

III Coloquio de estudios Fenicios*

M.E. Aubet - Barcelona

Durante los días 9 y 10 de diciembre de 1983 se celebró en la Universidad Libre de Bruselas el tercer Coloquio de Estudios Fenicios organizado por el Grupo Interuniversitario de Estudios Fenicios y Púnicos. Dicho grupo, fundado en 1980 por el Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones belga y presidido por E. Lipinski, ha promovido durante estos últimos años un ambicioso programa de reuniones científicas orientadas al estudio y discusión de temas concretos del mundo fenicio-púnico. Un primer Coloquio se celebró en abril de 1981 para discutir la cuestión de la conservación y salvaguarda de Tiro y una segunda reunión, organizada en diciembre de 1982, trató sobre aspectos de la historia de Fenicia. Ambos coloquios acaban de ser publicados en los volúmenes I y II de los recién inaugurados "Studia Phoenicia".

El objetivo de este tercer coloquio ha sido el de analizar la influencia del mundo fenicio sobre sus más próximos vecinos: Siria, Anatolia, Mesopotamia, Persia, Palestina, Egipto, Chipre y el Egeo. El contenido es, en consecuencia, muy amplio, máxime si se tiene en cuenta que el Grupo de contacto interuniversitario belga se ha propuesto abarcar todas las disciplinas —arqueología, historia del arte, epigrafía, numismática, filología y religión— que guarden relación con el estudio del mundo fenicio.

Precedida de un texto de introducción al Coloquio por parte de E. Lipiński, la primera comunicación corre a cargo de D. Homès-Fredericq, quien analiza y valora el conocido texto de Ezequiel sobre Tiro para el estudio del comercio fenicio con los antiguos reinos de Edom, Ammón y Moab, comercio del que únicamente se conservan escasas evidencias filológicas y arqueológicas de la Edad del Hierro. Seguidamente, J.B. Hennessey destaca los resultados de sus propias excavaciones en la zona del aeropuerto de Ammán, en Jordania, donde en 1966 identificó una gran estructura de piedra, con altar central, en la que apareció cerámica micénica y chipriota, así como vasos de piedra egipcios. La presencia, en las proximidades, de una zona de incineraciones, traduce la práctica de sacrificios humanos realizados en el recinto sacro durante el siglo XIII a.C.

La comunicación de G. Bunnens se centra en el estudio de las listas de tributos que el rey de Assur impuso a Fenicia y a sus vecinos. De ellas se infiere que la materia primera exigida como tributo a Fenicia la constituyeron los metales, en tanto que la púrpura, la madera de cedro y el marfil lo fueron de Karkemish o Patina.

Por su parte, E. Gubel propone un carácter simbólico-religioso en sustitución de la imagen de Astarté para las pequeñas cabezas de leona de marfil, de fabricación fenicia y procedentes de Nimrud, y P. Bordreuil

* *La Phénicie et ses voisins*, III^e Colloque du Groupe de Contact Interuniversitaire d'Etudes Phéniciennes et Puniqes, F.N.R.S., Centrum voor Myceense en Archaisch-Griekse Cultuur, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 1983, Résumés des Comptes Rendus, 24 pp.

discute la identidad de la divinidad venerada en el Maabed de Amrit, identificada tradicionalmente con Melqart, pero que el autor considera que pudo ser Echmún. Por último, y también en el ámbito de la religión fenicia, J.W. Meyer suscribe la hipótesis de una mediación fenicia en la transmisión a Occidente de prácticas de magia y oráculo de tipo oriental.

En cuanto a los centros o ciudades estrictamente fenicias destaca el estudio de P. Swiggers sobre la historia política y económica de Byblos a principios del siglo XIV a.C. a partir de las cartas de El Amarna. A su vez, R. Echt presenta un grupo de objetos de marfil descubiertos entre otros extraordinarios hallazgos en el palacio de Kamid el-Loz, los cuales formaron parte de un tesoro real de la primera mitad del siglo XIV a.C. Con ello, el autor pretende resaltar la originalidad y total autonomía del artesanado fenicio ya durante el segundo milenio a.C.

En el campo de estudio de los textos antiguos, E. Lipinski incide de nuevo en el conocido pasaje 27 de Ezequiel para discutir la grandeza de Tiro y de las diversas naciones que contribuyeron a su poderío comercial. Por su parte, H. Limet revisa los textos de Mari de la época de la primera dinastía de Babilonia, que hacen referencia a los puertos levantinos de Ugarit y Byblos. Los textos asirios demostrarían, según G. Kestemont, que el comercio fenicio del primer milenio a.C. no habría sido exclusivamente marítimo, sino también terrestre. Así, la noticia referente a una importante presencia fenicia en el norte de Siria postularía un deseo, por parte de Tiro y Sidón, de asegurarse durante los siglos X-VIII a.C. el control de las principales rutas terrestres que enlazaban el golfo de Alejandreta con el Éufrates en dirección a Armenia, mediante instalaciones comerciales en el Eufrates. Dicho control por vía terrestre parece haber sufrido una involución a finales del siglo IX a.C., a raíz del creciente poderío político de los centros arameos de Hamat y Damasco, desapareciendo definitivamente como consecuencia de la reorganización política de los sargónidas. A juicio de Kestemont ello explicaría la influencia fenicia detectada hace tiempo y no suficientemente explicada en el arte de Luristán y en el célebre tesoro de Ziwiyé.

