SOME EARLY ARABIC INSCRIPTIONS FROM AL-HANĀKIYYA, SAUDI ARABIA* 

FRED M. DONNER, University of Chicago

During the spring of 1974, Dr. Michael Willis had occasion to visit a rock outcropping at al-Hanākiyya, Saudi Arabia, located about 110 km east-northeast of Medina. The rock outcropping is in the form of a large red sandstone butte standing isolated in the midst of otherwise rather flat terrain just to the left of the main highway through al-Hanākiyya as one travels towards the Najd. A second, smaller hill of similar appearance is located nearby. The steep rock faces of the larger butte contain numerous pre-Islamic inscriptions which appear to be known to those working on such materials but have not, to the best of my knowledge, found their way to publication.¹

In addition to the pre-Islamic inscriptions, however, Dr. Willis noticed a number of inscriptions of large graffiti in Arabic script, which he photographed as well as time and conditions permitted. These photographs he very kindly made available to me for study and publication, and they form the basis of the present article.

None of the inscriptions treated here is dated, but there are two reasons to assign them dates early in the Islamic era. The first is their color, which reflects the degree to which the naked stone has oxidized under atmospheric conditions. When freshly broken or incised, this stone is of a light pinkish-brown color, but over many centuries a broken surface weathers to a darker red-brown, the color seen on most exposed rocks in this outcropping. The coloration of a graffito etched into the rock surface can thus provide a very rough gauge of the age of the inscription; recent ones will show very pale against the dark rock on which they are inscribed, whereas the oldest will be weathered to the same dark color as the writing surface.² The majority of the

¹ A list of abbreviations used in the notes and text is found at the end of the article.
² Parts of some of these pre-Islamic inscriptions are visible in the photographs described in the next paragraph, and reproduced here. The Department of Antiquities and Museums of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia appears to be aware of the existence of inscriptions, and perhaps ruins, at al-Hanākiyya. Their photographic volume, An Introduction to Saudi Arabian Antiquities (Riyadh, 1395/1975) includes al-Hanākiyya on the “Geographical Map of Archaeological Sites of the Northwestern Region”
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on p. 95, where it is marked with a symbol for “antiquities.” But the volume contains no further mention of the site, even in the brief text devoted to the antiquities of this region (pp. 38–39), and no photographs of any inscriptions or monuments from al-Hanākiyya. Similarly, I have been unable to locate any reference to the site or its inscriptions in such surveys as that of M. L. Ingraham, T. D. Johnson, B. Rihani, and I. Shatla, “Saudi Arabian Comprehensive Survey Program: c. Preliminary Report on a Reconnaissance Survey of the Northwestern Province,” Aitāl 5 (1401/1981): 59–84. Evidently that survey did not cover this particular corner of the Northwestern Province; nor did the earlier surveys of Philby-Ryckmans-Lippens (see EPRL), etc. Grohmann’s summary of epigraphic discoveries in Arabia up to about 1960, which forms the introduction to EPRL (pp. x–xix), contains no mention of al-Hanākiyya, nor does his AP (published 1971).

² A similar process of weathering of basalt is described in Willard G. Oxtoby, Some Inscriptions of
inscriptions under consideration here are weathered to quite a dark tone; moreover, they are virtually the same shade as nearby pre-Islamic inscriptions on the same rock surfaces, which implies that they must be nearly as old. We might note, for example, the photograph of inscription W 2 (fig. 2), with the pre-Islamic inscription visible to the left (color relationships are clearer in the original color photograph). By the same process, we can deduce that W 5 (fig. 5) is much darker in color than a relatively recent mark (\(\text{\textit{\textbf{TT}}]\)) made at the center of the surface.

The second, and more compelling, reason for assigning most of these inscriptions an early date relates to paleography. The form of a number of the letters used in them is archaic and conforms most closely to letter forms used during the first two centuries A.H. (seventh-eighth centuries C.E.). The paleographic aspects of each inscription will be examined separately and in detail below, but a few general remarks anticipating those conclusions can be made here. The majority of the inscriptions include one or more of the following noteworthy characteristics: final \(\text{nūn}\) curved only slightly to the left; \(\text{rā}\) tightly curved on or near the base line rather than dropping below it; final \(\text{mīm}\) with a short, horizontal tail; medial and final \(\text{ʻayn}\) with an open top; \(\text{ḥā}\) as a diagonal stroke crossing the base line; and the open form of final \(\text{rā}\), with no barb or vertical stroke at its end. Moreover, a very early style of diacritical dotting is used in some cases. While the appearance of one or another of these forms in isolation is not sufficient to assign an early date to an inscription, the fact that these forms are used repeatedly and in association with one another, combined with other general characteristics of the inscriptions, permits one to confirm an early date for most of them with great confidence.³

In content, the inscriptions studied here closely resemble other known Arabic inscriptions from western Arabia. Most are brief prayers for forgiveness or mercy, or religious invocations or confessions; one (W 5) is a set of religious maxims. Taken as a group, and in the light of other early Arabic inscriptions, they help us glimpse the religious and ethical concepts of their time. They also, of course, provide linguists with information on the development of the Arabic language and the Arabic script, information that is sometimes highly unusual (e.g., the reversed Arabic writing of W 7).

