48)

The word simā-hum is attested in three different spellings in the QCT: بسيماهم (Q2:273; Q47:30; Q55:41); بسيماهم (Q48:29); بسيماهم (Q7:47,48). This spelling can scarcely be held as a strong counterexample, as the word is borrowed from Greek σῆμα ‘sign’ (Jeffery 2007: 183f). It seems possible that the spellings بسيماهم and بسيماهم reflect /simā/, accurately reproducing the Greek pronunciation, whereas بسيماهم represents a somewhat more nativized variant /simē/.

8.5 hudā-ya ‘my guidance’ (Q2:38; Q20:123)

The ی is probably a later addition in بسيماهم. The Samarkand Codex has بسيماهم for both attestations. We II 1913 has the same for the former, and بسيماهم for the latter. The ی looks like a later addition, however. Ma VI 165 has بسيماهم for Q20:123.²⁵ A similar example is found in Q6:162 mahīyā ‘my living’, which is spelled محيي in the CPP.

²⁵ All Quran manuscripts cited here were accessed through www.corpuscoranicum.de (27 september 2016).
8.6  ladā لدا ‘at’ (Q12:25)
ladā لدا is attested in one other place without pronominal suffixes. There it is spelled as in Classical Arabic: لدا (Q40:18). In the Saray Medina 1a Quran manuscript, this is spelled لدا as well. One is reminded of the spelling of the other ʔalif maqṣūrah-final prepositions ʕalā and ḥattā, which are spelled عل and حتا in Kufic Qurans (see Section 5). Like ʕalā, ʔattā and ʔilā, this particle is pronounced with an /ā/ in the Warš ʕan Nāfiʕ reading tradition. While this spelling is rather anomalous in the Cairo Edition of the Quran, it seems likely that it is related to the /ā/ reflex of ʔalif maqṣūrah of these prepositions.

8.7  tawallā-hu طوله ‘he took him as a friend’ (Q22:4)
tawallā-hu طوله ‘he took him as a friend’ occurs besides several cases of tawallā طول. A clear explanation for the spelling is not forthcoming. However, in light of the overwhelming evidence from the rhyme, this one exception seems to me a minor problem rather than definitive proof that ʔalif maqṣūrah was pronounced the same as ʔalif mamdūdah.

9  The development of *aWv in defective roots

In the above sections we have shown that the ʔalif maqṣūrah and ʔalif mamdūdah have separate etymological origins and that the orthography certainly points to an original contrast. This contrast still appears to be present in the language of the QCT. The developments that take place for the final triphthongs are:

1. *awv > ā
2. *ayv > ē (CAr. > ā)

   Similar to the development of *aWv in hollow roots, this shift does not seem to happen if another glide follows. This condition seems to affect only one word: CAr./QCT ˤayawān ‘animals’.

   As we will see in Section 10, it seems that the collapse of these triphthongs only happened if they were unstressed. For verbs and masculine nouns of defective roots this condition has no bearing on the outcome (as triphthongs there would always be unstressed), but it is relevant for the discussion of feminine nouns with a final *aw-atu, *ay-atu which will be discussed in that section.

9.1  Shortening of *ā and *ē

The development as described above creates a new superheavy syllable in the perfect 3sg.f; this is subsequently shortened. This development has taken place in both the language of the QCT and Classical Arabic:

---

From the reflexes of the verb, it is not clear whether the newly introduced fourth long vowel /ē/ in the language of the QCT was shortened to /e/ in this environment, or whether the vowel merged with /a/. This shortening has also affected nouns that ended in a triphthong *aWv, followed by nunation, e.g.:

- *sanawun > *sanān > Car. sanan; QCT سنا ‘flash’
- *hudayun > *hudēn > Car. hudan; QCT هدى ‘guidance’

The QCT and Classical Arabic orthographies reflect forms where nunation was lost. In the cases of sanan, the spelling سنا can be readily understood. The indefinite accusative -an on nouns is also written with final ی. This points to a shift *-an# > ā.

In the pronunciation of Classical Arabic, this explanation is also readily available for hudan with pausal hudā. However, in the language of the QCT, this form clearly rhymes with ē (e.g. Q20:10). This suggests that the reflex of *hudayun yielded /hudē/. This can be understood by assuming a shift *-en# > ē, thus yielding the development *hudayun > *hudēn > *hudēn > /hudē/. This would suggest that the /ē/ vowel was retained as /e/ when the syllable was shortened to avoid a superheavy syllable.

Another way of explaining the spelling هدى in the indefinite form is, by assuming an analogy. If /ē/, when shortened, merged with /a/, this would result in an asymmetrical paradigm: Def. *al-hudē; Constr. *hudē; Indef. *hudā. This paradigm could have easily been regularized, yielding an indefinite /hudē/.

9.2 Some minor developments in defective roots

There are several uncontroversial developments of the defective root which are worth mentioning here for completeness.

9.2.1 *iyu/i > *i, *uwu > *ū

Already at an early stage, Arabic undergoes several developments of defective verbs. The first of these, which is already complete in Safaitic and may therefore be a Proto-Arabic development, is the shift *iyu/i > *i,27 as in the nominative and genitive active participles of Safaitic s²t/šātī/ ‘wintering’ (Al-Jallad 2015: 49). The same development did not take place in front of *a, as we still find sequences of word-final -iya in Classical Arabic, e.g. xašiya خشي ‘to

---

27The sequence *iyu/i has the same reflex as *iusu/i, presumably by first shifting *u to i before y, and then partaking in the same shift. This can be seen in the stem V verbal noun of defective verbs, e.g. talaqqīn ‘receiving’ < *talaqqyayun, cf. takallumun ‘speaking’.
fear’. Al-Jallad also suggests that, despite a lack of evidence in the epigraphic record, the analogous shift *uWu > ʿū probably has also taken place in Safaitic. This development explains the imperfective stem of defective verbs. This development has certainly taken place in Classical Arabic and the language of the QCT:

- *yahdiyu > yahdī ‘he leads’
- *yadʕuwu > yadʕū ‘he calls’

Nouns with an original stem-final sequences *-iy- have the same contraction in the nominative and the genitive. In the indefinite form, the contraction also takes places, but is shortened to i to avoid a superheavy syllable:

- *zāniyu/in > (zānīn >) zānin ‘fornicator’
- *al-zāniyu/i > al-zānī ‘the fornicator’

9.2.2 *aWū > *aw, *aWī > ay

Sequences of *aWū or *aWī are contracted in Classical Arabic and the language of the QCT to aw and ay respectively:

- *taḡayū > taḡaw ‘they transgressed’
- *daʕawū > daʕaw ‘they called’
- *tarḍawī > tarḍay ‘may you be pleased’

This development appears to have already have taken place in Safaitic. In the Pre-Islamic Graeco-Arabic text published by Al-Jallad & al-Manaser (2015), Al-Jallad convincingly identifies ειραυ as representing/yirʕaw/ ‘and they pastured’ < *yirʕayū, already attesting this contraction.

10 Feminine nouns of the type *CaCaWat-

In a recent article, Al-Jallad (forthcoming d) discusses in great detail that the nouns that orthographically end in and in the QCT cannot be attributed to an Aramaic orthographic borrowing of *אלאהא ‘prayer’ and *אלאה ‘merit’ giving rise to ‘prayer’ and ‘alms’, not only because there are several originally Arabic words with such spellings, but also because the Old Arabic data make it absolutely clear that several of these words originally had a triphthong. For example, ‘salvation’ is attested in Safaitic as ngwt ‘id.’; ‘salvation’ ‘Manāh (Deity Name)’ is attested in Thamudic and Dadanitic as mnwt ‘id’ and in a Latin inscription as MANAVAT. This expected /aw/ syllable resurfaces in the plural formation in Classical Arabic, e.g. şalawát- ‘prayers’.

---

28The vowel of these imperfectives is occasionally shortened in the QCT. Apparently this mostly happens in in pause and in front of two consonants (Diem 1979: §§31–36).
Another reason why we must assume a triphthong in these nouns is because without it, we are at a loss of how to explain the shift of the final -t to -h in the language of the QCT. The -t in Arabic only shifts to -h when it is preceded by the short vowel a. This is why this development fails to apply to the feminine plural ending -āt. Hence, a form **manāt would not be expected to yield **manāh, whereas a form like *manawat can undergo this development.

To explain these forms, Al-Jallad suggests that in the language of the QCT underwent a stress shift that places the accent maximally on the antepenultimate syllable, and that the monophthongization of *awv > ā only takes place in unstressed syllables or if the second syllable of the triphthong was stressed. When the triphthong *āwv was stressed, it would have then developed into ō (although a retention of the triphthong also seems possible). This would predict the alternation between the مص and مث spelled that we find between the indefinite/definite and the construct form:

- *aṣ-ṣalāwatu > aṣ-ṣalāwah > aṣ-ṣalōh (الصلو) (Q62:10)
- *ṣalawātī-ka > ṣalātika (صلان) (Q17:110)

The stress rule that produces this stress pattern is formulated as follows:

- Stress falls on the antepenultimate, unless the penultimate is heavy, in which case it takes the stress.

Being identical to the stress system of Latin, this stress system will henceforth be referred to as ‘Latin stress’.

In Classical Arabic, this development of the stress system may not have taken place. In which case the stress system attributed to it in modern tradition applies:

- Stress falls on the last non-final heavy syllable. If there is no heavy syllable, it falls on the first syllable.

This stress rule will henceforth be referred to as ‘Classical stress’. Classical stress results in the following development for Classical Arabic:

- *ṣalawatu > ṣalātu
- *ṣalawati-ka > ṣalātika

This would result in forms that cannot undergo the -at > -ah shift, and therefore a pausal pronunciation ṣalāṭ would be expected. Nouns of this type commonly are pronounced as ṣalāṭ in Classical Arabic in pause. The Classical

---

29 A development well-attested in the Modern Arabic dialects of e.g. the Najd, which reflect *baqāratu as bgušra (Fischer & Jastrow 1980: 109).
30 Nouns with the feminine ending are given without nunation, as Van Putten (forthcoming) argues that feminine nouns in the language of the QCT were diptotic.
The development of the triphthongs in Arabic spelling would seem to represent an amalgamated form of the QCT orthography and the Classical Arabic pronunciation, which does not accurately represent its pausal pronunciation in Classical Arabic.

The nouns of this type that are attested in the QCT are tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QCT</th>
<th>pronunciation</th>
<th>meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>مشكوه</td>
<td>/miškṓh/</td>
<td>‘niche’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>صلوه</td>
<td>/ṣalṓh/</td>
<td>‘prayer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>صلاتهم</td>
<td>/ṣalātu-hum/</td>
<td>‘their prayer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>زكوه</td>
<td>/zakṓh/</td>
<td>‘alms’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>حىوه</td>
<td>/ḥayṓh/</td>
<td>‘life’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>حانكم</td>
<td>/ḥāyāti-kum/</td>
<td>‘your life’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الغدوه</td>
<td>/al-ḡadṓh/</td>
<td>‘in the morning’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مرضاة</td>
<td>/marḍāt/</td>
<td>‘the pleasure of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مرضاة</td>
<td>/marḍātī/</td>
<td>‘my pleasure’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two cases in the Ḥafs ʕāṣim reading tradition where ṣalātu-ka ‘your prayer’ is spelled as صلوتك, rather than the expected صلاتك (Q9:103, Q11:87). In both cases, these words are read as plurals in other reading traditions, ṣalawātu-ka. The plural reading should be considered original.

In Q24:58 the construct of ṣalāh is spelled as صلوه twice. In the QCT it is the orthographic practice to write construct feminine nouns in the form they take as indefinite nouns. This practice is occasionally not observed, e.g. niʕmatu llāhi ‘the approval of Allah’ (Q2:207, 265; Q4:114). In the majority of feminine construct nouns, we see this practice. The construct ṣalāti spelled as صلوه must be understood as a result of adherence to this practice, despite the rather big phonetic difference between the indefinite and construct form. 31

Besides these nouns, there are also three nouns that have a ـه ending that corresponds to the ending -āt- in Classical Arabic. These nouns are given below, and must be understood as having undergone an analogous development to the -awat- nouns above, but instead of collapsing to ő, the accentted triphthong ĕya collapsed to ĕ.

• مرجيه /muzǧēh/ [32] < *muzǧáyatu ‘of little value’
• تقه /tuqēh/ < *tuqáyatu ‘as a precaution’
• التوريه /at-tawrēh/ < *al-tawráyatu ‘The Torah’

31 It is unclear when and why this orthographic practice developed. Nehmé (forthcoming) examines the Nabatean inscriptions written in the transitional Nabateo-Arabic script, and concludes that such a practice has not yet developed in inscriptions as late as 428 AD. The fact that a rather large percentage of all the feminine constructs in the QCT (I count about 22%) are still written with the ـه form suggests that this practice had not yet reached complete acceptance in Arabic orthography at the time the QCT was canonized.

32 These nouns are read in the Warš ʕāṣim tradition with a vowel /ē/, pointing to this monophthongization and phonemic differentiation from the ṣalāh type nouns.
An interesting factor of nouns with this shape is that two of these forms also have a masculine formation in Arabic. This confirms that the underlying form is *-ay-at-, as the masculine nouns are written with a final ى Pronounced in Classical Arabic as ā, which must go back to an old triphthong *ayv (see Section 6):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>feminine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>muzǧan</td>
<td>muzǧāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuqan</td>
<td>tuqāh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The spelling Q3:102 تقاته ‘the fearing of him’, however, would appear to present a problem for this development in the QCT. As suggested in Section 5, unaccented *ayv is expected to yield ē, not ā, which is what this form seems to reflect: *tuqayáti-hi > */tuqēt-ih/, but the spelling suggests /tuqṭi-h/. It therefore seems that the triphthong with the accent on the second syllable developed differently from the unstressed triphthong. This then leads us to posit three separate outcomes depending on the position of the stress.

Before the loss of final short vowels, we have the shift discussed in Section 9:

- Unstressed *aya > ē; *awa > ā

After the loss of final short vowels we have the following developments:

- *āya > ē; *āwa > ď
- *ayá, awá > ā

These developments predict that the construct *-aw-at- nouns have ď in the absolute and ā in both the construct before a noun and before a pronominal suffix, whereas *-ay-at- nouns have ē in the absolute and construct before a noun, but ā before a pronominal suffix: *saláwatu > șalōh; *salawátuka > șalātuka; *salawatu + noun > șalātu; *tuqayatu > *tuqēh; *tuqayáti-hi > tuqāti-h; *tuqayatū + noun > *tuqētu + noun. Construct nouns of the *-ay-at- type are unattested in prenominal construct, so this hypothesis is impossible to confirm or disprove.

### 11 Relative chronology

The sound laws presented in this paper can be placed in a fairly clear relative chronology. The language of the QCT and Classical Arabic take slightly different trajectories, and their individual developments will be discussed below. The two varieties share several developments. The first two of these developments can plausibly be reconstructed for Proto-Arabic. These developments assume the Classical stress system in this stage of Arabic.

1. *iWi/u > ĩ; *uwu > ū
2. \*aWī > ay; \*aWū > aw
3. \*āWv[-W] > ā; aWv[-W] > ā

Until the loss of the final case vowels a phonotactic rule that shortens superheavy syllables (vC.$ > vC.$) remains active in the QCT and Classical Arabic. An overview of these developments, with several relevant reconstructed forms display how the order of these rules have affected the developments, is displayed in Table 1 of Appendix A below.

11.1 Triphthong developments in the language of the QCT

The developments argued to have taken place in the language of the QCT are:

1. Classical stress > Latinstress
2. Unstressed \*ayv[-W] > ē; \*awv[-W] > ā
3. \*u/i(n)# > Ø; an# > ā; (en# > ē)
4. \*at# > ah
5. \*āya > ē; \*āwa > ā; \*aWā > ā

An overview of these developments is displayed in Table 2 below.

11.2 Triphthong developments in Classical Arabic

The following developments have to be assumed for Classical Arabic:

1. Unstressed \*aWv[-W] > ā
2. \*u/i(n)# > Ø; an# > ā (only in pause)
3. \*at# > ah (only in pause)

The result of the first of these developments is displayed in Table 3 below.

12 Conclusion

This paper shows that the unusual spellings of ā in the QCT with the glides ى and ٠, cannot be attributed to arbitrary, purely orthographic practices. The comparative Semitic evidence, as well as Arabic-internal evidence leaves little doubt that whenever ى and ٠, are used to represent ā, said ā developed from an original triphthong, which must have had distinct phonetic values at the time that the Nabatean writing system was adapted for writing Arabic. It is, moreover, argued that the situation in the QCT is best understood by assuming that the language had developed an /ē/, marked by ى, and that the ى and ى in words like صل٨, ‘prayer’ and تق٨, ‘precaution’ point to /ōh/ and /ēh/ respectively.

