W. M. CALLEWAERT

Nāmdev's poems in Rājasthān and Panjāb

There is as yet no convincing explanation why the very popular songs of Sants in Northwest India started to be written down only around 1600 AD and not before. Nāmdev, Kabīr and others were certainly popular during the 16th century, as will appear from the analysis of the musical repertoires below. But why are the earliest manuscripts giving their songs dated around 1600 AD [1] and after, and only in Rājasthān? Would they be lost, while we have many Jain manuscripts in Rājasthānī and Gujarātī *bhāṇḍārs*, or Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Gītagovinda*? Was there for the singers handling these repertoires no need to write the songs in a 'proper' way? Or did the technology to produce home-made paper in plenty become easy only after the impetus given to miniature painting at Akbar's court? Or did the Muslim devotion for the Book encourage them to produce a similar object of veneration? Like a sudden blizzard in the Thar desert or the first monsoon in fertile Panjāb, an abundance of manuscripts with the songs of the Sants appears around 1600.

And then hundreds, if not thousands of manuscripts started to be written in 17th century Rājastān. Undoubtedly, the Dādūpanth has been a nucleus of high literary activity, rivalling the production in the Panjāb around 1604 [2].

Let us imagine we are travelling through Northwest India in 1520

---

[1] The earliest manuscript giving the 'Hindī' songs of Nāmdev (11) and Kabīr (15) is found in the City Palace, Jaipur (Fatehpur Manuscript, 1582 AD).

[2] See W. M. Callewaert, *Search for Manuscripts of the Dādūpanthī Literature in Rājasthān*. In: Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica, Leuven, 4, 1977, 115–167; and *Ibidem, II*. In: *cit.*, 8, 1977, 305–308. Also *Nirguṇ Literature on Microfilm in Leuven, Belgium*. In: *IAVRI Bulletin* (London), IX (Dec. 1981), 24–28.

AD, on sandy tracks or on bumpy roads after the rainy season. We spend the nights on the floor in temples and watch the audiences drawn by travelling singers singing songs of *bhakti*. These singers – like the Purānic bards – received extended hospitality depending on the quality and depth of their performance. We are on the way to Rājasthān after a visit to Banāras, where a few years before Raidās had died and where the grandfather of one of the singers had heard a person called Kabīr. And this grandfather's great–grandfather – in this family of travelling musicians – may have been to Mahārāshtra where he had heard a poet called Nāmdev.

The singers sang the songs which were most in demand, such as those of Nāmdev and Kabīr, which they had learned from their fathers. They also kept enlarging their repertoire when, during their travels, they heard a new song by a famous *bhakta*. Inspired by a particular environment, they added new songs to the repertoire. Memory was their only way of recording, but as the repertoires grew bigger, some musicians started to keep little (or big) notebooks as an aid to their memory. The earliest manuscripts seem to have had these notebooks as their basis. The manuscripts of the 17th century that have been preserved are *copies* of these early manuscripts now lost. Scholars of the 20th century have to rely on 17th century manuscripts which are copies of the scribbled notes of singers in order to reconstruct and edit what the singers were singing. I do not say: 'to reconstruct what Nāmdev or Kābir had sung'.

Musicians classified the songs according to the *rāg*. Scribes kept the *rāg* tag of each song. Eventually, more 'message'–oriented compilers like Rajab and Gopāldās classified them in chapters, roughly according to theme. But this was a later phenomenon. It is on the early manuscripts with the *rāg* classification that we must rely if we hope to get close to what the original songs of a Santa might have been.

These songs have been mediated by unknown singers and known scribes. Very few such transmitters passed on the songs of a poet–mystic without changing them. Musicians adjusted the poetic line to suit the rhythm and adapted the language for the convenience of the audience, as they went from village to village, from one region to the other. And then the scribes took over, while the oral tradition too continued, adding and changing.

Studying the songs of a poet like Nāmdev is quite different from the study of Shakespeare or of Kālidāsa. It is the ambition of a text–critic studying Shakespeare to bring out the text 'written' by the author, looking at the various versions available in manuscripts. The text–critic soon realizes that this is impossible in the case of a Nāmdev or a Kabīr. There is no way by which we can reach beyond the oral tradition to the poets

themselves. This oral tradition, unlike that of the Vedas, did not shun variety and creativity. Consequently, the oeuvre of Nāmdev (and other Sants?) has come to us in a multiplicity of forms, changing over both space and time. We should look for an analogy in the Purāṇas, rather than in Shakespeare or Kālidāsa.