E. Warmenbol y M. van Loon aluden a aspectos de iconografía y epigrafía fenicias sobre la base de una estatuilla de Sefire y del sarcófago de Aḥiram de Byblos. S. Galle centra su comunicación en la circulación monetaria fenicia y sus cambios e influencias antes y después de Alejandro Magno.

En el ámbito de la arquitectura y a propósito de la publicación de una tumba real micénica de h. 1500 a.C. hallada en Thorikos, J. Servais advierte contra el peligro de establecer paralelos entre la arquitectura funeraria micénica y ugarítica. Por su parte, M. Trokay preconiza una influencia cassita transmitida por mediación de Byblos sobre la orfebrería chipriota, al tiempo que K. de Mulder advierte elementos levantinos en la arquitectura de los santuarios chipriotas del Bronce Reciente.

Por último, C. Tzavellas-Bonnet subraya el origen oriental del Herakles griego en su doble vertiente de dios/héroe a través de los testimonios más antiguos provenientes de Creta y F. Vandenberghe analiza con prudencia la influencia fenicia sobre la coroplástica chipriota de los siglos VIII-V a.C.

The Spanish Archaeological Mission of the Foundation Durán-Vall Llosera in the Sudan: 1978-1981.

V.M. Fernández - Madrid

The cultural Foundation Durán-Vall Llosera (S. Pedro de Premiá, Barcelona) has sponsored up to now four field archaeological campaigns around the small centre of Abri (Northern Prov., Sudan) from 1978 to 1981. The Spanish teams (from the Univ. of Madrid-Complutense) have investigated Nubian cemeteries from the Kerma Period (*ca.* 1750-1600 B.C.) up to the medieval (Christian) times. The work seasons were in Jan.-

Feb. 1978, Dec. 1978-Feb. 1979, Dec. 1979-Jan. 1980 and Jan.-Feb. 1981; Prof. Martín Almagro was appointed Director General of the Mission and the field tasks were carried out by Fernando Fernández Gómez, Diego Oliva and Victor M. Fernández. The latter was in charge of excavating the big Meroitic cemetery of Amīr 'Abdallāh and the small Kerma cemetery at the same place. Fernando Fernández began the works on the site in 1978 and Diego Oliva dug on Christian, X-Group and Pharaonic remains at the nearby site of Amara in 1978-79.

The oldest site recorded by the Mission in Abri was the Kerma cemetery of forty graves, excavated in 1981 by the author. The Kerma culture flourished in the Northern part of Upper Nubia, between the Second and the Fourth Cataracts, during the third and second millennia B.C. It was first discovered and studied by the great Egyptologist (and father of Nubiology) G.A. Reisner (1923), during the excavation of its greatest centre at the present town of Kerma. Unfortunately, the findings and part of the site recorded all belonged to the Classic phase of the culture (*ca.* 1750-1580 B.C.) and for long this biased picture prevailed up to the University of Lille excavations at Sai island in the seventies. After the work of synthesis of B. Gratien (1978), the period is accurately seriated in three phases: Ancient (*ca.* 3000-2000 B.C.), Middle (2000-1750 B.C.) and Classic Kerma, with its characteristic funerary patterns and culture.

The small site of Abri has two conspicuous stages, A with some features transitional between Middle and Classic, and B clearly provided with the Classic Kerma type-fossils (the characteristic blacktopped beakers). In this way, our dig has endorsed the Sai results, in the same manner as did the recent Swiss excavations at Kerma itself. The unusual conditions of preservation of our site led us to place great emphasis on the anthropological aspects of the funerary rituals, ascertaining the statistical association between the females and the richer grave goods, and the sex-dissociation which relates to the position and kinds of necklaces. Another not so well established distinction refers to the positioning of arms and legs, and the place of deposition of red ochre on different parts of the body in men and women. An attempt to explain the possible kinship relations between the living population was also made, and the previous French survey of the area gave rise to an approach to the likely settlement and to some factors controlling site location (river floods).

On the other hand, the excavation of the big cemetery of Meroitic date, some 300 m. to the south, showed completely different characteristics. There were 377 graves and 208 pottery and bronze vessels were recovered from them. This set of artefact-type categories very soon and in the course of field work proved to be specific to a previously unknown Nubian culture, defining for the first time the early Meroitic facies in Northern Nubia (III-I centuries B.C.). The Meroitic epoch in Southern Egypt and the Sudan represented the summit of Nubian power in all the periods. It began when the capital of the kingdom of Kush moved from Napata, in the Fourth Cataract, to Meroe, between the Fifth and the Sixth in the area of the modern town of Shendi. During eight centuries (IV B.C.-IV A.D.) the royal Dynasty that sprang from the old Napatan monarchs of obscure origins ruled an immense country from that seat. We know the names of many of them, written in their tombs with an up to now only partially deciphered scripture, but most of their kingdom is archaeologically unknown.

The exception is Lower Nubia (1st-2nd Cataracts), intensively investigated since the beginnings of this century and finally exhausted (and not only for the Archaeology) in the sixties when the completion of the Aswan High Dam and the flooding to full depth of Lake Nasser in 1972 took place. Eminent archaeologists and Egyptologists (Reisner, Griffith, Randall-MacIver, Woolley, etc.) spent long and hard field seasons there throwing light on the history of the area, and the famous Meroitic cemeteries and settlements of Faras, Karanog, Gebbel Adda, Qasr Ibrim, etc. explained a flourishing and rich culture, developed during the I-IV centuries A.D. An idiosyncratic, richly decorated pottery, now exhibited in the most important museums, was its type-fossil.