Address for Correspondence: m.van.putten@hum.leidenuniv.nl
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33In front of a geminate, long vowels are not shortened, e.g. َبلا ‘someone who has strayed’.
A  Developments of the triphthongs illustrated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Proto-Arabic</th>
<th>*iWu/i &gt; ī;</th>
<th>*uwu &gt; ū</th>
<th>*aWū/i &gt; aw/y</th>
<th>*áWv[-W] &gt; ā́;</th>
<th>*aWv[-W] &gt; ū́</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qāwuma</td>
<td>qāwuma</td>
<td>qāwuma</td>
<td>qāma</td>
<td>qūmtu &gt; qūmtu</td>
<td>qūmtu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qawīmtu</td>
<td>qawīmtu</td>
<td>qawīmtu</td>
<td>qūmtu</td>
<td>qūmtu</td>
<td>qūmtu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāwīma</td>
<td>nāwīma</td>
<td>nāwīma</td>
<td>nāma</td>
<td>nāma</td>
<td>nāma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nawīmtu</td>
<td>nawīmtu</td>
<td>nawīmtu</td>
<td>nūmtu</td>
<td>nūmtu</td>
<td>nūmtu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāšawa</td>
<td>dāšawa</td>
<td>dāšawa</td>
<td>dāšawa</td>
<td>dāšawa</td>
<td>dāšawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāšawat</td>
<td>dāšawat</td>
<td>dāšawat</td>
<td>dāšawat</td>
<td>dāšawat</td>
<td>dāšawat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dašawtu</td>
<td>dašawtu</td>
<td>dašawtu</td>
<td>dašawtu</td>
<td>dašawtu</td>
<td>dašawtu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hādaya</td>
<td>hādaya</td>
<td>hādaya</td>
<td>hādaya</td>
<td>hādaya</td>
<td>hādaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hādayat</td>
<td>hādayat</td>
<td>hādayat</td>
<td>hādayat</td>
<td>hādayat</td>
<td>hādayat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haddātu</td>
<td>haddātu</td>
<td>haddātu</td>
<td>haddātu</td>
<td>haddātu</td>
<td>haddātu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yāḍāšū</td>
<td>yāḍāšū</td>
<td>yāḍāšū</td>
<td>yāḍāšū</td>
<td>yāḍāšū</td>
<td>yāḍāšū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yāḍāšū</td>
<td>yāḍāšū</td>
<td>yāḍāšū</td>
<td>yāḍāšū</td>
<td>yāḍāšū</td>
<td>yāḍāšū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāşāwī</td>
<td>dāşāwī</td>
<td>dāşaw</td>
<td>dāšaw</td>
<td>dāšaw</td>
<td>dāšaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tārdāwi</td>
<td>tārdāwi</td>
<td>tārday</td>
<td>tārday</td>
<td>tārday</td>
<td>tārday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wādifun</td>
<td>wādifun &gt; wādin</td>
<td>wādifun</td>
<td>wādin</td>
<td>wādin</td>
<td>wādin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pātayun</td>
<td>pātayun</td>
<td>pātayun</td>
<td>pātayun</td>
<td>pātayun</td>
<td>pātayun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patayu</td>
<td>patayu</td>
<td>patayu</td>
<td>patayu</td>
<td>patayu</td>
<td>patayu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sānawun</td>
<td>sānawun</td>
<td>sānawun</td>
<td>sānawun</td>
<td>sānawun</td>
<td>sānawun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāgayawu</td>
<td>nāgayawu</td>
<td>nāgayawu</td>
<td>nāgayawu</td>
<td>nāgayawu</td>
<td>nāgayawu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāgayawu</td>
<td>nāgayawu</td>
<td>nāgayawu</td>
<td>nāgayawu</td>
<td>nāgayawu</td>
<td>nāgayawu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāgayawu-ka</td>
<td>nāgayawu-ka</td>
<td>nāgayawu-ka</td>
<td>nāgayawu-ka</td>
<td>nāgayawu-ka</td>
<td>nāgayawu-ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tāqayati-hi</td>
<td>tāqayati-hi</td>
<td>tāqayati-hi</td>
<td>tāqayati-hi</td>
<td>tāqayati-hi</td>
<td>tāqayati-hi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tāqayati-hi</td>
<td>tāqayati-hi</td>
<td>tāqayati-hi</td>
<td>tāqayati-hi</td>
<td>tāqayati-hi</td>
<td>tāqayati-hi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Developments of the triphthongs shared by the QCT and Classical Arabic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin stress;</th>
<th>*u/i(n)# &gt; Ø;</th>
<th>at# &gt; ah</th>
<th>*áya &gt; ē;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unstressed</td>
<td>*a/en# &gt; ā, ē</td>
<td>*áwa &gt; ō;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*awv[-W] &gt; ā,</td>
<td>*aWá &gt; ā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*u/i(n)# &gt; Ø;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qama</td>
<td>qām</td>
<td>qām</td>
<td>qām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qumtu</td>
<td>qūmt</td>
<td>qūmt</td>
<td>qūmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāma</td>
<td>nām</td>
<td>nām</td>
<td>nām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nīmtu</td>
<td>nīmt</td>
<td>nīmt</td>
<td>nīmt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāsā</td>
<td>dāsā</td>
<td>dāsā</td>
<td>dāsā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāsāt &gt; dāsat</td>
<td>dāsāt</td>
<td>dāsāt</td>
<td>dāsāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dašāwtu</td>
<td>dašāwt</td>
<td>dašāwt</td>
<td>dašāwt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hādē</td>
<td>hādē</td>
<td>hādē</td>
<td>hādē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hādēt &gt; hādet</td>
<td>hādet</td>
<td>hādet</td>
<td>hādet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hadāytu</td>
<td>hadāyt</td>
<td>hadāyt</td>
<td>hadāyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yādī</td>
<td>yādī</td>
<td>yādī</td>
<td>yādī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yāhdi</td>
<td>yāhdi</td>
<td>yāhdi</td>
<td>yāhdi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dāsaw</td>
<td>dāsaw</td>
<td>dāsaw</td>
<td>dāsaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tārday</td>
<td>tārday</td>
<td>tārday</td>
<td>tārday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wādīn</td>
<td>wād</td>
<td>wād</td>
<td>wād</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pātēn &gt; pāten</td>
<td>pātē</td>
<td>pātē</td>
<td>pātē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patē</td>
<td>patē</td>
<td>patē</td>
<td>patē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sānān &gt; sānan</td>
<td>sānā</td>
<td>sānā</td>
<td>sānā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nagawatū</td>
<td>nagawat</td>
<td>nagawah</td>
<td>nagōh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nagātu</td>
<td>nagāt</td>
<td>nagāt</td>
<td>nagāt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nagawatū-ka</td>
<td>nagawat-ka</td>
<td>nagawat-ka</td>
<td>nagawat-ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuqāyatū</td>
<td>tuqāyat</td>
<td>tuqāyah</td>
<td>tuqēh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuqayāti-h</td>
<td>tuqayāti-h</td>
<td>tuqayāti-h</td>
<td>tuqāti-h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Developments of the triphthongs in the QCT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>last shared ancestor with QCT</th>
<th>unstressed</th>
<th>*aWv[-W] &gt; ā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qāma</td>
<td>qāma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qūmtu</td>
<td>qūmtu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāma</td>
<td>nāma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nūmtu</td>
<td>nūmtu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dā́sawa</td>
<td>dā́sā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dā́sawat</td>
<td>dā́sāt &gt; dā́t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daʕawtu</td>
<td>daʕawtu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hādāya</td>
<td>hādā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hādāyat</td>
<td>hādāt &gt; hādāt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hadāytu</td>
<td>hadāytu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yādstituição</td>
<td>yā蚰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yāhdī</td>
<td>yāhdī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dā́saw</td>
<td>dā́saw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tā́rday</td>
<td>tā́rday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wā́din</td>
<td>wā́din</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pātayun</td>
<td>pātān &gt; pātan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patayu</td>
<td>patā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sānawun</td>
<td>sānān &gt; sānan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāgawatun</td>
<td>nāgātu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nagawatu</td>
<td>nāgātu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāgawatu-ka</td>
<td>nāgātu-ka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tūqayatu</td>
<td>tūqātu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tūqayati-hi</td>
<td>tuqā́ti-hi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Developments of the triphthongs in Classical Arabic*
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Abstract

This contribution provides a preliminary update to An Outline of the Grammar of the Safaitic Inscriptions (SSLL 80; Leiden: Brill, 2015) based on new inscriptions and the re-interpretation of previously published texts. New data pertain to phonology, demonstratives, verbal morphology, and syntax. The supplement to the dictionary contains hundreds of new entries, mainly comprising rare words and hapax legomena.

Keywords: Safaitic Ancient North Arabian Arabic grammar

1 Introduction

In the preface of my Outline Grammar of Safaitic (Al-Jallad 2015c), I remarked that the rapid pace of discovery will require constant updates, as new inscriptions will inevitably yield new grammatical constructions and vocabulary, and provide a better context for the interpretation of older inscriptions. While I am currently in the process of preparing a full revision of the text in the form of a second edition, I thought users would find it helpful if I published occasional notes in the meantime. The following pages contain data from unpublished inscriptions relevant to the grammar of the language as well as corrections, modifications, and emendations to grammatical outline itself. In addition to this, I have added a supplement to the dictionary containing many rare words and hapax legomena that I have omitted from the first edition.

*I thank Marijn van Putten, Benjamin Suchard, Ali al-Manaser, Fokelien Kootstra, and Jérôme Norris for their corrections and suggestions. All abbreviations follow Al-Jallad (2015c), unless otherwise indicated.
2 Notes on chapters

§1.6.1 Text Genres

A new poetic text has been identified and will appear as Al-Jallad (forthcoming a).

Phonology

§3.1 Consonants

a) New consonantal representations: Safaitic ḡ and ṭ are represented by Gamma and Tau, respectively, in Γαυτος /ġawṭ(os)/ (Al-Jallad & al-Manaser 2016). The latter representation is probably on account of the fact that ṭ is not specified for aspiration, and that Greek Theta remained an aspirated stop [tʰ].

§3.2.3 Diphthongs and Triphthongs

a) The diphthong /aw/: The new bilingual Safaitic-Greek inscription published by Al-Jallad & al-Manaser (2016) further proves that diphthongs were maintained in word-internal position but simply not represented in Safaitic orthography, thus Safaitic ḡṯ is transcribed as Γαυτος /ġawṭ(os)/.

b) It is worth stating explicitly that the triphthongs of III-w/y nouns also remain intact, compare (see Al-Jallad forthcoming b for a discussion):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safaitic</th>
<th>QCT</th>
<th>CAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ngwt /nagawat/ (C 4842) ‘escape, deliverance’</td>
<td>ngwh ‘salvation’</td>
<td>naḡāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥywt /ḥayawat/ (ISB 14) ‘life’</td>
<td>ḥywh ‘life’</td>
<td>ḥayāh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mnwt /manawat/ (MISSB 1) ‘fate, divine name’</td>
<td>mnwh ‘divine name’</td>
<td>manāh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) The attestation of the divine name rḍw as rḍʾ in CSNS 304 suggests that the sound change of aw(V)# > aʾ occurred in the source of this particular manifestation of the deity. Since divine names can cross linguistic boundaries, this may not reflect a sound change that operated in the Safaitic varieties. Given that this sequence is preserved in all other environments in Safaitic, it would suggest that the sound change is foreign to the area.¹

§3.4a

The attestation of the prefix conjugation of the verb rb ‘to exalt’ (APMS) as yrb may further support the change of *iyu to *i, if it is derived from the root √rbw/y.

¹Note that this change cannot be compared to Classical Arabic, where final awV and ayV become ā. Only āy/w develops into a glottal stop, so fatayV > fatā but samayV > samāʾ.
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§3.4.1 Uncommon Sound Changes

a) \( \text{ḍ} \rightarrow \text{ṭ} \): In a new inscription from Wādī Salmā, which I am preparing for publication, the tribal name \( \text{ḍf} \) is spelled \( \text{ṭf} \), suggesting a merger between the two sounds.\(^2\) This merger occurs in some pre-Hilalian Maghrebian dialects of Arabic (Al-Jallad 2015b). The same sound change is attested in the divine name \( \text{ṛḍy} \), spelled \( \text{ṛṭy} \), which occurs in unpublished inscriptions from Marabb al-Shurafā'.\(^3\)

b) \( \text{ḍ} = \text{q} \): In 2016, I published an inscription from Jebel Qurma where the divine name \( \text{ṛḍy} \) was spelled \( \text{ṛṣy} \) (Al-Jallad 2016). This is not likely the result of a sound change, but rather the Aramaicization of the Arabian god’s name.

c) \( \text{s}^1 > \text{s}^2 \): I have had the opportunity to study the photograph of SLJ 644 closely and I no longer thing it supports the confusion of these two sounds. The word in question is much more likely \( \text{ṭs}^2 \text{wq} \).

d) \( \text{ṭ} > \text{ḥ} \): One possible example is known to me of regressive voice assimilation of the pharyngal \( \text{ṭ} \) to \( \text{ḥ} \) when contiguous with \( \text{ḥ} \):\(^4\)

\[ \text{ISB 76:} \]
\[ \text{ḥ lt gmn t-ḍ s}^2\text{ḥḥ w s}^1\text{lm} \]
\[ ‘Ω Lt may he who leagues with him have spoil and be secure’ \]

If the reading is correct, \( s^2\text{ḥḥ} \) is best parsed as \( s^2\text{ḥ}, \) possibly a noun ‘his colleague’ or a verb \( s^2\text{ḥ} \) ‘to league with someone’. The latter case requires us to posit the loss of the final /a/, so perhaps */sāḥḥʊ/ < */sāi-ḥʊ/ or */sāḥḥʊ/ < */sāi-ḥ/.\(^5\)

Morphology

§4.4.2 Plural

I identify the plural of ‘night’ \( \text{lyly} \) as a reflex of the \( \text{CaCāCay} \) pattern rather than the \( \text{CaCāCiy} \) pattern found in Classical Arabic \( \text{layālin} \) and Gəʿəz \( \text{layālay} \). The reason for this is orthographic – the sequence iy with a suffixed pronoun seems to disappear: \( r^γ-ḥ \) ‘his friend’ */rāi-ḥ/ (KRS 25). The pattern \( \text{CaCāCay} \) is common with final-weak roots, so \( \text{ḥādāyā} < \text{ḥādāyaw} < \text{ḥādāay} \), and so it is likely that the plural of ‘night’ was drawn into this pattern. A full discussion of this is found in Al-Jallad (forthcoming b).

\(^2\)M.C.A. Macdonald points out to me that \( ḍf \) is found as a personal name in six inscriptions, which could suggest the sound change occurred more widely or that it is in fact a separate name, and that the ‘ḍ’ is a minor lineage group attested just once. Nevertheless, the spelling \( ṭy \) can only be interpreted as a sound change, and therefore gives more weight to connecting the ‘ḍ’ with the well-attested ‘ṭ’.

\(^3\)Dr. Ali al-Manaser kindly informs me that \( ṭy \) has also appeared in the inscriptions of Wādī Salmā.

\(^4\)A similar development is found in some modern dialects of Arabic.

\(^5\)Dr. Ali al-Manaser suggests the possibility that \( s^2\text{ḥḥ} \) be amended to \( s^2\text{ḥṣ} \) ‘to experience scarcity, want’, which produces an attested formulation.
§4.9.1 The Proximal Demonstratives

Chiara Della Puppa reads a new inscription from Jebel Qurma as follows:

QUR 541.9.1:
{l hs¹m h-ʿr h difíc/n/y}
‘By Hs¹m is this ass’

The final word must be identified as a demonstrative pronoun, preceded by a deictic h-. This has only previously been attested with the feminine dual (H 457). A line leaning towards the left and a bit thicker at the top follows the word. This letter could conceivably be a y or an n. If the former is the case, one may consider a connection with the augmented demonstratives in Maghrebian Arabic, hadaya, but if the latter is true, then perhaps the form terminated with an n, as in Aramaic, Sabaic, Thamudic D, Taymanitic, and Maltese.

§4.9 Demonstrative Pronouns

I suggested that the expression h- nfs¹ t might be better parsed as h- nfs¹ t, where t is the Old Arabic demonstrative tī, cf. Namarah Inscription ty. This suggestion is now supported by the attestation of the same construction in the plural followed by the demonstrative in an unpublished inscription from Marabb al-Shurafā’.6

h-ʾfs¹ ṭy */haʾ-ʾaffosʾolay/
‘these funerary monuments’

The term ṭy must be the plural demonstrative ṭ olay, cf. Classical Arabic ʿulāʾī/ʿulā and Hebrew ʿellē.7 In another inscription from the same corpus, the demonstrative precedes the noun, ṭy h-rgm ‘these funerary cairns’, also showing that the demonstrative can take prepositive and postpositive positions in Safaitic.

This allows us now to provide the following demonstrative paradigm, which can be compared to the relative pronoun series of Late Sabaic and of the modern Arabic dialects of the Asir (Watson 2011):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masc</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safaitic</td>
<td>ḏ, ḏ(y/n)</td>
<td>t, ḏ</td>
<td>ṭy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigāl Alma</td>
<td>ḏā</td>
<td>tā</td>
<td>wulā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Asir)

---

6 These texts will appear in the Leiden University dissertation of Phillip Stokes.
7 On cognates of this form in the pre-Classical Arabic material, see Rabin (1951: 153).
§4.10 Relative-Determinative Pronoun: Masculine Singular

Chiara Della Puppa reads and interprets a new inscription from Jebel Qurma as follows:

**QUR 689.3.1:**
\[ l \text{ gdy bn mn}^{t} \text{ d(w)} l \text{ nm(fr) } \]
‘By Gdy son of Mn’t of the lineage of Nmr’

In the discussion of the relative pronoun in the Grammar, I note the existence of at least one example where the glottal stop is elided, yielding a \( y \) in its place. This could imply, among other things, that the vowel following the pronoun’s onset was /ī/, and the \( y \) emerged in the transition from this vowel to the /ā/ of the word /āl/ ‘lineage’. The form \( ďwl \) here suggests that the vowel in at least some dialects of Safaitic was /ū/, as in the Arabic of the Namārah Inscription (i.e. \( dw = ḏū \)), and was probably pronounced as */ḏū-wāl/. If case inflection were active in the relative pronoun, the ī vowel would have been expected, as in the first example. The presence of the /ū/ here could suggest that case had been neutralized in the relative pronoun.⁸

§5 The Verb

a) I have identified a number of functions of the prefix and suffix conjugation. These can be more simply organized into indicative and modal categories, where the modal category can cover optative, subjunctive, and possibly future meanings.

§5.2.1 d Suffix Conjugation, Functions, Future

I have argued that the suffix conjugation used to express travelling to a location that is not the one in which the inscription was produced and an accompanying prayer cannot be so easily construed as a past tense. Such examples prefer a future tense interpretation, perhaps derived from the modal use of the suffix conjugation. Another interpretation is also possible: such verbs can be interpreted as inchoatives, so that \( ʾs¹fr \) would not mean ‘he travelled’ or ‘he will travel’ but ‘he set off for’ or ‘he began the journey’. So, the re-interpretation of C 1649 would be \( w ʾs¹fr tdmr f h b/l s/lm \) ‘he set off for Palmyra so, O B’l, may he be secure’ or NST 7: \( w \text{ hyt mdb} r f h lt mgd t w s/lm \) ‘and he began the journey to the inner desert so, O Lt, may there be bounty and security’.

§5.6.1.1 Verb Stems, CCC, G-stem, prefix conjugation

Spelling of the prefix conjugation of nwy as yny ‘to migrate’: The vocalization I suggested was /yenāy/ or /yanūy/, based on the collapse of the medial glide.

⁸One caveat deserves mention. The \( w \) of this inscription has a small tail, which is not typical of the letter shape. This may suggest that the author hesitated between a \( w \) and a \( y \).
However, if like Classical Arabic, these yielded first forms with the collapse of the final triphthong, like yarwī, we may also permit the vocalizations /yan-yi/ or /yenyā/. A further example of this verb type has been recognized: ygy (KRS 583) */yagī/y ‘may it come’, cf. Car yaǧī’u.

§5.6.1.1 Verb Stems, CCC, G-stem, Notes on Weak Roots

a) I-y/w: In an unpublished inscription from Wādī al-Ḥašād, the prefix conjugation of the verb wgd ‘to find’ is attested in the expression: lm ygd-h */lam yaged-oh/ ‘he did not find him’.

b) II-w/y: I analyzed the term mt as the suffix conjugation of the root mwt, with the collapse of the internal triphthong, so māta. However, it is noteworthy that the original form myt */mayta/ is not attested in contexts where one would expect a participle, for example in the epitaph of grieving formulæ: NST 2: wgm ʿl-ḫld ʾḥt-h mt ‘he grieved for Ḫld, his sister, who died’. Since myt forms never occur in this context, it is possible to consider mt and mtt participle forms comparable to Hebrew mēṯ; also see the discussion in Rabin (1951: 111–113).

Note also that in the discussion of the phonetic realization of medial weak forms, I suggested that stress played the primary role in producing the stem allomorphy in the suffix conjugation of Classical Arabic, qāma vs. qumtu. This was actually first suggested by Bauer (1912: 111), which I was unaware of at the time of writing this section.9

§7 Prepositions

a) I remarked that ‘l and l do not have an identical distribution, the former being used primarily with the verb ts²wq ‘he longed for’ and once with s²ty ‘he petitioned’. To this should also be added the construction ḥwb ʾl-rḍw ‘he cried out to Rḍw’ in an inscription re-edited and interpreted by Chiara Della Puppa (forthcoming), and originally published by Knauf (1991).10

b) One of the functions of the preposition m(n)- is to indicate the partitive. A new example of this usage is attested in the curse section of an inscription re-edited by M.C.A. Macdonald and myself in 2015: ‘wr ḏ yʾwr h-sifr w sḥq w mhq w nqʾt b-w(d)j l-[l-d] yḥbl m-h-sifr ‘And blind him who would efface this writing, and may ruin and misfortune befall him who would obscure any part of this inscription, and may he be thrown out (of the grave) by a loved one’.

§11.1 Coordinating Conjunctions

To the functions of w /wa/ should be added the comitative, attested in A1: owa ḍavāa /wa bannā/a/ ‘with Bannā’.

---

9 For a discussion of these verbal forms, see Voigt (1988: 142–148).
10 Knauf (1991) translated this phrase as ‘he sinned against Rudaw’, but neither this meaning of the verb or preposition is definable from other attestations. A related construction is attested in CSNS 918.
Syntax

§ 12.1 Existential clauses

An existential clause following $f$ and a presentative $h$ has been identified:

**KRS 1617:**

\[ls'bnbn'dwngsw'nhyts'hbfhhlmtf'mr\]

‘By $s'bn$ of $bnw'd$ son of $gs'nn$ and he journeyed swiftly and, behold, there
was a plain and he found herbage’

§ 15 Topicalization

We can also add to category 1, topicalization of nouns, the following example:

**LP 679:**

\[hltrm'slfl{w}{t}{b}rl-hm\]

‘O Lt, he will have vengeance against those who committed this act and may
{destruction} befall them!’

§ 16.1 Infinitive chain

To the examples I have given in the book, we may add the following inscription:

**KhBG 432:**

\[l'llbnhlggtstqtl's'dnws'fhr-mdflhlwnhltgnths'nt\]

‘By $l'bn$ son of $lggt$, the year $s'dn$ was killed, and he travelled to $Mdf$ and
camped so, O $lt$, may this year bring spoil’

If $hln$ is an infinitive, it would be a morphological by-form of the infinitive
of this verb, already attested as $hlt$ in JaS 159.2 (Al-Jallad 2015c: 322).

§ 16.3 Infinitive to express purpose

The use of the dative $l$- to introduce the infinitive of purpose is attested once:

**KRS 1575:**

\[hytfllgth\]

‘O $yt$, grant deliverance in order to heal him’

§ 22.7 Names of deities

To this list, we may now add $gdnbt$ ‘the Gadd of $Nbt$’ and $gdtm$ ‘the Gadd of (the
lineage group) $Taym$; on this inscription, see Al-Jallad & Macdonald (2015).
3 Notes on the interpretation of inscriptions

KhBG 411:
\[ l\, hs¹m\, bn\, ghfl\, bn\, s¹dy\, w\, ml-h\, ys¹r\, b-dkr\, 'gzt \]
‘By Hs¹m son of Ghfl son of S¹dy and may his work be successful during Aries when (the rains) were held back’

KRS 15:
\[ s¹lm\, w\, ḡnyt\, l-d\, s²hš \]
This should be translated as ‘may he who suffers from scarcity have security and abundance’.