I would like to emphasize the fact that all the readings proposed here are tentative because all were made from photographs which, however clear, can be quite deceptive. In a number of cases, moreover, poor lighting conditions and the rough surface of the stone make many details of the inscriptions unclear. When other photographs become available, or—better yet—an opportunity to study the inscriptions on site arises, it will

³ I have tried to bear in mind the warnings expressed by Grohmann in *EPRL*, p. xxi: "... dating according to seemingly typical forms of letters—\(\text{\textit{\textbf{Trump}}}\) which look old but in fact occur throughout nearly the whole period in which the old monumental angular style was used, e.g., open \(\text{ʻAin}\) or triangular \(\text{Mīm}\) or \(\text{Ḥā}---\) might be considered purely haphazard. Well known examples... show the danger of any such attempt. However, an obvious relationship between the style of writing, together with certain isolated forms on the one hand, and the style or writing and forms in certain dated parallels on the other, occasionally allow these texts to be dated."
doubtless be possible to clarify some of the problems I have encountered in rendering the texts. One of the photographs provided was of an inscription that was apparently so weathered, or shallow in its engraving, that little more than an occasional word could be made out, although the inscription itself was relatively long (perhaps eight lines?). This inscription has not been included in the present collection; from its script, it appears to be somewhat more recent than the others considered here.

Note on the Figures

All the original photographs taken by Dr. Willis were 35 mm color transparencies. From these slides were made a set of ten 8" × 10" prints, most in color, and it was from these prints, in the main, that I worked, although for a time I consulted the original slides to attempt to resolve difficulties in inscription W 5. The relationship of the prints to the plates published here and to the inscriptions is as follows:

| Print Number | Figure Number | Inscription Number |
|--------------|---------------|-------------------|
| 1 (black and white) | 1 | W 1 |
| 2 (color) | 2 | W 2 |
| 3 (black and white, same as 2) | — | W 2 |
| 4 (color) | 3 | W 3 |
| 5 (color) | 4 | W 4 |
| 6 (color—light photo) | 5 | W 5 |
| 7 (color—dark photo) | — | W 5 |
| 8 (color) | 6 | W 6–W 12 |
| 9 (color) | 7 | W 13–W 14 |
| 10 (color) | — | W 15 (omitted) |

Prints number 2 and 3 were identical (made from the same slide original), except that number 2 was in color, number 3 in black and white, and not as clear as number 2. Print number 7, like number 6, showed inscription W 5, but in much poorer light, and is too dark to merit publication here, although ironically it turned out that by candling it against a bright light some of the inscription could be recovered from it more easily than from print 6. As noted above, the inscription W 15 was too indistinct in the photograph to warrant publication here.

W 1 (fig. 1)

*Rock Graffito*, First–Second Century A.H.

*Confession*
1. I believe that there is no god except Him in whom the children of Israel believed,
2. (believing as) a Muslim hanif; nor am I among the polytheists.
3. And Rāfiʿ bin ʿAl<ī> wrote (it).

1–2. A verbatim quote of part of Qur'ān 10:90.
3. A close paraphrase of Qur'ān 3:67, wa lākin kāna hanīfan musliman wa mā kāna
   min al-mushrikīna, "but he (Abraham) was a Muslim hanīf, and not among the
   polytheists."
4. The inscription has ʿalā for ʿalā; for another instance of this orthography, see W 2,
   line 2.

Confessions of this kind are encountered fairly frequently in early Arabic inscrip-

tions. See, for example, *EPRL*, nos. Z 31, 33, 34, 40, 43, 46, 47, 53, 109–112, etc.,
mostly dated by Grohmann to the first–third centuries A.H.

Paleographically, the inscription shows many archaic features. These include the
open-ended form of final bāʾ (line 4) and tāʾ (lines 1 and 2), without any trace of a
barb or vertical stroke to close the letter; the swept-back form of final yāʾ (line 2); the
large, angular dāl (line 2); the small, curved rāʾ (lines 2, 3, 4); the semi-circular form of
fāʾ (lines 3, 4); and the open final ʿayn with a tail turning sharply to the right in a
flattened hook (line 4). For most of these forms, the closest specific parallels are found
in the graffito from Ḥafnat al-Ubayyid in Iraq, dated 64/684.4 The final nūn (lines 3

4 ʿIzz al-Dīn al-Ṣandūq, “Hajar Ḥafnat al-Ubayyid,” *Sumer* 11 (1955): 214 and plate facing
p. 216 (Arabic).
and 4) may suggest a slightly later date, as it is somewhat more curved and closed than those in the Ḥafnat al-Ubayyīd inscription.