Fortunately, the manuscript tradition allows us to reach the threshold of this oral tradition, or the moment when it started to be written down, some time before 1600 AD (while the oral tradition continued).

In the early, *rāg* oriented Mss. of the Dādūpanth, Nāmdev's songs are part of a larger corpus called *Pañcavāṇī*, literally the 'songs of the five'. These are the *Vāṇīs* of the five highly–respected poets in the Dādūpanth: Dādū, Kabīr, Nāmdev, Raidās and Hardās.

The six Mss. which give the Nāmdev repertoire in a *Pañcavāṇī* group can be classified in two groups, depending on the first song they give and on the sequence of songs: group I with Mss. *d a v* and group II with Mss. *h m p*.

Looking at the consistent order (Dādū, Nāmdev, Kabīr, Raidās and Hardās) in all the *Pañcavāṇī* Mss., we might be tempted to imagine that the numerous *Pañcavāṇī* manuscripts we have today all go back to a single archetype, compiled by one of the learned disciples of Dādū, perhaps even under the guru's direct inspiration. It might seem to us that this archetypal exemplar served as the basis for all later copies, the earliest now extent being dated 1636 AD.

Such an idyllic thought, cherished by text–critics up till the present, must be given up. The *Pañcavāṇī* manuscripts now at hand cannot go back to one archetype or to any single compiler.

With the hypothesis that the *Pañcavāṇī* tradition in the Dādūpanth started around 1600 AD, we face the amazing fact that there must have been several *Pañcavāṇī* compilers, each working separately either from exsisting manuscripts or in direct contact with the oral tradition. We can no longer speak of *one* Rājasthānī *Pañcavāṇī* recension or Western *pāṭh* tradition.

Because of a plainly direct link with different musical traditions, we find in our manuscripts variants which were *introduced during the musical transmission*, along with those produced by scribes. To keep both the oral and the scribal variants in mind and clearly distinguish between these two streams is a gigantic task for unaided human memory which has to collect its data over a span of several years. Our hypothesis about musical repertoires could be formulated only with the help of computer programmes developed to count and compare variants, making a distinction between those that are oral and those that are scribal.

A consideration about 'musical' variants in the text is not the only

clue pointing to a development of Nāmdev's songs in different 'recensions' during the oral period. Indian musicians used to sing clusters of songs according to particular modes, called *rāg*. It appears that first the singers sang a particular *pad* in a particular *rāg*; then they grouped together the *padas* which were to be sung in the same *rāg*. Consequently, a *rāg* is like an identity-card for the earliest period of oral transmission. It was only later, when compilers took over, that *padas* were classified in *aṅgas*, according to the main theme. The same song, however, could be sung to different *rāgas*. As a result we find songs classified under different *rāgas* in different manuscripts. This variation in classification is obviously not due to a scribe's intervention, but stems from the oral period itself, when the songs were in the hands of the singers. Subsequently, the songs were transmitted under different *rāgas* and appeared as such also in the manuscripts. Thus, looking at the *rāg* structure we are able to make a preliminary classification of the musical recensions. The statistical computer count corroborates this classification, adding nuances.

Not all our Rājasthānī 'musical' manuscripts are of the *Pañcavāṇī* type. Ms. *u* is Dādūpanthī but not *Pañcavāṇī* and Ms. *c* (and *j*) may be defined as 'Nāth-siddha'. Ms. *c* is a huge compilation of the songs and sayings of the Siddhas, which includes along with Nāmdev other *nirguṇ* poets like Kabīr and Raidās, who seem to have been popular in the 17th century Nāth circles. Like the *Pañcavāṇī* collections, these Nāth collections are of a musical kind, classifying songs according to *rāg*. Although postdating the Dādūpanthī collections, they are independent repertoires, relying on an independent source. Again, although they are sometimes quite different, the songs of Nāmdev in these Nāth collections often have much in common with the versions we find in the Dādūpanthī collections.

This suggests the hypothesis that the singers walking on the Rājasthānī roads around 1520 drew their repertoires from a common source. But this source is different from the source which gave us the *Guru Granth* repertoires. When we compare the *rāg* structure in the *Guru Granth* with that in the Rājasthānī repertoires, we find considerable differences. The Panjābī singers handled a text which was musically and morphologically different from what their colleagues in Rājasthān had [3]. We

[3] For his critical edition of the *pad bhāg* of Kabīr, P. N. Tivārī finally selected 200 *padas*. Of these, 121 are found in the *Guru Granth* also, and of these only 55 are classified under the same *rāg* as in the Rājasthānī tradition. Out of the 35 common *padas* under *gauḍī* in the Rājasthānī tradition, 31 are under *gauḍī* in the *Guru Granth*. Further, *āsāvarī*: 8 out of 23; *rāmkalī*: 3 out of 6; *kedārau*: 1; *bhairū*: 8 out of 11; *vasant*: 4 out of 5. For the other *rāgas*, nothing is common.

are tempted to propose that the *padas* which have the same *rāg* in the *Guru Granth* and in the Rājasthānī Mss. are likely to have belonged to a very early common source. Perhaps we should resist the temptation.