KRS 941:
\[ \{w\} \{q\} l\, ḫbl-h\, trḥ \]
In my interpretation of this inscription, I took ḫbl as an active participle with a suffixed pronoun ‘its effacer’ (referring to the inscription), the phrase being a curse against vandalism – ‘may its effacer perish’. However, in 2016, Al-Manaser and Abbadi published a new inscription (p. 47) containing the phrase \[ trḥ-h\, l-ʾbd \]. The best interpretation of the element trḥ here is as a noun, taraḥun ‘grief, sorrow’ (Lane 302b), the entire phrase meaning ‘his sorrow was everlasting’. This opens up another avenue of interpretation for the phrase \[ w\, ql\, ḫbl-h\, trḥ \], namely, ‘and he said: sorrow drove him mad’. Both interpretations are suitable as reactions to finding the (grave) inscription of a loved one.

KRS 1015:
\[ wgd\, ṭr\, l\, df\, w\, rb-h\, qyl\, hy\, lt\, s¹lm\, w\, b-ʾn-h\, s¹lm\, w\, \{q\} m-h\, ʾbd \]
In my original interpretation of this inscription, I took ḥbl as ‘trace’, but it is equally possible and perhaps more likely that it refers to the ‘l df’ ‘the lineage of Dayf’, in this case being masculine or feminine singular. An alternative translation is: ‘and he found the trace of the lineage of Dayf, and exalted them saying O Lt may it be secure and remain secure throughout time and its people forever’.
RWQ 334:

\[\text{wgd 'tr 'l df glyn mhrb nbh}\]

In my original interpretation of this inscription, I took glyn as referring to the 'trace' or 'graves' of the 'l df but it is equally possible to take it as a participle 'exiled' (Al-Jallad 2015c: 314–315). This interpretation permits the following translation:

\[\text{wgd 'tr 'l df glyn m-hrb nbh}\]

'and he found the trace of the lineage of Df, who were exiled on account of the Nabataean war'

RWQ 335:

\[\text{w hřš b'sl w hr}\]

This is better rendered ‘and he kept watch during bad and good times’.

WH 375

The translation of 'tm 'ys' could be ‘the restoration to health of 'ys' in light of Thamudic B meaning of 'tm (Al-Jallad & al-Manaser 2015).

WH 736.a

The term ġnmt, which I took as raiders (Ar. ġannāmat) based on its context can naturally be interpreted as 'spoil', as the original editors suggested.

C 285

The phrase nyk b-grmh is certainly nyk bgrmh, where bgrmh is a single name.

KRS 1427:

\[— — — — r'l bn mty h- till f 'l h 'wdn\]

'— — — — R'1 son of Mty is this writing so protection be upon it/him'
KRS 1064:
\[ l \text{ḥd } bn \text{ḥrb } bn \text{s¹d } bn \text{s¹krn w ḫrṣ } ʾh[l-ḥ] f h lt s¹lm w wgd s¹fr ʾb-h f ḥdš-h \]
‘By Ḥd son of Ḥrb son of S¹d son of S¹krn and he kept watch for his family so, O Lt, may they be secure and he found the writing of his father and read it aloud’

This inscription provides further evidence for the reading aloud of inscriptions, compare ḥdš with Arabic ḥaddaṭa, taḥaddaṭa ‘to speak’.

KRS 583:
\[ l bn bn rmʾl bn bs¹ʾ w rʿy h-nḥš {ṣ}wy w hmr ygy hlh \]
‘By Bn son of Rmʾl son of Bs¹ʾ and he pastured the valley {suffering from the lack of rain} so let the rain flow, O Lh!’

4 Notes on vocabulary

’s¹d: ‘to raid’, cf. Sabaic ’s¹d ‘troop, war party’.

LP 319:
\[ h ṭrdw hb l-qdm nqmt mn ’s¹d ʾbl-h \]
‘O ṭrdw, grant retribution to Qdm against the raiders of his camels’

RWQ 187:
\[ l-s²mt bn ṯrbt h-dr w s²ml ’s¹d \]
‘By S²mt son of Ṭrbt, at this place, and he went north to raid’


C 2947:
\[ f h lt w dṣr nqmt mn-mn mṣr-h \]
‘O Lt and Dṣr, let there be vengeance against whoever has attacked him’

s¹ʾr: ‘to remain alive’. I no longer think the meaning ‘to leave untouched’ is viable. The verb primarily occurs in the blessing and curse following narratives describing mourning for the dead.

ZSSH (=ZmNSIH = ASFF) 32:
\[ l zhrn bn ys¹lm w bny ʾl-ṯṭ ḫ-nfs¹ w wgm f h lsy l-d s¹ʾr \]
‘By Zhrn son of Ys¹lm and he built this funerary monument for Ṭṭ and grieved, so, O Lt, may those who remain alive be delivered’
5 Supplement to Dictionary

This supplement to §24 Dictionary contains rare words and those attested only once. Many of these also come from hand-copies that cannot be relied upon completely. This list, combined with §24, forms over 90%, in my estimation, of the Safaitic vocabulary.

`b (HCH 73): herbage
`fl (WH 2870): young, weaned camel; CAr `afilun (Lane, 70a)
`ll (LP 1300): SC to cry
`nf (C 1475): G-SC to cry, feel sadness
`nn (WH 345): SC to cry out in sadness
`s`f (WH 2017): G-SC to feel sorrow
`yl (KRS 753): G-INF to make attain
`yb (C 3293): G-SC to return; CAr `aba
`yl (WH 1145): weariness

`bs` (NST 2): G-SC to frown
`gz (passim): withhold, restrain, usually in reference to rain and signifying a drought.
`hn (KRS 1596): G-SC he dwelt; CAr `ahana “he remained, stayed, dwelt” (Lane, 2185a); INF `hnt (KRS 38).
`lt (KRS 1575): INF to restore to health
`mt (WH 583): sign, mark
`n (WH 1599): C-SC to cause hardship, √`ny, perhaps related to Arabic `annā-hu ‘he caused him difficulty’ (Lane, 2180c). Note the non-representation of the final glide!
`nw (KRS 1570): to suffer, VAR `ny
`qbt (passim): retribution
`rs` (KRS 1703): G-SC to be fatigued
`s` (WH 3840): night watchman (Lane, 2039c)
t`tk (WH 3129): T2-SC to be/become a freeman
`ty (KRS 203): to behave arrogantly G-SC, CAr `atā “he behaved proudly, he was excessively proud” (Lane, 1951a).
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‘yr (WH 1599): ‘disgrace’, CA rārun ‘shame, disgrace’.
mʿdt (C 823): safe return

B

bʿr (HNMSII 10): g-sc to ride a beast
bʿyr (BTH 39): camel, probably a diminutive or plural; CA r baʿīrun
bd (M 147): g-sc to begin
bdd (KRS 306): D-IMP compensate; CA r biddun, bVdād “a lot, share, portion” (Lane, 161c).
bhm (KRS 439): mutism; CA r abhamu “destitute of the faculty of speech or articulation, like the beasts” (Lane, 269b).
bhr (KRS 439): disappointment, CA r bahrun “being overcome, disappointed” (Lane, 265c).
bhr (WH 1002): pond (?) or late summer
bl (C 1046): g-sc to be healthy, well
bnyt (WH 967): building, structure
brʿ (M 160): freedom (from illness or affliction)
bd (KRS 2669): desert; CA r barratun (Lane, 177b).
bwy (C 1828): g-sc to come back to, to return to; CA r bāʾa
bzt (Ms 15): booty

D
dgyn (Mu 894): lurking place; CA r dağiyyun ‘lurking place’
dll (LP 997): mark, writing; CA r dālīṭun ‘sign’
dmʿ (CSNS 895): g-sc to shed tears
dwy (KRS 15): g-sc to feel sick (from grief)

Ḍ
dḥb (WH 1666): to go (perhaps euphemism for death); CA r dāhaba
dkrt (APMS 1): fame, memory
‘dr (KRS 1703): g-sc to set up a shelter, CA r dāriyyun “a shelter” (Lane, 965a).
dyrt (KRS 2842): chaff
dwq (SHNS 4): to taste (grief)

Ḍ

dʿw (KRS 1707): g-sc to efface
drb (CEDS 371): injury
dr (WH 2180): to break wind (?)
dyq (WH 2704): g-sc to experience straitness, difficulty

86
F

$f$ (APMS 1): mouth  
$f'l$ (KRS 1924): g-sc to do; INF $f'lt$  
$f'dl$ (CSNS 190): favor  
$f'g'$ (H 122): G-sc to pain, distress someone  
$t[f'h'rt$ (HFSI 46940.1): t2-sc to be proud, haughty  
$fl$ (RWQ 124): G-sc to set off; Levantine Arabic $f$-leave, run off  
$flht$ (KRS 2609): prosperity; CAr falāh ‘prosperity, success’  
$fr'$ (SIJ 784): wild ass, CAr fara‘un  
$frqt$ (C 3871): separation  
$fs$ (APMS 1): good fortune, $\sqrt{fwz}$

G

g'$l$ (WH 1603): to make, set up (camp)  
g'$lt$ (HNSM 31) short palm-trees; CAr ǧa‘lun ‘short palm-tree’  
g$b$ (KRS 3051) a well; CAr ǧubbun  
g$dr$ (KRS 201) enclosure  
g$ny$ (KRS 2425): l-sc (?) to injure; CAr ǧānā-hu “he injured him” (Lane, 472).  
gr$ft$ (ZSHA 14): a young female camel at the age of weaning; CAr ǧarfatun.  
grt (KRS 1585): snare; CAr ǧarrun; pl. (?) grt (WH 752.1).  
gr$m$ (C 2405): G-sc to be cut off  
gr$yt$ (HaNS 408): a female slave  
gr$zx$ (HaNS 156): G-sc to be cut off  
gr$y$ (ISB 366): river course  
grt (WH 930): body, corpse  
$'g'wf$ (KRS 900): a hollow; lowland; CAr ǧawfūn, ’aḡwāfūn.  
gr$y$ (KRS 583): g-pc to come $\sqrt{gw'y}$; CAr ǧā’a  
gr$y$z (WH 1255): G-sc to pass; CAr ǧāza ‘he passed’ (Lane, 484–485)  
gr$mr$ (KRS 2453): dwelling  
gr$wz$ (KRS 878): G-INF to cross  
gr$wy$ (WH 620): to be satisfied; CAr ǧazā

G

$'g'rb$ (WH 2165): to return from the inner desert, opposite of $'ašraqa$ to migrate to the inner desert.  
gr$nz$ (WH 1675): G-sc to be distressed  
gr$nn$ (KRS 2457): G-INF remove affliction $\sqrt{gw't}$  
g$yb$ (WH 19): G-sc to become absent, remote  
t$gw'd$ (RWQ 1): t2-sc to long for
mḥlk (LP 720): a perilous place √ḥlk
ʾḥmd (C 2473): G-SC to remain in place √ḥmd, CAr ʾahmada
hmīl (C 2363): G-SC to be bathed in tears
ḥmr (KRS 583): flow of water; CAr hamara “it flowed, said of water, rain, and
of tears” (Lane, 2900b).
ḥrg (KRS 2916): killing, death (?)

ḥdl (KRS 1064): D-SC to speak/read aloud
ḥfr (WH 1031): migrating group
ḥfr (CSNS 23): G-SC to dig (a grave?)
ḥlmt (KRS 1836): forbearance, health; cf. CAr ḥilmun (Lane, 631c–632a)
ḥls¹ (KRS 2273): weakness
ḥmr (WH 2311): donkey
mhmy (KRS 2425): a guard √ḥmy
ḥqt (RWQ 329): cultivated (feminine adjective) √ḥnt
ḥqtr (C 657): T2-SC to become contemptible √ḥqr; CAr ḥaqura (Lane 661c).
ḥws² (WH 710): D-SC to drive game (Lane, 668c).
ḥyḍt (WH 2814): G-SC F.SG to menstruate

ḥḥlb (WH 3134): G-SC to seize
ḥḥmlt (KRS 1617): a plain producing herbage or plants; CAr ḥamlatun
ḥḥfg (WH 171): a kind of plant, ḥafaḡ = diplotaxis Harra (see the commentary
to KRS 1836)
ḥḥs (APMS 1): G-SC to be tracked (or return)
ḥḥrf (HNSM 42): the side of a rivulet; CAr ‘the extremity, verge, boarder, mar-
gin, brink, brow, side, or edge of anything…for example the side of a rivulet’
(Lane, 550a)
ḥḥmr (CSNS 296): G-SC F.SG to hide, conceal oneself; CAr ḥamira; INF ḥmr (WH
2706).
ḥḥyṛṣ (RWQ 214): PC to keep watch for, guard ḥyṛṣ
ḥḥṣ¹ (Unpub): decline, scarcity, C-SC ḥḥṣ¹ (WH 2411): to experience scarcity
ḥḥṣ² (LP 161): stagnate water
ḥḥṭ (KRS 2604): G-SC to do wrong; CAr ḥṭiʾa
ḥḥwt (BTH 92): vacant land; CAr ḥuwwatun
ḥḥym (LP 344): to pitch tents
K

kbs¹ (HN 91): to attack; CAr kabasa fulānan “they made a sudden attack upon the house of such a one and surrounded it” (Lane, 2588a).

‘km’ (WH 2867): truffles, plural of km’ (Al-Jallad 2015c, s.v.)

kmh (C 2816): blindness; CAr kamahun “blindness from birth” (Hava 668).

kns¹ (H 1017): sc to drive animals

kfʾ (KRS 1866): to turn over, pc ykfʾ (KRS 2573)

krs¹ (KRS 3001): a plant name, Syr karšā

mkr (WH 3405): repeatedly Ṯkrr

ks¹ (WH 25): a contrary wind; CAr kawsun (Lane 2638).

L

lt (WH 1229): lion

lḥm (RWQ 325): meat

lgm (Mu 868): to reach; CAr laǧgama, ʾalǧama “to reach the mouth of (a swimmer: water)” (Hava 670).

M

ymṯl (C 2163): G-PC to copy; CAr maṭṭala

‘mrʾ (KRS 1617): C-SC to find herbage, pasture C-SC, CAr. ʾamraʾa

mrʾ (KRS 2224): G-SC to spoil an affair

mtʾ (H 122): SC to beat, afflict pain upon; CAr mataʾa “to beat [someone with a staff or stick]” (Lane, 2688a).

mwʾ (KRS 1482): waters

N

nʾrt (KRS 2830): place name (?)

ndr (CSNS 578): prominent part of a mountain; CAr nādirun

ndr (KWQ 42): G-SC to make a vow

nfy (CSNS 388): to be in exile, CAr nafā “to be exiled” (Hava).

nhl (C 4355): to drink

‘ḥl (KRS 47): valleys, plural of nḥl

nqʾt (MSTJ 22): stagnant water

ns¹ (M 160): people, folk

nsʾn (unpub): women, CAr nasūna

ʿns¹ (WH 3730): mankind

nym (KhBG 283): G-SC to die (lit. to sleep)

ʿnwy (KRS 583): remote, CAr ʿanwā “to be remote” (Hava).

nzʾ (C 3216): G-SC to yearn (?) ; CAr nazaʾa ʿilā ʾahli-hī

ns² (WH 3685): G-SC to engage in a skirmish ; CAr nāwaša
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Q

$qbb$ (KRS 1377): a curse; distress
$tpnt$ (KRS 1305): $\tau2$-sc he was filled with despair
$qrb$ (WH 2411): $g$-sc to make an offering
$qrmt$ (Ms 83): highest point, most elevated part of a desert
$qnwt$ (WH 1699): canal
$qn$ (KRS 1695): slave
$qrh$ (CSNS 426): $g$-sc to be wounded; CAr $qara\ta-h\u$ “he wounded him” (Lane, 2509c)
$qm$ (unpub): $c$-sc to settle down; CAr $\tauq\ama$
$mqm$ (WH 1411): place, area
$mqft$ (C 1240): a stopping place
$qrt$ (L 206): small mountain; CAr $q\aroatun$
$ql$ (APMS): a saying $\\lwql$

R

$r's$ (APMS 1): first, foremost
$r'dmt$ (KhU 27): area with large rocks
$rg'$ (C 4276): $g$-sc to return
$rh$ (KRS 534): hillock
$rhl$ (WH 142): abode
$rhl$ (APMS): $sc$ to journey
$rql$ (C 4276): $sc$ to traverse a desert; CAr $raqala$ (Lane, 1138b).
$r$sb (N 90): $sc$ to remain, dwell
$rtv$ (SHNS 4): to be sad
$rtm$ (KRS 424): to be crushed (by grief) $g$-sc, CAr $ratama$ “he broke a thing” (Lane, 1028c).
$r'nh$ (ISB 79): $c$-sc to depart, set off; CAr $'ar\ta\ha$
$r'w(h)$ (MKWI 88): $c$-sc to wish for ease
$rwy$ (ASWS 124): sweet water; CAr $raw\aro\un$ “sweet [water]” (Lane, 1195c).
$rzy$ (C 74): to accept a bounty; CAr $raz\aro$

S¹

$s'b$ (H 19): IMP curse; CAr $subb$
$s'l$ (LP 435) flashflood, torrent
$s'hwt$ (WH 2016): a great mass of stones
$s'h\b$ (KRS 1617): swiftly; CAr $marra\ yash\abo\ fi\ l'arda$ “he went, or passed by, or ran, swiftly [in the land, or upon the ground]” (Lane, 1515b).
$s'hlt$ (ISB 104): lamb, kid; CAr $sah\rlatun$
$s'l\h$ (C 4985): to feed (animals) on $S'l\h$ (a type of desert plant)
$s'ltq$ (WH 1666): $g$-sc to remember; call out to
$s'mn$ (RWQ 333): prosperity; fat
$s'qr$ (unpub): sun-scorched
s¹qy (ISB 366): G-sc to give drink; CAr saqā

ts²r (RWQ 324): T2-sc to be pleased

ms¹tr (C 1781): PPC something written

s¹ (WH 191): evil; CAr sūʿun

ms¹lt (WH 1023): streambed, √s¹ył

s¹y't (KRS 878): an order; Arm šyt ‘to give an order’

S²

s²fr (ISB 58): edge, border of an area; CAr šufrun

s³ml (RWQ 187): D-sc to go north

s²rgt (KRS 1779): a place in which water flows from a ḥarrah to a soft or plain;
CAr šarqatun (Lane, 1529b).

s²rk (ISB 58): war party

s²ry h-ns¹ (ls.Mu 89 = LP 407): pox

ms²t (RWQ 340): will, √s²yʾ

s²q (RWQ 124): G-sc to long for; more commonly ts²wq

s²qt (C 1970): longing

s²wt (KRS 1715): sheep

S

ysʾb (WH 700): G-pc to experience difficulty

šb (C 4454): sc to make a libation

šbh (WH 2833.1): sc to arise, arrive at

šdt (HNSM 10): side of a valley; CAr šuddun ‘the side of a valley’ (Lane, 1659a)

šgr (WH 2165): emaciation

šhy (RWQ 343): drought

šrb (KRS 2580): a type of herbage; CAr šarabatun (Lane, 1674c).

šrm (KRS 439): separation from friends; CAr šurmun “separation from a friend” (Lane, 1684a).

šyʾ (RWQ 155): sc to be in a state of commotion

šwf (JaS 11): to trade wool (?) or a variant of syf, to spend the early summer.

T

tbb (KRS 2408): scarcity, diminution; CAr tabba, tabbun “he, or it, suffered loss” (Lane, 203a).

tlʾt (KRS 366): watercourse; CAr talʾatun “high or elevated, land or ground, a water course from the upper part of a valley to its lower part” (Lane, 312b-c).

trk (WH 1241): G-sc to leave, go off

twr (CSNS 958): sc to return time after time; CAr t āra
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ṯdw (SESP 96): a certain desert plant; cf. ṭudā’ “a certain plant [growing] in the desert” (Lane, 344a).
ṯrm (KRS 2453): to eat, feast
ṯql (KRS 1435): G-sc to be weighed down (by grief)
ṯr (KhBG 193): a bull (animal); CAr ṭawrun
ṯyt (WH 1023): sheepfold; CAr ṭiyyatun
ṯwl (KRS 439): madness; CAr ṭawalun “madness” (Lane 365b).
ṯwy (APMS 1): to alight

T

ṯhr (MA 1): G-sc to be purified; CAr ṭahara
ṯwf (C 1900): G-sc to return; CAr ṭāfa; G-pc yṭf (WH 3894)

W

wʾl (KRS 456): escape
wdy (HN 61): G-sc to go towards, draw near to; Levantine Arabic waddā ‘to send’
wgʾ (M 98): G-sc to be injured
ʾgd (KRS 1715): C-IMP to cause one to find (smth), ṣwgd, CAr ʿawḍada
mwgd (SIJ 287): perseverance, ṣwgd
ṯwḥt (BTH 92): T2-sc to be weak, languid, ṣwḥt; CAr wahāṭa, tawahḥaṭa
wlʾ (KRS 2473): G-sc to be fond of, eager for, CAr wallaʾa bi-hi “he made him to be desirous, or fond, of it” (Lane, 3060a).
ʾld (Mu 89): children, offspring; CAr ʿawlāḍun
wqʿt (KRS 2999): watering place
wqd (C 1927): scorching
h-wrd (C 744): common toponym, perhaps meaning ‘the lowlands’.