There has been much discussion about the date of beginning of this culture, it now being clear that Lower Nubia was almost empty of human occupation during the first millennium B.C. and that the Meroites

repopulated the area throughout the first century A.D. The archaeological fact is that very few remains have been found belonging to the preceding period, yet some historians believe the contrary on the basis of written records and temples from that time. Whatever it may be, the ethnical and cultural origin of the Lower Nubia Meroites was the real crux of the matter.

The excavation of Amīr 'Abdallāh cemetery can be the starting point to solve the problem, since it shows an older Meroitic facies in an area immediately to the south of Lower Nubia. All its cultural traits are in the phylum of the typical and well known late Meroitic types. The funerary ritual has not significant differences; the classical, from pharaonic times, threefold division was then in use: axial chamber, lateral chamber and single-niche graves. The first phase of the cemetery was built exclusively of western axial-chambered tombs, following the standard rules of Napata and Meroe, and no social stratification is apparent in the structures or the grave goods. Later on, these big graves were reduced in dimensions and the chambers orientated to the east, perhaps as a functional means to avoid plundering, and the lower strata of the population deserved a poorer burial in lateral chambers and single pits. This pattern has been detected in Meroitic burial grounds of all times.

The pottery vases from the cemetery have been classified in four types: hand-made impressed or incised black ware (phases A and B), wheel-made band-painted burnished ware (B), Hellenistic imitation wheel-made ware (B) and Aswan pink ware (end of phase B). A few archaic vessels of Napatan inspiration were also found. Painted decoration is very simple, if comparing with the exuberant patterns of Lower Nubia, but the shape and general character of these vessels are similar to the ones registered in the early phases of Faras and other sites, as Griffith correctly remarked long ago. The Hellenistic jars and amphorae show a clear antecedent of late Meroitic painted decoration, and the Aswan ware is prototypical of the later and much more abundant vases from the North, pointing out the end of the site sometime in the first century B.C., perhaps after the Petronius' Roman raid on Napata (23 B.C.).

Amīr 'Abdallāh, although being the greatest up to now, is not the only known site of this period. Assemblages from Qasr Ibrim (W.Y. Adams, Cambridge-Kentucky expedition), Irki Saab and Dawki Dawi (A. Vila, French-Sudanese Unit), Soleb (M. Schiff Giorgini, U. di Pisa), and Kerma (Ch. Bonnet, Swiss Mission), discovered during recent years, all show the same early Meroitic facies, filling the historical gap in the area and indicating the southern origin of the Lower Nubia settlers.

The roots of this early Meroitic people of the North are still hard to elucidate. The abundance of hand-made black impressed ware, specially in the early stages (*ca.* 300-150 B.C.) suggests a more southerly point of departure, the famous site of Jebel Moya in Central Sudan being the nearest parallel. The area between the Second and Fourth Cataracts was probably deserted in the VI century B.C. after the historically known raid of Psamtik II (591 B.C.) and the Napatan culture seemed to vanish. The new riverain settlers in the III century were early Meroitic in character and perhaps came from an intermediate area, between the Meroitic North and the centres of the Butana plain (Northern Kordofan?).

Literature

- Fernández, F.; Oliva, D.; Fernández, V.M. In press: "Excavations at the Meroitic cemetery of Emir Abdallah (Abri, Northern Prov., Sudan). Preliminary report 1978", *KUSH* (Khartoum).
- Fernández, V.M. 1979: "Rapport sur la poterie du Cimetière méroïtique d'Emir Abdallah", *Bulletin de liaison du Groupe International d'Étude de la céramique égyptienne*, IV, 14-15 (I.F.A.O. Paris-Cairo).
- 1980a: "Excavations at the Meroitic... Some aspects of the pottery and its distribution", *Meroitic Newsletter*, 20, 13-22 (C.N.R.S. Paris).
- 1980b: "The Meroitic cemetery of... A preliminary outline of the funerary patterns", *4. Internationale*

- Tagung für meroitische Forschungen, 23. bis 30. November 1980 in Berlin.* Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin (*Meroitic* 7, in press).
- 1981: "La Misión Arqueológica Española en El Sudán", *Revista de Arqueología*, 3, 18-25 (Madrid).
- 1982: "El cementerio Kerma de Abri-Amir Abdallah (Prov. del Norte). Excavaciones de la Misión Arqueológica Española en El Sudán", *Trabajos de Prehistoria*, 39, 279-334 (Madrid).
- 1983a: *La cultura alto-meroítica del Norte de Nubia (Evolución de la cultura material y el ritual funerario en el Norte de Nubia del siglo III al I a.C.: la necrópolis de Amir Abdallah)*. Doctoral Dissertation submitted to the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, June 1983.
- 1983b: "Spanish Archaeological Mission", A.L. Kelley (Ed.), *Papers of the Pottery Workshop. Third International Congress of Egyptology*. Toronto.
- In press (a): "Early Meroitic in Northern Nubia", *Society for Nubian Studies. Fifth International Conference*. Heidelberg, 20-25 September 1982.
- In press (b): "A new Kerma site in Abri (Northern Province, Sudan)", *Society for Nubian Studies. Fifth International Conference*. Heidelberg, 20-25 September 1982.
- Fernández, V.M.; Hainsworth, M. 1981: "Un grafito meroítico sobre cerámica, de la necrópolis de Emir Abdallah (Sudán)", *Meroitic Newsletter*, 21, 27-28 (C.N.R.S. Paris).