One important point can be made at this stage: we can no longer call the *Guru Granth* the oldest available version of, for example, Kabīr's *padas*. What we find in the 17th century Rājasthānī Mss. is a variant musical version which may well be as old as the musical version from which the Panjābī singers drew their inspiration, if not older. At what muddy or sandy crossroads did singing families go their own way, and at what point in history? We do not know, but the division certainly set in quite early.

When we look at the (only) 11 songs of Nāmdev which are classified under the same *rāg* in the *Guru Granth* and in the Rājasthānī Mss., we notice that these songs are found in *all* the Rājasthānī recensions (with only one exception), and we see that these songs have exactly the same *rāg* in all these recensions. On the other hand, when we look at those songs which do not have the same *rāg* in all Rājasthānī Mss., they are also the songs which are not given in all the Mss., often occuring in a few Mss. only.

With regard to Raidās, when we add up all the *padas* we find in the *Guru Granth*, in the Rājasthānī Mss. and in the Belvedere edition, we get a total of 112 songs. Out of the 40 songs found in the *Guru Granth*, only 19 are also found in the Rājasthānī Mss. and of these 19, only 10 are given under the same *rāg*.

Traditionally, language has been considered a reliable clue for arriving at the authentic version of a text. Many text-critics have used it to define the genuineness of an expression, a line or a whole song. They have also used it as a norm for modifying a text. The linguistic test, however, is often contradicted by the musical (*rāg*) pattern in which the songs of Nāmdev were arranged. Songs which are found under the same *rāg* in all our manuscripts, and presumably belong to an old layer in the oral tradition, are linguistically quite a mixed bag: we have songs in almost pure Gujarātī, others in a kind of Marāṭhī-Rājasthānī and still others in Braj. Must the text-critic stick to the assumption that the poet sang in his own dialect *only*?

When we construct a tentative stemma on the basis of the similarity in the order in which the songs were arranged under the heading of a *rāg*, then our effort will continually be contradicted by the dissimilarity

---

On the other hand, most *padas* of Kabīr we looked at in 3 Rājasthānī Mss. (one *Pañcavāṇī* manuscript, Ms. *u* and Ms. *c*) are there classified under the same *rāg*.

of the oral and scribal variants. The result is a totally blurred and confused pattern, if any pattern appears at all. If – after having the computer count the variants and compare the variants that are identical in only particular manuscripts – we draw the proper conclusion, we despair of ever finding a classical stemma and an archetype.

The computer count establishes that, in the case of Nāmdev's songs, there is *no* consistent relation between two manuscripts of the same 'recension'. We notice also that, when looking at variants from different angels, no consistent relation even between manuscripts is seen throughout. This suggests a very nebulous *interaction* between singing traditions. If we seek to establish an 'original text' on the basis of stemmatic clues, we deceive ourselves for the simple reason that a '*critical text*' perhaps never existed.

Or, if Nāmdev once sang his poems, very soon they became the property of singers who handled them according to their own inspiration, musical genius and particular dialect. Singers may well have combined several versions they had heard, and passed on to their students new textual combinations. We may assume that it was mostly the capable singers, those who were more poetic and creative, who prevailed; we notice the consequences in the stemmatic chaos before us.

What then have we looked for? We have looked for a text which is found in many musical traditions. We have tried to isolate an old Rājasthānī core, without suggesting that the songs of this core are in any way closer to the poet. It is our translation that accords them a special status, in the hope that what we selected for translation forms the oldest Rājasthānī layer.

If there is no stemma and no justified 'critical' text, then what do we have? We have the convinction that, possibly for centuries, a Nāmdev enthusiasm had gripped people in Rājasthān and Panjāb, and that this enthusiasm was linked somehow to Nāmdev's songs of the 14th century. Full of enthusiasm for Nāmdev's songs, poets and musicians sang and recited his verses, adding songs or lines of their own or changing the lines according to their own taste and genius. This *Santa–enthusiasm theory* may well apply to many more *nirguṇ* and *saguṇ* mediaeval poets than has hitherto been believed.