Z

zm (RWQ 325): a dish of milk; CAr zawmūn
zrʾ (C 1383): G-sc to plant, sew a field

Z

zmʾ (KRS 33) G-sc to thirst; CAr ẓamiʾa “he thirsted, thirsted most vehemently” (Lane 1923b).
6 Bibliographic Updates


2) The edition of the poetic text KRS 2453 is now published as Al-Jallad (2015a), with further notes in Al-Jallad (forthcoming a).

3) For an in-depth discussion on the palaeography of Ancient North Arabian and the Safaitic square script, see Macdonald (2015).

4) AsUI 1 (= AbNH 1) is now published as Abbadi (2015).

7 Updates to Sigla

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APMS</td>
<td>Safaitic inscription published in Al-Jallad (forthcoming a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JaS</td>
<td>Safaitic inscriptions published by Jamme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JbS</td>
<td>Unpublished inscriptions recorded by the SESP 1995 survey at Jabal Says.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KWQ</td>
<td>Inscriptions recorded and edited by Khraisheh from Wadi Qattafi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKWI</td>
<td>Safaitic inscriptions recorded on the M.C.A. Macdonald, Geraldine King, Ann Searight Jawa Epigraphic Survey Wādī Irenbeh (published in OCIANA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QZUI (= QZMJ)</td>
<td>Previously unpublished inscriptions of Alqadrah and Al-Zoubi on OCIANA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address for Correspondence: a.m.al-jallad@hum.leidenuniv.nl
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La datation paléographique des inscriptions sudarabiques du 1er millénaire avant J.-C. : méthode et limites

Mounir Arbach
(CNRS, Centre français d’archéologie et de sciences sociales, Koweït)

Résumé

This paper proposes a new chronological classification of the Ancient South Arabian inscriptions of the first millennium BCE. Our proposal is based on recent archaeological and epigraphic discoveries, as well as synchronisms with external sources. These data contradict the traditional paleography-based dating and invalidates paleography as a method of dating the South Arabian inscriptions.

Mots-clés : Ancient South Arabian Paleography Chronology Yemen Dating

Jusqu’aux années 1980, on disposait de peu de données archéologiques fiables pour établir une chronologie solide des royaumes sudarabiques. Ces sont les inscriptions qui servaient de base pour cette chronologie. C’est dans ce contexte de rareté des datations archéologiques que la paléographie a été utilisée comme critère principal de datation des inscriptions. Le but était de mettre en place une chronologie relative des royaumes sudarabiques du 1er millénaire av. J.-C.

Durant près de quarante années d’incertitudes et de spéculations, deux écoles ont animé le débat sur la recherche relative à la chronologie sudarabique. La première, défendue par Jacqueline Pirenne, soutenait une chronologie dite « courte », fondée sur la paléographie des inscriptions (PIRENNE 1956). Elle est partie du postulat que l’écriture sudarabique était d’origine phénicienne.

et que l’Arabie du Sud n’était pas en mesure d’élaborer, seule, une écriture géométrique dont les lettres s’inscrivent dans un rectangle (11 lettres sur 29 ont deux axes de symétrie). Elle aurait donc eu recours à une écriture qui lui aurait servi de modèle, à savoir l’écriture grecque (PIRINNE 1955 ; 1961). En suivant ce raisonnement, J. Pirenne a daté les premières inscriptions sudarabiques du Vᵉ siècle av. J.-C. et a classé les inscriptions monumentales alors disponibles selon leurs styles paléographiques, en attribuant à chacun d’eux une valeur chronologique. Elle a ainsi distingué six périodes principales identifiées par des lettres majuscules (A, B, C, D, E et F), chaque période étant à son tour divisée en plusieurs styles (A1–A4, B1–B4, etc.). À partir de ce classement stylistique, J. Pirenne a dressé une liste de critères paléographiques destinés à permettre le classement chronologique des inscriptions. Pour la période ancienne A–B (préclassique et classique), par exemple, les traits des lettres sont rectilignes, sans apex ni empattement, les angles des lettres sont droits et les lettres sont de grande taille, avec une proportion qui varie selon la période. Les cupules des lettres h/ḥ, ḥ/H, ṣ/x ont la forme de la lettre V en majuscule. Enfin, le sens de l’écriture est souvent en boustrophédon, alternativement de droite à gauche et de gauche à droite. Les inscriptions qui présentent ces caractéristiques, propres à la période dite ancienne, celle des mukarribis « fédérateurs » de Sabaʾ, remplacées progressivement pour céder la place à des inscriptions écrites exclusivement de droite à gauche, avec des lettres de petite taille, des lignes médianes qui deviennent légèrement obliques (n/q, ḥ/M) et, pour les appendices diacritiques des j/v et h/ḥ, des traits qui deviennent épaiss et tendent à former des apex/empattements. Les deux triangles des lettres m/ḥ et ẓ/z qui ont une forme géométrique parfaite, avec des lignes brisées, à l’époque ancienne A et B, s’ouvrent progressivement et deviennent de plus en plus écartés. Les lettres à cercles, w/w, ʾ/o, ṣ/x, ṭ/j, qui forment à l’origine un rond parfait de grande taille, deviennent plus petites et de forme elliptique.
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il aurait fait don de pierres précieuses et d’aromates placés dans le dépôt de
fondation du temple lors de la fête du Nouvel An à Assur, à une date comprise
entre 689 et 681 (ROBIN 1991 ; 1996).

Cette identification des noms de souverains sabéens mentionnés dans les
sources assyriennes pose des problèmes d’homonymie car les noms et épithètes
des souverains de Sabaʾ étaient limités (ROBIN 1996). Elle a amené H. von
Wissmann à remonter la date des premières inscriptions sudarabiques jusque
vers le début du VIIIᵉ siècle av. J.-C. Pour cela, il a utilisé les mêmes critères
paléographiques que J. Pirenne, mais il a daté les premiers souverains de Sabaʾ
au VIIIᵉ siècle av. J.-C. et non du Vᵉ siècle comme l’a fait J. Pirenne. Pour
couvrir les deux premiers siècles de l’histoire de Sabaʾ, Wissmann a proposé des
dynasties continues de souverains de Sabaʾ, sans tenir compte de la simultanéité
de certains règnes due à des corégences (VON WISSMANN 1982). Quant à la date
d’apparition du royaume de Maʾīn, il la situe vers 525 av. J.-C. Enfin, il date
avec certaine vraisemblance la guerre entre les Mèdes et l’Égypte en 343 av.
J.-C. (VON WISSMANN 1976).

Ce qui précède montre bien la fragilité de l’utilisation du critère paléogra-
phique pour dater les inscriptions sudarabiques, les marges d’erreur de datation
étant assez grandes.

Le lien entre l’écriture grecque et l’écriture sudarabique, défendu par J. Pi-
renne, est aujourd’hui abandonné. La succession des styles graphiques qu’elle
a distingués est remise en question et les dates qu’elle a proposées pour sa
reconstruction historique ne sont plus utilisées. Les principes généraux sur les-
quels elle a fondé l’analyse paléographique des inscriptions ne sont utilisables
que s’ils sont confrontés aux données historiques et archéologiques d’une part
et aux données internes aux inscriptions d’autre part, c’est-à-dire aux informa-
tions généalogiques et dynastiques, linguistiques, et religieuses, notamment les
panthéons, ou encore à la provenance des textes. Ils doivent également tenir
compte du support du texte : pierre taillée ou rocher, bois, bronze, poterie,
car plusieurs styles graphiques, monumentaux ou cursifs par exemple, peuvent
être contemporains (RYCKMANS 1991 ; ROBIN 1996).

La chronologie dite « longue » de H. von Wissmann est en revanche acceptée
aujourd’hui par l’ensemble des chercheurs, malgré la difficulté de trouver les
bons candidats pour l’identification des souverains sabéens mentionnés dans les
sources assyriennes. Quelques dates proposées par H. von Wissmann sont éga-
lement retenues, à savoir le VIIIᵉ siècle av. J.-C. pour les premières inscriptions
sudarabiques monumentales, le synchronisme assyrien comme repère chrono-
logique (des VIIIᵉ et VIIᵉ siècles av. J.-C.) et enfin la date de la révolte entre
les Perses et l’Égypte vers le milieu du IVᵉ siècle av. J.-C. (VON WISSMANN
1976 ; 1982 ; LEMAIRE 2010)¹. En revanche, sa date d’apparition du royaume
de Maʾīn – en 525 av. J.-C. – est largement abandonnée pour celle du début du

Cette chronologie dite « longue » est, dans ses grandes lignes, confirmée par

¹Voir cependant A. Lemaire qui situe cet événement au début du IVᵉ s. av. J.-C. Cf. LEMaire
(2010).
les découvertes archéologiques et épigraphiques de ces deux dernières décennies, qui ont bouleversé notre connaissance de l’histoire de l’Arabie du Sud ; la chronologie est devenue plus précise.

Pour ce qui est de l’origine et la forme de l’écriture alphabétique sudarabique, le déchiffrement, par Abram G. Lundin, d’une tablette cunéiforme trouvée à Beth Shemesh, en Palestine, comportant un alphabet du type sud-sémitique (sudarabique et éthiopien) et datée vers le xiii\textsuperscript{e} siècle av. J.-C. (LUNDIN 1987), apporte la preuve définitive qu’elle se trouve non pas en Grèce (alphabet phénicien) comme le prétendait J. Pirenne, mais au Levant, en Syrie-Palestine. En effet, cette tablette présente une variante de l’alphabet ougari-lique dans l’ordre sud-sémitique (ḥ l ḥ m, etc.), que l’on retrouve quelques siècles plus tard, en Arabie du Sud et en Éthiopie. Cet ordre alphabétique a donc été élaboré au Levant (Syrie-Palestine) et a ensuite été emprunté et diffusé dans toute la péninsule Arabique (ROBIN 1991 ; 2008). La forme des lettres de l’écriture sudarabique aurait été élaborée en Arabie du Sud, vraisemblablement à partir du x\textsuperscript{e} siècle av. J.-C. dont la phase définitive monumentale apparaît à Sabaʾ à partir du milieu du viii\textsuperscript{e} siècle av. J.-C., sous le règne de Yathâʾamar Watâr fils de Yakrubmalik (CAUBET et GAJDA 2003).


Cette date correspondrait à un premier balbutiement de l’écriture sudarabique et aux plus anciens textes sudarabiques connus à ce jour. Les bâtonnets inscrits confirment par ailleurs que l’écriture sudarabique a connu une évolution, finalement assez normale, depuis une écriture irrégulière et maladroite jusqu’à une écriture monumentale (Pl. 1). Ces deux écoles d’écriture, monumentale et cursive, ont coexisté tout au long de l’histoire de l’Arabie du Sud (RYCKMANS 2001 ; STEIN 2013).

des aromates avec le Proche-Orient.

Données archéologiques, datations au radiocarbone et découvertes épigraphiques ont considérablement amélioré nos connaissances et précisé la chronologie des premiers siècles de l’histoire de l’Arabie du Sud du VIIIe au VIe siècle av. J.-C.

Parmi les découvertes importantes figure une inscription sabéenne gravée sur un autel en bronze, AO 31929, provenant du site de Nashshān dans le Jawf (CAUBET et GAJDA 2003), dont l’auteur n’est autre que le mukarrib sabéen Yathathaʾamar Watār fils de Yakrubmalik, contemporain du souverain de Nashshān, Malikwaqah Rayad, fils de ʿAmīʿalī. Ce dernier serait à situer dans la deuxième moitié du VIIIe siècle av. J.-C. La graphie de cette inscription, du style A1–2 de Pirenne, montre que les canons de l’écriture sudarabique étaient déjà fixés à cette date alors que la fixation définitive de la forme des lettres était jusque-là datée du règne de Karibʾīl Watār, le mukarrib de Sabaʾ, dans la première moitié du VIIe siècle av. J.-C. (ROBIN 1991 ; 1996).

Une autre donnée historique fournie par ce texte est que ce souverain de Sabaʾ, Yathaʾamar Watār fils de Yakrubmalik, est attesté ici avec le titre de mukarrib et pourrait correspondre à « Itaʾamra le Sabéen », mentionné dans les sources assyriennes du règne de Sargon II (722–705) (CAUBET et GAJDA 2003). Cette hypothèse d’identification, proposée par I. Gajda, a été confortée par la découverte d’une grande inscription historique du même souverain (DAI Şirwāh 2005-50 ; Pl. 2), sur le site de Şirwāḥ (NEBES 2007 ; 2011 ; 2016). Les savants allemands ont confirmé le synchronisme assyrien et ont daté ce texte vers 715 av. J.-C.

Si on accepte cette identification on doit admettre que la graphie de cette inscription pose un problème qui illustre la fragilité de l’utilisation de la paléographie comme critère de datation. En effet, comme l’a justement remarqué C. ROBIN (2012), le style graphique de cette inscription est très semblable, voire semble postérieur, à la graphie de l’inscription RES 3945 du mukarrib sabéen Karibʾīl Watār fils de Dhamarʿalī (Pl. 3), que J. Pirenne classait en style B1 (deuxième moitié du Ve siècle av. J.-C.) et que l’on date aujourd’hui de la première moitié du VIIe siècle av. J.-C. De même, la graphie des textes laissés par le souverain sabéen Yathaʾamar Bayān, le prédécesseur de Karibʾīl Watār, fin VIIe–début VIIe siècle av. J.-C., a été classée entre les styles A et B2 de Pirenne (au milieu du Ve s. av. J.-C.; PIRENNE 1956). Le phénomène de la simultanéité des styles graphiques s’observe également dans les inscriptions laissées par Karibʾīl Watār sur le site de Khirbat Saʿūd, classées également en styles A et B1 de Pirenne. Ces exemples montrent qu’un classement paléographique des inscriptions par styles n’implique pas nécessairement un classement chronologique, car plusieurs styles graphiques peuvent coexister à toutes les époques. En toute état de cause, le mukarrib sabéen Yathaʾamar Watār fils de Yakrubmalik serait, malgré le problème posé par la graphie de ses inscriptions, à identifier avec « Itaʾamra le Sabéen » des sources assyriennes (NEBES 2007 ; 2011 ; 2016), sans pour autant exclure totalement son homonyme Yathaʾamar Bayān fils de Sumhūʿalī qui, rappelons-le, était à la fin de son règne en corégence avec

M. ARBACH
Karibʾīl Watār (ROBIN 1996).


Les synchronismes assyriens permettent, avec les nouveaux synchronismes entre Sabaʾ et Nashshān, l’établissement d’une chronologie relative des souverains connus de ces deux royaumes pour la période de la deuxième moitié du VIIIe siècle av. J.-C. (ARBACH et ROSSI 2011 ; 2012 ; ARBACH 2014b).


Ce nouveau synchronisme constitue un repère chronologique précieux pour cette période du VIe siècle av. J.-C., où le royaume de Sabaʾ semble être concurrent, dans le contrôle de la route commerciale reliant l’Arabie du Sud à la Méditerranée orientale et au Levant, par les autres royaumes sudarabiques, Qatabān, Maʾin et le Ḥadramawt. Grâce à ce synchronisme, on peut désormais dater les guerres menées entre Sabaʾ et le royaume de Qatabān (RES 3858, Ja 550) dans la première moitié du VIe siècle av. J.-C., alors que Pirenne les datait vers 300 et Wissmann vers 400 av. J.-C. On peut également placer vers la fin du VIIe siècle av. J.-C., la guerre menée par Sabaʾ contre Qatabān, Maʾin et Muḥaʾmir/Najrān (RES 3943) (Pl. 5).

Il est désormais acquis que les souverains de Sabaʾ adoptent, vers le milieu du VIe siècle av. J.-C., le titre de « roï de Sabaʾ » au détriment de celui de « mukarrīb de Sabaʾ », porté pendant les deux siècles (VIIIe–VIe) durant lesquels le royaume de Sabaʾ a exercé une certaine hégémonie politique et militaire sur


Dans ses derniers travaux sur la chronologie de l’Arabie du Sud au Ier millénaire av. J.-C., A. Avanzini opte pour une périodisation fondée sur des critères politiques, en divisant cette époque en trois périodes et en attribuant à chacune, comme l’a fait J. Pirenne, une lettre latine en majuscule (AVANZINI 2010) :

- Période A : suprématie de Sabaʾ, première moitié du Ier millénaire av. J.-C. ;
- Période B : suprématie de Qatabān et du Ḥaḍramawt et place économique de Maʿīn, deuxième moitié du Ier millénaire;
- Période C : établissement des États des Hautes-Terres et alliances avec Sabaʾ et Qatabān, du Ier siècle av. J.-C. au IIe siècle ap. J.-C.

Ce même système de périodisation a été utilisé par Avanzini dans son Corpus des inscriptions de Qatabān (AVANZINI 2004), ainsi que dans la base des données en ligne intitulée Digital Archive for the Study of pre-Islamic Arabian Inscriptions (http://dasi.humnet.unipi.it). Il est vrai que l’Arabie du Sud a connu, aux Ier siècle av. J.-C. et ap. J.-C., des bouleversements politiques dont il est, dans l’état actuel de nos recherches, difficile de préciser la chronologie et les acteurs. A. Avanzini place en effet au Ier siècle av. J.-C. la désintégration du royaume de Qatabān, marquée par la montée en puissance des tribus des Hautes-Terres méridionales qui se détachent du royaume de Qatabān et qui formeront, au siècle suivant, la dynastie royale de dhū-Raydān/Ḥimyar. Enfin, l’auteure considère également que le royaume de Maʿīn a disparu de la scène politique dès la fin du IIe siècle av. J.-C., comme le suggérait VON WISSMANN (1976), et donc que cette époque marque un tournant de l’histoire politique de l’Arabie du Sud (AVANZINI 2004). Si l’hypothèse d’Avanzini s’avère exacte,
tous les souverains de Maʿīn et de Qatabān, que nous situons au 1er siècle av. J.-C., devaient être placés au 1er siècle av. J.-C., ce qui semble peu probable en raison du nombre de souverains attestés aussi bien à Maʿīn qu’à Qatabān et des synchronismes entre les deux royaumes au 1er siècle av. J.-C. (ARBACH 2006 ; 2009).

Certes, le royaume de Qatabān perd le contrôle des Hautes-Terres méridionales à partir du 1er siècle av. J.-C. et son territoire s’est considérablement réduit, mais il ne disparaît pas complètement de la scène politique. Plusieurs inscriptions, laissées par les souverains de Qatabān, peuvent être datées au 1er siècle av. J.-C. (ARBACH 2006 ; 2009). Sa capitale, Tamnaʿ, continuait d’être le siège des souverains de Qatabān, même après l’incendie qu’elle a subi au milieu du 1er siècle ap. J.-C., comme en témoignent plusieurs inscriptions laissées par les rois de Qatabān et surtout les données archéologiques obtenues par les fouilles franco-italiennes du site de Tamnaʿ (DE MAIGRET et ROBIN 1989). La chronologie des royaumes sudarabiques au 1er siècle av. J.-C. est assez complexe et nécessite des recherches approfondies. Quant à la date de la fin du royaume de Maʿīn, qui est également liée aux relations entre Maʿīn et Qatabān, nous pensons que l’hypothèse de Ch. Robin selon laquelle Maʿīn disparaît de la scène politique vers la fin du 1er siècle av. J.-C., est aujourd’hui confortée à la fois par le synchronisme minéo-qatabānite, entre Waqahʿ il Yathaʿ roi de Maʿīn et Shahir Hilāl en corégence avec son fils Hawfīʿ am roi de Qatabān (Lion 1), que nous situons au milieu du 1er siècle av. J.-C., par les récentes découvertes (Arbach 2014b ; Avanzini 2014) et par les résultats des fouilles archéologiques de Barâqish et de Tamnaʿ (ROBIN 1998 ; ARBACH 2009 ; DE MAIGRET et ROBIN 2006 ; ROBIN et DE MAIGRET 2009).