Another interesting feature is the presence of diacritical dots, found over nūn and tāʾ in lines 1 and 2 and over nūn and under yāʾ in line 3. The arrangement of dots—two dots placed vertically directly under the vertical stroke of yāʾ—and over the vertical stroke of final tāʾ—seems closely paralleled by the most ancient dotted inscription known, the dam inscription of A.H. 58/677–78 C.E. near al-Ṭā’īf. The next dated examples of dotted stone inscriptions following the dam inscription come only from the later third century A.H. and clearly betray their late date in their arrangement of dots. The first of them, dated 270/883, has the two dots of yāʾ arranged horizontally, not vertically as in W 1 and the dam inscription of A.H. 58. The second, dated 272/886, displays the horizontal placement of dots both for yāʾ and for final tāʾ. The third, dated 283/896, shows similar features. Moreover, all three of these later inscriptions have the forked or barbed alif, lām, hāʾ, dāl, etc., again clearly revealing their later date; W 1, on the other hand, has, as noted, uniformly archaic letter forms. Both from the letter forms and from the manner of dotting, then, it seems clear that we are dealing with an inscription of very early date; unfortunately, the absence of any dated and dotted inscriptions from the long span of time between the al-Ṭāʾīf dam inscription and the third century inscriptions just described prevents us from narrowing down further the possible chronological range of W 1 on the basis of the paleography of stone inscriptions alone. If we broaden our view to consider early Arabic writing in other media, however, we find some further hints about the possible date of our inscription. The same arrangement of dots used in W 1 is found in the earliest dotted Islamic coins, dating to the latter years of the first century A.H. This method of dotting also is found in the oldest pointed papyrus, dated A.H. 22, and conforms to the system of pointing used in some old Qurāʾ manuscripts. All considered, then, it seems very probable that W 1 was written during the first century or first half of the second century A.H.

W 2 (fig. 2)

Rock Graffito, First–Second Century A.H.

Prayer for Forgiveness

5 First published by George Miles, “Early Islamic Inscriptions near Tāʾīf in the Hijāz,” JNES 7 (1948): 236–42; republished in EPRL, no. Z 68. On this style of dotting, see EPRL, pp. 57–58.

6 Grohmann, AP, p. 41, mentions inscription no. 155 in the collection of R. Lepsius, Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Äthiopien, vol. 11, pt. 6 (Berlin, n.d. [ca. 1846]), fig. 20, as being from the first or second century A.H. It has yāʾ with two dots side by side, as well as a dotted hāʾ. However, other features of this inscription suggest that it may be later than Grohmann proposes, notably the form of medial hāʾ in line 2 (... ʾal., not ... ʾal.), the elongated curve of final nūn, the closed medial ʿawr, and the drooping tail of final mīm in line 1.

7 SF, vol. 3, no. 1168 (pl. 72).

8 Ibid., vol. 4, no. 1219 (pl. 3).

9 Ibid., vol. 4, no. 1359 (pl. 25).

10 CMC, vol. 2, p. 86, nos. 192, 193, and 194 (gold dinars, A.H. 82, 83, 84; no mint); p. 145, no. 366 (silver dirhem, A.H. 90, Damascus).

11 The papyrus in question, PERF. no. 558 in the Archduke Rainer Collection in Vienna, was published by Grohmann in “Aperçu de papyrologie arabe,” Études de papyrologie 1 (1932): 41f. and pl. 9. Cf. EPRL, pp. 57–58.

12 See Grohmann, “The Problem of Dating Early Qurāʾāns,” Der Islam 33 (1958): 213–31.
1. O God, forgive 'Āsim
2. ibn 'Al<î> al-Tha'labî then al-'Uwâ<î>.
3. Lord of the worlds, Amen.

1–2. The name is clearly 'Āsim ibn 'Alî, even though the final yâ in 'Alî has been omitted, for we have in W 3 another inscription with the same name in which 'Alî is written with the final yâ. The name has a double nisba, the second separated from the first by the word thumma ("then") and referring to a particular clan or lineage within the larger tribal group designated by the first nisba. Such double nisbas are encountered fairly frequently in the literary sources for the early Islamic period. Since the inscription is written without diacritical points, the first nisba could be read either as al-Tha'labî or as al-Taghlibî, both of which are fairly common tribal names. The latter possibility can be excluded for several reasons. First, the tribe of Taghlib historically occupied areas far from the location of the inscription in the early Islamic centuries, mainly along or north of the Euphrates in northern Syria and Iraq, whereas one of the important tribes of the region around Medina at that time was Tha'labâ ibn Sa'd, part of the tribe of Dhubyân in the Ghaṭafân confederation. This initial conclusion in favor of Tha'labâ as the referent for the first nisba is confirmed when we

13 See, for example, Ahmad ibn Yahyâ al-Balâdhrî, Futûh al-buldân, ed. M. J. de Goeje (Leiden, 1866), p. 257: “Zuhrâ ibn Hawiyya ibn 'Abdullâh ibn Qatâda al-Tamîmi thumma al-Sâ'dî,” i.e., of the clan of Sa'd ibn Malik of Tamim; Tab. i/2350: “'Abdullâh ibn Sinân ibn Jarîr al-Asadî thumma al-Saydawî,” i.e., of the clan of al-Saydâ aç ibn ‘Amr of Asad.

14 Many other possible readings could be formulated in theory, given the basic letter-forms provided, but only these two correspond to any known tribal names. Cf. Mushtabih, p. 73.

15 See H. Kindermann, “Taghlib,” Encyclopaedia of Islam (first edition).

16 On Tha'labâ ibn Sa'd ibn Dhubyân, see IK/ Caskel, index s.v. and vol. 2, p. 13. For their location, see J. W. Fück, “Ghaṭafân,” Encyclopaedia of Islam (new edition).
scrutinize closely the second nisba. It is, unfortunately, incomplete as written; the photograph shows no trace of any additional letters either at the end of line 2 or the beginning of line 3, and although the identical name, with nisbas, appears in W 3 in a somewhat fuller form, the final letters in the second nisba in W 3 appear to be garbled and offer us little help in reading. The most plausible reconstruction of the second nisba is “al-‘Uwālī,” referring to the clan of ‘Uwāl ibn al-Hārith, part of the tribe of Tha‘labat ibn Sa‘d. 17 No other possible solution of the incomplete second nisba yields a satisfactory reading.