La expresión adverbial *šḥwr šḥwr* y su campo semántico

J. Ribera - Barcelona

La expresión adverbial aramea *šḥwr šḥwr*, que pertenece a la radical *šḥr*, es patrimonio del semítico común. Aparece ya en acadio el vocablo *saḥāru* con el significado básico de "volverse, rodear"¹. El ugarítico, en cambio, sobre este radical no nos proporciona ningún elemento orientador puesto que lo encontramos formando parte de un nombre propio, *bn šḥr*, sin poder afirmar con certeza cuál sea su verdadero sentido². Sin embargo, las glosas cananeas de El-Amarna atestiguan su existencia con el significado genérico de "volver". Igualmente el término *šḥrt* lo hallamos en una inscripción fenicia del s. VIII a.C., pero con el sentido específico de "comerciante" que conservará el púnico y el hebreo mishnico³. El hebreo bíblico, por su parte, emplea esta raíz, según parece, tanto en sentido genérico de "ir de acá para allá" (cf. Gn 42,34; Jr 14,18) como en el concreto de "traficante, mercader ambulante", especialmente en la función nominal del participio (cf. Gn 23,16)⁴.

Por otra parte, no debe confundirse el campo semántico de *šḥr* con el de otra raíz homónima, pero distinta en su origen. Se trata de la palabra acádica *sāḥīru* que coincide semánticamente con la radical árabe

1. Según Lieberman *saḥāru* procedería del sumerio *saḥir/saḥarrum* con el significado de "montón de paja", cf. *The Sumerian loanwords in Old Babylonian Akkadian*. Harvard 1977, p. 451. Cf. también L. Cagni, *Crestomazia Accadica*. Roma 1971, p. 355, donde según el autor la acepción de *saḥaru* sería "volverse atrás". S.A. Kaufman en su obra *The Akkadian influences on Aramaic*. Chicago 1974, no indica la relación de esta palabra con el radical arameo *šḥr*; menciona, en cambio, los términos *saḥertu* "cerco amurallado, palacio" y *siḥḥaru* "jofaina", cf. pp. 90-91.

2. F. Gröndhal en *Die Personennamen der Texte aus Ugarit*. Roma 1967, p. 184 supone que debe interpretarse según el radical *šḥr* "volverse".

3. Cf. M.J. Fuentes, *Vocabulario Fenicio*. Barcelona 1980, pp.185-186. Jean-Hoftijzer, *DISO*, p.192, confunden el púnico con el fenicio.

4. Cf. F. Brown-S.R. Driver-Ch. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford 1907, p.695.

šhr en el sentido de "hechizar, mago" y que en sud-arábigo significa "amuleto"⁵. Probablemente *šhr* sería la raíz hebrea paralela, en su acepción genérica de "buscar, indagar", lo cual nos revelaría su origen fonéticamente distinto con respecto a la anterior.

Los primeros vestigios arameos de la raíz *šhr* los hallamos en una de las inscripciones de Sefire (III Sefire, líneas 7-8) de la primera mitad del s. VIII a.C., donde se emplea como sustantivo, *šhrty*, y que suele traducirse por "mi entorno, mi vecindad": *wkl mlky' zy šhrty* "y todos los reyes de mi vecindad"; y en la línea 19: *wmlkn zy šhrty* "y los reyes de mi circunscripción"⁶. La ausencia de este radical en el arameo bíblico no es significativa por tratarse de un texto muy reducido que no abarca ni mucho menos todo el léxico del arameo imperial.

En cambio, los textos de Qumrán la usan con bastante frecuencia tanto en forma verbal como adverbial, que es la que más nos importa. En su función verbal conserva el sentido básico de "ir alrededor, viajar" (cf. 5QJN ar frag. 1, col. II,3,4,5; 1QapGen 21,15,16,17,18). También la forma participial mantiene este significado (cf. 4QEnAstr^b frag. 23,6). Pero lo que más nos llama la atención es que por primera vez en los textos qumránicos aparece el uso de la expresión adverbial *šhwr šhwr* con la variante gráfica *swšr šhwr* (cf. 5QJN ar frag. 1, col. I,1; 2QNJ ar frag. 1,2; 4QLv ar frag. 2,2), en este último caso traduciendo literalmente el vocablo hebreo *sabbib* de Lv 16,18⁷. El hecho, empero, de que por primera vez aparezca esta expresión adverbial en su forma reiterativa en Qumrán no puede inducir necesariamente a la conclusión de que su uso se iniciara en esta época. Tenemos indicios indirectos que supondrían la existencia de este sintagma en épocas anteriores. Si constatamos, como veremos seguidamente, que en los targumin oficiales de Onqelos y Jonatán ben Uzziel la expresión *šhwr šhwr* traduce literalmente el adverbio hebreo *sabbib*, advertiremos que en la lengua bíblica *sabbib* sólo empieza a usarse en forma repetida a partir de Ezequiel (cf. Ez 37,2; 40,5,14,16, etc.) y Crónicas (2 Cr 4,3), que son libros con claro influjo arameo⁸. Por consiguiente, detrás del adverbio hebreo repetido *sabbib sabbib* podría perfectamente entenderse una imitación aramaizante de *šhwr šhwr*, lo cual nos llevaría a la existencia de esta expresión aramea ya en el s. V a.C.