Les repères historiques que nous avons énumérés ci-dessus, notamment les synchronismes avec les sources extérieures, permettent de dresser un cadre chronologique général en vue d’établir, un jour, une chronologie « absolue » des royaumes sudarabiques au 1er millénaire av. J.-C. Des lacunes subsistent cependant dans la documentation épigraphique et archéologique. La prudence est donc de mise, notamment pour le classement chronologique des souverains dont nous ne connaissons à ce jour ni la durée du règne, ni le mode de succession, ni le moment exact auquel ils montent sur le trône.

Alors que la chronologie dite « courte » de J. Pirenne, fondée exclusivement sur la paléographie des inscriptions, est aujourd’hui complètement abandonnée, on continue d’utiliser, par commodité, son classement paléographique général en attribuant aux inscriptions une lettre majuscule selon leur style graphique, mais en donnant une date approximative selon la nouvelle chronologie, par exemple le style A au VIIIe siècle, B au VIIe, C au VIe et ainsi de suite (ROBIN 1996).

De nouvelles tentatives de classement paléographique des inscriptions ont été proposées, notamment par S. Frantsouzoff. Tout en critiquant la méthode de J. Pirenne, il a utilisé le croisement des deux critères, paléographique et linguistique, notamment l’emploi du verbe factitif sabēen (hqny) dans les textes haḍramawtiques et du pronom suffixe haḍramawtique masculin singulier -t, qu’il a
appliqués aux inscriptions ḥadramawtiques des temples du site de Raybūn, remontant au 1er millénaire av. J.-C. S. Frantsouzoff distingue ainsi deux grandes périodes, Ancienne (= An.) et Récente (= R.), divisées chacune en plusieurs phases (An. 1, 2, 3), de la fin du VIIIe au IVe siècle av. J.-C. et Récente (= R.) en deux phases (R. 1, 2), du IIIe au Ier siècle av. J.-C. (FRANTSOUZOFF 2001 ; 2007). L’auteur est conscient que la chronologie des inscriptions ḥadramawtiques qu’il propose est relative et doit être confrontée aux données archéologiques disponibles. Il nous semble que le critère linguistique, comme celui de la paléographie, ne peut pas être généralisée à l’ensemble de la documentation sudarabique et doit être utilisé à titre indicatif. Signalons également la chronologie de l’ensemble de la documentation sudarabique proposée, avec des dates précises pour chaque règne, par A. Kitchen, dont les fondements et le mode de succession des règnes, notamment du 1er millénaire av. J.-C., restent à démontrer (KITCHEN 2000).


En guise de conclusion, nous considérons que le cadre chronologique général de l’Arabie du Sud au 1er millénaire av. J.-C. est désormais bien connu et accepté par l’ensemble des chercheurs, mais que la chronologie des royaumes sudarabiques, notamment la succession des souverains, est loin d’être établie avec certitude en raison de la nature des textes, des lacunes dans la documentation et de l’absence de fouilles scientifiques systématiques des très nombreux
sites toujours sous le sable. En l’absence de données archéologiques datées, de monnaies, de synchronismes avec des événements et sources extérieures datés, de lignées dynastiques continues, toute chronologie des inscriptions sudarabiques du 1er millénaire av. J.-C. fondée sur des critères internes tels que la paléographie, la linguistique, l’onomastique, la généalogie, le panthéon, la provenance, etc., ne peut être que relative, avec des marges d’erreur conséquentes. Seules des fouilles archéologiques permettraient d’établir une chronologie absolue des royaumes sudarabiques au 1er millénaire av. J.-C.

À partir du 1er et jusqu’au 6e siècle de l’ère chrétienne, les inscriptions sudarabiques sont, pour la plupart, datables avec précision grâce à l’utilisation d’ères locales. On connaît aujourd’hui le point de départ de ces comptes grâce aux textes sudarabiques datés rapportant des événements cités également par les sources extérieures.

Adresse de correspondance : XXX
Planches

*Pl. 1 : SW-BA/1/1 : graphie archaïque (début du VIIIᵉ s. av. J.-C.)*
Ladatation paléographique des inscriptions sudarabiques

Pl. 4: RES 3943 : graphie B4 (guerre entre Saba' et Qatabân, début du VIe s. av. J.-C.)
Pl. 5 : Demirjian 1 = B-L Nashq (guerre entre Chaldéens et Ioniens, vers 550 av. J.-C.).
Pl. 6 : RES 3022 (guerre entre les Perses et l’Egypte, 343 av. J.-C.).
Pl. 7: A-20-216 (synchronisme avec Séleucos I, vers 297 av. J.-C.).
Sigles des inscriptions

Pour la résolution des inscriptions citées, se reporter à KITCHEN (2000). Pour une mise à jour, consulter le site : http://dasi.humnet.unipi.it.
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A new Safaitic square-script inscription with a unique expression of ‘longing’*

Mohammad I. Ababneh
(Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg)

Abstract

This paper aims to study a new Safaitic inscription documented from the eastern Jordanian Badiyah. The inscription is written in the square script by a member of the lineage of ‘mrt and includes a rare expression of longing.

Keywords: Ancient North Arabian  Safaitic  Safaitic square script  Palaeography  Graffiti

This inscription was documented in the year 2000 through my epigraphic survey in Wādī Ruʿeila in the eastern Jordanian Badiyah. It is written in what is known as square script (i.e. the general features of most letters are angular). The square script inscriptions are a minority in the Safaitic corpus, and were produced primarily by members of the lineage ‘mrt. This paper studies a new inscription in the square script, adding to this small corpus, and examines its rather atypical formulation.

All the characters of the inscription are clearly engraved in three lines in a boustrophedon direction, and the reading of the text is certain. This inscription is introduced by the l (lam-auctoris), the author’s name, and his genealogy including his lineage group. The narrative contains a unique expression of longing. In most inscriptions of this category, the object of longing is a person, but here the verb ts²wuq takes the relative pronoun ḏ as its object, and is followed by two lexemes: ʿqb and s¹lm, both of which require further discussion.

*I am grateful to Dr. S. Al-Jarrah for reading the draft version of this paper, as well as to Mr. M.C.A. Macdonald for his suggestions and comments.

1A collection of the documented inscriptions from this region was used in my dissertation and published in 2005, and another collection of Safaitic inscriptions will be published in OCNIA.

2It is known that the script of Safaitic inscriptions is divided in two forms: the normal and the square script. For the discussions on the palaeography, see Al-Jallad (2015: 27). The study by Macdonald (2015: 30, Appendix 2) gives a detailed description of the square script and disproves any connection with the Ancient South Arabian alphabet.

3There are some inscriptions which were written in square script by persons of the lineage ‘bs²t (CSNS 424), nġbr (Alolow 1999, 396), ḥly (Al-Housan 2015, 58), mḥrb (Oxtoby 1968, 57), as well as some letters in square script appearing in the inscriptions Alolow 1999, 388, 389, 390 and 391 that were written by members of the lineage ʃʾd.
A NEW SAFAITIC INSCRIPTION WITH A UNIQUE EXPRESSION OF ‘LONGING’

Figure 1: Photograph of the inscription by M.I. Ababneh

Figure 2: Tracing of the inscription by M.I. Ababneh
Transliteration

l ṭwḏ bn nmr ḏ l ṭmrt w ts²wq l-ḏ ṭqb s¹lm

Translation

‘By ṭwḏ son of Nmr of the lineage of ṭmrt and he longed for him who had gone away. Peace!’

Palaeographic notes

This inscription consists of 29 letters, 13 without repetition. Of these, 8 are written in square script. According to Macdonald’s classification, the letters l and n appear in normal script form and the letters ṭ, q and w seem to be closer to the normal Safaitic form. The eight letters ṭ, b, t, ḏ, r, s¹, s² and m are written in a square or square-like form.

In some inscriptions, the square letters appear next to the normal letters, attesting to a stylistic choice in the use of these shapes rather than the existence of a truly independent script. In addition to the examples mentioned by Macdonald (2015: 32), see also the following examples of the mixed Square-Normal script (using capital letters and ṭ, ṭ to show square forms):

- The edited inscription in this paper:  l ṭwḎ Bn nMR ḏ l ṭMRT wT S²wq lḎ ṭqb S¹lm;
- Ma’ani & Sadaqah 2002, 7:  l ṭbgr bn ṭTr ḏ ṭfrṭ;
- Ma’ani & Sadaqah 2002, 8:  l ṭTr bn ṭbgr bn ṭTr ḏ ṭfrṭ;
- Harahsheh 2007, 25:  l ṭzyd Bn M’yR ḏ ṭl ṭMRT;
- Harahsheh 2007, 26:  l ṭn’M Bn ʿqRB ḏ ṭl ṭMRT S¹lm;
- Harahsheh 2007, 27:  l ṭqRB Bn S¹dl S¹lm;
- Bani Awad 1999, 187:  l ṭksṭ bn ṭwhbṱ bn ṭrl wwl ṭbd ṭhr ṭwmgn ṭ ṭḥ ṭḥ (only ṭ appears in square script);
- Bani Awad 1999, 188:  l ṭS²kr¹l bn ṭQrb bn ṭHn¹ bn ṭrgl wwl ṭbd ṭhr;

4Here, it occurs in the form of a swastika, see Macdonald (2015: 31). It occurs also in the inscriptions WH 1725a and CSNS 388 which are written in normal Safaitic script, as well as in Alolow 1999, 276 and 389, which are written in both forms (i.e. not all letters in square form).
5The form of s² here is clearly square or squarish, contrary to the classification of Macdonald (2015: 30), where it does not take a square form. Cf. e.g. the shape of S² in dS²R (CIS V 2947), in dS²R (Abbadi & Zayadine 1996: 157) and in dS²R (Al-Housan 2015, 58). Furthermore, in the inscription Bani Awad 1999, 188 in which some of the letters take the square form, S² appears clearly in a completely square form in the word S²kr¹l.
• Al-Rousan 2005, 45, 47: l s²R Bn khs¹Mn Bn khs¹Mn Bn Znn Bn s²R Bn gn¹l D¹l kn ws¹RT s¹nT ngy ‘MD Bn l¹s¹ HDy ws¹nT dRg HsMkRn HMD fhgddf s¹lM wqMnMT lḌ d iy hs¹fR wnq¹T lḌ Mḥy hs¹fR;

• Al-Housan 2015, 58: l ʿbDT bn ʿQrb bn lb n Ḏ l Ḥly WḤgg s¹nT MyT MnʿT Bn RḌWT ḫmḥ ḫl ḫs¹hd s¹lM ḫqbl l s¹(R).

Commentary

The two personal names ‘wḏ and nmr are previously attested in the Safaitic corpus (e.g. HIn 448, 599). It should be noted that this person, ‘wḏ bn nmr of the lineage ‘mrt, is not previously attested.

‘wḏ bn nmr: This phrase is the common way of expression affiliation with a lineage group; see Macdonald (1993: 352–354); Al-Jallad (2015: 57, 84).

‘mrt: This lineage name is well attested in the Safaitic inscriptions (Harding 1969: 14, 21; Al-Rousan 1992: 336). It should be noted that the majority of the inscriptions of this lineage includes a short genealogy, few exceeding three generations. The lineage is also attested in a Safaito-Hismaic inscription (Al-Salameen 2011: 216, figs 2, 3), as well as occurring in a bilingual Nabataean-Greek inscription from Madaba (Milik 1958: 244); see also Graf (1989: 360) and Macdonald (1993: 359).

As stated earlier, the unique feature of this inscription is the structure of the longing formula, which consists of two parts. The first begins with the verb ts²wq and the preposition l. This phrase is common and it means ‘he longed for’, which is the usual form to express longing in Safaitic (Al-Jallad 2015: 220).

The nomadic lifestyle, like seasonal migration to pasture in the inner desert, is reflected in the contents of the inscriptions, which record escorting herds and long stays away from family and relatives. Thus, longing is a natural theme. In the Safaitic corpus this verb occurs to state the longing of the author in general or to express his longing for his family, relatives (father, brother, sister, maternal uncle, maternal aunt, etc.), companions, beloved, a named person and gods. Furthermore, the author longed for someone e.g. after...
finding a trace or a writing of his paternal uncle, maternal uncle or a person identified by name.\textsuperscript{17}

The second part, i.e. the object of the verb ts\textsuperscript{wq}, appears here in a sentence which includes the relative pronoun ḏ, the verb ‘qb and the substantive s\textsuperscript{lm}.


‘qb: The word ‘qb is previously attested in the Sabaic in the inscription CIS V 4404,\textsuperscript{18} where it occurs in the invocation of several deities to exact a punishment. The root ‘qb is common in Semitic language and has different meanings. In Arabic there are many meanings of the root ‘qb; some of these are not suitable for the context of this text. It could be interpreted here as cognate to Arabic ‘aqaba ‘to come after’ or ‘aqqaba ‘to return back’ (\textit{Lisān} √‘qb). It is clear that the author is longing for someone who has left him or someone who came to him.

s\textsuperscript{lm}: This common term occurs in a rather unusual context here, where it directly follows the verb ‘qb; this syntax seems to be characteristic of inscriptions by members of the lineage ‘mrt.\textsuperscript{19} It could be translated as ‘greeting, peace, salute’. It is helpful to illustrate the use of s\textsuperscript{lm} in this case to compare it with the use of s\textsuperscript{lm} in the short Nabataean inscriptions.\textsuperscript{20}

Address for Correspondence: ababneh5@yahoo.com

\textsuperscript{15}CIS V 95: wwdg s’fr ḏdh ftx\textsuperscript{wq}.
\textsuperscript{16}See Alolow 1999, 28: wwdg s’fr ḏh ftx\textsuperscript{wq}.
\textsuperscript{17}WH 1105: wwdg ḏr ‘qrh ftx\textsuperscript{wq}; KRS 2321: wwdg ḏr ‘qnt ftx\textsuperscript{wq} ḥl qbl s\textsuperscript{lm}.
\textsuperscript{18}CIS V 4404: … f h s‘ms\textsuperscript{1} (w) h gd\textsuperscript{wq} w h ṭ ‘qb b–ḥ rm ḏ ‘s‘l ḏ ‘wr ḏ –– ‘… and so O S‘ms\textsuperscript{1} and O Gd\textsuperscript{wq} and O ṭ punishment for it ṭm who did it in revenge and blind whoever ––‘. The reading and the translation are by the editors of OCLIANA. ‘qb also occurs as a personal name (Hln 426). The word ‘qt occurs in the inscription BS 92: wmr\textsuperscript{r} bt\textsuperscript{y} b’qṭ ‘gt ḏ‘ and the sky rained after a long time of no rain’ (translation from OCLIANA).
\textsuperscript{19}It occurs in the following inscriptions, all written in square script: Harahsheh 2007, 26: l ‘n\textsuperscript{m} bn ‘qrh ḏ‘l ‘mrt s\textsuperscript{lm}; 27: l ‘qrh bn s\textsuperscript{dl} s\textsuperscript{lm}; 24: l nhs\textsuperscript{t} ḏbn ḏ‘l ‘mrt { } { } ḏrm s\textsuperscript{lm} whlt wds\textsuperscript{r} s\textsuperscript{lm}; Al-Manaser 2008, 133 = BS 2000: l ‘s\textsuperscript{t} bn rwḥ ḏ‘l ‘mrt s\textsuperscript{lm}.
\textsuperscript{20}Passim, e.g. see Nehmé (2015: 111–112).
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Sigla

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CISV</td>
<td>Ryckmans (1950–1951)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSNS</td>
<td>Clark (1979)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Inscriptions recorded by the Badia Survey in north-eastern Jordan in 2015 and published online in OCIANA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCH</td>
<td>Harding (1953)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIn</td>
<td>Harding (1971)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRS</td>
<td>Inscriptions recorded by Geraldine King on the Basalt Desert Rescue Survey in north-eastern Jordan in 1989, published online in OCIANA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCIANA</td>
<td>Online Corpus of the Inscriptions of Ancient North Arabia, <a href="http://krcfm.orient.ox.ac.uk/fmi/webd#ociana">http://krcfm.orient.ox.ac.uk/fmi/webd#ociana</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>Winnett &amp; Harding (1978)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References


——— 1971. An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions, (Near and Middle East 8), Toronto: Toronto University Press.


New dated inscriptions (Nabataean and pre-Islamic Arabic) from a site near al-Jawf, ancient Dūmah, Saudi Arabia

Laïla Nehmé (CNRS, Orient & Méditerranée)

Abstract
This article publishes eighteen inscriptions: seventeen in the Nabataean script and one in the pre-Islamic Arabic script, all from the area of al-Jawf, ancient Dūmat al-Jandal, in north-west Arabia. It includes the edition of the texts as well as a discussion of their significance. The pre-Islamic Arabic text, DaJ144PAr1, is dated to the mid-sixth century AD. It is important because it is the first text firmly dated to the sixth century AD from north-west Arabia. The Nabataean texts are interesting because they are dated to the beginning of the second century AD and they mention both cavalrymen (Nabataean pršyʿ) and a centurion (Nabataean qntwyn).

Keywords: Nabataean inscriptions Pre-Islamic Arabic Dumah Saudi Arabia Roman Army

1 Introduction
The archaeological and epigraphic surveys undertaken between 2009 and 2017 by the Saudi–Italian–French Archaeological Project in the regions al-Jawf (ancient Dūmah) and Sakākā, in north-west Saudi Arabia, have led to the discovery of a number of sites, twelve of which contain Nabataean, Nabataean-Arabic (i.e. inscriptions which are clearly transitional between Nabataean and Arabic) or pre-Islamic Arabic (i.e. clearly written in a recognisable form of Arabic script) inscriptions. The author is responsible, in the project, for the publication of the texts written in these three categories of scripts. The examination, in early 2017, of all the photographs taken by the team members

1This project is directed by Guillaume Charloux (CNRS, Orient & Mediterranée, France) and Romolo Loreto (University of Naples “L’Orientale”, Italy).
2To the inscriptions photographed in situ should be added a four line inscription carved on a moveable stone, photographed by G. Charloux in a window display of the Sudayrī Foundation building in Sakākā. A label identifies it as having been brought there by Dr. Nawāf Dūbyān al-Rāshid. The text is unfortunately not readable on the available photographs.
3Note that two other epigraphists, Frédéric Imbert and Jérôme Norris, are responsible for the publication of the Arabic and Ancient North Arabian inscriptions respectively. I am grateful to G. Charloux, the co-director of the project, for putting all the project’s material at my disposal.
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Figure 1: Map of the region of al-Jawf and Sakākā.

during the surveys has allowed for the identification of c. 106 inscriptions, sixty-eight of which seem to be so far unpublished. All but two of the remaining thirty-eight were previously recorded in Sulayman al-Theeb’s monumental publication Mudawwanat al-nuqūš al-nabatīyyah in 2010. The last two were published by Khaleel al-Muaikel in 2002. Ninety-five inscriptions are written in the Nabataean script, ten are written in the Nabataeo-Arabic script (including two unpublished) and one, dated to the mid-sixth century AD, is written in what can safely be considered as pre-Islamic Arabic script. The mid-sixth century text is very important for the history of the region because it is the first clearly dated pre-Islamic Arabic text from north-west Arabia. The Nabataean inscriptions are also very interesting because two of them are dated to the beginning of the second century AD and mention Nabataean soldiers recruited in Roman military units. Considering the importance of these texts, it was decided, in agreement with the project’s directors and the Saudi Commission for
Tourism and Heritage, to make them available to the scholarly community as quickly as possible.

All the texts come from site no. 144, numbered DaJ144, where DaJ stands for Dūmat al-Jandal. It is located 20 km north-west of al-Jawf, on the foothills of a long (13 km) rocky plateau known as az-Żilliyyāṭ and either at the outlet of, or inside, a small wadi (figs 1–2, see also § 3.1 below). Among the other sites recorded in this area, only one yielded Nabataean inscriptions: DaJ7, known as ʿAbdal-Jawf, which contains two unpublished texts. The plateau culminates at 833 m asl, and the inscriptions themselves are at about 750 m. Note for comparison that the altitude in the centre of al-Jawf is c. 600 m asl.

2 The inscriptions

The eighteen inscriptions photographed at site DaJ144 are published here for the first time. They belong to ten different epigraphic points which contain from one to five texts (figs 3–4). The inscriptions have been numbered according to the way the epigraphic material from the Arabian peninsula will be numbered: the Nabataean ones bear numbers DaJ144Nab1 to DaJ144Nab17 and the pre-Islamic Arabic inscription is numbered DaJ144PAR1.

*These will be published later.*
new dated inscriptions from a site near ancient Dūmah

Figure 3: Google Earth Satellite image showing the distribution of the inscriptions in the wadi. Only five points appear on the map because some epigraphic points are too close to each other to be shown at this scale.

