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Abstract

This article re-examines three graffiti published in Eskoubi (1999) and argues that they are examples of the Dadanitic script being used away from the area of al-ʿUlā.
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This contribution is devoted to four Dadanitic graffiti from the Region of Taymāʾ – North-West Arabia and will provide a new philological treatment of them. They were published by M. Kh. Eskoubi in his work entitled Dirāsa Tahliilya Muqārina li-Nuqūṣ min Miṣṭaqat (Ramm) Ġanūb Ġarb Taymāʾ, which appeared in al-Riyāḍ in 1999. It is worth mentioning here that the Taymāʾ region witnessed a diversity of written epigraphical types that can be called Ancient North Arabian.¹

Eskoubi 74

Figure 1: Photo by M. Eskoubi

¹This contribution was composed during my two-month stay as a visiting scholar at the Leiden Center for the Study of Ancient Arabia (Leiden University) in Summer 2016. I am deeply thankful to Dr. Ahmad Al-Jallad, Dr. María del Carmen Hidalgo-Chacón Díez, and Dr. Marijn van Putten for valuable comments on an early version of this article.

The personal name Mzn occurs often in Safaitic (Harding 1971: 543). A misplaced dot as a word divider «/» is recognizable in the second line after the letter t, separating it from the rest of the word, qt. Given that the word qt is well known and attested elsewhere (for examples, see Farès-Drappeau 2005: 264), this is likely a writing mistake. The sign for z at the end of the first line can be considered as a variant of the relative pronoun “who”, cf. Arabic ḏū, which precedes here the verbal form, tqt. In the inscriptions from oasis of al-ʿUlā, this relative pronoun is written with the ḏ sign. Although some scholars derive the verb from the root qṭṭ,2 no verbal form qt or qṭ is attested in Dadanitic. Macdonald (2004: 512–513) considers a possible derivation from nqṭ or wqṭ and interprets it as a t-infix stem (ftʿl).

---

Eskoubi 115

Figure 3: Photo by M. Eskoubi

Figure 4: Tracing by H. Hayajneh

1. ḥfr
2. h-rs

“ḥfr engraved this/the [. (?)]”

For onomastic derivatives and parallels related to the personal name ḥfr, see under the names ḥym and ḥyn in Hayajneh (1998: 195f). The verbal form ḥfr “to dig, engrave, carve, dig” is known in Safaitic (Clark 1979 [1983]: 23;
CIS 777) and other Semitic languages (see Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 396f and Cohen 1970–2012: 906f). There could be traces of a deteriorated letter after the s.

**Eskoubi 154 = JSLiḥ 382**

1. $\text{Ṣlm}yɔ́hb / zll

“$\text{Ṣlm}yɔ́hb$ performed the $ζ/τl$-ceremony / has offered”

The inscription was already identified as Dadanitic by Jaussen & Savignac (1909–1922: 532).

$\text{Ṣlm}yɔ́hb$: Hidalgo-Chacón Díez (2010: 193) translates $\text{Ṣlm}yɔ́hb$, which is the name in the present text, as “Ṣalm hat beliebt”. It is not attested in the Dadanitic onomasticon from Dadan itself, but we encounter the name $\text{Ṣlm}gd$ in a Dadanitic graffito from from Tal‘at Al-Ḥammād ($Mr’liḥ bn \text{Ṣlm}gd$), where the theophoric element $\text{Ṣlm}$, the divine name venerated in Taymā’ itself, is used as part of the name. The nature of the name and presence of the graffiti in Taymā’ itself leaves us with some speculations regarding his origins and whether he belongs to the Taymanite community. In the Dadanitic inscriptions, the root $zll$ produced the verbal causative form $\text{ḥzll}$. Its etymology

---

and semantic field is disputed, however its conventional unanimous meaning is “offer, sacrifice”, “perform ẓll-ceremony” (Farès-Drappeau 2005: 264–265), or, as Sima (1999) constantly translates, “(er) hat gedeckt den unterirdischen Wasserleitungskanal”. In contrast to the Dadanitic inscriptions from Dadan, the verbal form in the present graffiti is ẓll (1st or 2nd stems) not in the typical Dadanitic causative stem. It is not easy to decide whether the bearer of the name Ṣlmyḥb belongs culturally and linguistically to the Dadanitic realm or not, to explains his usage of the of ẓll instead of ʾ/hẓll.

Eskoubi 253

Figure 7: Photo by M. Eskoubi

Figure 8: Tracing by H. Hayajneh

1. $S^1\ln / s^1\ytz$

“$S^1\ln$ placed this (inscription)”

Eskoubi reads (ʼ)$s^1\lns^1\qt$. For the etymology and parallels of the PN $S^1\ln$, see the name $s^1\lm$ in Al-Said (1995: 117). The word-divider is lightly incised on the rock and seen close to the $n$ glyph. The reading of the following three letters is certain, especially the $y$. A small diagonal short stroke is seen on the right side of the rhombus, however a reading such as $q$ or $t$ is not eligible; for a $q$, the stroke is expected to be longer and straight and for a $t$, another stroke on the left side is expected. In addition, Semitic has no root clusters that begin with $s$ and $t$. As for the last sign, which appears as an inverted triangle with protrusions at the points of interchange of the upper two acute angles, it is best identified as a $z$. It is unlikely that this figure represents a drawing, e.g. of the
head of the deity Šlm. Following these epigraphical remarks, I would take the cluster s₁yt as a form of suffix conjugation from the root s₁-y-t, cf. Ugaritic št ‘to place, set, set up’ (Del Olmo Lete & Sanmartín 2003: 848), Phoenician št ‘to place, to put, to establish’ (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 1130), Hebrew šyt ‘to set, stand, place’ (Koehler & Baumgartner 1967–1990: 1375ff). In a similar semantic contextual usage, i.e. “placing an inscription, name” we encounter this verb “to place, to put, ...”, cf. Phoenician w hspr z št phlʾš hspr “and this inscription P. the scribe has set down” and wʾm ʾbl št šm ʾtk “and if you don’t put my name beside your own” (Hoftijzer & Jongeling 1995: 1130f); see Koehler & Baumgartner (1967–1990), pages 1375ff. for more Semitic derivatives, especially in the Old Testament, e.g. šät “to set, stand, place”. The final z should be identified as a demonstrative pronoun.⁴

**Concluding remark**

While the shape for z in the first inscription (Eskoubi 74), which we dealt with above, has a regular “H” form, it has the evolved triangular form “∇” in Eskoubi 253.⁵ This would mean that we are dealing with two shapes of the grapheme z used in the same region. This is applicable to the letter ḏ as well but from other texts in Dadan proper. No paleographic or chronological order on the basis of these undated graffiti can be drawn. We may assume that with these letters, as Macdonald (2010: 13f) observed for the glyphs of s₁ and ḏ, the informal shapes must have evolved in parallel with the use of the formal ones, since we regularly find them used side by side in the same Dadanitic inscriptions. It is strange, but it appears that the stonemasons of the official inscriptions and those who employed them, considered the informal shapes to be valid alternatives to the formal ones, even within the same text.⁶ This could be applicable for the forms in this collection, i.e. both shapes were used in graffiti in an unofficial context.
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⁴See Macdonald (2004: S18) for the demonstrative adjectives in Dadanitic and Taymanitic.

⁵The letters ṣ, ḡ and s₁ are encountered in a triangular form in Dadanitic.

⁶See Macdonald (2010: 14) and Farès-Drappeau (2005: 109ff) for the development of the letter shapes in Dadanitic.
Sigla

\textit{JSLiḥ} Dadanitic inscriptions, in Jaussen & Savignac (1909–1922).
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