

Slušanschi, Dan

**Anew on the "Etruscan homeland"**

*Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. N, Řada klasická. 2007, vol. 56, iss. N12, pp. [125]-129*

ISBN 978-80-210-4388-6

ISSN 1211-6335

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/114000>

Access Date: 27. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

## ZAHRANIČNÍ PŘEDNÁŠEJÍCÍ NA ÚKS

V této rubrice předkládáme čtenářům písemnou podobu přednášek (eventuálně jejich abstrakty), které na ÚKS proslovili zahraniční hosté. Podobu příspěvků ponecháváme zcela na přednášejících.

DAN SLUŞANSCHI

### **ANEW ON THE ‘ETRUSCAN HOMELAND’**

0. The Tyrrhenian / Etruscan problem is emphatically not to be treated on the same level as the ‘Atlantidic’ or the ‘Nostratic’ ones. Its core and its charm do reside both in palpable, historical forms and in their elusive interpretations. While, for Atlantis, at stake is the myth of ‘greater origins’, and, for the Nostratics, the modern quasi-religious need for ‘ONE origin’, here the whole difficulty of the comes from too hasty prejudice: one should not try and jump to foreseen conclusions, even starting from ancient positive hints, but search for other data and hypotheses which could open new views.

1. Hence, I, for myself, believe A. J. Pfiffig (1998) to be right in trying to maintain a disjunction between the (Italic) Etrusci / Ras(en)na, and the (originary) Tursēnoi / Tyrrheni. This means that we can adopt the fact of the essentially Italic civilization of the Etruscans, ‘fruit of the Italic soil’ (as the Italian scholars prefer to put it), along, with their initially foreign language-stratum, evidently non-Indo-European (pace Vl. Georgiev and others!), coming from elsewhere.

2. Three hypotheses battled, as known, along the time, about this ‘origin’ theme: – the ‘eastern theory’, from Lydia (Herodotus, 1, 94) – the ‘autochthonous theory’ (Dionysius Hal., 1,28,2 sqq.) – the ‘northern theory’ (modern, first put forward by Freret, 1741, then, in the nineteenth century, by Niebuhr, Chierici et al.).

2.1. The ‘autochthonous’ view is a pragmatic one, based on the Etruscan isolation and on their own, autoethnonymic, name Ras(en)na, which, although, may have come from Turs(en)na, due to the drastic reduction (under a harsh initial stress-accent), well attested in the historical evolution of their language. All the same, some further truth lies there, since, if we take the motto ‘what we know is what we see’, the Etruscan civilization is Italic.

2.2. The ‘northern’ hypothesis was only a ‘road-view’, born from the modern archaeological discovery of the northern push of the Etruscans, towards the Alps. They did not come from there, they did, in fact, expand, from Etruria and Umbria, towards the much-coveted plains of the Po valley.

2.3. Then, from where in the East? The Lydian language proved to be no kin of Etruscan, and archaeological Anatolia provides us, so far, with no palpable clue and no written traces of an analogy with the actual Etruscan civilization. The only find belongs not to the Microasiatic mainland, but to an Aegean island, Lemnos (now Limnos): the much-famed ‘warrior stela’, bearing a para-Etruscan inscription, legible, but not wholly understood. The odd thing is that it is, at least, two centuries later than the first Italic Etruscan direct discoveries.

3. The eastern hypothesis proceeds, then, from the wrong question: ‘May Herodotus have been right?’ As to myself, due to the fact that Herodotus, relying heavily on his informers, cannot be ever entirely trusted, a better question would be: ‘Should Herodotus be entirely right?’ Perhaps it would be wiser to look elsewhere, though still to the East, and not to the alluring Anatolian matrix gentium.

4. But where to look for other hints? When I have been working, some years ago, on the completion of a new (hexametrical) Romanian translation of Homer’s epics (1997, 1998), it struck me hard that Odysseus begun his painful travels by an odd route. Instead of faring south, like his more famed companions (Agamemnon, Menelaos, Nestor etc.), he landed, in the first place, north, in the land of the Kikones. So, his journey goes wrong from its start.

4.1. To get to Troy from Greece, by sailing with the dominant winds, you have to take from a safe haven (as was the bay of Iolkos) on a northerly route: that is why the Achaeans touched also Lemnos (with the ensuing misfortune of Philoctetes), before landing in Tenedos, and then camping in the Ilios plain. After winning the war, they had to take a southerly route, by Lesbos and Chios, then west, on some variant, to their lands in Greece. The great chieftains tried and, some of them, succeeded to do so – to their luck or not, that remained to be seen.

4.2. But Odysseus, failing to sail together with Nestor, got into contrary, god-raised, winds and was taken from Tenedos to the ‘Thracian’ coast ‘where the Kikones are’ (Od., i, 39–66). But the Odyssey tells us nothing – as the Cycle does – of an encounter there between Odysseus and Neoptolemus; another hero displeasing the Gods for his rashness, comes there by land. Tempted to plunder *”Ισμαρος*, a city of this tribe, allied to the Troyans (cf. Il., B 846, R 73), the Ithacans committed their first blunder, by not listening to their chieftain, and indulging in their victory and in its feasting, being subsequently overrun by the locals: the morning’s triumph turned into a disastrous evening (A. Heubeck, II, 1992, 25).

