

SVENSKA INSTITUTEN I ATHEN OCH ROM
INSTITUTUM ATHENIENSE ATQUE INSTITUTUM ROMANUM REGNI SUECIAE

OPUSCULA

Annual of the Swedish Institutes
at Athens and Rome

1
2008

STOCKHOLM

Editorial Committee:

Prof. Charlotte Scheffer, Stockholm, *Chairman*;

Prof. Eva Rystedt, Lund, *Vice-chairman*;

Mr. Mårten Lindstahl, Stockholm, *Treasurer*;

Dr. Michael Lindblom, Uppsala, *Secretary*;

Prof. Hans Aili, Stockholm; Prof. Barbro Santillo Frizell, Rome; Prof. Eva-Carin Gerö, Stockholm; Prof. Lena Johannesson, Göteborg; Prof. Lars Karlsson, Uppsala; Ms. Maria Lowe Fri, Stockholm; Dr. Ann-Louise Schallin, Athens; Prof. Margareta Strandberg Olofsson, Göteborg.

Secretary's address: Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, Box 626, SE-751 26 Uppsala, Sweden.

Editor: Dr. Brita Alroth, Uppsala.

Distributor: The Editorial Committee of the Swedish Institutes at Athens and Rome, c/o Dr. Jenni Hjohlman, Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, Stockholm University, SE-106 91 Stockholm. E-mail: Jenni.Hjohlman@antiken.su.se, fax: +46-(0)8-16 13 62.

The English text was revised by Dr. Janet Fairweather, Ely, England.

*Published with the aid of a grant from
The Swedish Research Council*

Opuscula. Annual of the Swedish Institutes at Athens and Rome is the new combined volume of *Opuscula Atheniensia* and *Opuscula Romana*. Subscriptions can be placed with The Editorial Committee of the Swedish Institutes at Athens and Rome, c/o Dr. Jenni Hjohlman, Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, Stockholm University, SE-106 91 Stockholm. E-mail: Jenni.Hjohlman@antiken.su.se. Fax +46-(0)8-16 13 62.

Price: SEK 800:– incl. VAT.

Contributions to *Opuscula. Annual of the Swedish Institutes at Athens and Rome* should be sent to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee (address above) before 15 September every year. Contributors are requested to include an abstract summarizing the main points and principal conclusions of their article. Manuscripts, including photocopies of illustrations, should be submitted in duplicate. For style of references to be adopted see 'Guide for contributors' *Opuscula Atheniensia* 25–26, 2000–2001, 137–140 or *Opuscula Romana* 25–26, 2000–2001, 135–138. All articles are sent to referees for peer review.

Books for review should be sent to the Secretary of the Editorial Committee, address above. All books, whether reviewed or not, will be listed under the heading Books received.

ISSN 2000-0898

ISBN 978-91-977798-0-7

© 2008 Svenska Institutet i Athen och Svenska Institutet i Rom

Printed in Sweden 2008

Textgruppen i Uppsala AB

THE RELIGIO-SOCIAL MESSAGE OF THE GOLD TABLETS FROM PYRGI

BY

OLA WIKANDER

Abstract

The gold tablets from Pyrgi, studied many times for linguistic and philological reasons, constitute a clear example of religio-social ideology at work. They deploy their themes (the goddess, the ruler, the sanctuary) in a way that helps create the symbolical universe of the readers, in whose world it is inscribed that these things are part of a greater, orderly whole. The texts are here analysed from the points of view of ideology, power and religious tendency, as parts of the system of religious symbolism that they seek to legitimize. Rhetorical points are also touched upon, as well as the fundamental question of the implied readership of the texts.

The Etrusco-Phoenician bilingual inscriptions from Pyrgi (modern S. Severa) have, from the time of their discovery in 1964, attracted much scholarly interest and have been subjected to much thorough research. First and foremost, they have been studied from a linguistic and philological point of view, mainly because bilingual inscriptions are generally presumed to constitute an incomparable source of knowledge.