En la traducción aramea de Onqelos y del targum a los Profetas la radical *šhr* se emplea en función nominal, verbal y adverbial, manteniendo el sentido genérico antiguo de "ir alrededor, girar"⁹. Tanto la forma nominal *šhuranut* (cf. Jc 7,18), *šhrame* (cf. Jr 48,17) como la adverbial *sešor sešor* (cf. Onq. Gn 23,17; Tj Jc 7,21; Is 49,18, etc.) son exclusivas de estos targumin y del targum samaritano (cf. *šhrt* en Gn 35,5; Nm 16,24,27...), mientras el targum palestinese reemplaza la expresión *šhwr šhwr* por *hšwr hšwr*, presente también esta última en el hebreo mishnico. Sin embargo, el targum palestinese conserva en alguna ocasión la forma verbal de *šhr* (cf. N Gn 49,17) en su sentido básico de "dar vueltas". También el arameo cristiano de Palestina emplea otro radical (*hgwl hgwl*) para el adverbio "alrededor"; y lo mismo sucede en la Peshitta (*kd hdr' hdry*)¹⁰.

Sólo en Shabbat 13a del Talmud Babilónico, que a su vez depende en este caso del comentario midráshico del Génesis Rabbah (Nm 6,1-3), hallamos también la expresión *šhwr šhwr*, que probablemente no

5. Cf. Kaufman, *op. cit.*, p.90, y J.C. Biella, *Dictionary of old Arabic Sabeian dialect*. Harvard 1982, p. 504, donde Biella no distingue las dos acepciones de *šhr*.

6. Cf. Donner-Röllig, *KAI*, vol. II, p.268.

7. Cf. J. Fitzmyer, *A manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts*. Roma 1978, en las referencias de la p. 330, y del mismo autor, "The Targum of Leviticus from Qumran Cave 4", en *Maarav* 1(1978)11, y *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire*. Roma 1967, p.111.

8. Sobre el influjo del arameo en el hebreo bíblico tardío cf. M. Hadas-Lebel, *Histoire de la langue hébraïque*. Paris 1977, pp.99-103.

9. En su forma causativa *šhr* asimila también el significado tardío de "sentarse a la mesa", que se da al vocablo *sbb* en el hebreo postexílico (cf. Cant 1,12) y postbíblico (cf. Eclo 9,9). Asimismo es peculiar de los targumin oficiales el término *šhwr* "mercancía" (cf. Onq Gn 23,16), tomado también del hebreo bíblico tardío (Ez 27,15). Cf. A. Tal, *The language of the targumim of the former Prophets...* Tel Aviv 1975, pp. 173,165. Cf. también M. Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim...* Nueva York 1950, p. 971.

10. Cf. Tal, *op. cit.*, pp. 21, 26-27.

es una expresión propia del arameo babilónico sino que, perteneciente a otra área del arameo, ha sido introducida en este texto de índole mixta¹¹. El mandaico conserva todavía en su forma verbal el significado primitivo de "ir alrededor, recorrer", cuando ya en siríaco ha tomado el sentido específico de "mendigar"¹².

De estas breves notas podemos concluir que el radical *šhr* a partir de su acepción básica de "volverse, rodear", acuña en época más o menos avanzada del arameo clásico la expresión adverbial intensiva *sehor sehor* "alrededor", que empleará el arameo predialectal de qumrán y de los targumin oficiales en Palestina. Más tarde desaparecerá esta forma para ser sustituida por otras expresiones similares, pero de distinta raíz. La radical *šhr* tomará a su vez sentidos específicos entre los que sobresalen el de "mercader ambulante" y "mendigar".

11. Cf. Tal, *op. cit.*, p. 27, nota 76.

12. Cf. E.S. Drower-R. Macuch, *A Mandaic Dictionary*. Oxford 1961, p.320.

On the nature of West-Semitic writing systems*

P. Swiggers - Leuven

Ignace Gelb's foundation-laying work *A Study of Writing* makes the claim that West-Semitic writing systems are syllabic¹. This claim had already been made before, e.g. by Praetorius², Yeivin³, Poebel⁴ (all mentioned by Gelb)⁵, and also by Meillet and Vendryes⁶. However, Gelb has offered the most coherent defense (integrated within a comparative theory of the evolution of writing) of the thesis that West-Semitic writing is syllabic. Gelb's arguments are based on the resemblance between Semitic and Egyptian writing systems:

"Once the identity of the Egyptian and Semitic systems is placed beyond the pale of doubt, the inevitable conclusion must be drawn that either they all represent alphabets, as is generally accepted, or syllabaries, as proposed in this study. Therefore, all the evidence brought together above in favour of the syllabic character of the Egyptian writing⁷ may be used for the Semitic writing; and vice versa, whatever evidence can be found to prove the syllabic character of the Semitic writing should tend to support the conclusions drawn above in respect to Egyptian (...) Since all the cases discussed above in the Semitic and cuneiform writings are identical in structure, the respective transliterations should be identical, that is, either syllabic or alphabetic. In view of the fact that the

* Research for this article has been supported by the Belgian National Science Foundation (N.F.W.O.)