4.3. What exactly happened to Odysseus in *”Ισμαρος* is accounted for later, on the occasion of the red and sweet wine taken with him (i, 195–211) and then handy to inebriate the Cyclops (i, 343–374). The Greek hero had received it as a ransom-gift from the local priest of Apollo, *Μάρων*, instead of his and his family’s safety. This is, by the way, the only priest mentioned in the poem (A. Heu-

beck, loc. cit.): his priesthood explains Odysseus' compliance with his prayer, and he was, then, to be a prominent figure linked to the cult of Dionysos (from whom he was supposed to be a descendant and, later, a companion: Hes., fr. 120; Eur., Cycl., 141 sqq.). In later years, a cult was devoted to him, as a spring-god, precisely in Maroneia and in Samothrace.

4.4. The priest must have been a most famed man, since his name is linked with the one of the important historical city of Μαρώνεια (also with Ἰσμαρος?): to me, it is not so easy to ascertain that the anthroponym was derived backwards from any place-name, as it is usually accepted among scholars, since the city was founded by the colonists from Chios, only in the VII<sup>th</sup> century B.C. His name in the Odyssey (i.e. in the VIII<sup>th</sup> century B.C.), and the name of Ἰσμαρος stand both proof to the contrary.

4.5. Whence all my fuss about Μάρων? Because there exists in Etruscan a title maru (A. J. Pfiffig, 1969, 239–240; 294, cf. TLE 133, 137, 171), with the supposed role of a 'public official' ('Beamte'), not fully elucidated to this day. The same Pfiffig tried, hesitantly, to see in him an aedilis ('Aedil?', 1998, 4), but this is contradicted by the fact that there was a whole collegium of these marones (as the Romans took the word – like Virgil's cognomen, whose origins were in Mantua, one third Etruscan), headed by a cepen, or a zilc (/ zilath) (A. J. Pfiffig, 1969, loc.citt.). It is not clear, either, what kind of chiefs were these (praetores, primores?), and their secular and/or religious function remains to be clarified, too.

5. If this Μάρων name and cult was known already to Homer (but wrongly related to Apollo, instead of Dionysos), and, later, we find by the Etruscans a maru title, so honored as to give birth to a cognomen, there could be a shade of a possibility that, like Odysseus in his wanderings, then like Aeneas, the Tyrrhenian, forefathers of the Etruscans, came all the way from the northern Aegean, presumably forcibly expelled – for their most part, who didn't dwell much longer in the northern islands of Samothrace, Lemnos, perhaps also Thasos – to the shores of Italy. With which intermediary stations? Since they didn't write till much later, it is very hard to say, but we could, possibly, take into account the, also somewhat puzzling, question of ἐν Ἀρίμοις (Hom., Il., B 781–783) Typhoeus' fiery dwelling: this legendary volcanic bursting place migrates, throughout the Greek archaic tradition, all along from SW Asia Minor (Lycia / Cilicia) to Sicily (Aetna), and then to the volcanic Lipari (Stromboli) and to Ischia (Inarime in Virgil, Aen., 9, 716 (later Aenaria), but its name is explainable as Arima ('Monkey') in Etruscan, translated into Greek as Πιθηκοῦσσαι, 'Monkey-island', cf. also Ariminum). Its etymology proceeding from πίθος does not do justice to its structure, evidently coming from πίθηκος. Does all that have anything to do with some intermediate Tyrrhenian wanderings – that is the question!

6. But let's not forget that scientific archaeology is a relatively young sister of history and philology, not more than 130 years old, and that her harvest from the fields reaches only 2, 5, at most 20 % of their potential. What is more, some regions (like Greece's 'North-West Thrace') have scarcely been touched, due to their military, or political interest in the modern world. With the expansion of the

European Union, these tense areas will calm down, and new horizons of findings and research may arise, with many future surprises to come: only let us hope humanity will know to keep her healthy peace up to those times.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- L. BANTI (1969). *Il mondo degli Etruschi*. Rome.
- G. AND L. BONFANTE (1985). *Lingua e cultura degli Etruschi*. Rome. Romanian translation with supplementary notes by D. SLUŞANSCHI, Bucureşti, 1995.
- L. BONFANTE (1990). *Etruscan*. London.
- M. CRISTOFANI (1978). *Introduzione allo studio dell'etrusco*. Florence.
- A. HEUBECK – A. HOEKSTRA (1992). *A Commentary to Homer's Odyssey*, II. Oxford.
- HOMER (1997). *Odysseia*. Romanian translation, with an Introduction and Indices by D. Sluşanschi, Bucureşti.
- HOMER (1998). *Iliada*. Romanian translation, with an Introduction and Indices by D. Sluşanschi, Bucureşti.
- M. PALLOTINO (1968). *Etruscologia*, I-III, VI. ed., Milan.
- ID. (1968). *Testimonia linguae Etruscae*, Florence, (TLE).
- A. J. PFIFFIG (1969). *Die etruskische Sprache*. Graz.
- ID. (1998). *Die etruskische Religion. Sakrale Staetten, Goetter – Kulte – Rituale*. Wiesbaden.
- Thesaurus linguae Etruscae*, I. Indice lessicale, Rome, 1978.