Over the years in which the Pyrgi inscriptions have been studied, however, it has become increasingly obvious that the methodological problems associated with the study of bilinguals and pseudobilinguals are immense, entailing as they do a need to differentiate what is translated from what is merely paraphrased. Moreover, in the case of the Pyrgi inscriptions, another methodological obstacle is posed by the fact that the “parallel” Etruscan and Phoenician texts must be considered as being aimed at different and probably separate audiences, differing not only in language but also in cultural and religious outlook.

It is thus not surprising that the purely philological study of the Pyrgi tablets is a difficult task, especially given their rather technical and specific contents. It is interesting to note that not many words of great significance for the whole of the Etruscan corpus have been yielded by the texts (the most important being the secure equation of the word *ci* and the numeral “three”). This is a clear indication of the fact that the Pyrgi texts represent a very specific and (in the context of the Etruscan corpus) atypical genre—a commemoration of a building of a sanctuary and the dedication of it as a gift to a goddess. The inscriptions represent a *Gattung* oth-

erwise unheard of in the whole of preserved Etruscan, and their interpretation thus offers both more challenges and more possibilities than can be deduced from a purely linguistic point of view. The aim of this article is to highlight and elucidate some of these special, seldom discussed characteristics as they pertain to history of religion, social history and *Sitz im Leben*, as well as to examine some of the intriguing linguistic problems posed by this ensemble of texts. The object is to investigate not only “what” the Pyrgi inscriptions are saying but also “why” they are saying it and, to some extent at least, why they say it in the particular way that they do. These texts are not without interest from a rhetorical point of view, expressing as they do an ideological motivation and display of power (on which see, further, below).

I will begin by quoting the texts themselves, and by offering a translation of them, which in the case of the Etruscan ones must, of course, be highly tentative. This is not the place to enter into lengthy philological discussions; linguistic issues relevant to the points of inquiry will be brought up, but otherwise the translations are offered “as is”, with the reader being referred to the appropriate secondary literature as far as philological matters are concerned.

The Phoenician text is as follows:¹

lrbt l'štrt 'šr qdš
'z 'š p'l w'š ytn
tbry' wlnš mlk 'l
kyšry' byrh zbḥ
šmš bmtn' bbt wbn
tw k'štrt 'rš bdy
lmlky šnt šlš 3 by
rh krr bym qbr
'lm wšnt lm'š 'lm
bbty šnt km hkkbm
'l

¹ Text based on Gibson 1982, 151–159.

“To the Lady Asthart, this sacred place, which Thefarie Velianas,² king over Caere, made and dedicated in the month of the offering to the sun, as a gift in the house.³ And he built a chamber, because Ashtart asked⁴ this of him in the third year of his reign, in the month of *krr*, on the day of the funeral of the god. And may the years for the gift⁵ of the divinity in its house be as [many as] these stars.”

The longer Etruscan text is:⁶

*ita. tmia. icac. he
ramaśva[.] vatieχe
unialastres. θemia
sa. meχ. θuta. θefa
riei. velianas. sal.
cluvenias. turu
ce. munistas. θuvas
tameresca. ilacve.
tulerase. nac. ci. avi
l. χurvar. teśiameit
ale. ilacve. alśase
nac. atranes. zilac
al. seleitala. acnaśv
ers. itanim. heram
ve. avil. eniaca. pul
umχva*

I offer the following tentative translation:⁷

“This sanctuary and these houses [?] were dedicated to Uni,⁸ Thefarie Velianas gave (them) for his own money, as an offering for ... for this place, this chamber, at the festival-time [?] of *tuler*. For [at the time of] three years, in [the month] *χurvar*,⁹ at the festival time [?] of *alśa* ... of the *zi-laθ*-ship ... And in the temple [?] may the years of the ... be as [many as] these stars [nails?].”

The shorter text is:

*nac. θefarie. vel
iiunas. θamuce
cleva. etanal.
masan. tiur
unias. śelace. v
acal. tmial. a
vilχval. amuc
e. pulumχv
a. snuiaφ*

It is not possible to offer a real running translation of this shorter text, however, we can note that the first clause seems to speak of some form of offering which Thefarie Velianas has instituted (*θamuce cleva etanal*). The text begins with the conjunction *nac* (“since”, “when” etc.), which seems to indicate that the text is some sort of continuation

of the longer one. The words *masan tiur* (or possibly *tiuru-nias*) seem to be an expression naming a month,¹⁰ and *śelace* is probably a verb meaning something like “he gave”, probably with the dative object *unias*.¹¹ The term *vacal tmial avilχval* (which ought to be the object of *śelace*) in all probability refers to some sort of ritual action: a tentative translation might be “the yearly offering of the temple”. *Amuce* is the preterite of the word *am-*, “to be”. *Pulumχva* is the same word that seems to be used for the “stars” or “nails” in the longer text. No good explanation of the word *snuiaφ* can be given. All in all, we can note that the shorter text seems to speak of different cultic practices instigated by Thefarie Velianas.