Of paleographic interest are the open medial /ayn (lines 2 and 3); the final nūn extending nearly straight down with a slight bend to the left at the end (line 3), or simply arcing gently to the left from the base line (line 2); the open-ended form of final bā’ (line 3); and the form of final yā’, sharply swept back parallel to the base line (line 2). All these features persist through the first and second centuries A.H., and virtually assure a date for the inscription within this time frame.

Other paleographic features assist us in narrowing the possible date of W 2. The hā’ in the form of a large triangle or loop drawn above the base line and flattened on the left side, in which a diagonal stroke has been added (line 1), is similar to some first-century inscriptions, notably a milestone from Palestine dating to the reign of ʿAbd al-Malik (A.H. 65–86/685–705 C.E.)18 and an inscription dating from 72/691 in the Dome of the Rock, Jerusalem.19 Other letter forms, however, warn us against assigning to W 2 too early a date. One is the form of mīm, which appears as a small triangle (line 1) or as a rounded arc (lines 2, 3) above an essentially flat base line. While this form is first attested in another milestone from ʿAbd al-Malik’s reign,20 it is lacking in other first-century inscriptions and appears more prominently in second-century inscriptions, such as those from Qasr al-Ḥayr al-Sharqī (110/728)21 and the mosque of al-Baṣra (128/745–46).22 The barb drooping to the left from the peak of lām in line 1 may be nothing more than the result of an unintentional slip of the engraving tool. It is not repeated in the other lāms of this inscription, nor in those of W 3, which appears to have been inscribed by the same hand.

All considered, a date in the late first century or second century A.H. seems most plausible for this graffito.

W 3 (fig. 3)

Rock Graffito, First–Second Century A.H.

Prayer for Forgiveness

17 Abū Bakr Muhammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Durayd, Al-İshiqāq, ed. Ferdinand Wüstenfeld (Göttingen, 1854), p. 174; IK/Caskel, vol. 2, p. 580, s.v. “ʿUwāl ibn al-Ḥārīt.”
18 MCIA, vol. 2.1, no. 2 (pp. 18–19 and 21).
19 Text in MCIA, vol. 2.2, no. 215 (pp. 228–46); drawing, see Charles de Vogüé, Le Temple de Jérusalem (Paris, 1864), pl. 13.
20 MCIA, vol. 2.1, no. 1 (pp. 17–18 and p. 21).
21 RAO, vol. 3, pp. 285–91 and plate VII A; cf. RCEA I, no. 28.
22 Jean Sauvaget, “Les Inscriptions arabes de la mosquée de Bosra,” Syria 22 (1941): 53–65, no. 2.
EARLY ARABIC INSCRIPTIONS FROM SAUDI ARABIA

1. O God, forgive ʕāṣim
2. ibn ʕAlī ibn ʕāṣim al-<Tha>läbī then al-ʕuw-
3. ʕālī; he bears witness that God is truth and
4. that there is no doubt concerning the hour (of judgment).

1–3. The name, clearly referring to the same person as W 2, is here given in more complete form. The writer has inadvertently omitted the vertical stroke for the first letter after the article in al-Tha läbī (cf. W 2). On the other hand, he has included here the final yā in ʕAlī, omitted in W 2 (line 2) and also, apparently, in the different name in W 1, line 4. The second nisba seems at first glance to be given in more complete form here than in W 2, but reading the first group of letters on line 3 proves anything but straightforward. The initial vertical stroke may be a lām, or it may be an extension of the alif at the beginning of line 4. I favor the latter interpretation in view of the thinness with which it is engraved, which seems to conform more to the other characters in line 4, evidently written with a freshly-sharpened tool; the writing at the beginning of line 3, on the contrary, generally has the coarse character of work done with a dull tool.

3–4. The text is a close paraphrase of Qurʾān 18:21 and 45:26.

Paleographically, W 3 naturally resembles W 2, as it was doubtless written by the same person; but as it is longer than W 2, it provides a few additional letter-forms of paleographic interest. We note the final qāf in line 3, with its broken or recurved tail extending downward. Such recurved tails on qāf are found in some—but not all—early inscriptions, such as one of the first-century milestones from Palestine.23 The

23 MCIA, vol. 2, i, nos. 1–4 (pp. 17–21); no. 1 has the recurved qāf, the remainder lack the recurve.
same recurved tail is also found in final qāf in the legends of some early Islamic coins, including a copper coin minted in Damascus around 650 C.E., another minted there by ʿAbd al-Malik (65–86/685–705), and two silver dirhams from the 70s/690s.24 Grohmann goes so far as to term this the “old form” of qāf, and traces it up to the end of the second century A.H.25 We may note, however, that similar broken qāf can be found at least as late as A.H. 304 in a road inscription of ʿAlī ibn ʿIsā of that date (line 6).26 We may also call attention to the final dāl in line 3 of W 3, virtually identical in form to that of the dam inscription of A.H. 58 near al-Ṭāʾif, lines 2 and 4. Grohmann has noted the unusual character of this letter, close to the cursive form.27

