



**HAL**  
open science

## Eteocypriots

Anna Cannavò

► **To cite this version:**

Anna Cannavò. Eteocypriots. Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Phoenician Culture, I. Historical Characters, 2018, pp.78-79. hal-02746706

**HAL Id: hal-02746706**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02746706>**

Submitted on 19 Jun 2020

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



EDPC

# ENCYCLOPAEDIC DICTIONARY OF PHOENICIAN CULTURE

## I HISTORICAL CHARACTERS

Edited by

ANDREA ERCOLANI and PAOLO XELLA

In collaboration with

UMBERTO LIVADIOTTI and VALENTINA MELCHIORRI



PEETERS

LEUVEN – PARIS – BRISTOL, CT

2018



**EDPC**

Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Phoenician Culture

General Editor

Editorial Board

Editorial Board: *[Faint text]*

*[Faint text]*

Editorial Board

Editorial Board

*[Faint text]*

*[Faint text]*

*[Faint text]*

*[Faint text]*

*[Faint text]*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-90-429-3680-5  
eISBN 978-90-429-3681-2

D/2018/0602/110  
© 2018, Pecters, Bondgenotenlaan 153, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any electronic or mechanical means, including information storage or retrieval devices or systems, without the prior written permission from the publisher, except the quotation of brief passages for review purposes.

the death of his father TABNIT and reigned as coregent with his mother, Emmiashtart. According to that text, he lived for only 14 years, leaving no offspring. His inscription provides other interesting historical information. The expressions used suggest that he died in unclear circumstances, perhaps confirmed by the fact that he was not buried in the royal necropolis together with the other rulers of his dynasty. Moreover, E. claims that, together with his mother, he built several sanctuaries in Sidon, three in the city itself – dedicated to Astarte and ‘Baal of Sidon’ (= \*Eshmun?) – and another located at the “Ydlal-source”, in the suburbs – dedicated to Eshmun, powered by the waters of the \*Awali river (ancient Bostrenus). This last sanctuary had to undergo various modifications and it is not certain that its foundation dates back to this king, who may only have restored an earlier shrine. Also according to the funerary inscription, the king of Persia gave E. and his mother the plain of Sharon, including \*Jaffa and Dor (\*Tel Dor), which were then added to Sidonian territory, in exchange for “the striking deeds” (*lmdt šmt*: line 19) E. had performed for him. Considering that E. was only a youth, it is difficult to interpret the expression as referring to specific actions: it is more plausible to think of generic support and loyalty given to the king by E. and the dynasty to which he belonged.

Xella, P. and Zamora, J. Á. (2005) *ZDPV*, 2005, 119-129; Xella, P. and Zamora, J. Á. (2004) [2005] *BAAL*, 8, 273-299; Xella, P. (2007) *OrNS*, 76, 93-99; Niehr, H. (2013) Die phönizische Inschrift auf dem Sarkophag des Königs Ešmunazor II. aus Sidon (KAI 214) in redaktionsgeschichtlicher und historischer Sicht. In: Loretz, O., Ribichini, S., Watson, W. G. E. and Zamora, J. Á. (eds) *Ritual, religion and reason. Studies in the Ancient World in honour of Paolo Xella*. AOAT 404. Münster, 297-309.

P. XELLA

## ETEOCYPRIOTS

The modern term E. is used for the speakers of a language that has not yet been deciphered, found locally on \*Cyprus, and especially at \*Amathus, between the 8th and 4th cent. BCE and transcribed by means of the local Cypr. syllabary. The term E. is a calque on Homeric “Eteocretans”, literally, “true Cretans” (Gk *ἐτεός*: “true, genuine”), cited in Hom. *Od.* 19,176 and by other classical writers (Str. 10,4,6; Diod. 5,64,1) as an autochthonous population of

\*Crete. The term was first proposed by J. Friedrich in 1932, specifically in relation to the language of some syllabic inscriptions (two of which are digraphic bilingual texts) found in Amathus. The term suggests identifying the speakers of this language, which is neither Greek nor Semitic, with the pre-Gk population of the island. The existence of Gk literary traditions that connect the inhabitants of Amathus with the local mythical person \*Cinyras (Theopomp. *FGrHist* 115 fr. 103) and ascribe an autochthonous origin to them ([Scyl.] 103) supports the aptness of the term, which O. Masson has called “une heureuse suggestion” (*JCS*, 85). However, it does not seem possible to identify a material culture corresponding to an ethnic group that is different from the Cypr. population at the time and presumably autochthonous, either at Amathus or elsewhere. The E. are archaeologically ‘invisible’. For this reason, various doubts have been raised concerning the validity of the hypothesis that Eteocypriot is a language of the pre-Gk population of Cyprus and concerning the chronological and temporal spread of its use. For A. T. Reyes, Eteocypriot is “a phenomenon peculiar to the circumstances of fourth-century Cyprus”, having no connection with the autochthonous element, while for M. Given, Eteocypriot, read in a post-colonial key, should be interpreted in the light of British imperial power in the first half of the 20th century. In fact, Eteocypriot is documented, however sporadically, from the 8th cent. and however much its connection with Amathus is undeniably distinctive, the earliest documentation (from the archaic period) suggests that this language was spread throughout the whole south-west. region of the island (comprising the regions of Amathus, \*Paphos and \*Kourion). It is only in the classical period that Eteocypriot seems to become exclusive and peculiar to Amathus, with indications that the royal power used this language for the purposes of politics and identity.