1. I.J. Gelb, *A Study of Writing*. Chicago 1952 (1963²), pp. 122-153.

2. F. Praetorius, *Ueber den Ursprung des kanaänischen Alphabets*. Berlin 1906, p. 1.

3. S. Yeivin, "The Sign 3 and the True Nature of the Early Alphabets", *Archiv Orientalní* 4(1932)71-78.

4. A. Poebel, *Studies in Akkadian Grammar*. Chicago 1939, pp. 61-64.

5. I.J. Gelb, *A Study of Writing*, p. 152 and pp. 289-290 note 63.

6. A. Meillet-J. Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*. Paris 1924, p. 26.

7. See I.J. Gelb, *A Study of Writing*, pp. 72-81.

cuneiform writing is definitely syllabic, the resulting conclusion is that the identical Semitic spellings should also be considered syllabic and not alphabetic."⁸

Gelb's position –criticized by, among others, Stanislav Segert⁹– is in total disagreement with the epigraphist's view¹⁰ on West-Semitic writing as a consonantal writing system (with some consonants marking, at times, a vowel). Admittedly, Gelb's thesis contains some flaws, in that it puts on a par the Ethiopic syllabic script with the West-Semitic writing systems¹¹, but it also seems that scholars have often criticized the thesis without taking into account its theoretical basis. The purpose of this article is to examine the theoretical basis of Gelb's position.

Graphemic theories necessarily imply a semiotic point of view¹², since in dealing with written notations, scholars have to make clear the status of these signs. It seems to us that Gelb's characterization of West-Semitic writing as syllabic must be understood in the light of his semiotic views on the graphemic system of the West-Semitic languages, and his views on graphic representation in general.

In order to understand Gelb's views, it will be necessary to make a preliminary distinction between two semiotic relations, viz. the relation of *denotation* and the relation of *standing for*. The relation of denotation (*x denotes Y*) is a direct and, ideally, bi-unique and unequivocal relation between a *signans* (the mark) and a *signatum* (the thing marked). As a good example, we can mention the symbols of the International Phonetic Alphabet as used for the phonetic notation of a particular language. On the other hand, the relation of standing for (*x stands for Y*)¹³ is a mediated, non bi-unique and, possibly, equivocal relation between a given symbol and its applicational field (i.e. the virtually symbolized instances of the symbol). If we look at Gelb's definition of his technical terms, we can notice that his theory hinges on the standing-for relation of graphic signs: the sign is defined as "a conventionally used *Symbol* forming part of a system, such as a word in a system of signs called 'language', or a written mark in a system of signs called 'writing'. In a narrow sense only a written mark"¹⁴. Also, the entry "*Syllabary or Syllabic writing*" of Gelb's "Terminology of Writing"¹⁵ clearly attests this semiotic point of view: "A writing in which a sign normally stands for one or more syllables of the language. Thus, in Sumerian, one sign has the syllabic value *ba*, another *ri* or *dal*, still another *bala*"¹⁶.

Adopting this "standing-for" view, one is justified in characterizing the West-Semitic writing systems as syllabic: as a matter of fact, the letters of the Ugaritic, Phoenician, Aramaic, Moabitic and Hebrew notation systems (as used in epigraphical texts)¹⁷ include among their values the sequence *Consonant + Vowel*, or *Doubled Consonant + Vowel*¹⁸. As such, we can say that in these cases the graphic signs stand for a syllable. However, if one adopts the "denotation" view, it becomes clear that the letters of the West-Semitic notation systems mostly denote a single consonant. In some cases, they denote a doubled consonant, or, much more rarely, a vowel. In none of these cases however, the signs can be interpreted as denoting syllables.

To conclude, the characterization of notation systems strongly depends on the semiotic interpretation of the nature of graphic signs. Within different semiotic views, the same empirical data will be characterized in a divergent way.

8. I.J. Gelb, *op. cit.*, pp. 147-148 and p. 149. As will be clear, Gelb includes among the Semitic writing systems the cuneiform scripts used for the notation of a Semitic language.

9. S. Segert, "Charakter des westsemitischen Alphabets, eine Entgegnung an Ignace J. Gelb", *Archiv Orientalní* 26 (1958)243-247, and "Charakter des westsemitischen Alphabets", *Archiv Orientalní* 26(1958)657-659.

10. See e.g. G.R. Driver, *Semitic Writing. From Pictograph to Alphabet* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy). London 1948, p. 78 and p. 127.

11. In this view, the West-Semitic writing systems are characterized as systems of syllabic signs each expressing a consonant plus any vowel (see I.J. Gelb, *A Study of Writing*, p. 152). This of course raises the (empirical) problem to distinguish between signs expressing a consonant and signs expressing a consonant plus an undetermined vowel (i.e. any vowel occurring within the language in question). Note also the following passage in I.J. Gelb, *A Study of Writing*, p. VI-VII: "In order to prevent misunderstanding on the part of some linguists it should be pointed out that the term 'syllabic sign' is used here to denote a unit of writing which must contain

a vowel (either by itself or flanked by consonants in front or in back of it) and which may or may not contain prosodic features (such as stress, tone, quantity, etc.); this definition in the field of writing differs, therefore, from that of a syllable, taken by some linguists to denote a speech unit which is characterized in the first place by prosodic features and which may or may not contain a vowel."

12. See G.L. Trager, "Writing and Writing Systems", in *Current Trends in Linguistics* (ed. by Th. A. Sebeok), vol. 12: *Linguistics and Adjacent Arts and Sciences*. The Hague-Paris 1974, pp. 373-496.

13. The Latin term corresponding to the English gerund "standing for" is *suppositio*. This notion played a very important role in medieval grammar and philosophy of language. For a few notes on the relation of *suppositio*, see my remarks in *Studies in Language* 4(1980)426-432.