## ZNOVU O VLASTI ETRUSKŮ

Ze tří možností, odkud Etruskové pocházejí, podporuji tu, která počítá s jejich příchodem po moři z východu, a to z důvodů námořních, vojenských i lingvistických. Hérodotos měl asi pravdu když jejich vlast umíšťoval do severní Egeidy. Ale vezmeme-li v úvahu několik dalších jednotlivostí jako

- Homérovo vyprávění o městě Ismaru v krajině thráckých Kikonů, ležícím snad severně od ostrova Thasu, které Odysseus vyvrátil hned na počátku své plavby od Tróje (Hom., Od. IX, 39–66; pozdější město na místě Ismaru se snad nazývalo Maróneia, a to podle tamního Apollónova kněze Maróna, kterého Odysseus ušetřil a ten se mu zato odvděčil chutným tmavým vínom (IX, 195–211),
- dále pak založení této Maróneje (s důležitým dionýsovským kultem) osadníky z ostrova Chiu při západním maloasijském pobřeží,
- a konečně etruský tradiční titul maru, etymologicky snad s Marónem související – jestliže tedy vezmeme v úvahu tyto tři argumenty, pak se jeví jako velmi důležitá kardinální otázka, zda bychom neměli pokládat za geografické východisko Etrusků nikoli Lydii (jako to činil Hérodotos), ale spíše dále na sever thrácké pobřeží a přilehlé větší severoegejské ostrovy, jako byl Lemnos (se svým „para“-etruským /tj. quasietruským/ nápisem z Hefaistie /cca 500 př. Kr./ nebo Samothráké).

V úvahu bychom mohli vzít i homérský obrat „ἐν Ἀρίμοις“ v Hom., Il. II, 783 jakožto jednu z možných lokalizací ohnivého příbytku nestvůry Tyfóea, draka dštíciho oheň; toto legendární ohnivé místo se v archaické řecké tradici stěhovalo z místa na místo: z Kilicie a Lykie na jihozápadě Malé Asie až daleko na západ na Sicílii (do Etny) a pak na vulkanické Liparské ostrovy (Stromboli) a dále na ostrov Ischii v Neapolském zálivu (lat. Aenaria, řec. Πηθηκοῦσσαι). Slovo Inarime jako jméno pro ostrov Ischii, nebo možná pro její nejvyšší horu, čteme ve Vergiliově *Aeneidē* 9, 716: *Tum sonitu Prochyta alta tremit durumque cubile / Inarime Iovis imperiis imposta Typhoeo*, a to

v místě popisujícím Tyfóeův hrob na Inarime, tj. na Ischii, v sousedství Prochyty, dnes ostrova Procida u nedalekého neapolského mysu Misenum). Výraz *arima* (možná) v etruštině označoval „opicí“ (srov. snad i Ariminum, tj. latinský název dnešního italského města Rimini), řecké slovo pro Ischii znělo Pithécoussai, což tedy snad znamenalo „Opičí ostrov“ (řecky je opice „πίθηκος“) (DS). Stopy po opicích v Itálii chybějí, ale na Gibraltarské skále prý jeden druh malých opic žije dodnes. Pravdu nám tedy asi ukáže budoucnost, až přibudou další písemné i věcné argumenty.

## SUMMARY

Of the three ‘Tyrrhenian origins’ of the Etruscans, the ‘eastern, by sea’ remains the more likely for the upper, naval, military and linguistic component of this subsequent Italic civilization. Herodotus might be partially right in placing them in the North-Aegean, but, if we take into account Homer’s Ismaros tale (Od., IX, 39–66; 195–211), then the Chian (= of Chios!) founding of the important city of Μόρπων (with the Dionysiac Mórpōv cult) and the Etruscan ‘maru’, the good question would be if we should try not Lydia as a starting point, but rather the Thracian coast and the bigger northern islands (as Lemnos /with its para-Etruscan inscription!/ and Samothrace). Perhaps we could also take into account the question of the puzzling ‘ein Arimois’ (Hom., Il., II, 783), Typhoeus’ fiery dwelling: this legendary volcanic bursting place migrates, throughout the Greek archaic tradition, all along from South-West Asia Minor (Lycia / Cilicia) to Sicily (Aetna), and then to the volcanic Lipari (Stromboli) and to Ischia (Inarime in Virgil, Aen., 9, 716, later Aenaria), but its name is Arima (‘Monkey’) in Etruscan, translated into Greek as Πίθηκονσσαι, ‘Monkey-island’, cf. also Ariminum). In the future years, only archaeology, if not appearing new manuscript tradition, could prove us right, or, alas, wrong.

Dan Slušanschi  
(Bucharest University,  
slusanschi@yahoo.com)