Linguistic analyses of Eteocypriot have not established any definite affinity with any other known languages. In any case, the corpus is limited, a factor that is a fundamental obstacle to deciphering the language. New readings of previously known inscriptions and new finds are liable to rekindle and modify the terms of the debate.

Friedrich, J. (1932) *Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler*. Berlin, 49-52; Consani, C. (1988) Bilinguismo, diglossia e digrafia nella Grecia antica, I. Considerazioni sulle iscrizioni bilingui di Cipro.

In: Campanile, E., Cardona, G. R. and Lazzeroni, R. (eds) *Bilinguismo e biculturalismo nel mondo antico*. Pisa, 35-60; Reyes, A. T. (1994) *Archaic Cyprus: a study of the textual and archaeological evidence*. Oxford, 13-17; Petii, T. (1997-1998) *AfO*, 44-45, 244-271; Given, M. (1998) *JMedA*, 11, 3-29; Petii, T. (1999) *JMedA*, 12, 108-120; Egetmeyer, M. (2009) *Pasiphae*, 3, 69-90; Steele, P. M. (2013) *A linguistic history of ancient Cyprus*. Cambridge, 99-172; Perna, M. (i.p.) La grande inscription d'Amathonte (ICS 194+195): une nouvelle étude épigraphique. Rapport préliminaire. In: Cannavò, A. and Thély, L. (eds) *Les royaumes de Chypre à l'épreuve de l'histoire*. BCH Suppl. Athens.

A. CANNAVÒ

## ETRUSCANS

Heteronyms: Gk Τυρσηνοί, Τυρρηνοί; Lat. *Tusci*; autonym (transmitted by Dion. Halic. 1,30,3): Rasenna (?).

A people of ancient Italy who, during the 1st mill. BCE, at the end of a long and complex formative process, developed a flourishing urban civilization in the mid-Tyrrhenian region of the Peninsula (Latium, Umbria, Tuscany), as well as in several strategic areas in north. and south. Italy (Emilia Romagna, Campania) [FIG. 36]. Before they became part of the Rom. state, both politically and culturally, the E. succeeded in exerting a deep cultural influence on broad sectors of Italian territory (Serv. A. 11,567; Liv. 1,2; 5,33), chiefly on the Italic populations of Latium (LATINS, Falisci, Sabini). Thanks to their advantageous geographical position (large housing developments close to the coastline, the proximity of rich mineral deposits) and to some social, economic and cultural predispositions (advanced technical knowledge in matters of navigation and all the branches of technical expertise in general, a penchant for commercial exchange), early on the E. came into contact with the civilizations of \*Phoenicia, Greece and \*Magna Graecia. All these exerted a strong cultural influence on them, which they transformed in their own original way (\*Orientalizing and \*Hellenization). These relationships were fostered and at the same time conditioned by the fact that Greeks, PHOENICIANS and other Levantine peoples had already come into contact with the E. well before they began their own colonization towards the W. Yet, the E. were already well settled in the lands of central Italy, on a par with several Italic peoples. As a result, Greeks and Phoenicians were unable to found colonies in the central Mediterr. region further to the N of the Gulf of Naples and \*Sardinia. However, they

were able to establish a cultural and commercial network of relations with the Etr. and Italic communities in Campania and central Italy which controlled vast, rich lands extending towards the sea.

As the classical sources (both literary and historical) refer exclusively to the Greeks and Romans, they illustrate this relationship with the E. and the peoples of the Levant in a very fragmented and completely fortuitous way, i.e. only when others (Greeks and/or Romans) are involved. In spite of these limitations, the written documentation contains some very interesting information for the history of the relationships between the E. and the Phoenicians and the PUNICS. Much of this information goes back to the period when \*Carthage reigned supreme in the central Mediterranean and it refers directly or indirectly to that great North African metropolis.

The most important item of information is reported by Herodotus in the first book of his *Histories* (Hdt. 1,165-167) and refers to the naval battle in the Sea of Sardinia in about 535, with the Greeks of ALALIA (originally from Phocaea) on one side, and the Carthaginians and E. on the other. From a passage in this valuable excerpt by the 'Father of History' we learn that the Etr. city involved in the conflict was \*Caere. We also learn that the Caeretans committed a very grave crime on that occasion by stoning the Phocaeans captured at sea. This is why they were forced to expiate their crime by instituting funereal games in honour of the prisoners they had killed, which were still celebrated in the time of Herodotus. Even if some aspects of this episode are still obscure, it remains an historical event. It indicates the existence of a political and commercial alliance between the Carthaginians and the maritime Etr. cities (especially Caere) which was sealed to counter the initiative of the Phocaeans after the founding of Marseille (ca 600).

In a famous passage in his main political writing, Aristotle (*Pol.* 3,9 [1280a 35]) also alludes to actual trade agreements between E. and Carthaginians. There, he also considers the Etr.-Carthag. treaty as paradigmatic for exclusively commercial inter-ethnic agreements (TREATIES). These agreements regulated commercial exchanges between peoples in contact, above all defining the areas in which navigation for commercial purposes was permitted (or prohibited). This was certainly the nature of the first Rom.-Carthag. agreement, recorded by Polybius (3,22-26), which some historians believe goes back to the earliest years of the republic.