W 3 is provided with occasional diacritical dots in lines 3 and 4; over fāʾ in both lines, over nūn in line 3, under yāʾ in lines 3 and 4, under bāʾ in line 4, and over shīn in line 3. The two dots under yāʾ are arranged vertically, as in early inscriptions (see W 1). The dot under final bāʾ, however, is not placed under the vertical stroke, but rather under the body of the letter. Shīn has three dots, one over each tooth, an arrangement found only in documents from the first and second centuries A.H.; it occurs in the earliest dated Arabic papyrus extant, no. 558 in the Rainer collection from A.H. 22/643 C.E., where the shīn in shāh at the end of line 6 is dotted in this way.28 Dotting of shīn with a horizontal row of points also occurs on some coins from the late first and early second centuries A.H.29 No dated and dotted inscriptions from the first or second century A.H. provide us with a shīn to serve as a basis for comparison within this medium, but the first dotted inscriptions having a shīn, the grave stela of 270/883,30 shows the three dots arranged in the triangular way found in later inscriptions.

Considering all factors of dotting, letter forms, and the general style of the inscription, it can be dated on paleographic grounds to the first or second century A.H., like its companion W 2, the dating of which appears to be confirmed by the further paleographic evidence provided in W 3.

W 4 (fig. 4)

Rock Graffito, First–Third Century A.H.

Prayer for Forgiveness

24 CMC, vol. 2, p. 6 (no. 12); p. 37 (British Museum no. 121); p. 83 (Königsberg no. 1); p. 143 (British Museum no. 352).
25 EPRL, p. 26.
26 George C. Miles, “ʿAlī b. ʿIsā’s Pilgrim Road: an inscription of the year 304 H (916–917 A.D.),” Bulletin de l’Institut Égyptien 36 (1953–54): 477–87.
27 EPRL, p. 57.
28 Illustrated in A. Grohmann, “Aperçu...” (see n. 12 above), pl. 9. There are no dots visible over the shīn in shāh of line 7; the shīn in shahr in line 8 is not clear in the photo but may also have a row of dots.
29 CMC, vol. 2, p. 144, no. 359 (silver dirhem, A.H. 85, Damascus); p. 151, no. 397 (silver dirhem, A.H. 121, Damascus). But cf. p. 148, no. 381 (silver dirhem, A.H. 104, Damascus), with only two dots arranged at an angle over shīn. Is this due to a break or error in the die? Or does it represent a transition toward the triangular array of points that later predominates?
30 SF, vol. 3, no. 1168, pl. 72. Shīn occurs in lines 13 and 17.
EARLY ARABIC INSCRIPTIONS FROM SAUDI ARABIA

Fig. 4—Al-Haraqiyya inscription W.4
1. May God forgive Abū
2. al-Ḥulw (?) Arbad ibn
3. Nāfi', and succor his house (?).

1. On the imperfect used as optative, see EPRL, no. Z 2. The imperative mood, or the perfect used to express the optative, is much more common.

1–2. The name is problematic. “Al-Ḥulw” is rare but attested as a masculine proper name. However, there appears to be a diacritical dot below the letter ١, and if this is in fact the case, then we must assume that the name is an incomplete rendition of some other, such as Jalwān or Jilwān or Jiluwī—but all of these lack the definite article. Jiluwī is, of course, a fairly common name in the Saudi family. For the name Arbad, see IK/Caskel, s.v., and Tab. index, s.v. J. J. Hess, Beduinennamen, p. 25, records the feminine form of the name, Rabdā. My restoration to “al-Ḥulw” is conjectural.

3. The last group of letters in this line is not clear in the photograph. The first letter following the wāw may be a lsen, in which case we would read, “and (may God also forgive)…” followed by another name or designation of someone. No acceptable reading for a name, etc., seems possible on the basis of the letters given, however, and the reconstruction provided, though tentative, seems as likely as any. The verb amadda most commonly means “to assist” or “to reinforce” in a military sense, but it can also mean to aid by giving foodstuffs, etc.; indeed, it is used in this sense several times in the Qurʾān (e.g., Q. 52:22, wa-‘ammadnā-hum bi-fākihatīn wa lahmin mimmā yash-tahūn, “and We succored them with fruit and meat that they desired”).

31 IK/Caskel, s.v. “al-Ḥulw b. Mālik.” But the name is not listed in Mushtabih in the index to al-Ṭabarī’s chronicle, etc.
32 Mushtabih, p. 169.
33 Cf. also Beduinennamen, p. 16: “Ǧiluwī.”
As in W 1–W 3, the letter forms of this inscription suggest a fairly early date, although the brevity of the text requires us to be a bit cautious. A date within the first three centuries a.h., however, seems assured by such features as the open medial ʾayn (line 1), the form of final ʾayn with open top and sharply bent tail (line 3), the large, rectilinear dāl (line 2), and the small, tightly-curved ṛāʾ (lines 1 and 2).