Still, even if we cannot get to Nāmdev himself, our search is worthwhile. We discover poetry that is often very beautiful and a mystical literature which has influenced the religious life of thousands, from the beginning of the 15th century until the present day.

Nāmdev in Panjāb?

The traditional 'Panjābī' view suggests that Nāmdev[4] sang *abhaṅgas* in Mahārāshtra and that he spent his later days in Panjāb. In Ghumān (Panjāb) we find his *samādhi*[5].

There is more than one problem in this view. With due respect for oral traditions, it should be noted that the first documents referring to Nāmdev's presence in Panjāb are W. Crooke, *The Tribes and Castes of the Western Provinces*, 1869, and M. A. Macauliffe, *The Sikh Religion*, 1909[6]. So far we have found no reference to Nāmdev's presence in Rājasthān[7]. The Mahārāshtrian oral tradition reflected in Mahīpati: 1762 speaks of Nāmdev's journey to Banāras. Isn't it even today a respectable reference to be able to say you have studied in Banāras? Mahīpati makes no mention of Rājasthān or Panjāb.

It is hard to explain how a Panjābī influence could have caused so many and so varied musical repertoires of Nāmdev's songs to be popular in Rājasthān around 1550. We pointed out earlier that 61 songs of Nāmdev are given in the *Guru Granth*. Of these only 25 are found in the Rājasthānī Mss., and only 10 are found under the same *rāg*. This suggests a weak rather than a strong connexion between Panjāb and Rājasthān.

If we suppose, as we have done, that the presence of Nāmdev's songs in Panjāb and Rājasthān is explained by a transmission through wandering musicians, and not by Nāmdev's physical presence, we still have problems. How can we envisage the relation between the quite different Rājasthānī and Panjābī repertoires? It is hard to argue that the abundant material in Rājasthān is a later offspring of an original corpus in Panjāb. There are too few songs in common, considering the abundant

---

[4] For the 'six' persons called Nāmdev, see P. Caturvedī, *Uttarī Bhārat kī Santa Paramparā*, 1951, p. 105. For the argument that the 'Panjabī' Nāmdev and the Mahārāshtrian Nāmdev are *not* identical, see S. K. Āḍkar, *Hindī nirguṇ–Kāvya kā Prārambh aur Nāmdev kī Hindī kavitā*, Allahabad, 1972, p. 59f.

[5] Another '*samādhi*' is found in Pandharpur, Mahārāshtra.

[6] Even in N. Singh, *Bhagata Nāmdeva in the Guru Grantha*, Patiala, 1981 we find no mention of earlier Panjābī references.

[7] In interviews in Jaipur, in 1986, tailors and *chīmpīs* claimed to be of the *vamsha* of Nāmdev. Should this be rendered as 'in family–lineage linked to Nāmdev'? They also stated that originally they were not from Rājasthān, but from Gujarāt. There are two distinct groups, apparently not inter–marrying, in Cār Pol Bāzār, Thākur Bagru kā rāstā, near Raghunāth kā Mandir, Jaipur. There are also clans in the South which claim a connexion with Nāmdev. For the genealogical table from Nāmdev, 'via Bohddasa to the present day descendants in Panjāb', see N. Singh, *op. cit.*, p. 73–75.

material found in Rājasthān, presumably going back to repertoires of pre–Nānak times. One may perhaps explain the phenomenon by supposing that Nāmdev travelled through Rājasthān, spending time in temples and villages so that his songs and message became popular. He then went on to Panjāb and from the repertoire which developed there independently of Rājasthān 61 songs found their way into the Sikh tradition. No other repertoire is now found there.

But is the presence of Nāmdev at all necessary to explain the popularity of his songs? Kabīr and Raidās are not said to have been to Panjāb and Rājasthān; yet we find a large number of their songs too in both the *Guru Granth* and in the Rājasthānī (*Pañcavāṇī*) manuscripts [8]. What evidence do we have to believe that Nāmdev was in Panjāb, while Kabīr and Raidās were not? Perhaps we should not forget that Kabīr lived around 1500 and Nāmdev around 1300 AD. Two centuries – at that time – may have been sufficient to allow devotees (in the 18th century?) to 'know' that the great Santa Nāmdev had actually been in their region. Of course, there is no point in 'proving' that Nāmdev did *not* go to Panjāb. The point is that not enough importance has been given to travelling singers and their repertoires. *They* spread the *nirguṇ* message and the traces of their handling of songs are seen in our manuscripts. We reached this conclusion early in our study when we realized that looking for a scribal archetype or the hypothesis of a mammoth scribal contamination could not bring clarity to the material in the 17th. century manuscripts.