2.1 DaJ144PAR1 (figs 5–7)

This is the most significant and most important text and the one which motivated the publication of this collection of texts. It is carved in the middle left part of a sandstone boulder, c. 1.10 m high and 0.70 m wide (fig. 5), while a Nabataean inscription, DaJ144Nab13, on which see below, is carved in its lower part. Six animal figures are drawn on the rock. These are, from top to bottom: three camels, probably female because they have their tail raised,\(^5\) one ibex, one male camel and one other probably female camel. Two of the camels have a load on top of the hump: one is represented by a simple stroke

\(^5\)As first recognised by A. Searight (Macdonald & Searight 1983: 575).
which thickens slightly at its top and the other is probably a human stick figure (rather than a cross). If the interpretation is correct, the right arm is bent and the legs are not shown, as if the figure was standing on the hump rather than riding the camel. There are comparable representations elsewhere in Arabia and among the drawings of mounted camels which are associated with the Safaitic inscriptions. Since the drawings occupy the greatest part of the surface of the rock and since the two inscriptions are written around them, it is possible that the carving sequence is the following: drawings, Nabataean inscription, pre-Islamic Arabic inscription. But it is equally possible that the drawings and the pre-Islamic Arabic inscription are contemporary, as indicated by the fact that the tools used to carve them produced the same kind of incision (same width, same depth, etc.).

The text (figs 6–7):

\[
\begin{align*}
dkr \\
dkr \ 'l-\ 'lh \\
hg\{b/n\}w \ br \\
š\text{lmh}^7 \\
\{b\}y(r)\{h\} \ šnt \ 4 \times 100 \\
+ 20 + 20 + 3 \ \text{cross}
\end{align*}
\]

---

6 Such as the one published in Nayeem (2000: fig. 191) (I thank Michael Macdonald for this reference).

7 I have decided, conventionally, to keep \( ś \) in the transliteration of all the Nabataean, Nabataean-Arabic and pre-Islamic Arabic inscriptions, whether \( ś \) represents Arabic \( š \) or \( s \).
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Figure 5: The boulder which bears inscriptions DaJ144PAR1 and DaJ144Nab13 (G. Charloux).
Figure 6: Close-up of DaJ144PAr1 (G. Charloux).

Figure 7: Facsimile of DaJ144PAr1 (L. Nehmé).
“May be remembered. May God remember Ḥgʿ{b/n}w son of Salama/Salāma/Salima (in) the m[onth] (gap) year 443 [AD 548/549].”

The text is clear, except for the possible confusion between the b and the n in the author’s name and the doubtful presence of byrḥ, “in the month of”, at the beginning of line 5. The patina of these three letters is identical to that of the other letters but it is surprising that the author wrote neither the final ḥ nor the month name. It is possible that the small cracks which affect the stone at this point just prevented him from writing the ḥ, which in turn discouraged him from writing the month name.

Except for the first line, the text is written in a script which is the ultimate stage of the development of Nabataean into Arabic and which can be considered as Arabic. It can be compared with the 5th and 6th century pre-Islamic inscriptions from the Arabian peninsula, particularly those discovered in the area of Ḥimā, north of Najrān, and published in Robin et al. (2014). Two of the latter are dated, one to AD 470 and one to AD 513. If one compares DaJ144Par1 to the AD 513 one, Himā-al-Musammāt PalAr 1 (fig. 8), one can see that the letters and the numerals which appear in both texts have very similar shapes (d, h, w, l, n, š/s, 4×100), except for the final t of šnt which in Dūmah is made of two rather than three strokes. Note that the letters dkr, at the beginning of line 2, if read correctly, are also different (see below). Finally, like the Ḥimā texts, none of the letters bears a diacritical dot.

The text shows a very interesting feature, which has never been found before, and that is the repetition, at the beginning of the text, of the word dkr, Arabic ḏkr. It is written once in Nabataeo-Arabic characters, line 1, and once in a script which would be at home in the first century Hijra at the beginning of line 2. The fact that ḏkr was repeated shows that the Nabataeo-Arabic formula was still present in the author’s mind but that it was perhaps

---

Figure 8: Facsimile of Ḥimā-al-Musammāt PalAr 1 (L. Nehmé).

---

Note that C. Robin uses “PalAr” to label inscriptions for which it is impossible to decide whether they still have an Aramaic content or whether they are Arabic in language. In our terminology, Pre-Islamic Arabic (“PAr”) is used to label inscriptions which are written in the Arabic script in the pre-Islamic period.
considered as a logogram. In this respect, it is worth noting that none of the dated pre-Islamic Arabic texts known so far, and none of the inscriptions written in the most developed version of the Nabataean-Arabic script – the closest to pre-Islamic Arabic – contains the typical Nabataean formulas found in the graffiti, šlm + name(s) ± bṭb, dkyr + name(s) ± bṭb, and dkyr w šlm + name(s) ± bṭb. What we see, on the contrary, is the appearance of new formulas, based on the use of verbs in the 3rd person singular of the perfect with an optative force, such as šmʿt + the divine name al-ʿUzzā in UJadh 345, 364, and 313 (Nehmé 2013; 2017: 82–83). In DaJ144PAr1, dkr is also, most probably, Arabic ḏakara with an optative force. Arabic samʿat and ḏakara in these texts are thus used with the divine names al-ʿUzzā and the god named ʾl-ʾlh (on which see below), who are asked to listen to and to remember the authors of the texts. One finds an exact equivalent of this formula in the Zebed inscription of the martyrion of St Sergius, in northern Syria, dated AD 512, which starts with [ḏ]{k}r ʾl-ʾlh (Macdonald 2015: 410–411).

With regard to the language of the text, there are both diagnostic and non-diagnostic words in it. If one agrees with the interpretation of dkr given above, this can only be Arabic because the Aramaic suffix conjugation does not have an optative force whereas the perfect in Arabic is constantly used in wishes, prayers and curses with an optative meaning (Wright 1896–1898: II, 2–3). Since these texts can be considered as prayers, the optative is more likely. The god’s name, ʾl-ʾlh, has the definite article typical of Classical Arabic and most modern dialects. If {b}yṛḥ[ḥ] was indeed intended to be written by the author, it would be an Aramaic word, not an Arabic one, and the same is true of br, which is systematically used for “son of” in the pre-Islamic Arabic inscriptions (see Macdonald 2010: 20 n. 41). Both yrḥ and br are also attested in the pre-Islamic Arabic texts from Himā and it is not surprising to find them used here. As for šnt, it can be both Aramaic and Arabic.

This mixture of Arabic and Aramaic is a typical feature of both the Nabataean-Arabic and the pre-Islamic Arabic texts from the Arabian Peninsula. I have suggested elsewhere (Nehmé 2017: 86), however, that in most cases, the Aramaic words appear in the formulaic parts of the texts, which are conservative, and particularly in the dating formula. They are therefore not indicative of the language spoken by the authors of the text. On the contrary, the use of ǧakara with an optative force shows that the author of DaJ144PAr1 was very likely an Arabic-speaking individual.

The reading of the date is clear. It is written in the way that one would expect, i.e. 4 × 100 followed by 20 + 20 + 3. That is year 443 of what can only be the era of the Roman province of Arabia, the only one which was in use in

---

9 For this to be true, however, we would need to have dkyr in line 1, not dkr. It is just possible that the short and thin vertical line between the k and the r represents a badly formed y. Whatever the explanation, the author wrote this word twice, in two different scripts.

10 Both of these usages are found in Hismaic. See references for ŠMʿ in Nehmé (2017: 83).

11 The reading of [ḏ]{k}r ʾl-ʾlh in this text is of course uncertain.

12 Or, as suggested to me by R. Hoyland (pers. comm.), an Arabic word of Aramaic origin, i.e. in this pre-Islamic dialect of Arabic it could have become a naturalized word.
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this region at this period. Considering that the month is not given, the text is dated to AD 548/549.

What follows “3” in line 6 is not another numeral. Indeed, were it a numeral, it could only be a “4”. However, it does not look like the “4” which multiplies the “100” immediately above (it has a + shape rather than an X shape) and, more significantly, it would not be in the right place. Numerals are multiplied when going from the smaller to the bigger numeral (hence 4×100) and added when going from the bigger to the smaller (hence 20+20+3). Another “4” after “3” would therefore not make sense. This + sign is also not likely to be identical to the X sign which is written before the beginning of some of the Nabataean inscriptions of the same group (DaJ144Nab9 and 12). It is thus most likely that what follows the numerals is a cross, like the ones which are associated with the inscriptions of the Ḥimā region, especially those described as type 2, made of two simple segments which cross each other at right angles (Robin et al. 2014: 1054). This would indicate that the author is a Christian.

The inscription contains two personal names, ḥgʿ{b/n}w and ʿlhm. The reading of the first one is certain but no parallels could be found for it either in Nabataean or in Arabic. It may be a name composed of ḥg (Arabic Ḥājj?) and either ⟨b⟩ or ⟨n⟩, i.e. Arabic ‘B, GB, ‘N or GN. Ancient North Arabian provides many examples of both the words ḥg and ṣḥg and theophoric names built with ḥg, such as ḥgʿl (C 553, Safaitic), ḥgbrʾ (KRS 2244, Safaitic), ṣḥḥ (BTH 213, Safaitic) and ṣḥlt (BR 6, 7, 35, Sij 54, etc., Safaitic and Hismaic), and it is possible that we have here the same kind of compound name, although ‘B / ‘N / GB / GN would still have to be explained. To my knowledge, there is no theophoric name built with either of these sequences of letters in the Nabataean and Nabataean-Arabic corpus. One should note the presence of wawation at the end of ḥgʿ{b/n}w. As for ʿlhm, it may be the equivalent of Arabic Salama, Salāma or Salima, this order reflecting the decreasing popularity of the name in Ibn al-Kalbi’s genealogies. I know of two instances of ʿlmt in Nabataean, with a t, one in ThMNN 39 (JSNab 77) and one in ThMNN 871. If ʿlhm and ʿlmt are indeed the same name, it means that it was initially pronounced with a t at the end, and that in the 6th century, this phoneme had changed to final h.

Finally, one needs to comment on the divine name ʾl-ʾlh, which occurs here for the first time in north-west Arabia. It occurs, also in a Christian context, in Ḥimā-Sud PalAr 8 (Robin et al. 2014: 1099–1102, see the commentary on ʾl-ʾlh p. 1102), north of Najrān and it is the name of the Christian God in the Zebed inscription. It is the normal Christian pre-Islamic Arabic name for God. I formerly thought, in the edition of the Nabataean-Arabic inscription DaJ000NabAr1 (Nehmé 2016), that ʾl-ʾlh was used in the theophoric name

---

13 Note that what comes before the ḥ is the tail of the mounted camel.
14 For all these examples, see the indexes in OCIANA.
15 Note that ʿlmt is not attested in JSNab 102, which does not read ʿlmt br rbʾl but ʿlm rḥbʾl. ThMNN’s index should therefore be corrected.
16 This sound change apparently took place quite early in Nabataean, as can be seen from the Greek transcriptions (Al-Jallad 2017: 157–158).
brʾlʾlh, a compound made of br + ʾl-ʾlh, but a closer examination of the stone (fig. 9) shows that it is also possible, and probably better, to read [d]kr ʾl-ʾlh, i.e. the same formula as the one in Zebed and in DaJ144PAr1. The stone is broken on the right, and one can just see, to the right of the k, the bottom part of the missing d. There is however a theophoric name built with ʾl-ʾlh, and that is ʿbdʾlʾlh in LPArab 1. Indeed, in the first line of this inscription (fig. 10), I suggest to read ʿnh ʿbdʾlʾlh instead of ʾllh ʾfrʾ lʾlyh (“God, [grant] pardon to ʿUllaḥ”) of the editio princeps, which was followed by various other unsatisfactory readings. Lastly, ʾl-ʾlh is the name of God in the foundation inscription, in Arabic, of the monastery of Hind in al-Hira, in c. AD 560 (on this inscription, Hind and the date, see Robin 2013: 239 and § 3.4.2 below), as it is preserved in two transcriptions of al-Bakrī and Yāqūt.

Note: the Nabataean inscription on the same boulder as DaJ144PAr1 is DaJ144Nab13, for which see below.

17I am grateful to Ali Manaser who provided a new photograph of the inscription, now kept in the Mafraq museum in Jordan.
2.2 DaJ144Nab1 (fig. 11)

This text is carved on one of the boulders which are visible on fig. 4, along with DaJ144Nab2–8. The reading is clear, except for the last part of line 2, which seems to have been incised by another hand. Indeed, up to tymw, the letters are carved carefully, with a pointed tool which gives the lines a slightly hammered aspect, whereas what follows is less deeply and less carefully engraved. It is therefore possible that someone else added his name at the end. This would also explain the form of the y, which is different from the two other ys in the text. The first two letters of the last name are uncertain and I cannot offer a better suggestion for the reading.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{šlm tymʾbdt pršʾ} & \\
\text{br tymʾw} & \{p\} \{ṣ\} \{y\} \text{w}
\end{align*}
\]

“May Taymʾobodat, {the} cavalryman, son of Taymʾu, be safe, {and} P[ṣ]yw.”

The same man wrote DaJ144Nab3 in the same area. The three personal names are widespread in the Nabataean onomasticon and do not require any comment. On pršʾ, see the general commentary, § 3.3.
2.3 DaJ144Nab2 (fig. 12)

This text is also written on one of the boulders visible on fig. 4.

\[
\{\text{mgyn}\} \text{t} \ 'bd''lhy \ ---- \ (b/\$) y (d/r) \\
\text{"(Mgyn) t son of } 'Abd'allahi \ ---- \ (b/\$) y (d/r)."
\]

The first name is difficult to read and the suggested reading is the best one I could provide. \{\text{mgyn}\} \text{t} is not attested in Nabataean or Arabic but since all the letters except the last one are uncertain, there is no point in trying to offer an etymology for it. Note the form of the letters \text{b}d' in 'bd''lhy, which are more or less written as parallel lines, except for the \text{b}' which has an oblique line protruding to the right at its end. This sequence can be compared with the same sequence in the name ‘bd’lg’ in two inscriptions from Umm Jadhāyidh, ThMNN 587 (UJadh 129) and ThMNN 560 (UJadh 202). The combination of letters \text{b-d}' had apparently become some sort of formalized way of writing these letters. A few letters are carved after ‘bd’lhy but I cannot make any sense of them; perhaps it is another name.

2.4 DaJ144Nab3 (fig. 13)

DaJ144Nab3 to 7 (four texts) are carved on the same boulder in the same area as DaJ144Nab1–2. The first one, on top of the rock face, is the most finely carved and occupies a prominent position. Two animal figures are also crudely drawn on the stone. They may represent a horse mounted by a man holding a spear and possibly a small shield, hunting an ostrich.

\[
\text{šlm tym'bdt br tymw}
\]

The same man wrote DaJ144Nab1 in the same area and since he is said in this text to be a prṣ', tym'bdt of DaJ144Nab3 was a prṣ' too. The handwriting of both texts is identical.
2.5  DaJ144Nab4 (fig. 13)

ṣlm ʿbdt br ʿbdʾlḥy br tymw w {d/r}ʿytw

“May ‘Obodat son of ʿAbdʾallāhī son of Taymū be safe, and {D/R}ʿytw.”

The text is much less carefully written than the previous one. The last name is not previously attested in Nabataean and may correspond to Arabic Dāʿiya. The same man wrote DaJ144Nab7 on the same stone, and the handwriting is similar in both texts, particularly visible in the way the first name is written.

2.6  DaJ144Nab5 + DaJ144Nab6 (fig. 13)

ṣlm gršʾw [br] tymʾbdʿt pršʾ ṣlm

“May Gršʾw [son of] Taymʾobodat the cavalryman be safe.”

This graffito was initially considered as two separate texts, but if one examines DaJ144Nab8, where all the names are repeated, it appears likely that br should be restored between gršʾw and tymʾbdʿt. The first name is not previously attested in Nabataean and I have found no Arabic equivalent. According to J. Norris, to whom I am very grateful for the references which follow, the name Gršʾ appears several times in the so-called “Hismaeo-Safaitic” texts from

Figure 13: Nabataean inscriptions DaJ144Nab3–7 (G. Charloux).
the Dūmah area, in the form gršʿ, as well as in Hismaic and Safaitic (see OCIANA). It probably derives from Arabic gršʿ, which means “who has a large chest (of a camel), large (of a wadi)” (Lisān, s.v. gršʿ). On pršʾ, see the general commentary, § 3.3. Since tymʿbdt is said to be a cavalryman in DaJ144Nab1, it is tempting to consider that pršʾ in the present text also refers to tymʿbdt, but it is more likely that the profession refers to the author of the text and that the pršʾ is Gršʿw.

2.7 DaJ144Nab7 (fig. 13)

šlm ḏdt br ḏd[ʾ]lḥy

This text was probably written by the same man as DaJ144Nab4, but this time he gives only his father’s name. The end of the text has been damaged by the drawing of an ostrich.

2.8 DaJ144Nab8 (fig. 14)

šlm gršʿw br tymʿbdt
pršʾ šnt tltyn

“May Gršʿw son of Taymʿobodat the cavalryman be safe, year thirty.”

¹⁸Five unpublished texts and five previously published texts (ThNQT 116, 128, 129, ThNTS 86, 108). The Hismaeo-Safaitic script category is currently being discussed between the experts on Ancient North Arabian scripts and its existence is still debated.

135
This graffito is identical to DaJ144Nab5 + 6, with the exception of the date, which is not given in the latter. šnt šltn most probably corresponds to year 30 of the era of the Roman province of Arabia, i.e. AD 135/136. On prš̄, see the general commentary, § 3.3.

2.9 DaJ144Nab9 (fig. 15)

DaJ144Nab9 and 10 are on the same stone.

\[ d̲k̲y̲r̲ \ 'bd̲l̲h̲y̲ \ br \ tymw \ {šnt \ t}\̲X \]

“May ‘Abd’ālāhī son of Taymū be remembered, \{year ni\}ne X.”

šnt t\̲X\̲ corresponds to AD 114/115. The reading of the date is almost certain despite the fact that this part of the text has been damaged by the drawing of an ibex over it. A few letters and another X sign are carved under the beginning of the line but no sense could be made of them: \{d/r\}{b/w/p}X br \{t\}..?. Another dkyr is not very likely.

In the present graffito, an X is written after the date but it is very unlikely that it is a numeral. X signs written at the beginning or at the end of texts occur elsewhere in the Nabataean inscriptions. One finds an X, for example, carved at the end of ThMNN 752 and ThNS 19 or before the beginning of four texts of the Darbal-Bakrah corpus, all unpublished. Three of the latter are carved on the same rock face and it seems that the X was added later, as if it was intended to mark the texts for a reason which remains unknown.

2.10 DaJ144Nab10 (fig. 16–17)

\[ d̲k̲y̲r̲ \ ‘zyaw \ \{q\}{n}{t}rywn’ \]
\[ br \ ‘w{yd\{w\}} bṭb \]

“May ‘Azīzū the \{c\}en\{t\}urion son of ‘U\{w\}ayd\{ū\} be remembered in well-being.”
Both names are well known in the Nabataean onomasticon. The author is a centurion, a military rank which is relatively common in the Nabataean inscriptions of north-west Arabia, for which see the general commentary, § 3.2.

2.11 DaJ144Nab11 (fig. 18)

DaJ144Nab11 and 12 are carved on the same stone.

\[ \text{dkyr } \{m\} \{d/r\}w \text{ br} \]
\[ \text{šmylw} \]

The reading of the first \( m \) is not certain because the right part of the letter is very faint, but there is enough space for an \( m \) and both \( m/dw \) and \( m/rw \) are
possible names in Nabataean, attested in several inscriptions. The first one may correspond to Arabic Maʿadd, Maʿdor Muʿāḏ and the second was derived by E. Littmann (1914: no. 22) from Arabic maghar, which refers to a reddish colour. The name šmylw is not previously attested in Nabataean and no exact equivalent was found in Arabic, where only one Šumayla (which would normally be written šmylt in Nabataean) is known in Ibn al-Kalbi's genealogies.

2.12 DaJ144Nab12 (fig. 18)

X šlm ʿ{bdʾ}ly br tym[w]

It is possible that DaJ144Nab9 and 12 were written by the same person. Compare the way the sequence of letters bdʾ is written in this text with the way it is written in DaJ144Nab2, 4 and 9: the d and the ʾ are joined, which is unusual in Nabataean, and the b and the d have almost identical shapes (see under DaJ144Nab2). The same X sign as the one mentioned under DaJ144Nab9 is carved before šlm.