Once again, we have diacritical dots in the inscription; under bāʾ in line 1, over nūn in line 3, over fāʾ in lines 1 and 3, and perhaps under jīm in line 2. It is not clear from the photograph whether the two tiny, light points under the yāʾ of line 1 represent diacritical dots, or only extraneous scratches in the stone. If they are intentional dottings, their arrangement side-by-side may suggest a somewhat later date for the inscription, as the earliest dotted inscriptions have the two dots of yāʾ, etc., arranged vertically (see discussion of W 1, W 3). On the other hand, it is possible that these dots were added to the inscription at a later date—perhaps centuries later—in view of the fact that they are much smaller than other dots in the inscription, appear to be crowded in between the yāʾ of line 1 and the top of the alif at the beginning of line 2, and appear to be of a lighter coloration than the rest of the inscription, if we can trust the tones of the photograph. Only close examination of the original inscription in situ will permit us to decide this question with any certainty.

W 5 (fig. 5)

Rock Graffito, Second Century a.h

Religious Maxim
FIG. 5—Al-Hanakyya inscription W 5
The inscription is in general difficult to read, being very crudely inscribed on a rough surface that was apparently already partly covered with what appear to be, in part, animal drawings (note especially the form drawn below the word “God” in line 1). Numerous drawings of this kind not reproduced in the facsimile sketch can be found in the photograph to the upper right of the inscription. Other marks, probably tribal wasūm, are interspersed amid the words of the inscription, notably above line 2. Poor lighting makes the whole left side of the inscription very difficult to make out in the two photographs, and the lower left corner of the inscription has evidently flaked off. Even in places where the writing seems to be quite legible in the photographs, the letter groups sometimes yield no satisfactory reading.

1. The lower part of the name is obscured by an area of chips and scratches, and the reading should be considered only tentative.

2. The verb naṣara, “to assist,” is frequently used in the Qurʾān, but usually in the sense of God assisting believers. If we take al-rahmān to be the subject of the verb, however, (“whomsoever the Merciful assists . . .”), we would expect the verb to have an object pronoun (man yansuru-hū al-rahmānu). Since the pronoun is lacking, the reading “whosoever helps God . . .” seems indicated. The notion of believers assisting God is less common in the Qurʾān than the reverse but nonetheless attested (e.g., Q. 59:8 and Q. 47:7). The tribal mark (?) above yansuru is much lighter than the other markings and presumably is much more recent than the inscription and other drawings; the W-shaped mark between al-rahmān and lā, on the other hand, is much darker, and may antedate the inscription, which seems to have been written around the chipping beneath it. The last two words on the line are difficult to discern in the
photographs, and the solution proposed for them, while appearing to conform generally to the shapes visible, is not entirely satisfactory. The word rendered here as yuṣannānu appears to have two bars between jīm and final nūn in the lighter photograph, but only one in the darker. The verb janna ʿalā (form I) is used in the sense of “to overshadow” or “to cover (something) with darkness” in Q. 6:76, and form IV (ajanna) can also be used in this way. My reading, however, requires that form II (or the emphatic of I, yuṣunnānu) be used and must remain tentative. Probably only close examination of the original inscription will clarify this passage.

3. Unlike the preceding line, the readings here seem quite straightforward. The inscription appears at this point to be written around the designs scratched in the rock surface, and hence to be later than those designs. On the other hand, the fact that part of man near the beginning of the line has been effaced suggests that further flaking or chipping of the surface took place after the inscription was written. The mark at the far left of line 3 may or may not represent the beginning of another word which is mostly effaced by flaking.

4. The way in which the line is curved around the designs above it again implies that the designs are earlier than the inscription. As in line 2, many of the words here do not resolve themselves into readily acceptable readings, and satisfactory solutions may have to await examination of the inscription itself. The word istamaddā occurs in the dictionaries but is not attested in the Qurʾān—nor is any other plausible reading of the apparently clear letters (istafāda/yastafīd, etc.). The word following ʾī in this line is even more vexing. The article and initial letter tāʾ, with diacritical dots, seem clear enough, as do the two bars and final nūn. But none of the possible readings that can be derived from these apparently clear letters (of which the proposed tabayyūn is by far the most common word) makes much sense of the sentence. The maʿaḥū at the left of the line is very tentative; the other words, however, being written on a smoother spot in the stone, are more secure.

5. If the text is indeed to read “his defender” (ḥāmi-hī), the scribe has dropped the yāʾ that should stand before the enclitic pronoun. After yadhūdu ʾān one would expect, of course, something in need of protection; is ḥāmi-hī an error for ḥimā-hū, “his private pasture”? The reading bi-yād toward the end of the line is conjectural.

6. The last word before the break seems legible enough but can hardly be satisfactorily restored without further context.

The text of this inscription, being less formulaic than most, is among the most interesting of all in this collection. Despite the difficulty encountered in reading several parts of it, the general structure of the text is readily grasped. It takes the form of a series of parallel religious and/or ethical maxims of the form, “he who does A, does/suffers B; he who does C, does/suffers D; . . .” Maxims of this kind are found in the wisdom literature of the ancient Near East34 and in the biblical wisdom literature. Single maxims of this form occur in many passages in the Qurʾān, such as Q. 6:48, “. . . whoever believes and acts justly, no fear shall be upon them. . . .” A few Greek maxims of this form, but different in content, circulated in Arabic translation.35 The

34 See, for example, W. G. Lambert, Babylonian Wisdom Literature (Oxford, 1960), pp. 113 and 133; most passages in his collection, however, do not show this structure.