If we now turn to the questions posed at the beginning of the article it might be fruitful to state the following:

The Pyrgi tablets represent a form of text wholly without parallel among the preserved Etruscan texts. They are made

² I normalize the name of the “king” in this way based on the form in which it is given in the longer of the two Etruscan tablets, while deleting the final *-i* of *Thefariei*, as the form *Thefarie* (which is the one found in the shorter inscription) fits better with normal Etruscan onomastics.

³ Or, possibly, “as a gift and a temple” (cf. Gibson 1982, 156, with different segmentation of the text).

⁴ The verb *rš* has also been interpreted as meaning “she helped” or something similar (thus, for example, Pfiffig 1965, 18). Much more convincing is the translation “she asked” (cf. Gibson 1982, 154 and Mettinger 2001, 103).

⁵ The exact meaning of the word *m’s* has been the cause of some debate; it has often been translated “statue” (thus for example Gibson 1982, 158), but this translation has been called into question (cf. Garbini 1969, 379–380 and Colonna 1991, 202), and a more general expression (“gift”, “donated object”) has been suggested. The meaning of this word is of course of central importance, as it has a direct influence on the translation of the Etruscan terms *heramaśva* and *heramve* (which I have tentatively chosen to translate “houses” and “in the temple”, instead of “statue” or the like, following Colonna 1991, 213). A fact that speaks against the translation “statue” is the lack of the word *m’s* in the beginning of the Phoenician text; it is strange that such a central subject of the text would not be mentioned.

⁶ The Etruscan texts are given according to *CIE* (nos. 6314 and 6315).

⁷ For discussions concerning the philological interpretations of the texts, see in particular Pallottino 1964, Pfiffig 1965, Rix 1981 and Colonna 1991.

⁸ Or possibly, following Colonna 1991, 201, “were wished by Uni”.

⁹ Normally, it has been the custom to see the equivalent of the Phoenician expression meaning “in the month of *krr*” either in the word *χurvar* (cf. Heurgon 1966, 14) or in the expression *ilacve alśase* (based on the double expressions with *ilacve*). It is, however, quite possible to regard both as parts of the date—one month and one “time of sacrifice”, just as in the Phoenician version.

¹⁰ For different versions of this interpretation, see, for example, Pallottino 1964, 101 and Pfiffig 1965, 37–38.

¹¹ If this (very tentative) interpretation is correct, we find in both Etruscan texts a dating using a month seemingly in the *casus rec-tus*, in the expressions *ci avil χurvar* and *masan tiur*.

as a commemoration of the installing and dedication of a sanctuary of a goddess, and, in this context, they make special mention of the person responsible for the event, Thefarie Velianas. Their purpose is to make a statement about the pious religious activity of a prominent citizen, in all probability the leader of the community (*zilaθ*), and thus to provide legitimation for his power and to prove his close relationship with Uni/Ashtart and the divine protection with which his leadership is blessed.

In analysing the three texts, the first question to be addressed is the one which concerns the text-ensemble as a whole, namely why the message of the texts is given in two different languages. The answer is, of course, that the duality of language is due to the fact that the texts were aimed at two different audiences, as stated above. There is a distinct possibility that the existence of a Phoenician version of the text was motivated by the presence in Caere of a Phoenician-speaking priest, who performed the relevant rites and therefore prompted the writing of text in his native language, but it is hard to imagine that such a text would have come into being without any idea of its ever being read. As much as any other ancient and modern text, it must have had an audience,¹² and this must have been an audience of Phoenician-speakers with a cultural and religious background to match. The two languages thus indicate duality of aim. This fact must be borne in mind if any analysis of the contents is to be attempted, and yet we must remember that the central message imparted by the texts is the same in both cases. (I here regard the shorter Etruscan text as an update or sort of “appendix” to the longer one. It is quite apparent that it is in the longer text that we find the clearest parallels to the Phoenician inscription, which is what concerns us here.)¹³ We must, then, analyse the ways in which the Etruscan and Phoenician texts differ, and, to an even greater extent, the ways in which they concur: the things the two have in common are probably those points which were deemed most central by the author, and by a comparison of the two it is possible for us to underline exactly those parts of the texts that carry the main message of the tablets.

