



European Network of Scientific and  
Technical Cooperation Applied to  
Cultural Heritage

Réseau Européen de coopération  
scientifique et technique appliquée au  
patrimoine culturel

Chairman :  
His Highness Hans Adam II  
Prince of Liechtenstein

Président :  
S.A.S. le prince Hans Adam II  
de Liechtenstein

Pact 20 - V.6 : Anthony Bonanno

Evidence of Greek, Carthaginian  
and Etruscan Maritime Commerce South  
of the Tyrrhenian : the Maltese Case

OFFPRINT — TIRÉ À PART

PACT Belgium, B - 1330 RIXENSART, 28 A, avenue Léopold

MZ9  
P.B. 97  
B



P.B.

Pact 20 - V.6 : Anthony Bonanno

## Evidence of Greek, Carthaginian and Etruscan Maritime Commerce South of the Tyrrhenian : the Maltese Case

I feel I should commence by thanking Prof. Tony Hackens and Dr. François Widemann on behalf of the Centro Universitario Europeo for kindly inviting me to take part in an active way in this symposium<sup>1</sup>. When I first received the invitation to present a report at this meeting with the proposed title, I very cautiously declined. I did so for two reasons : in the first place, because having in the last ten years dedicated myself almost entirely to archaeology related to the Maltese islands, I judged myself unfit to tackle any aspect strictly connected with the theme, and secondly, because I felt that Malta lay too much outside the Tyrrhenian sphere to be the focus of a paper in this symposium.

Eventually I let myself be persuaded with the understanding that the topic of my paper should justify its inclusion in the programme of this meeting, and we agreed to the present title which may appear to some, perhaps justifiably, to be a bit too stretched. Nevertheless, during the reading I undertook in its preparation I was gradually and increasingly convinced that Malta must have played a significant role in the development of Phoenician commerce in the western Mediterranean — particularly in the Tyrrhenian — and its impact on, and *rappor*t with, the Greek and Etruscan ones : a role which, I think, has still got to be properly defined.

In my paper I shall be referring to « Phoenician », sometimes to « Punic » and at other times « Carthaginian » commerce and objects without much distinction between the three adjectives, although I am very much aware of the intrinsic differences between the three labels. As far as the present topic is concerned I would apply the term « Phoenician » to all that is connected with this Semitic people both in the homeland and their movements in the eastern Mediterranean (an ethnic and political reality that

1. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Tancred Gouder, Curator of Archaeology at the National Museum in Valletta, for his generosity in providing me with some of the slides as well as a number of important bibliographical references. I am also grateful to Professors Piero Gianfrotta and Gioacchino Falsone for some very useful advice and bibliography.

200702

survived practically down to Alexander's incorporation of the area in his empire) and in their commercial and colonial expansion in the western basin of the Mediterranean: It is in the latter area that the situation complicates itself, mostly because the English language lacks the substantive, corresponding to the adjective « Punic », to designate the western Phoenicians following their progressive detachment (culturally and politically) from the motherland from around the mid-sixth century B.C. when the ancient sources start referring to them as « Carthaginians » (Greek Καρχηδόνιοι ; Latin *Carthaginienses* ; Italian *Cartaginesi*) or « Punics » (Latin *Poeni* ; Italian *Punici*). The modern historical perspective distinguishes, and very rightly so, between what was strictly Carthaginian — *i.e.*, referring to anything connected with or emanating from the city of Carthage — and the collective name of the Phoenician settlements in the west which, sometimes individually, at other times in concert, had dealings of various nature with the other political powers of the region, first the Greeks and later the Romans. Until this question of nomenclature is settled, the term « Phoenician » is likely to remain the more generally applicable one.

It may sound commonplace and like stating the obvious, but it should, nevertheless, be emphasized that all objects and artifacts of foreign origin found in a Maltese archaeological context must have reached Malta by sea since the latter is an island, or rather a group of islands. Therefore, although as yet no discovery of a pre-Roman shipwreck, in particular Greek or Phoenician, has ever been made in Maltese waters — at least not any that has been officially recorded, since the earliest material from the Xlendi wreck is second century B.C. (*M.A.R.*, 1961, p. 6-7, fig. 5) — all Greek, Phoenician and Etruscan objects unearthed from the Maltese islands have all the merits and charm we normally associate with shipwrecks, and something more. All such objects are undeniable evidence of trade, certainly in that direction (*i.e.*, to Malta), and possibly in other directions (*i.e.*, for re-export).