35 They were secular, not religious, in content. See Dimitri Gutas, Greek Wisdom Literature in Arabic Translation (New Haven, 1975), pp. 124–25 (no. 16).
closest analogue to W 5 in both structure and content is a set of parallel maxims found in EPRL, no. Z 137 (pp. 87–88), which reads, "whosoever trusts in God, God will spare him; and whoseover is spared by God, God will grant him security . . . ."

Paleographic analysis of this inscription is complicated by the fact that it is inscribed very crudely on a rough stone surface, so that we may be dealing with distorted and atypical letter forms. Generally, however, the letter forms suggest a fairly early date, although probably not quite as early as some of the other inscriptions in this group. Several letter forms are common to the first two centuries A.H., such as those of final rā as a tight curve near the base line, the angular dāl, the isolated kāf, and the medial hā. Other letters, however, suggest a date after the first century A.H.; final nin, for example, is more curved than those in first-century inscriptions, and initial hā, with its overhang (lines 2 and 5), although paralleled at Hafnat al-Ubayyid (A.H. 64), is not commonly encountered until the second century A.H., at sites such as Qaṣr al-Hayr al-Sharqi and ʿAsqalān.36 We find diacritical points used in several places, and showing the early vertical arrangement of dot pairs for yā and tā: note the yā in lines 2, 3, and 4; tā in line 4 and perhaps line 5; niin with dot in lines 2 and 3, and possibly line 6; a dot possibly over dhāl in line 4; and possibly a dot under fā in line 3, although I have preferred to read this letter as mim in the restoration above. As noted in my examination of W 1 above, the vertical arrangement of dots for yā and tā virtually assures a date within the first two and one-half centuries A.H. All considered, a date in the second or early third century A.H. seems most probable for W 5.

W 6–W 12 (fig. 6)

Rock Graffiti

W 6

Prayer, First–Third Century A.H.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

يرحم الله على

مجنن (؟)

1. In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful
2. May God have mercy upon
3. Mihjan (?)

36 I. al-Ṣandūq, “Hajar Hafnat al-Ubayyid,” Sumer 11 (1955): 213–17; RAO, vol. 3, no. 53, pp. 285–91 and pl. 7A (Qaṣr al-Ḥayr); RAO, vol. 1, pp. 214–18 and pl. 11 left (ʿAsqalān).
2. A few marks appear to precede ﺮٰ at the beginning of the line, but it is unclear whether or not they form part of the inscription (see p. 199 above).
3. The single name in this line is not clear in the photograph; it is perhaps Mihjan (cf. W 11).

Paleographically, this brief graffito provides hints suggesting a fairly early date: final ﻣَ with a short stubby tail, ﺮٰ in the form of a small, tight hook, final ﻥٰ a nearly straight vertical line with almost no bend or hook. A dating within the first three centuries A.H. seems likely. The form of initial ﻫٰ in line 2 ( ﺢـ) is unusual, and different from the more conventional angular ﻫٰ used in line 1.

W 7

Prayer for Forgiveness, First–Second Century A.H.

بِسْمِ الله الرَّحْمن
الرَّحْمن اللَّهِ الَّهُمَّ اغْفِر
لِعِبْدِ الله ابن
نَزَّ (؟) امِين رَبَّ
العالمين

1. In the name of God, the compassionate,
2. the merciful. O God, forgive
3. ʿAbdullāh ibn
4. Dharr (?). Amen, Lord of
5. the Worlds.

3. In view of the alif in ibn, we may wish to read ʿabd allāh as a kind of honorific title, rather than as a personal name: “the servant of God, Ibn. . . .” This formula is quite common in early inscriptions.37
4. The name rendered “Dharr” is not entirely clear in the photograph; are the letters دَلٰ and رَّ followed by an alif with a floriated or split top, or is this just the top of ﻞٰ from line 5 converging with the bottom of دَلٰ from line 3? Dharr is a rare name, but attested in a few instances.38

This inscription is most interesting for orthographic reasons, being to my knowledge the only example of a mirror-image Arabic inscription, that is, with the writing going from left to right. Reversed writing of this kind is also found in some early Islamic coin legends; on a copper Byzantine-Arab coin of about 650 C.E. from Damascus, for

37 See, for example, the dam inscription of Muʿāwiya at al-Tāʿif (EPRL, pp. 56–58).
38 Beside the famous early companion of the prophet Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī, see also 1K/Caskel, vol. 2, p. 325, s.v. “Dharr b. ʿAbdullāh.” Mushtābih, pp. 198–99, notes only al-Durr and al-Dharr with the article.
example, the word jāriz, “current,” is written in reverse, and in a few other instances of copper coins from the second half of the first century A.H. the mint names “Palestine” and “Aleppo” are reversed.\(^{39}\) Such reverse writing on coins may not be fully analogous to the reverse inscription in \(W\) 7, however, because we may suspect that on coins the reversal was the inadvertent result of accidentally reversing part of the stamps used in making the die; for one thing, other Arabic phrases on the same coins are read normally, from right to left. The argument that reversed inscriptions on coins are essentially accidents rather than conscious efforts to write from left to right seems strengthened, moreover, by one coin from Damascus in which the initial \(dāl\) of \(Dimashq\) is engraved upside down and to the left of the letter group \(m-sh-q\), which is engraved properly.\(^{40}\) In the case of \(W\) 7, on the other hand, it is certain that the decision to write from left to right rather than vice-versa was an intentional one. Whether this phenomenon reflects a phase in the development of the Arabic script so early that even the proper direction of the script was not yet firmly set, or (more likely) merely the whim of the engraver, or even some neurological flaw in his brain, we cannot say.