If we look at the two texts together it is clear already at a glance that they are centred on two specific themes: the fact that Thefarie Velianas has built a sanctuary to Uni/Ashtart, along with dates and other adverbial descriptions of how this occurred.

The Phoenician text begins by stating the recipient of the gift (*lrbt l'štrt*, “to the lady Ashtart”), and thus immediately sets the tone for the rest of the text. The Etruscan version instead refers to the donation itself (*ita tmia icac heramašva*, “this sanctuary and these houses”), something that directly follows in the Phoenician version (*šr qdš 'z*, “this [is] the sacred place”). In both cases the texts begin by making sure the divine or religious significance is well displayed. The fact that the Phoenician text begins by mentioning the god-

dess and the Etruscan one by mentioning the temple and the gift, could possibly mean that the Etruscan text is more concerned with the building itself, the building being a visible token in the day-to-day lives of the Etruscan inhabitants of Pyrgi, while the Phoenician one (aimed at Phoenician-speakers) begins by mentioning a concept well known and authoritative to that audience: the goddess Ashtart. Already at the beginnings of the texts we can therefore probably see the structural aiming of the two texts towards two separate groups of readers.

Both texts then name the person responsible for the meritorious action, Thefarie Velianas himself. They tell that he “made” and/or “dedicated” the sacred place, and the Etruscan text probably also states that he did this “with his own money” (or, possibly, “for the sake of the people”).¹⁴

It is interesting to note the different ways in which the two texts refer to Velianas. In the Phoenician version, he is described as *mlk 'l kyšry*, “king over Caere”, a title completely missing in the Etruscan version.¹⁵ Not only does the word “king” not have any expression in the Etruscan version—the word “Caere” is not even mentioned.

The most plausible reason for the Phoenician version naming Velianas as “king over Caere” and the Etruscan leaving this information out is, of course, that the author considered this information redundant for Etruscan-speaking audiences. For an Etruscan resident of Pyrgi, the identity of Thefarie Velianas was apparently quite clear, and there was no need to point out his exact social function. The mention of him as *mlk 'l kyšry* must be seen as being aimed at visiting Phoenician speakers, which shows us clearly that the Pyrgi tablets are well thought through products of a multi-cultural society, and that this very multi-culturality and its consequences were known to the author.

By looking only this far at the inscriptions, we find a clear example of a socio-religious legitimization of a leader: Thefarie Velianas is the man who made the donation and the temple of the goddess; he paid for it and is responsible for it. The three central items at the beginning of the texts

¹² The only other possibility would be to regard the goddess herself as the only intended reader of the Phoenician text, but this is contradicted by the much more “public-minded” mention of Ashtart’s “asking”.

¹³ See, for example, Heurgon 1966, 6–15.

¹⁴ For an interpretation of this sort, see Pfiffig 1965, 27.

¹⁵ Unless, of course, the word *tamera* is to be understood as a title and not a word for a room, something I regard as highly improbable (cf. Olzscha 1970, 265–267 and Morandi 1986, 140–141). Another (equally improbable) option is to understand *θemiasa meχ θuta* as a title of the builder, as is done in Bonfante & Bonfante 1985, 77. The attempts to find the title “king over Caere” somehow expressed in the Etruscan texts seems to be based on a wish to get the two texts to harmonize perfectly, something which they obviously do not. It is my view that many interesting pieces of information are to be gleaned from precisely this fact, and trying to force the texts together seems to me to be methodologically quite unsound.

are carefully chosen to prove a point. The mention of (a) the donation and temple, (b) the goddess, and (c) Thefarie Velianas himself, immediately shows the relationship between goddess and ruler with the gift as a sort of mediator. The statement about the giving of the gift therefore serves as proof of the closeness of the divine to Thefarie Velianas. The liberality and unselfishness of the ruler is also made plain in the phrase *themiasa mex utha*. Thus already in the first “paragraph” of the text we learn that Thefarie Velianas is a divinely protected ruler, whose piety is only matched by his sense of unselfish giving. Uni/Ashtart is “his” goddess, and the donation is the means of proving this.