The same case cannot be made for commerce between Phoenicians and Greeks on the island of Sicily. Since that island was divided between Phoenician colonies in the west and Greek colonies in the rest of it, certainly some of the commodities, even those of ultimate overseas origin, must have changed hands between Greek and Phoenician colonists by means of overland traffic, and were not necessarily imported directly from their centre of production. I mean to say that Greek archaic pottery found in the necropolis of Mozia (*Mozia VII-IX*) and Palermo (Tamburello, 1971 and 1978 ; Camerata Scovazzo e Castellana, 1980), for example, could have got there through the intermediary of the Greek colonies of Sicily, and similarly the Phoenician faience and pottery discovered in the necropolis del Furco at Syracuse (Pelagatti, 1978) and the red-slip ware found in Zancle (Bacci, 1978) could have reached these destinations through the intervention of Phoenician tradesmen from the western Sicilian colonies. This problem is treated extensively by S.F. Bondi (1979 and 1983) and V. Tusa (1979).

A very different problem is, of course, posed by the Greek marble statue of a « Charioteer » (datable to c.450 B.C.) discovered on Mozia some years ago (Tusa, 1983 : bibl.). Phoenician commerce is normally concerned with small-scale, easily handled goods and the Mozia statue would be quite a rare exception. I would be more inclined to believe it was part of a booty plundered from a Sicilian Greek city in times of war.

There seems to be a traditional resistance to the view that by early Phoenician times open-sea navigation was regularly practiced. Some still believe that the Phoenician navigators, like their Greek counterparts, continued to hug the coast well into the first half of the first millennium B.C. (e.g. Breglia, 1966, p. 122, pls. II-III). The contents of three tombs discovered at Ghajn Qajjet (Baldacchino e Dunbabin, 1953), Mtarfa (*M.A.R.*, 1926/7, 8 ; Culican, 1982, figs. 13-4) and Qallilija (*M.A.R.*, 1916/7, 9-10), all in the vicinity of Rabat, Malta, apart from establishing a *terminus a quo* for the Phoenician presence in Malta, go a long way to establish that open-sea faring was being practiced by the Phoenicians by the first half of the seventh century B.C., especially if one takes into consideration the diminutive size of the island and its pelagic position.

In the first instance, the characteristic burnished red-slip ware which represented the bulk of the ceramic kit found in the Ghajn Qajjet tomb reveal a pedigree which can be derived from the Syro-Palestinian area, although they are related to contemporary pottery found in other early Phoenician settlements in the west (Ciasca, 1971, p. 67-68). Secondly, the head of a bronze torch-holder is normally attributed a Cypro-Phoenician origin (Baldacchino e Dunbabin, 1953, p. 37-38, fig. 6, pl. XIII ; Tore, 1986). These items, together with the strongly egyptianizing amulets and jewelry from other tombs (Hölbl, 1986a, p. 141, 268, 421 ; 1986b, p. 202) as well as the archaic materials of oriental origin from Tas-Silg, constitute strong evidence of a trading route from Phoenicia to the western Mediterranean (*i.e.*, to Malta and, presumably, Carthage and western Sicily) via Cyprus and, very likely, Crete.

The two other significant items, a Proto-Corinthian *kotyle* and an eastern Greek « bird-bowl » confirm the eastern origin of most of the furniture in the Ghajn Qajjet tomb<sup>2</sup>, but they also open a new dimension to the question : the itinerary they followed to arrive in Malta.

2. Since they provide the basis for the dating of the associated Phoenician material, and of the end of Prehistory and the beginning of Ancient History for the Maltese islands, these archaic Greek pots deserve a special note. Previously they have been assigned to the second half of the eighth century (bibl. in Bonanno, 1983, p. 15-16, n. 84-88) mostly on datings suggested by Dunbabin (Baldacchino e Dunbabin, 1953, p. 40) and accepted by Culican (1961, p. 48) and Ciasca (1971, p. 64). In more recent years, however, both Culican (1982) and Ciasca (1982, p. 148) have lowered their date to the second half of the seventh century, with which date W. Johannowsky and M. Gras are in agreement (see Discussion). As to the Proto-Corinthian skyphos from the Mtarfa tomb, both Johannowsky and Gras concur on a date in the first half of the seventh century B.C.