A Thamudic C text, DaJ144ANA54, is carved vertically to the right of the two Nabataean ones. It reads wdd f dʾ, “Greeting be with Dʾ”, an expression which is common in the Thamudic C graffiti. Note that if the sign for the ʾ

---

19 See also Al-Theeb (2010: 262–263). No other attestation of the name was found.

20 The translation is the one suggested in Al-Jallad (2016 [in preparation]). See also the discussion of wdd in Stokes (2016: 37–38)
is not closed, it may also be a b, but it is less likely. D‘ is attested in Safaitic and Hismaic (SIJ 402, Jacobson B 2.1 and TLWS 25, see references and sigla in OCIANA s.v.). Dozens of ‘Thamudic’ graffiti were recorded at site DaJ144. These will be published by Jérôme Norris and only the ones which appear on the same blocks as the Nabataean inscriptions are mentioned here.

2.13 DaJ144Nab13 (fig. 19)
On the same stone as DaJ144PA1.

\begin{align*}
\text{tymw br} \\
\text{zbdw šlm}
\end{align*}

The second name can be read zbdw only if one takes the sign between the d and the w, which resembles a Greek phi, as not belonging to the text, which is possible since it continues below the line. zbdw is a well-known Nabataean name in north-west Arabia.

2.14 DaJ144Nab14 (fig. 20)
DaJ144Nab14 and 15 are on the same stone.

\begin{align*}
\text{mškw br ‘bd’lg’ šlm}
\end{align*}
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Figure 20: Nabataean inscriptions DaJ144Nab14–15 (G. Charloux).

Figure 21: Nabataean inscription DaJ144Nab16 (G. Charloux).

Figure 22: Nabataean inscription DaJ144Nab17 (C. Poliakoff).
This text is finely carved and very clear. Both names are well-known in the Nabataean onomasticon (cf. Arabic Māsik, while ʿAbdʾalgā, “the servant of [the god of] ʾl-gʾ” is a typically Nabataean name).

2.15 DaJ144Nab15 (fig. 20)

dkyr ʾlw(p) br š

The text is unfinished. The first three letters of the name are certain and the last one is tentatively read as a final p. The possible alternatives, although less probable, are a final y (but it would in the wrong direction) or a w (but the loop would probably be closed). The name ʿlwš is not attested before in Nabataean but a name ʿIlāf is attested once in Ibn al-Kalbi’s genealogies.21

2.16 DaJ144Nab16 (fig. 21)

dkyr k{h}lyw br tymʿbdš šlm

The second letter of the first name is uncertain because it looks either like a final h or possibly like a m (but kmlyw does not exist in Nabataean whereas khylw is a common name). It is probable that the author made a mistake and used the final rather than the medial form of the h. There are comparable examples in JSNab 2 (in the name šlm line 3), JSNab 12 (in grhm line 6 and in hlpʿly line 12) and in a text from Wadi Maghārah (in the name hʿly) (Negev 1967: 251–252, fig. 3 and pl. 48B).

There is an Ancient North Arabian inscription below the Nabataean one, DaJ144ANA29. It reads l tʾl bn brd. The first name is well known in Safaitic (and occurs once in Hismaic, cf. OCiana, s.v.) and the second is well known both in Safaitic and Hismaic. The text is probably Hismaic because of the dot for n and because the r is smaller and more rounded than the b. It has recently been suggested, however, that because of the form of the l auctoris, which is not hooked (but the l in lʾl is), this text may have to be considered as a Hismaeo-Safaitic text.22

2.17 DaJ144Nab17 (fig. 22)

dkyr rk{ym} br ----w

The name is not previously attested in Nabataean. Despite the presence of a possible small tail on top of the last letter, I do not think this is an ʾ.

---

21Nabataean w can be used to represent Arabic ẓ (Cantineau 1930–1932: I, p. 48), as in ‘dnwn, which is probably the equivalent of Arabic ʿAdnān. There is one example in JSNab 328 and many others (most unpublished) in the Darb al-Bakrah corpus, both of ‘dnwn and of compound names built with ‘dnwn such as ‘bdʾdnwn in ThNUJ 157 and 209, and zbdʾdnwn in ThNUJ 13 (reread), etc.
3 Additional commentaries

3.1 The location of the texts

As I already said in the introduction, the collection of inscriptions published in this article is carved in the first series of rocky outcrops one encounters when leaving Dūmat al-Jandal towards the north-west. Since the ancient city itself is located north of the main wadi bed, it is likely that people who travelled out of Dūmah going north-west, in the direction of Wadi Sirḥān, did not follow this wadi bed, because this would have required a useless detour of several kilometers to the south, but probably went north-west immediately. This would have brought them, in three hours, to the vicinity of these outcrops. It should be noted, however, as can be seen on figure 3, that the texts are not located on the external foothills of the latter but are all, except for DaJ144Nab17, carved on the banks of the only wadi which crosses the outcrop from north-east to south-west. It is therefore very likely that the eleven individuals who wrote these texts, especially the three among them who were military men, were on some sort of official or unofficial reconnaissance patrol and stopped on the way to carve their signatures. The other possibility is that they were, for whatever reason, crossing the outcrops to reach their northern side, but it is less likely because there is nothing, on that side that would justify this crossing. Whatever the case, the authors of these texts were not far from the ancient caravan road which joined Dūmat al-Jandal with Syria through Wadi Sirḥān (see most recently Loreto 2016: 309–312). They were either travelling along it or keeping this part of it, close to Dūmah, under surveillance from the top of the plateau which may have served as a watch post. They may also simply have been garrisoned in Dūmah and gone there on a patrol.

3.2 The centurion

One text, DaJ144Nab10, mentions a centurion. The word is written in Nabataean, qnṭrywnʾ, and despite the uncertain reading of the first three letters, the restitution is almost assured because most of the letters are visible (see fig. 17). The word centurion written in Nabataean letters occurs in three other inscriptions, which are mentioned in an article published ten years ago (Nehmé 2005–2006: 185–186). It is written once qnyrwnʾ, once qnṭrynʾ and once qnṭrwnʾ. DaJ144Nab10 is thus the second attestation of the orthography qnṭrywnʾ. Since DaJ144Nab9 (dated to AD 114/115) and DaJ144Nab10 are carved on the same stone, it is likely (but it is unfortunately impossible to be sure) that both texts were written at about the same date. If this is the case, DaJ144Nab10 would be the first evidence of a centurion bearing a Nabataean name, ʿAzīzū, recruited in an early Roman provincial military unit. Since he

---

23 The inscriptions are JSNab 31, UJadh 6 = ThNUJ 90 and inscription no. 8 in Nehmé (2005–2006), which will ultimately be numbered MS111Nab1.

24 The only other dated Nabataean text mentioning a centurion is JSNab 31, which is dated to the reign of Aretas IV.
does not mention his Roman citizenship, it is likely that he was a *peregrinus* and was an infantryman possibly commanding part of an auxiliary cohort, a *centuria* (or a detachment), who came to this place in AD 114/115, i.e. less than ten years after the annexation of the Nabataean kingdom.\(^\text{25}\) He cannot have commanded an auxiliary cavalry unit (an *ala*) because the latter would have been commanded by a prefect, nor part of a cavalry unit, a *turma*, because the latter would have been commanded by a decurion. Of course, this remains speculation because there is no way we can be sure that DaJ144Nab10 is dated to AD 114/115. If it is not, there is also no particular reason to consider that it is contemporary with the other dated inscriptions.

### 3.3 The *pršʾ*, the “cavalrymen”

Three inscriptions contain the word *pršʾ* “cavalryman”, a well-known Nabataean military function (for which see Graf 1988: 201 and Starcky 1971: 159) attested in Petra, Sarmadāʾ, as-Sij, al-ʿUdhayb and several places in the region of al-Jawf (see the table below). The three inscriptions are DaJ144Nab1, Nab5 + 6, and Nab8. They were written by only two individuals since DaJ144 Nab5 + 6 and DaJ144Nab8 are written by the same person, *gršʿw* son of *tymw*. Note also that although the author of DaJ144Nab3 does not say that he is a *pršʾ*, he probably was one because he bears the same name, *tymʾbdʿ* son of *tymw*, as the author of DaJ144Nab1, who says he is a *pršʾ*. Both names are very common in the Nabataean onomasticon and it may be a coincidence, but it is not likely because the handwriting of the two inscriptions is very similar. Finally, it is also likely that the two *pršʾ*, *tymʾbdʿ* and *gršʿw*, were brothers, because they have the same father’s name.

DaJ144Nab8 is dated to Ad 135/136, i.e. 21 years later than the text which mentions the centurion, DaJ144Nab10. The centurion and the *pršʾ* were therefore not there at the same time. As pointed out to me by P.-L. Gatier, it is however possible that both were part of a *cohors equitata* which consisted of *turmae* commanded by decurions and of *centuriae* commanded by centurions.\(^\text{26}\) The wadi would then have been visited once by infantrymen and once by cavalrymen, belonging or not to the same regiment. It is also possible that the centurion and the *pršʾ* were not part of the same kind of unit and that the *pršʾ* were part of an *ala*, a cavalry unit.

It is worth recalling here that a group of twelve Greek inscriptions carved in Qubūr al-Jundi, 7 km south-west of Hegra, mention both horse (*ἱππεύς*) and camel (*δρομεδάρις*) riders.\(^\text{27}\) One of them, Seyrig no. 5, says that one of the camel riders was a member of the *turma* Marini (Graf 1988: no. 6, pp. 194–195, I am very grateful to Pierre-Louis Gatier, who helped me determine what the function of this particular centurion could be and was very patient with me in correcting various versions of this paragraph.

\(^{\text{25}}\) On the *cohortes equitatae* in Arabia, see Speidel (1977: 709–710).

\(^{\text{26}}\) For the interpretation of these texts, see now Gatier (2017: 268–269). They were previously published in Seyrig (1941), Sartre (1982), and Graf (1988).
NEW DATED INSCRIPTIONS FROM A SITE NEAR ANCIENT DŪMAH

In the same area, two Nabataean inscriptions, JSNab 227 and 245–246, mention one cavalryman and a group of cavalrymen respectively. It is possible that all the individuals mentioned in these texts were members of the *ala I Ulpia droma (dariorum) Palmyr (enorum) (milliaria)*, which was stationed in the Ḥijāz in the first part of the second century AD and which may have included horse and camel riders.

The new texts from the region of Dūmat al-Jandal are interesting because they show that people who bore Nabataean names and who identified themselves as cavalrymen served in the Roman army around AD 135/136, at the same time as we assume they did in the area of ancient Hegra on the basis of the neighbouring Greek inscriptions. It is of course well known that Nabataean soldiers were incorporated in the Roman army by Trajan soon after the annexation of the Nabataean kingdom. What is new is the fact that these soldiers, when they talk of themselves, use the same terms, *pršʾ* and *qntywnʾ* (if DaJ144Nab10 is indeed dated to AD 114–115) as the ones which were used by the Nabataeans before the annexation. It is noteworthy that in both sites, the riders are not mentioned in the city but on its outskirts. The troops they were part of were possibly stationed outside the oases of Hegra and Dūmah, on the main routes leading to them.

Table 1: The distribution of the word *pršʾ* in the inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site name</th>
<th>Inscription number</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Petra</td>
<td>MP 58 (doubtful, see Nehmé 2012)</td>
<td>*rb [prš/mšr]<em>ʾy[ʾ/tʾ]</em>, dated either c. 67 BC or c. AD 8 (year 16 or 17 of a king Aretas).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>MP 664 (= Starcky 1971)</td>
<td><em>rb pršʾ</em>, dated either 67 BC or AD 8/9 (year 16 of a king Aretas). Possibly MP 85, but very uncertain (see Nehmé 2015: n. 14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

28 I also photographed this text, the reading of which is certain. Note that in this text, *turmā* is spelled *tarma*, which is unusual and is found again in the graffito from Bāyir published by P.-L. Gatier (2017).

29 JSNab 245–246 was written by a man named ʾAftāh who mentions his companions the cavalrymen in charge of the guard: *ʾph br rmʾ tlm prbwrhy (or w) hrwwhy) pršʾ nptrn, “ʾAftāh son of Ramʾel, may he be safe, and his companions the cavalrymen in charge of the guard”*. As is now proven by the three military diplomas dated to AD 126, 142 and 145, where it is mentioned, see the references in Gatier (2017: n. 65). On the fact that δρομεδάριος may apply to the soldiers of the unit whatever their mount, ibidem: 263.

30 As is now proven by the three military diplomas dated to AD 126, 142 and 145, where it is mentioned, see the references in Gatier (2017: n. 65). On the fact that δρομεδάριος may apply to the soldiers of the unit whatever their mount, ibidem: 263.

31 Bowersock (1983: 157), Sartre (2001: 612), and references there: the *Cohortes Ulpia Petraeorum* are the most famous.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Resolution/Reference</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Al-ʿUdhayb</td>
<td>JSNab 227</td>
<td>ʿṣm pršʾ (the same man as ThNIS 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Maqʿad al-Jundi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>JSNab 245–246</td>
<td>pršʾyʾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>As-Sīj</td>
<td>ThNIS 1</td>
<td>ʿṣm pršʾ (the same man as JSNab 227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>ThNIS 2</td>
<td>hrs pršʾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>ThNIS 3</td>
<td>ḥnynw pršʾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>ThNIS 4</td>
<td>ṣḥlw pršʾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>ThNIS 13</td>
<td>ṭṣ(ṯ/ṯ) w pršʾ  (read ṭḥrw in ThNIS 13 but not likely)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>ThNIS 21</td>
<td>glayn pršʾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sarmādāʾ</td>
<td>ThNS 7</td>
<td>rḥyʾl pršʾ w ḥprkʾ (rather than ḏwynʾl of ThNS). Note that he is the son of Damasippus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(between al-ʿUlā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Taymāʾ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Al-Jawf, DaJ144</td>
<td>DaJ144Nab1</td>
<td>gršʾw pršʾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>DaJ144Nab5 + 6</td>
<td>tymʾbd t pršʾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>DaJ144Nab8</td>
<td>gršʾw pršʾ, dated AD 135/136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Al-Jawf, Qārāt al-Mazād (DaJ156)</td>
<td>ThMNN 751 checked on a photograph</td>
<td>ʾltw pršʾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>ThMNN 752 checked on a photograph</td>
<td>mnṭnṭy (rather than mnṭnw of ThMNN 752) ḥprkʾ w pršʾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>ThMNN 753 checked on a photograph</td>
<td>ṣḏw (son of mnṭnṭy of ThMNN 752), ṭšʾlḥy and one other, all bny pršʾ(y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>ThMNN 754 checked on a photograph</td>
<td>zydw pršʾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>ThMNN 761 checked on a photograph</td>
<td>ṣbdʾlḥy pršʾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>ThMNN 763 checked on a photograph</td>
<td>tymʾlḥy pršʾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>ThMNN 764 checked on a photograph</td>
<td>probably ṣbdʾṭbd pršʾ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW DATED INSCRIPTIONS FROM A SITE NEAR ANCIENT DŪMAH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>ThMNN/MP</th>
<th>Location/Description</th>
<th>Date/Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ThMNN 767 copy only</td>
<td>probably mytnw pr[šʾ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ThMNN 768 copy only</td>
<td>mškw pršʾ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ThMNN 769 copy only</td>
<td>‘---- pršʾ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>ThMNN 790 copy only</td>
<td>‘bdʾlhy pršʾ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ThMNN 791 checked on a photograph</td>
<td>ʾb(d)ʾl(hy) prš[...]y (reading uncertain), dated to year 18 (and not 13) of Rabbel II (AD 88/89).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ThMNN 803</td>
<td>zydw pr[šʾ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table requires a few comments. It contains twenty-seven attestations of pršʾ/{pršʾ}, including three uncertain ones, which come from eight different sites. All are located in north-west Arabia, except Petra, where we have at least one – and possibly two – mention(s) of rb pršʾ, a chief cavalryman who was probably of a higher rank than a simple pršʾ. More than half of the texts come from the area of al-Jawf (fig. 23), but there is no reason to consider this as particularly significant. What is worth noting is the fact that most of the cavalrymen who are mentioned in the inscriptions appear in groups. This shows that they were probably members of cavalry squadrons which went around together and wrote their name and profession in the same places and sometimes on the same rock faces. This is the case in the site DaJ144 and this is also the case in as-Sīj and in Qārat al-Mazād where several pršʾ carved their inscriptions in the same place.

Four inscriptions which contain the word pršʾ are dated: three (no. 26: ThMNN 791, no. 1: MP 58 and no. 2: MP 664) to a time when the Nabataean kingdom was independent, and one (no. 14: DaJ144Nab8) to AD 135/136, thus post-annexation. It is therefore now certain that the word pršʾ was used during both the Nabataean and the Roman periods, and this information is important in itself because it shows the continuity of the use of this Nabataean term in the Roman period.

It is also noteworthy that the author of ThNS 7 (as reread by the author) is called Rabīʾel son of Damasippos, who is also the author of ARNA.Nab 3, and it seems to me that both inscriptions are in similar handwritings. Rabīʾel is usually considered to be the same man as the author of JSNab 43, despite the fact that in the latter Rabīʾel does not give his father's name. Rabīʾel son of Damasippos was a member of a very well-known family who played a significant part in the administration of ancient Hegra and ancient Dūmah and who was involved in the so-called revolt of Damas, about which much still needs to be written (see Al-Otaibi 2011: 89–91, with previous bibliography and
In general commentary. In ThNS 7, he is said to be pršʾ and hprkʾ, i.e. a military officer of lower rank than a strategos. If my demonstration that the Rabibʾel of JSNab 43 and JSNab 34 was a strategos in Hegra in the interval between AD 40 and AD 72 is correct (Nehmé 2005–2006: 209–210), it is possible that ThNS 7 dates back to a period before he was appointed strategos in Hegra, when he was ‘only’ a pršʾ and a hprkʾ. The association of pršʾ and hprkʾ in the same text, here and in ThMNN 752, is also interesting because it gives an argument for the interpretation of hprkʾ as a cavalry officer, ἵππαρχος (cavalry commander) or ἐπαρχος (commander, praefectus), rather than as a ὑπαρχος, a subordinate commander, a lieutenant.\footnote{On hprkʾ see Healey (1993: 108–109).}

We know that two brothers were probably pršʾyʾ at the same time (see above). Moreover, we learn from ThMNN 753 that a father and his son, who

Figure 23: The distribution of the inscriptions mentioning a pršʾ around Dūmat al-Jandal.
wrote their signatures on the same rock face, were also both pršʾ. Finally, the son and two other individuals are all said to be bny pršʾ, bny probably meaning here, as it does in Palmyra, “members of a brotherhood, a caravan, a city, etc.”.33

The list of names given in the table shows that each of the pršʾ, as far as we can tell from the available data, appears only once in the inscriptions, with the probable exception of ʿsm, who left his signature twice, once in al-ʿUdhayb (no. 3) and once in al-Sij (no. 5), two sites which are about 40 km distant from each other. Finally, it is important to note that two individuals who are pršʾ are also hprkʾ: rbybʾ l son of dmsps of ThNS 7, on whom see above, and mnny of ThMN 752.34

I once asked myself whether pršʾ in Nabataean meant horse rider or camel rider but it is likely that had the mount been a camel, the Nabataeans would have used a word derived from gml, which exists in Nabataean (see the references in Nehmé forthcoming).35 Two other words designating animal riders are known in Nabataean. One is mqtbyʾ, which appears in three inscriptions from two Egyptian sites, one south-west of Suez and one north of Myos Hormos, published by Littmann & Meredith (1953: nos 34, 37, and 46a). The text of the first two is almost identical and ends with a word in the emphatic plural which was derived by Littmann from QTB, a root which means in Arabic “to bind upon the camel the [saddle called] qatab [a pack-saddle]” (Lane 1863–1893: 2485), hence the meaning “cameleers” he suggested to give to the word. The alternative, since the b might also be read as a r, would be to read mgtʾ and derive it from Syriac mtrʾ, “zither player”. Since inscription no. 64a mentions the “return of the mqt(b/r)yʾ”, it is perhaps more likely that what is meant in these texts is “the return of the cameleers” or of someone who had to do with camels, rather than “the return of the zither players”, but this remains speculation. The other word related to an animal rider in Nabataean is rkbʾ, which probably means horse or camel rider and is attested in two Nabataean inscriptions.36

3.4 The history of Dūmat al-Jandal in the 2nd and mid-6th centuries AD

The texts published in this article belong to two completely different groups: DaJ144Par1 on the one hand, dated AD 548/549, and the DaJ144Nab inscriptions on the other hand, for which two dates are available, AD 114/115 and AD 135/136, i.e. the beginning of the Roman province of Arabia.