This theme of legitimization continues later on in the texts. Here we find the mention of the reason for the giving of the gift: the fact that the goddess has “asked” Thefarie Velianas to build the shrine for her. The stating of this fact, of course, draws further attention to the close relationship between the ruler and his divine protectress. Thus, the relationship already established between ruler and goddess now attains a quality of reciprocation—it “goes both ways”, so to speak. Thefarie Velianas is a divinely blessed ruler who helps his community, and this is shown by the facts that: (1) the goddess asks him (and no other) to make the shrine. And (2) he has consecrated the shrine using his own money and thus proven himself pious and “goddess-fearing”. Both his piety and his divine protection, as well as his inevitable role in society, have thus been underscored.

It might be fruitful to mention a few obvious parallels to this theme of legitimization between ruler and god/goddess. We might, for example, look to the descriptions of the relationship between Solomon and the God of Israel, and the king’s building of a temple for his divine protector, and especially the episode where his father, king David, is specifically asked that a temple be built by the royal house in a way very reminiscent of the present case (2 Sam 7:13). We could also look to the description of the relationship between king Kirta and El in the Ugaritic *Epic of Kirta*, and, in the same epic, also the votive gift, a statue of the goddess Athirat, that Kirta seems to pledge himself to install in a temple.¹⁶

These examples are, of course, not in themselves historically related to the Pyrgi inscription, but they do, I think, point towards a certain genre or *Gattung* of text whose character is best attested in one cultural sector, viz. the Ancient Near East: that of the religious sanctioning of an earthly ruler by means of pointing out his close and reciprocated relationship with a divinity, and specifically, the building of a shrine as the means of proving this relationship. The existence of a Phoenician text could be a sign of this religio-cultural link. Solomon is protected by YHWH and builds his temple, and Kirta is protected by El and Athirat in his war on Hubur,¹⁷ just as Thefarie Velianas is chosen by the goddess to build her temple and thus wins earthly legitimacy

using exactly this fact. The theme of the ruler who is given the order to build a sanctuary to his personal protective deity runs through the whole of Near Eastern religious history, including Gudea’s building of the Eninnu-temple for Ningirsu c. 2100 BC and onwards. We thus find that the Pyrgi inscriptions could quite possibly stand in a long tradition of the acquiring by rulers of legitimization through their being “asked” by divinities to build temples and shrines.

If we now look at the phrases of dating and other adverbial expressions, we find again a clear indication of authorial awareness that the texts are to be read by differing groups. Both texts seem to contain dates, but the formulation of these dates differ. In the Phoenician version these dates have religious significance—the text speaks of “the month of the offering to the sun” and “the day of the funeral of the god”.¹⁸ These are specific references to Phoenician cultic practices which would not mean much to Etruscan readers. In the Etruscan text these dates are conveyed instead using the two expressions beginning with the word *il-acve*, which probably refers to some sort of (Etruscan) religious festival.¹⁹ It is of course not possible to know exactly what festivals are being referenced here, but it is important to note that none of the usual (and quite well-known) “burial”-terminology of Etruscan is present here, which makes it probable that the ceremonies mentioned are not identical with the “burying of the god”. Thus we find that the dates in the texts are in both cases given using a religious vocabulary, but probably *different* religious vocabularies depending on the language used. A sort of analogue to this culture-specific mention of rituals can perhaps be found in the shorter Etruscan text, which talks of *vacal tmial avilχval*, which seems to mean “the yearly offering of the temple” or something similar. This mention of a more “Etruscan” ritual would, then, not be appropriate for Phoenician audiences.