Singers are responsible both for the spreading of the message and for the stemmatic chaos [9].

[8] In the *Guru Granth* we find 225 songs of Kabīr, 61 of Nāmdev and 40 of Raidās; in the Rājasthānī Mss. we find ca. 350 of Kabīr, 258 of Nāmdev and ca. 80 of Raidās.

[9] See our study, *The Hindī Poems of Nāmdev*, (432 pp.), in collaboration with Mukund Lath, Leuven, 1988.

NOTE E DISCUSSIONI

FRANCESCO VATTIONI

Varia semitica - II*

III – Ρουμας *e* Ρουμαϑα

Tempo fa è stato studiato un epigramma di incerta provenienza, datato probabilmente in base a soli criteri paleografici tra il 50 e il 150 d.C., nella prima linea del quale è visibile un antroponimo all'accusativo, Ρουμμαν. Dall'esistenza di un'epigrafe funeraria del museo di Atene, dell'ultima parte del I sec. a.C. (*IG* II², 2573: 'Ρουμᾶς//χρηστὸς//χαῖρε), se ne è dedotto che l'antroponimo al nominativo doveva essere 'Ρουμᾶς[15]. Se poi si fosse dovuto cercare il corrispondente semitico, si sarebbe dovuti ricorrere a *rwm'*, cioè *rwm* più l'aleph dello stato enfatico dell'aramaico o del siriaco. E l'antroponimo *rwm'* è attestato dal nabateo[16].

'Ρουμᾶς è noto anche a Doura Europos[17] dove è testimoniato anche 'Ρουμαῖα[18], 'Ρουμαίαυ[19], Ρουπεαν[20], Ρουπης[21]. A Renea[22] si conosce Ρουμαι che è con-

---

* *Varia semitica I* è stato pubblicato in *AION*, 49 (1989), pp. 75–76.

[14] M.N. Tod, «The Inscribed Epigram and the Person commemorated», *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 73 (1953), 139 s.

[15] Dove il sigma è il suffisso del nominativo.

[16] J. Cantineau, *Le nabatéen*, II, Parigi 1932, 146.

[17] F. Cumont, *Fouilles de Doura–Europos*, Parigi 1926, nr. 125; *The Excavations at Dura–Europos*. Preliminary Report, 1, New Haven 1929, 46 (= *SEG*, VII, 665); VI, 1936, 248, nr. 762 e, forse, IV, 1933, 147, nr. 282.

[18] F. Cumont, *op. cit.*, nr. 110. Si sottolinea di solito che non è da confondere con Ρωμαια.

[19] *The Excavations... cit.*, IV, IV, 133.

[20] F. Cumont, *op. cit.*, nr. 69: per Ρουμεαν.

[21] *The Excavations... cit.* V, 1934, 114; VII–VIII, 1939, 307: per Ρουμης.

[22] M.–T. Couilloud, *Les monuments funéraires de Rhenée*, Parigi 1974.

siderato la vocalizzazione di *rwmj* noto dai busti palmireni[23] e da alcuni considerato l'etnico per rendere «Romano»[24].

Si conosce anche a Renea 'Ρουμαθα[25] e a Samo Ρουμαθας[26] che, evidentemente, sono la vocalizzazione di *rwmt'*[27], femminile enfatico di *rwm* che si vede vocalizzato nella regione di Moab[28] da Ρουμος. Il significato della radice è stato cercato nell'arabo («lobo dell'orecchio»)[29] e nel semitico comune (la radice *rwm*[30] che significa essere alto).

IV – *A proposito di* gr'šmn

Nel 1874 G. Colonna Ceccaldi[31] tra le varie iscrizioni greche di Cipro ne pubblicò una (Dali) di estremo interesse non solo per l'antroponimia fenicio–punica ma anche per la storia della religione cipriota nel III sec. a.C. Il testo è datato 7 di Xandico del 47 dell'era di Cipro, cioè 264 a.C.