14. I.J. Gelb, *A Study of Writing*, pp. 252-253.

15. I.J. Gelb, *op. cit.*, pp. 248-253.

16. I.J. Gelb, *op. cit.*, p. 253.

17. I also include texts written on pottery and on papyri, but I exclude the Massoretic script, which involves a system of vowel notation.

18. Other values of these letters are: single consonant (without a vowel following the consonant), and (long) vowel (this is the case, rarely attested in the oldest epigraphic texts, of the *mātres lectionis*). For a comprehensive analysis of one of the West-Semitic writing systems, see P. Swiggers, "The Notation System of the Old Aramaic Inscriptions", *Archiv Orientalni* 51(1983)378-381.

"Tu sei mio fratello ed io sono tua sorella" (KTU 1.18 I 24)

P. Xella - Roma

Nel poema ugaritico di Danil e Aqhat, uno dei momenti-chiave del racconto mitico è certamente rappresentato dal rifiuto del protagonista di consegnare alla dea Anat il suo meraviglioso arco "composito", dono di Kothar¹. Dopo che il giovane cacciatore ha respinto tutte le offerte di Anat, dalle ricchezze al privilegio di una vita simile forse² a quella degli dèi, accettando pragmaticamente la propria sorte mortale³, la dea furibonda si reca da El, minacciando anche lui con un violento discorso di vendetta. Il mite El non si opporrà all'ira di Anat, che metterà così in opera il suo piano: l'esito finale sarà tragico, con l'assassinio di Aqhat ad opera del sicario Yatpan, nel corso di una partita di caccia.

È proprio per invitare Aqhat ad una caccia comune e preparare così la tragica imboscata, che Anat si ripresenta nuovamente al giovane dopo la scena del rifiuto, usando questa volta parole amichevoli e accattivanti.

Malgrado il contesto piuttosto danneggiato, è chiaro che la dea propone ad Aqhat di andare insieme a caccia nel territorio circostante la città di *ablm*⁴. A questo punto si pone l'allocuzione di Anat, che impiega un'espressione caratteristica, in cui sembra dichiarare che lei ed Aqhat sono fratello e sorella. I versi in questione (nella trascrizione di KTU) sono i seguenti:

KTU 1.18 I 22ss.

w šhq.blt [nt]

²³[išu.] ḡh.w iṣḥ

Rise allora la Vergine Anat

alzò la sua voce e disse:

1. Sull'episodio cf. dello scrivente "L'épisode de Dnil et Kothar KTU 1.17 (=CTA 17) v 1-31 et Gen XVIII 1-16", *VT* 28(1978)483-88.

2. Si veda da ultimo H. Cazelles, "Quelle vie la déesse Anat proposait-elle au jeune chasseur Aqhat?", *AAS* 29-30(1979-80 = 1982)181-183.

3. Cf. P. Xella, "Il re, la morte e gli antenati nella Siria antica", in U. Bianchi-M.J. Vermaseren (edd.), *La soteriologia dei culti orientali nell'Impero romano*. Leiden 1982, pp. 620ss.

4. Cf. E.C. McLaurin, "QRT-'ABLM", *PEQ* 120(1978)113-114.

šm^c .m[^c.l a] 24[^cht.ğ]zr
at.ah.w an.ā[^chtk]

–Ascolta, di grazia, o eroe Aqhat!
Tu sei mio fratello ed io sono tua sorella...

La storia degli studi sul mito di Aqhat ha registrato fino ad oggi un accordo pressoché generale, sia nella restituzione della linea finale con le parole “fratello”/“sorella”, sia nell’interpretazione dell’espressione, intesa nei termini di una dichiarazione d’amore quasi formale, se non addirittura di un’esplicita proposta nuziale da parte della dea⁵.

È stato merito di H.H.P. Dressler⁶ avere ristudiato a fondo l’intero problema da tutte le angolazioni, in un articolo in cui l’Autore ha vagliato accuratamente tutta la documentazione vicino-orientale solitamente adottata a sostegno dell’interpretazione del discorso di Anat in chiave “amorosa” o “nuziale”. Le conclusioni del suo studio, esauriente e convincente, sono le seguenti: “There is no evidence that the phrase “you are my brother and I am your sister” is either a “formal declaration of love” or a “formal proposal of marriage” in the literature of the ancient Near East. The terms “brother” and “sister” are terms of affection for lovers only in Sumerian and Aegyptian love songs”.⁷

Proprio partendo dai risultati di questa sua verifica e dalla indimostrabilità dell’accezione “amorosa” o “nuziale” dei termini “fratello”/“sorella” nel discorso di Anat, il Dressler ha poi proposto una diversa traduzione ed interpretazione della linea, in cui *at* non è più inteso come pronome personale maschile di II persona, ma come un imperativo di *atw* “to come”; il verso suonerebbe dunque: “Come, o brother, and myself will...”.⁸ Queste parole introdurrebbero il successivo invito rivolto ad Aqhat, a recarsi insieme a caccia presso *ablm*. Come ulteriore argomento a favore della propria proposta, il Dressler ha sottolineato la difficoltà epigrafica di integrare *ah^ctk* alla fine della linea 24.