33On the use of bny in Nabataean, see Macdonald & Nehmé (forthcoming).
34The order in which the two professions are given is not the same in the two texts, see the table.
35Note that in Classical Arabic, fāris can apply to “a rider upon any solid-hoofed beast”, but it is rare (Lane 1863–1893: 2368).
36Nehmé (2000: no. 5 and the commentary on p. 75–76) and CIS II 704 as reread in Nehmé (2000).
3.4.1 The 2nd century

We already knew, from the ancient sources and from two Latin inscriptions, that ancient Dūmah was part of the Roman province of Arabia and that soldiers of legio III Cyrenaica were stationed there. The sources are Pliny in the first century (Natural History, VI.XXXII.146), Ptolemy in the second century (Geography, 5.19.§7), Porphyry in the third century (On Abstinence, II.56), quoted in Eusebius of Caesarea (Praeparatio Evangelica, Book IV, chapter XVI), and Stephanus of Byzantium in the sixth century (Ethnica, s.v. Doumatha). Pliny mentions Domata and Hegra together but, contrary to what has often been suggested, there is nothing in Pliny to suggest that they both belonged to the Avalitae (Rohmer & Charloux 2015: 313). Ptolemy mentions Doumeta/Doumaitha as an inland city of Arabia and Porphyry (II.56) says that the inhabitants of Dūmah sacrificed a child every year and buried him under the altar they used to represent the deity.

The two Latin inscriptions are the following: a dedication to the god Sulmus by a centurion of legio III Cyrenaica named Flavius Dionysius, inscribed on an altar discovered near the oasis and dated to the 3rd century because it mentions two unnamed emperors who are likely to be Septimius Severus and Caracalla (AD 197–211),; and a stele discovered in Qasr al-Azraq, in present day Jordan (Bauzou 1996, see also Christol & Lenoir 2001), which mentions the road between Boṣra and Dūmah, along Wadi Sirhān. The latter is traditionally dated to the third century, under the emperor Aurelian and after the Roman campaign against Palmyra in AD 272 which put an end to queen Zenobia’s reign. It has recently been suggested, however, that it may date to c. AD 333–334, a period during which the restoration of the Azraq (ancient Amatha) road station and the building of a new fort there were undertaken by a military man (a “protector”), Vincentius, in the context of a desire to regain control of Roman military stations in arid zones at the end of the reign of Constantine (Aliquot 2016: 165).

We also knew, from the excavations undertaken both in the historic centre of the oasis (Sector A) and in the so-called western settlement (Sector C), that the site witnessed a second and third century occupation. The fortifications excavated in the western settlement, 3 km west of the Nabataean centre, certainly controlled access to the valley. They are not firmly dated archaeologically yet but it is clear that they were in use during the Nabataean period. One structure, numbered L2018 and interpreted as a tower, located on top of the outcrop which overlooks the western settlement from the south, is particularly interesting because it yielded pottery dated to the interval between the 1st and the 4th century (Charloux et al. 2016: 227–228), i.e. in marked
contrast with the nearby Nabataean *triclinium* (structure L2017) which was used only during the Nabataean period (ibid.). The tower was therefore in use in the Roman period, as evidenced also by the discovery, in the collapse layer of the monument, of a Roman coin dated to the reign of Licinius (AD 308–324). A Nabataean-Arabic inscription, DaJ000NabAr1, undated but palaeographically compatible with the 4th/late 4th and 5th centuries (see fig. 9) was also discovered at the bottom of the same collapse layer. The coin gives a *terminus post quem* to the inscription which is therefore either 4th century or later. Finally, we should probably mention that, among the material discovered during the excavation of the necropolis, between the historical area and the western settlement, both Roman pottery and a Roman coin of the reign of Hadrian were brought to light (see Charloux et al. 2014b: 200).

What the present inscriptions show is that Dūmah was *certainly* integrated into the province of Arabia nine years after the annexation, and it is very probable that this took place as early as AD 106 or, if what happened in Hegra also happened in Dūmah, possibly in AD 107. Moreover, they show that a group of Nabataean cavalymen were recruited in Roman military units and used, in the inscriptions they left behind, the same word as the one they used before AD 106. Finally, they show that the military rank of centurion — if the text where it appears is indeed dated to AD 114/115 — was also used by a Nabataean in the Roman period, whatever his exact role was in the area at that time.

The epigraphic material related to Roman Dūmah and its region that we now have at our disposal is of course still relatively scarce but it is slowly increasing. There are now six Nabataean, Nabataeo-Arabic and Pre-Islamic Arabic inscriptions from al-Jawf dated to after AD 106: DaJ144Nab9 (AD 114/115), DaJ144Nab8 (AD 135/136), DaJ034Nab4 (AD 124/125), ARNA.Nab 17 (AD 275/276), DaJ000NabAr1 (*terminus post quem* AD 308), S1 (Sakākā, AD 428), and DaJ144Par1 (AD 548/549). Three of them are published here and all centuries are now represented in the region of al-Jawf.

### 3.4.2 The 6th century

The presence of a pre-Islamic Arabic inscription whose author is a Christian in the middle of the 6th century in the area of Dūmat al-Jandal raises the question of the authority which controlled the oasis and the region around it at this period, and hence of the identity of the author himself. What comes immediately to one’s mind is the presence, in Dūmah, in 9 AH (AD 631), of the last known Kindite king, a man named Ukaydir son of ʿAbd al-Malik al-Kindī al-Sakūnī, who reigned over the oasis and who is said to have been a Christian (Robin 2012: 86 and Vecchia Vagliari 2012). Ukaydir belonged to a branch of

39 On the possible annexation of Hegra only in AD 107, see Nehmé (2009: 42–44).
41 Macdonald (2009).
42 Nehmé (2010: 71).
the genealogy of Kinda called the banū Shukāma, which is different from the Ḥujrid branch of Kinda (Ibn al Kalbī, Nasab Ma‘add: 190). Of course, there is a gap of 82 years between AD 549 and AD 631 and many things may have happened in this interval, about which we know almost nothing. A few arguments can however be put forward to suggest a connection between Kinda, and more specifically the Ḥujrid kings, and Dūmat al-Jandal in the sixth century AD.

It is well known that one part of Kinda, called the Ḥujrids after the name of the founder of this dynasty (fig. 24), Ḥujr Ākil al-Murār, ruled over the tribal confederation of Ma‘add, in Central Arabia, on behalf of Ḥimyar, in the 5th and 6th centuries AD. According to Chr. Robin’s interpretation of the Arab sources, Ḥujr controlled Ma‘add in Central Arabia as well as Rabī’a in north-east Arabia, and launched expeditions against al-Bahrayn and Lakhm.43

Ḥujr’s reign, according to Ya‘qūbī, lasted 23 years. Not much is known of his son’s reign, ‘Amr al-Maqsūr, but he may be mentioned in a Nabataean-Arabic inscription from Umm Jadhāyidh, dated AD 455/456.44 His grandson,

---

43 For this paragraph, I relied very much on the following contributions, which are not systematically quoted in the text: Robin (2012), Robin (2013), and Munt (2015: 443–446). Robin (2012), particularly, offers the most complete account on Kinda.

44 UJadh 109: Fiema et al. (2015: 419–420), with reference to previous publications. The “king” referred to in this text might also be, possibly more likely, the Sahtihid leader ‘Amr b. Mālik.
al-Ḥārith al-Malik, or another al-Ḥārith,⁴⁵ may have concluded a peace treaty with the Byzantine emperor Anastasius (AD 491–518) before being killed, in AD 528 or a little earlier, by a coalition of Arab phylarchs, of two duces and others (Malalas, XVIII.16). Al-Ḥārith reigned also briefly in al-Ḥīra. One can assume an interval of 50 to 75 years between the beginning of the reign of Ḥujr Ākil al-Murār and al-Ḥārith al-Malik’s death, and this therefore suggests that the former’s reign started somewhere in the middle of the 5th century AD.

What happened after al-Ḥārith al-Malik was killed, which is precisely the period which interests us here, is not clear (see Robin 2012: 77). According to the Arab sources, his four sons divided the kingdom and each took one part, in two different areas: the right bank of the lower Euphrates and the neighbouring steppe for three of them (Maḍīkarib b. al-Ḥārith, Shuraḥbīl b. al-Ḥārith, Salama b. al-Ḥārith), and the area south-east of Mecca for the fourth (Ḥujr b. al-Ḥārith). The Byzantine sources offer a different story of the succession of al-Ḥārith. According to Procopius (Wars, I.20.9), a Byzantine ambassador asked the Ḥimyarite king, in AD 531, to establish a man named Kaïsos (Arabic Qays), whose parents had been phylarchs and who was a fugitive because he had killed a relative of the Ḥimyarite king, as phylarch over Ma‘add. This man used to live in a land “utterly destitute of human habitation” but was a good warrior. Another Byzantine source (Nonnus cited by Photius, Library, 3) says that a man named Kaisos, the descendant of a man named al-Ḥārith, and almost certainly the same man as the one mentioned in Procopius, was the head of two important Arab tribes, the Chindenoi and the Maadenoi, i.e. obviously Kinda and Maʿadd. Three Byzantine embassies were sent to this Kaisos but in the end, Kaïsos set out for Byzantium, having divided his chieftaincy between his brothers Ambros (ʿAmr) and Iezidos (Yazīd). According to Robin, this may have happened around AD 540, when the war between Byzantium and Persia resumed.

The identification of the Kaïsos mentioned in the Byzantine sources is a difficult problem. The two most likely interpretations are the following: Kaisos is the pre-Islamic Arab poet Imruʾ al-Qays b. Ḥujr b. al-Ḥārith al-Malik, or he is Qays b. Salama b. al-Ḥārith al-Malik (Robin 2012: 79–80). Whatever the case, we are, in AD 549, one generation, or possibly at the beginning of the second generation, after the death al-Ḥārith al-Malik and we may tentatively suggest that his sons or his grandson(s) were still active, in AD 549, in the area formerly controlled by al-Ḥārith, at least until the battle of Shiʿb Jabala, possibly around AD 560.

If this is correct, all that remains to make is the connection between the Ḥujrids and Dūmat al-Jandal. First, at the time of al-Ḥārith and Kaïsos, there were alliances between Byzantium and the Ḥujrids and there were contacts between the two, embassies being sent to the Ḥujrids and visits being made by members of the Ḥujrid dynasty to Byzantium. Since the Ḥujrids were present

⁴⁵P. Edwell (2015: 233) is more cautious in identifying the al-Ḥārith mentioned in John Malalas’ account with the Kindite king al-Ḥārith. He suggests it might also be a ruler associated with the banū Thaʿlaba.
in north-east Arabia (because they governed Rabīʿa, and particularly Bakr), Dūmat al-Jandal was a central place for them to be in the early 6th century AD, between eastern Arabia and Byzantium.

Second, it is said that the Sassanian King Qubad I asked al-Ḥārith al-Malik to impose his religion, Mazdakism, on the Arabs of the Najd and of the Tihāma. The Tihāma designates the Red Sea shore in the area of Mecca (and further north and south), including some inland territories since Mecca and Yathrib are said to be in the Tihāma (Robin 2008: 172). If this is true, it would mean that al-Ḥārith was considered to have authority over these regions of north-west Arabia, but Dūmat al-Jandal is certainly too far from the Red Sea seashore to have been part of the Tihāma.

Third, a possible link between al-Ḥārith al-Malik and Dūmat al-Jandal can be glimpsed in the chronicle of John Malalas (XVIII.16), who says:

In that year it happened that enmity developed between the dux of Palestine Diomedes, a silentarii, and the phylarch Arethas. Arethas took fright and went to the inner limes towards India. On learning this Alamoundaros, the Persian Saracen, attacked the Roman phylarch, captured him, and killed him, for he had 30,000 men with him.

Malalas does not give the date of the death of al-Ḥārith but only the date of the end of the attack, AD 528, and it is therefore likely that al-Ḥārith died in AD 528 or a little earlier. What is meant by the expression “inner limes” is not certain, but it probably refers, as suggested by Theophanes’ addition to Malalas (435.9) a place “where none of the Romans have ever been”. If Arethas is indeed the Hujrid ruler al-Ḥārith al-Malik and was fleeing from (Third) Palestine, i.e. from anywhere between southern Jordan and Hegra, it is likely that he was going either south or east. A good candidate, as suggested by Robin (2012: 76) could be Dūmat al-Jandal, because this place was halfway between Aqaba and the Euphrates and above all accessible to al-Mundhir.47

Additionally, it may not be a coincidence that Hind, al-Ḥārith al-Malik’s daughter, who married the Nasrid king al-Mundhir III (AD c. 503–554) and became the mother of al-Mundhir’s successor in al-Ḥīra, founded a monastery consecrated to a god whose name is identical to that of the god mentioned in DaJ144Par1 in al-Ḥīra around AD 560.48 The foundation inscription of the monastery is known only from the quotations in al-Bakrī and Yāqūt but it clearly mentions ʾl-ʾlh.49 This may be taken as an argument for a connection

---

47Note that Caskel (1966: II, 329) suggests that al-Ḥārith may have controlled the oasis of Dūmah.
49See Robin (2008: 185–186): al-Bakrī: ... fa-ʾl-ʾlh(ā)dhi banat la-hu h(ā)dhā ʾl-bayt yaghfira khatiyyata-hā wa-yatarahhama ʿalay-hā wa-ʿalā wāladi-ha..., “puisse Dieu pour qui elle a construit cette demeure pardonner ses péchés, avoir pitié d’elle et de son fils”; small variations, irrelevant for ʾl-ʾlh, in Yāqūt.
between the dynasty which ruled in Dūmat al-Jandal in the mid-sixth century and the family of the Kindite ruler al-Ḥārith al-Malik.

Finally, it may also not be a coincidence that the name of the author’s father in DaJ144PAr1 is šlmh, a name which is attested in the Nabataean inscriptions of the Arabian peninsula only twice (see the commentary of the text). It may therefore be tentatively suggested that the author’s father, i.e. the same generation as the father of Kaïsos, bore a name which had a connection with the part of the Kingdom of Kinda (or what remained of it) which belonged to Qays b. Salama b. al-Ḥārith.

Of course, the most important link between Kinda and Dūmat al-Jandal is given by Ukaydir. If we accept the idea that Kindite rulers, whoever they were (Ma’dīkarib, Shuraḥbīl or perhaps Salama since the fourth son of Ḥārith was apparently in the area south-east of Mecca) still controlled the area of Dūmat al-Jandal in AD 549, this leaves only three generations between AD 549 and the reign of Ukaydir. I would therefore tentatively suggest that although the kingdom of Kinda collapsed after the reign of al-Ḥārith, i.e. after c. AD 528, Kindite rulers or Kindite local chieftains, from different lineages, remained in the area until the final battle of Shi‘b Jabala, which Robin (2013: 216) suggests to place in AD 560. Since Ukaydir was Christian, and since the author of AD 549 was also a Christian, it is tempting to consider that at least some of the Kindite rulers were Christian already in the mid-sixth century AD, which would also explain why Hind, the daughter of al-Ḥārith, was Christian.

4 The significance of the texts

DaJ144PAr1 is important for several reasons. First, it is the only text dated to the sixth century from north-west Arabia. Until its discovery, there was a 170 year gap, possibly slightly less, between the latest Nabataeo-Arabic text, from Eilat, probably dated to the last quarter of the 5th century (Avner et al. 2013), and the earliest Islamic one in the Ḥijāz, the so-called Zuhayr inscription, dated AD 644 (Al-Ghabban 2008). This gap is now partly filled by this mid-sixth century text. Second, the presence of the cross and the use of the divine name ʾl-ʾlh are two strong arguments to suggest that the author was a Christian, possibly a Ḥujrid who was a member of one of the chieftains who succeeded the reign of al-Ḥārith al-Malik after AD 528. Third, it shows that in the mid-sixth century, one of the scripts used in this region was definitely Arabic, as was probably the language spoken by the people who used it. This does not, however, exclude the persistence of Nabataeo-Arabic script fossils, as evidenced by the repetition of dkfr at the beginning of the text. Finally, this text is important for the history of the region of Dūmat al-Jandal because it shows that there was, if not a Christian community, at least one individual who was a Christian, who claimed it by drawing a cross and by asking the Christian god to remember him. It is a nice coincidence that recent excavations in Dūmat al-Jandal have yielded, in pre-Islamic levels of a sounding undertaken near the ‘Umar b. al-Khattāb mosque, a small silver bell interpreted as a liturgical bell.
(Loreto 2017) which would be the first archaeological evidence of Christianity in Dūmat al-Jandal.

As for the seventeen Nabataean inscriptions, their importance is threefold. Two are dated to early years of the era of the Roman province of Arabia, and are the first clear evidence that the area was probably integrated in the province at the same time as the rest of the Nabataean kingdom. Second, one text mentions a new centurion, who was probably Nabataean and who may have been recruited in the Roman army, if the date of DaJ144Nab 10 is indeed AD 114/115. Finally, several texts mention Nabataean cavalrymen who were certainly members of Roman military units since they appear in texts dated to AD 135/136. In all these texts, the military men use the same words as the ones they would have used before the annexation.
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Indexes

Index of personal names

gršʾw DaJ144Nab5 + 6* (br tymw), Nab8* (br tymw). * = same author signing twice, pršʾ (AD 135–136)
{d/r}ʾyw DaJ144Nab4
zbdw DaJ144Nab13
ḥgʾ{h/n}w DaJ144PAR1 (br šlmh) probable author (AD 549)
k{h}ylw DaJ144Nab16 (br tymʿbdt) author
{mgyn}t DaJ144Nab2 (br ḏlḥy) author
{m}ʾ{d/r}w DaJ144Nab11 (br šmylw) author
mškw DaJ144Nab14 (br ḏlʾgʾ) author
ʿbdʾlhy DaJ144Nab2, Nab4 (br tymw), Nab7, Nab9* (br tymw), Nab12* (br tymw). * = same author signing twice (AD 114–115)
ʿbdʾlhy DaJ144Nab4* (br ḏlʾlḥy), Nab7* (br ḏlʾlḥy). * = same author signing twice
ʿzyzw DaJ144Nab10 (br ʾ{w}ydʾ{w}) author
ʾ{w}ydʾ{w} DaJ144Nab10
ʾlwʾp DaJ144Nab15 (br š[----]) author
{p}ʾ{š}ʾ{y}w DaJ144Nab1
{r/d}ʾyw DaJ144Nab4
rk{ym} DaJ144Nab17 (br ----) author
šlmh DaJ144PAR1
šmylw DaJ144Nab11
tymw DaJ144Nab1, Nab3, Nab4, Nab9, Nab12, Nab13* (br zbdw). * = author
tymʿbdt DaJ144Nab1* (br tymw), Nab3* (br tymw), Nab5 + 6, Nab16. * = same author signing twice, pršʾ
Index of words

ʾl-ʾlh  DaJ144PAr1 the god (God)
bṭb  DaJ144Nab10 in well-being
dkr (2x)  DaJ144PAr1 may be remembered (Arabic)
dkyr  DaJ144Nab9–11, Nab 15–17 may be remembered (Nabataean Aramaic)
y(r){ḥ}  DaJ144PAr1 month
pršʾ  DaJ144Nab1, Nab5 + 6, Nab8 cavalryman
{q}{n}{ṭ}rywnʾ  DaJ144Nab10 centurion
šnt  DaJ144Nab8, Nab 9 year
tltyn  DaJ144Nab8 thirty
{t}šʿ  DaJ144Nab9 nine

Index of signs

X  DaJ144Nab9, Nab12

Index of numerals

4  DaJ144PAr1
100  DaJ144PAr1
20  DaJ144PAr1
3  DaJ144PAr1
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**Sigla**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARNA.Nab</td>
<td>Nabataean inscriptions in Winnett &amp; Reed (1970)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DaJ</td>
<td>Inscriptions discovered in Dūmat al-Jandal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS II</td>
<td><em>Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, Pars Secunda, Inscriptiones Aramaicas Continens</em>, 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSNab</td>
<td>Nabataean inscriptions in Jaussen &amp; Savignac (1909–1922)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisān</td>
<td>Ibn Manzūr (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPArab</td>
<td>Arabic inscriptions in Littmann (1949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCIANA</td>
<td>Online Corpus of the Inscriptions of Ancient North Arabia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://krcfm.orient.ox.ac.uk/fmi/webd#ociana">http://krcfm.orient.ox.ac.uk/fmi/webd#ociana</a> (accessed September 10th, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Inscriptions recorded in Sakākā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThMNN</td>
<td>Nabataean inscriptions in Al-Theeb (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThNIS</td>
<td>Nabataean inscriptions in Al-Theeb (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThNQT</td>
<td>ANA inscriptions in Al-Theeb (2000 [1431]a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThNS</td>
<td>Nabataean inscriptions in Al-Theeb (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThNTS</td>
<td>ANA inscriptions in Al-Theeb (2000 [1431]b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThNUJ</td>
<td>Nabataean inscriptions in Al-Theeb (2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UJadh</td>
<td>Inscriptions recorded in Umm Jadhāyidh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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