Sebbene l'editore non ne avesse resa di pubblico dominio la fotografia, la sua lettura fu perfetta, almeno dal confronto che ho potuto fare su una pubblicazione recente[32]. Ecco il testo:

Μνασεας Αψητος Μετειρας ὑπερ
αυτου και του υιου Γηρυσμονος
Απολλωνι Αμυκλαιωι ευχην
ετους ως κιτιεις αγουσιν μί ξανδικουί

Di Mnasea, non raro nell'epigrafia greca, chi ha detto che copre Manasse

[23] F. Vattioni, «Le iscrizioni sui rilievi palmireni nella collezione Zeri», *AIONArchStAnt*, 8 (1986), 245–248, specialmente 247s, nr. 4, 2. A. Mastino, «Le relazioni tra Africa e Sardegna», in A. Mastino (ed.), *L'Africa romana*, II, Sassari 1985, 44, n. 91: Abillahas. Rummei (CIL, VIII, 9198) potrebbe esserne la vocalizzazione, se non si dovesse leggere Abillahas Arummet con N. Benseddik, *Les troupes auxiliaires de l'armée romaine en Maurétanie Césarienne sous le Haut*–Empire, Algeri 1982, 62.231, nr. 158.

[24] F. Vattioni, *AION*, 48(1988), 157.

[25] M.–T. Couilloud, *op. cit.*, nr. 34.180.

[26] T. Wiegand, «Antike Sculpturen in Samos», *AM*, 25 (1900), 145–214; specialmente 194, nr. 92.

[27] Anche Ρουμεθων (*PAES*, IIIA, 5) di Filadelfia (Amman) è da considerare derivato da *rwmt'* con il suffisso di appartenenza.

[28] R. Canova, *Iscrizioni e monumenti protocristiani nel paese di Moab*, Roma 1954, nrr. 354.355.365.366.376.398.410.411.

[29] J.K. Stark, *Personal Names in Palmyrene Inscriptions,* Oxford 1971, 111.

[30] O. Masson, «Quelques noms sémitiques en transcription grecque à Délos et à Rhénée», *Hommages A. Dupont–Sommer*, Parigi 1971, 61–73, specialmente 69.

[31] «Nouvelles inscriptions grecques de Chypre», *Revue archéologique*, 27 (1874), 78–95, specialmente 90, nr. 1.

[32] O. Masson, «Kypriaka», *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, 92 (1968), 375–409, specialmente 398, fig. 25; *SEG*, XXV, 1071.

chi Menahem, già noto dai testi cuneiformi. Di Abses, che ricorre anche altrove[33], si sostiene che è la vocalizzazione di *'bdṣd*, servo del dio Sid, divinità della caccia. Di Apollo Amicleo si crede che copra *Ršpmkl*[34]. Anche di Gerysmon si è detto con certezza che è la vocalizzazione di *gr'šmn*[35], ospite/cliente di Ešmun, il dio della medicina. Ciò che non si è mai detto, almeno a mia conoscenza, è che *gr'šmn* è stato abbreviato e l'epigrafia greca l'ha conservata nell'antroponimo Γῆρυς che ricorre alcune volte[36]. Quanto poi a grš di Costantina[37] e, forse, di Cartagine[38] c'è chi ne fa l'abbreviazione di *gr'štrt*[39] e chi, come chi scrive, pensa all'abbreviazione di *gr'šmn*.

V – *Hauran a Pozzuoli*

Alcune recenti pubblicazioni[40] hanno sottolineato i vari aspetti che hanno reso molto importante la regione sira dell'Hauran nella storia dell'antichità. Alcune piccole considerazioni renderanno più larga la conoscenza sia di quel paese sia dei suoi abitanti.

Innanzitutto va ricordato che sono almeno due gli oriundi dall'Hauran attestati a Pozzuoli: il primo è una donna (*CIL*, X, 2229):

D.M.
Carisiae Gauranae
Flavia Augustiniane
fecit

[33] *IG*, II^2 342; cfr. M.B. Walbank, «Athens, Carthage and Tyre (*IG*, II^2, 342+)», *ZPE*, 59 (1985), 107–111.

[34] L'ultimo studio sull'argomento – E. Lipiński, «Reseph Amyklos», *OLA*, 22 (1987), 87–99 – non si può dire documentato.

[35] F.L. Benz, *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions*, Roma 1972, 103: *CIS*, I, 5225, 1; 6013, 1; 6044; *RES*, 1216, 3.

[36] *IG.*, II^2, 10995: Γῆρυς μυλωθρος (IV sec. a.C.). Vedere anche *IG*, II^2, 1951, 24.151.403.422; *IG*, II, 2, 959c. 12 (Γῆρυς Απολλωνιδ[ου]); 2724 (Γῆρυς ισοτελης//Νικω Γηρυος γυνη). Tuttavia da quanto so non appare mai accompagnato dall'etnico di qualche città fenicia. M.–F. Baslez, «Le rôle et la place des phéniciens dans la vie économique des ports de l'Egée», *OLA*, 22 (1987), 267–285 specialmente 280 pensa invece a gr'štrt. Sul ger si veda M. Heltzer, «The 'Ger' in the Phoenician Society», *OLA*, 22 (1987), 309–314.