1. Were they carried to Malta all the way from Phoenicia? — Proto-Corinthian and eastern Greek pottery are regularly found in Syro-Palestinian coastal cities (Moscati, 1980, p. 30-35).
2. Were they picked up from some *emporion* on the way, say from Cyprus, Rhodes, or even Crete?
3. Or did they reach Malta through a Sicilian or North African intermediary?

Although possible, the last alternative seems to be the least likely, certainly at this period in time. The second calls in complications of Phoenician trading presence in the Aegean which lie outside the scope of this paper. In the absence of other evidence to the contrary the greater probability of 1. and 2. certainly points out to a direct commercial current from the eastern Mediterranean to, or via, the Maltese archipelago (Ciasca, 1971, p. 71; Moscati, 1980, p. 254).

The picture presented by these archaic tombs is, indeed, further confirmed by the archaic repertoire retrieved from that remarkable ancient site explored by the Missione Archeologica Italiana of the University of Rome in the 1960s, the sanctuary of Tas-Silg above the Marsaxlokk harbour (*Missione*, 1963-70), especially the ivories (Moscati, 1970), some architectural features (Moscati, 1964; 1966a) and some statuettes (Ciasca, 1971, p. 100: « stile fenicio-cipriota »). In some of this material A. Ciasca sees tell-tale stylistic analogies with the Greek world of Ionia and the islands (1971, p. 100).

What is conspicuously absent in the material of both the Ghajn Qajjet and Mtarfa tombs, as well as all the other tombs datable from the early sixth century onwards, is the native element which down to the arrival of the Phoenicians, and possibly for a few centuries afterwards, constituted the prehistoric population of the *Borg in-Nadur* and *Bahrija* cultures (Evans, 1971, p. 225-228; Trump, 1966, p. 44). Is it because the tombs belonged exclusively to members of the newly established Phoenician community who found little or nothing indigenous worth including in their funerary furniture? Or was the native population so overwhelmed by the new culture as to abandon almost completely their own artisanal production? Antonia Ciasca (1982, p. 142) has recently suggested that the early red-slip ware was locally produced and that it developed from an indigenous tradition. Evidence of a coexistence of some sort between the prehistoric native population and the literate newcomers was found, on the other hand, in a burial cairn in Rabat, Gozo (*M.A.R.*, 1923/4, 11) and at Tas-Silg where *Borg in-Nadur* (and *Bahrija*) pottery was identified in association with the earliest layers of Phoenician occupation (Ciasca, 1971, p. 65-66, 72).

Going back to the question of commercial sea routes from the East, it should be noted that the statuette of the so-called Melqart, or Reshef, fished out of the sea of Sciacca in 1955 (Purpura, 1981: bibl.) not only pushes the

plying of the western seas by Phoenicians even further back than is normally indicated by the archaeological documentation — it is dated to the ninth century at the latest — but, if the more widely accepted date of 14th-13th century is correct, it also opens the question of the earliest colonization in the West — those of Cadiz and Utica are fixed by the literary tradition around 1110 (Vell. Pat. I, 2, 3) and 1100 (Plin. XVI, 216) respectively — as well as the question of the very identity of the sea-farers before the twelfth century. Should they be called Phoenicians, Canaanites or, more generically, Syro-Palestinians ?

As yet, however, the archaeological record for Malta does not place the Phoenician presence there beyond the first half of the seventh century B.C., or thereabouts. The literary sources do neither contradict nor confirm this initial date of the settlement of this semitic people on Malta. Pseudo-Skylax (Müller, 1885, p. 89) writing in the mid-fourth century, described Malta as a Carthaginian colony, probably reflecting a contemporary reality, Malta having entered the Carthaginian political and military sphere with the decline of the political autonomy of the Phoenician motherland at the hands of the Assyrians first, and later, in a more definitive way, under the Persians. A later writer, Diodorus Siculus (V, 12, 1-4) writing in the first century B.C., somewhat anachronistically described Malta and Gozo as « Phoenician colonies ». He was most probably referring to a much earlier reality ; a reality, however, whose mark was somehow still felt or noticed in his own time, or in that of his source.