A ben vedere, mentre le conclusioni generali dello studio di Dressler appaiono solide e indiscutibili, l’argomentazione epigrafica non è altrettanto cogente: allo stato attuale della tavoletta, è francamente impossibile avere un’idea dello spazio disponibile alla fine della linea 24, che pare semmai piuttosto ampio⁹. Va inoltre tenuto conto del fatto che lo stesso Autore si proponeva soprattutto di invalidare l’interpretazione tradizionale dell’espressione in chiave “amorosa”, attribuendo esplicitamente alla sua successiva proposta di lettura e traduzione un carattere del tutto interlocutorio ed ipotetico¹⁰.

Una volta appurato che qui Anat non dichiara il proprio amore ad Aqhat, né tanto meno gli rivolge proposte nuziali, è opportuno allora chiedersi se sia proprio necessario reinterpretare la linea anche filologicamente, eliminando i termini “fratello”/“sorella” in parallelo, per la sola ragione di non trovare una spiegazione alternativa convincente. Se si parte dunque dal presupposto che il testo debba continuare a leggersi e a tradursi come sempre (ridimensionate le difficoltà epigrafiche), una valutazione del contesto e della particolare situazione descritta indirizza a nostro avviso verso un’interpretazione diversa, che afferisce idealmente ad un modulare espressivo che trova ampi riscontri nella coeva documentazione vicino-orientale di carattere epistolare e legale.

Nell’episodio descritto infatti una dea è sul punto di proporre ad un mortale di cacciare insieme, cioè lo eleva di fatto al suo livello; fatto ancor più significativo, se si considera che tale *parità* è sancita in funzione dell’attività venatoria, tradizionalmente carica di significati simbolici e di prestigio, pertinente per eccellenza a re, principi e nobili¹¹.

5. Cf. tra gli altri J.C. de Moor, “Frustrula Ugaritica”, *JNES* 24(1965)361; M. Dijkstra-J.C. de Moor, “Problematical Passages in the Legend of Aqhātu”, *UF* 7(1975)194.

6. H.H.P. Dressler, “The Metamorphosis of a Lacuna. Is *at.ah.wan...* a Proposal of Marriage?”, *UF* 11(1979)211-217.

7. Id., *ibidem*, p. 216.

8. Id., *ibidem*, p. 217.

9. Cf. la fotografia in *CTA* II, Pl. XXVIII. Non è del resto casuale che tutte le più recenti riedizioni del testo (da Gibson a Del Olmo Lete, senza contare la trascrizione di KTU) restituiscano la linea nel modo tradizionale.

10. Dressler, *op. cit.*, p. 217.

11. Cf. P. Xella, *Problemi del mito nel Vicino Oriente antico*. Napoli 1976, pp. 89ss.

Dichiarando formalmente e solennemente che lei ed Aqhat sono sorella e fratello, Anat non fa altro che conformarsi ad una terminologia stereotipa e convenzionale nella diplomazia dell'epoca, in cui la nozione di "fratellanza" incarna il modello ideale in cui si traduce la parità di rango e la reciprocità¹². Su tali tematiche si è avuto il recente studio di P. Kalluveettil¹³, che ha analizzato in dettaglio l'impiego del termine "fratello" in ambito biblico e vicino-orientale antico. Anche se in tale documentazione, per ragioni di sociologia storica, appare nettamente prevalente l'uso in parallelo di fratello//fratello, essendo in assoluta maggioranza i casi di due interlocutori di sesso maschile, vi sono tuttavia anche dei casi in cui personaggi di sesso diverso usano "fratello" e "sorella" per sancire anche formalmente la parità di rango: celebre è in particolare il caso di Puduḥepa, moglie di Ḫattušili, e del faraone Ramesse II¹⁴.

In conclusione, come aveva in parte giustamente visto anni addietro A.S. Kapelrud¹⁵, la dichiarazione di Anat si pone come logico presupposto formale di quanto verrà descritto subito dopo: una partita di caccia in cui una divinità eleva un uomo al proprio rango, consentendogli di ricoprire —sia pure nel tempo del mito— un ruolo paritetico (ed eccezionale!) di compagno di caccia.

Nel mito filtra così, non sorprendentemente¹⁶, un modulo espressivo "di etichetta" largamente attestato dalla coeva documentazione di carattere diplomatico-epistolare e legale, in cui, attraverso la rivendicazione di una fratellanza, gli interlocutori avevano cura di ribadire negli atti ufficiali la loro effettiva parità di rango.

12. C. Zaccagnini, *Lo scambio dei doni nel Vicino Oriente durante i secoli XV-XIII*. Roma 1973, pp. 108ss.

13. P. Kalluveettil, *Declaration and Covenant* (AnBi 88). Roma 1982, cap. 6, "The Formula 'Brother'", pp. 198-210.

14. Cf. KUB XXI 38: F. Pintore, *Il matrimonio interdinastico nel Vicino Oriente durante i secoli XV-XIII*. Roma 1978, pp. 33ss., in particolare pp. 37ss.

15. A.S. Kapelrud, recensione di A. Van Selms, *Marriage and Family Life in Ugaritic Literature*, *BO* 12(1955)137. Nel senso di una "alleanza" si sono pronunciati A. Caquot e M. Szyner, *Textes Ougaritiques-I. Mythes et Légendes*. Paris 1974, p. 436 n. i; pur essendo sulla via giusta, questa interpretazione non si concilia completamente con i propositi effettivi della dea, la quale, lungi dal voler creare un legame di fraternità, farà nel seguito assassinare Aqhat.

16. Cf. già F.C. Fensham, "Notes on Treaty Terminology in Ugaritic Epics", *UF* 11(1979)265-74.