[37] P. Berthier, R. Charlier, *Le sanctuaire punique d'El*–Hofra, Parigi 1952, nr. 157,4.

[38] K. Jongeling, *Names in neo–punic Inscriptions*, Groningen 1983, 162.

[39] F.L. Benz, *op. cit.*, 107. Si deve pensare al Γηρας di C. Wescher, *Poliorcétique des Grecs*, Parigi 1867, 9 (Γήρας... ὁ Καρχήδόνιος) e Vitruvio, *De architectura*, X, 13.2 (*Ceras... Carchedonius*).

[40] M. Sartre, *Bostra*. Des origines à l'Islam, Parigi 1985; J.–M. Dentzer, *Hauran I et II*, Recherches archéologiques sur la Syrie du Sud à l'époque hellénistique et romaine, Parigi 1985, 1986; R. Farioli Campanati (ed.), *La Siria araba da Roma a Bisanzio*, Ravenna 1989. Da non dimenticare D. Sourdel, *Les cultes du Ḥaurân à l'époque romaine*, Parigi 1959; G. Gualandi, «Una città carovaniera della Siria meridionale: Bosra romana», *Felix Ravenna*, 1975, 187–239. Sempre utile H. Leclercq, «Hauran», *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et liturgie*, VI, 2 (1924), 2067–2102.

Non sto qui a discutere se si tratti di una padrona che fa la lapide alla schiava. Suppongo che Gauranae stia per (C)auranae e che la grafia rifletta la difficoltà del latino nella resa della gutturale.

Il secondo oriundo dall'Hauran (*CIL*, X, 2971) crea meno problemi di grafia:

Stallius.Gaius.has.sedes.Hauranus.tuetur
ex epicureio.gaudivigente.choro

Le due diverse grafie (Gauranae, Hauranus) sorprendono se si pensa alla resa dei papiri di Zenone (Αυρανα)[41] o dei Settanta per Ez 47,16.18[42] (Αυρανιτις)[43] o per 1 Mac 2,5[44] (Αυαραν)[45]; 6,43[46] (Αυαραν)[47]; 2 Mac 4,40[48] (Αυρανου)[49] o 2 Esd 12,19 (Αρωνι). Infatti in siriaco il paese è detto *ḥwrn*[50] e viene fatto derivare da una radice *ḥwr* [51] che significa «essere bianco» sia in ebraico (*ḥāwar*) sia in aramaico (*ḥawar*[52]) mentre in arabo secondo una recente etimologia[53], indica «essere di un nero e di un bianco ben pronunciato così che uno faccia risaltare l'altro». Si è dimenticato tuttavia che la radice è stata presa in esame anche da Stefano di Bisanzio[54] a proposito della città araba Αὔαρα[55], nota anche a Tolomeo, alla Tavola di Peutinger e alla Notitia dignitatum: «e l'oracolo era cercare il luogo αὔαρα, che è secondo Arabi e Siri bianca» (accusativo femminile singolare di λευκός). Si aggiunga che in nabateo si conoscono antroponimi come *ḥwrw* e *ḥrw*[56].

---

[41] P.W. Pestman, *A Guide to the Zenon Archive*, Leida 1981, 480: PSI, 406, 17; PCZen, 1, 59008, 25.33; cfr. anche C. Orrieux, *Le papyrus de Zénon*, Parigi 1983, 44; id., *Zénon de Caunos, parépidémos et le destin grec*, Parigi 1985, 101–103.

[42] J. Ziegler, *Ezechiel*, Gottinga 1952, 323.

[43] Secondo R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus syriacus*, Oxford 1868, 1232, *ḥwrnjt'* può significare sia il pioppo bianco sia quello nero.

[44] W. Kappler, *Maccabaeorum liber I*, Gottinga 1936, 55.

[45] D. De Bruyne, B. Sodar, *Les anciennes traductions latines des Machabées*, Maredsous 1932, 9: i manoscritti L e B hanno *auran*, quelli di V *abaron*.

[46] W. Kappler, *op. cit.*, 88.

[47] D. De Bruyne, B. Sodar, *op. cit.*, 39: *auran* in L e B, *saura* in V.