On the other adverbial expressions there is not much that can be said with any certainty, owing to our very fragmentary understanding of the Etruscan. It is, however, interesting to note that both texts seem to mention a place, a gift

¹⁶ If the term *m’s* is to be understood as “statue”, the parallel would be even stronger, but this is (as we have seen) uncertain.

¹⁷ It is worth noting that Kirta’s consequent illness seems to have as its cause the apparent *neglect* on the part of the king to honour his part of the agreement with the goddess—cf. Greenstein 1997, 10.

¹⁸ On this highly interesting expression, which seems to allude to the celebration of a “dying god”, see Mettinger 2001, 104–106. Cf. also Bonnet 1988, 287–288. Another suggestion is proposed by Knoppers (1992, 114–119), who instead sees the expression as a reference to a human burial and considers the whole text to be a funerary inscription. This is not borne out by the other contents of the text, which do not in any apparent way refer to a burial. From the beginning the focus is on Ashtart, not a dead relative.

¹⁹ The word is used in this manner in the *Tabula Capuana*. Here it is probably a “modal” case either of the plural/collective of an inanimate noun or of a singular noun **ilacu*.

and chamber, expressed in Phoenician as *bmtn' bbt* ("as a gift in the house") and in Etruscan as *munistas θuvas tameresca*, which seems to mean something like "[for] this place, the chamber".

What, then, can be said in answer to the basic question of what the Pyrgi tablets want to tell us? To begin with, it is worth making the initial, and almost simplistic observation that a person named Thefarie Velianas, who ruled over Caere, has dedicated a shrine to a goddess, and that certain religious ceremonies seem to be mentioned in connection with this. This fact is commemorated using three tablets which are made of gold, a very valuable material without parallel in the corpus of Etruscan inscriptions. We find, therefore, that these inscriptions were thought to bear a special significance not shared, for example, by other inscriptions found at Pyrgi.

The building of the sanctuary, the donations, and indeed the inscriptions themselves, are to a large extent to be viewed as legitimizing markers of the just rulership of a leader. Thus, they carry a twofold message—one religious and one propagandistic, two messages that can hardly be separated from each other. The religious import of the gifts and rituals is being used in a propagandistic context, but the legitimizing message is also given a concrete religious meaning by firmly establishing the rule of Thefarie Velianas as having its basis in a super-human reality. His rule thus becomes a "religious" question in itself, being based directly on the favour of Uni/Ashtart. *He* is the one asked by the goddess to construct the sanctuary, and thus it can be surmised that non-obedience towards him might, in the cultural context of the tablets, be viewed as an act of non-obedience towards the goddess herself.²⁰ The implied message of the texts is that Thefarie Velianas is the "right" ruler, the one whom the goddess has chosen. The gift seems (though it is not formally stated) to have something of a *do ut des* quality: it is not hard to surmise that Thefarie Velianas wants Ashtart's favour to continue in the future. From a social point of view the texts underscore Velianas' munificence and must have almost automatically instilled a sense of gratitude towards him among the population.

Another fact worth noting is of course that one of the tablets is written in a "foreign" language. The honour they bestow on the "king over Caere" is to be seen and read even by non-Etruscans—this other audience is apparently an important one. The very fact that the texts make use of an identification between Uni and Ashtart is another example of the "audience-mindedness" of the author, who apparently thought this "double divinity" was the best rhetorical device with which to make his point.²¹

To conclude, then, we find in the Pyrgi tablets not only an interesting set of Etrusco-Phoenician bilinguals, but also an

important object of religious history. This has of course often been noted, but what has then been highlighted has mostly been the interesting identification between Uni and Ashtart coupled with the tantalizing mention of the "day of the burial of the God". In this paper I have tried to show that the very formulation of the contents of the text is as interesting on its own account, showing as it does a very deliberate piece of rhetoric and word-choice. It deploys the vocabularies of religion and political power together in a very succinct and specific way, which lets two very dissimilar groups of readers, differing not only in language but also in cultural and religious socialization, gain the same impression of the relationship between the goddess and the ruler of Caere.