Despite their reversal, the letters conform closely to the archaic style of writing found in most of the other inscriptions we have examined above. We may note the open medial \(\text{'ayn}\) (lines 3 and 5); the final \(mīn\) with short tail (lines 1 and 2); \(rā\) as a short, tight hook; and the final \(nūn\) of lines 3 and 5, with their straight, sloping stroke ending in a fairly sharp hook. The final \(nūn\) of lines 1 and 4, on the other hand, are more smoothly and fully curved.

\[W\] 8

**Invocation, First–Second Century A.H.**

\[\text{بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم}\]

1. In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful ...........

Trailing diagonally across the rock face, this inscription is too small and indistinct in the photograph to read beyond the initial words.

Paleographically, the letters visible appear similar to those of \(W\) 6 and \(W\) 7. The final \(nūn\) of al-rahmān, barely visible, appears to be short and pulled under the line to the right, with no hook, closer to the Syriac \(nīn\) than to the usual Arabic form, even of an early date. I know of no other published inscriptions where this form is attested, but it is found in lines 5, 6, and 8 of the papyrus PERF, no. 558, which is dated A.H. 22/643 C.E.\(^{41}\)

\(^{39}\) CMC, vol. 2, p. 7, no. 17 (ca. 650 C.E., Damascus); p. 24, no. 81 (670–685 C.E., Jerusalem); p. 35, no. 117 (685–705 C.E., Aleppo). Note also CMC, vol. 2, p. 38, no. 129 (copper fals, 685–705 C.E., Ammān), which has the phrase “‘Abdullāh ‘Abd al-Malik amīr al-mu‘minūn” in reversed writing.

\(^{40}\) CMC, vol. 2, p. 7, no. 18 (copper fals, ca. 650 C.E., Damascus).

\(^{41}\) See n. 12, above, for reference. “Ibn” appears as \(\text{ق}\) in lines 5 and 8, and as \(\text{ق}\) in line 6.
W 9

Prayer

يَرَحَم اللَّه
عِيَاض ابن عِيَبد

1. May God have mercy on
2. ʿIyād ibn ʿUbayd (?)

2. The name is difficult to read, and should be considered conjectural. If the reading is correct, the alif in ibn is a departure from standard orthography. The nun of ibn—assuming it is a nun—appears to be a hybrid of nun, with the long tail, and rā, with the tight curve.

A third line may be obscured by the left limb of the cross-like mark, but the marks there may just be more meaningless scribbling like that which seems to lie under the right limb of the cross.

W 10

Invocation

الله الرحمن (؟)

1. God the merciful>

The inscription appears to be incomplete—interrupted when barely begun. It is, in any case, very fine and faintly scratched.

W 11

Prayer for Forgiveness

اللَّهُ اغْفِرْ
لَنَّكَتَبَ هَذَا
الكَتَبَ مَحِجن

1. O God, forgive
2. him who wrote this
3. inscription, Mihjan (?).
3. The name is not very clear, but appears to be Mihjan, which is well attested.\textsuperscript{42}

Although its brevity prevents any firm conclusions regarding its date on the basis of paleographical considerations, this inscription is noteworthy for the very primitive appearance of its letter forms. If we are correct in reading Mihjan in line 3, then we have once again an instance of final $nūn$ as a straight stroke swept back to the right under the base line, as in W 8. A diacritical dot is found below $bā$\textsuperscript{2} in line 2.

\begin{verbatim}
W 12

Prayer

يعف الله لعبيد

1. [May] God [forgi]ve ʿUbayd.

We may also read ʿAbīd. The beginning of the graffito is evidently chipped or worn off. Paleographically, old letter forms predominate; note especially the open medial ʿayn.

\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
W 13 (fig. 7)

Rock Graffito, First–Third Century A.H.?

ابتسب ليل اراد هجر ن (؟) ابنا هلل مهجور هو ...
لا غفرت بموت بني ...
إلى (؟) ... عليك (؟)
هذا بعدك وهم ... اللهم اغفر ليسار و...

1.-3. ...
4. ... O God, forgive Sayyār (?) and ... .

This is the most vexing of all inscriptions in the collection. Although the photograph is quite clear, the letters that can be recovered—written among pre-Islamic Arabic inscriptions and animal drawings—do not yield a satisfactory continuous reading. We may, to be sure, plausibly identify isolated words here and there, but only the formulaic \textit{allāhumma ighfir li...} in line 4 seems certain, and in this instance we can see how crude the writing is in some respects (e.g., the angular final $rā$\textsuperscript{3}). Except for this phrase, all the restorations in the transcription must be considered conjectural.

\textsuperscript{42} See IK/Caskel, s.v.; a diminutive form is noted by Hess, \textit{Beduinennamen}, p. 17: “ʿMheğin.”
1. Mushir

The name Mushir is fairly well known; cf. IK/Caskel s.v., where more than a dozen people with this name are listed. Another possibility is the much rarer name Mushhar (Mushtabih, 486).

The form of ṛāʾ suggests that this is a recent inscription, as does the pale coloration of the incised stone.
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