[48] W. Kappler, R. Hanhart, *Maccabaeroum liber II*, Gottinga 1959, 65.

[49] D. De Bruyne, B. Sodar, *op. cit.*, 136s: tutte le versioni latine antiche hanno interpretato *tyranno* o *tiranno*.

[50] R. Payne Smith, *op. cit.*, 1232. In ebraico *ḥaw^{e}rân*.

[51] R. Payne Smith, *op. cit.*, 1229; C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon syriacum*, Halle 1928, 223.

[52] J. Levy, *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*, II, Lipsia 1879, 26.

[53] T. Fahd, «Le Ḥawrân à la veille de la conquête islamique», in R. Farioli Campanati, *op. cit.*, 35–43, specialmente 36.

[54] A. Meineke, *Stephan von Byzanz Ethnica*, Graz 1958, 144.

[55] Benzinger, «Auara», *PW*, II, 2, 2264.

[56] A. Jaussen, R. Savignac, «Nouvelles inscriptions nabatéennes de Pétra», *RB*, 11 (1902), 580–590, specialmente 584, 4; 587, 13; 588, 18.

Le iscrizioni di Delo (*ID*, 2308: II/I sec. a.C.)[57] mostrano come dèi di Iamnia Αυρωνα[58] ed Eracle mentre i testi alfabetici di Ras Shamra–Ugarit[59] parlano di *ḥrn jbn*[60], Horon di Jabneh/Iamnia e quelli di Antas (Sardegna)[61] menzionano *ḥrn* mentre fra i toponimi della Bibbia si conosce *bêt ḥoron*[62]. Il dio Horon[63] ha qualcosa in comune con la radice *ḥwr*?

---

[57] P. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Parigi 1970, 475.

[58] Per i nomi in –as/âs cfr. E. Locker, «Die Bildung der griechischen Kurz–und Kosenamen», *Glotta*, 22 (1934), 46–100, specialmente 89–94.

[59] C. Virolleaud, *CRAIBL*, 1936, 237.

[60] Il testo è fornito da R. Dussaud, «Encore le dieu Horon», *Syria*, 17 (1936), 394: *jtbr ḥrn Jbn//jtbr Ḥrn r'šk//'štrt šm B'l qdqdk* = Spezzerà Horon di Jabneh//spezzerà Horon la tua testa//Astarte, nome di Ba'al il tuo cranio.

[61] M. Sznycer, «Note sur le dieu Ṣid et le dieu Ḥoron d'après les nouvelles inscriptions d'Antas», *Karthago*, 15 (1969s), 67–74; M.L. Uberti, «Horon ad Antas e Astarte a Mozia», *AION*, 28 (1978), 315–317; G. Tore, «Religiosità semitica in Sardegna attraverso la documentazione archeologica: inventario preliminare», in P. Marras, *Religiosità teologia e arte*, Roma 1989, 33–90, specialmente 56: *l'dn* 1 [ṣd 'dr b 'bj mš//ḥrn '] *š ndr...bn // mgn b*[n...kš//m' q']*l' brk'*).

[62] Il toponimo anche a Tell Qasile in B. Maisler, «Two Hebrew Ostraca from Tell Qasîle», *JNES*, 10 (1951), 265–267: *z'b.'pr.lbjtḥrn//š IIII*. Vedere anche R. Payne Smith, *op. cit.*, 1232: *bjt ḥwrn tḥtjt'*.

[63] P. Montet, P. Bucher, «Un dieu cananéen à Tanis Houroun de Ramsès», *RB*, 44 (1935), 153–165; H. Seyrig, «A propos du dieu cananéen Houroun», *Syria*, 16 (1935), 417–418; W.F. Albright, «The Canaanite God Ḥaurôn (Ḥôrôn)», *AJSL*, 53 (1936), 1–12; id., «The Egypto–canaanite Deity Ḥaurôn», *BASOR*, 84 (1941), 7–12; J. Gray, «The Canaanite God Horon», *JNES*, 8 (1949), 27–34; M.H. Pope, W. Röllig, in N.W. Haussig, *Wörterbuch der Mythologie*, I, Stoccarda 1965, 288s; P. Xella, «Per una riconsiderazione della morfologia del dio Horon», *AION*, 32 (1972), 271–286; A. Caquot, «Horon: revue critique et données nouvelles», *AAS*, 291 (1979s), 173–180; P. Xella, «D'Ugarit à la Phénicie: Sur les traces de Rasap, Horon, Eshmun», *Die Welt des Orients*, 19 (1988), 45–64, specialmente 55–58.