The Pyrgi tablets are, then, an unusually clear example of religio-social ideology at work. It is not possible to separate religious motivation from social outlook: both sets of values are inseparable parts of a greater whole. The goddess, the ruler, the sanctuary—all these are interconnected by the texts and used to help create the symbolical universe of the readers, in whose world it is presumed that they form part of a greater, orderly whole. Thus, the tablets acquire the role of religious objects in themselves. They are parts of the system of religious symbolism that they seek to legitimize. Through their agency the rule of Thefarie Velianas is given its secure place within this ideological framework, and they seem almost calculated to inspire the idea that the years of his rule might be, just as those of the sanctuary, "as many as these stars".

Ola Wikander

Lund University

Centre for Theology and Religious Studies

Allhelgona Kyrkogata 8

SE-223 62 LUND

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bonfante & Bonfante G. Bonfante & L. Bonfante, *Lingua e cultura degli Etruschi* (Biblioteca di storia antica, 21), Roma 1985.

²⁰ One might quite possibly surmise that Ashtart's "asking" is a reference to some form of divinatory technique, but on this point it is impossible to draw any conclusions from the textual material. The fact that the exact day of the asking is given in the text reminds one of the "religious calendars" of the *Liber Linteus* type, and one could thus imagine a divinatory ritual performed on a certain day and that the "asking" was the result of the divine contact. This is, however, pure speculation.

²¹ I do not mean to imply that the author somehow did not "believe" in the identification, only that its adoption may be viewed as a very useful rhetorical method for reaching out to two different groups of readers.

- Bonnet 1988 C. Bonnet, *Melqart: cultes et mythes de l'Heracles tyrien en Méditerranée* (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de philosophie et lettres de Namur, 69; *Studia Phoenicia*, 8), Leuven 1988.
- Colonna 1991 G. Colonna, "'Tempio" e "santuario" nel lessico delle lamine di Pyrgi', in G. Bartoloni, G. Colonna, C. Grottanelli & A. Vivante (eds.), *Atti del convegno internazionale Anathema: regime delle offerte e vita dei santuari nel Mediterraneo antico: Roma, 15–18 Giugno 1989* (= *Scienze dell' antichità* 3–4), Roma 1991, 197–216.
- Garbini 1969 G. Garbini, 'Le parole iniziali dell'iscrizione etrusca "A" di Pyrgi', *PP* 24, 1969, 378–383.
- Gibson 1982 J. Gibson, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic inscriptions*, vol. 3. *Phoenician inscriptions including inscriptions in the mixed dialect of Arslan Tash*, Oxford 1982.
- Greenstein 1997 E. Greenstein, 'Kirta', in S. Parker (ed.), *Ugaritic narrative poetry* (SBL Writings from the Ancient World Series, 9), Atlanta 1997, 9–48.
- Heurgon 1966 J. Heurgon, 'The inscriptions of Pyrgi', *JRS* 56, 1966, 1–15.
- Knoppers 1992 G. Knoppers, "'The god in his temple": the Phoenician text from Pyrgi as funerary inscription', *JNES* 57, 1992, 105–120.
- Mettinger 2001 T. Mettinger, *The riddle of resurrection: dying and rising gods in the Ancient Near East* (Coniectanea biblica, Old Testament series, 50), Stockholm 2001.
- Morandi 1986 A. Morandi, 'L'iscrizione CIE 5683 del sarcofago tuscanense nel Museo Etrusco Gregoriano', *RM* 93, 1986, 135–144.
- Olzscha 1970 K. Olzscha, 'Etruskischer Literaturbericht II. Teil 1969: Die kleineren Inschriften', *Glotta* 48, 1970, 260–294.
- Pallottino 1964 M. Pallottino, 'Le iscrizioni etrusche', *ArchCl* 16, 1964, 76–104.
- Pfiffig 1965 A. Pfiffig, *Uni-Hera-Astarte: Studien zu den Goldblechen von S. Severa/Pyrgi mit etruskischer und punischer Inschrift* (DenkschrWien, 88:2), Wien 1965.
- Rix 1981 H. Rix, 'Pyrgi-Texte und etruskische Grammatik', in *Akten des Kolloquiums zum Thema: Die Göttin von Pyrgi. Archäologische, linguistische und religionsgeschichtliche Aspekte* (Tübingen, 16–17 Januar 1979) (Biblioteca di "Studi Etruschi", 12), Firenze 1981, 83–102.