Diodorus makes two further comments of great significance. He emphasizes the two islands' pelagic nature (« Far off the south of Sicily three islands lie out in the sea ») and the fact that they had « harbours which can offer safety to ships in distress of weather ». The latter observation seems to imply only the occasional shelter, a point of reference to be used in difficult weather conditions, but it does not exclude *a priori* a regular port of call for ships navigating on a direct route that cut straight through what Cicero, a contemporary of Diodorus, labelled *mare pericolosum*. In fact, Diodorus goes on to say that the Phoenicians selected Malta as a place to settle on precisely because « as they extended their trade to the western ocean, (they) found in it a place of safe retreat, since it was well supplied with harbours and *lay out in the open sea* ». A port of call, therefore, but not a port of trade. Diodorus' last statement runs counter to what Thucydides (VI, 2, 6) tells us as to the preferences of the Phoenicians in their choice of sites for settlement in Sicily, *i.e.* « promontories on the sea and small islands close to the coast » — for example, Mozia.

Therefore, the choice of the Maltese islands must have been dictated not by the usual criteria but by their convenient position, right on the direct route from east to west (Ciasca, 1971, p. 72-73), without having to sail too close to the Greek-controlled southern coast of Sicily, or take the much longer route

along the coast of North Africa. That this commercial traffic making use of Malta was a somewhat intensive one is borne out not only by the overwhelming Phoenician content of the archaeological material from the early seventh century onwards, but also by Diodorus' attribution of the great economic progress achieved by the Maltese inhabitants to the assistance received from the Phoenician merchants.

Presumably, then, the Phoenicians did not use Malta merely as a transshipment base in their trade system connecting the Tyrrhenian network with that converging on the Phoenician cities of the motherland ; they also developed crafts and industries on the islands themselves. One of these crafts, referred to by the Sicilian historian as the most important one, was the weaving of linen, an industry the product of which is mentioned by several other ancient writers (Bonanno, 1977, p. 77, n. 26). But this industry has not left any trace in the archaeological record. The other craft which was developed to such an extent as to produce exportable items was pottery-making to which I shall come back in a moment. It would seem likely that the colonizers helped the inhabitants to develop new lines of agriculture, in particular olive cultivation. The evidence for this is still rather flimsy and consists of pre-Roman (*i.e.* Punic) structures identified below several of the excavated Roman olive-pressing farms. However, from an examination of the documented Maltese ceramic exports Antonia Ciasca has come to the conclusion that Malta must have exported very little food merchandise, because large containers from Malta occur with far less frequency outside the islands than those of smaller dimensions (Ciasca, 1985, p. 22-23).

To return to the role of Malta in the flow of trade between the eastern Mediterranean and the various centres on the Tyrrhenian sea in the archaic period, in two contributions published soon after the archaeological campaigns conducted on the site of the sanctuary of Tas-Silg, and taking into consideration the results of those campaigns, Ciasca suggested that the island seemed to be detached, at least in the seventh and sixth centuries, from the great commercial routes directed to the Phoenician colonies of the west and that it appeared to fit more in the routes that from the eastern islands reached the areas of central and north Tyrrhenian through the straits of Messina (Ciasca, 1970, p. 101 ; 1971, p. 75).

The arguments brought forward in support of this view are the following :

1. the marked difference of the Phoenician pottery of Malta from that of the group Mozia/Carthage ;
2. the distribution pattern of the torch-holder represented, apart from Malta, in Sidon, Cyprus, Rhodes, Sardinia and Caere ;
3. the distribution pattern of the « bird-bowl » in Rhodes, Thera, Malta, Gela, Syracuse, Rhegion, Caere, Vulci, Vetulonia, Populonia.

To be frank, and with due respect to the authority of Ciasca, I find this conclusion somewhat hard to accept. In the first place it would seem more logical, all other things being equal, to suppose that Malta was on the straight route to Carthage and to the Tyrrhenian via the Sicilian canal (Moscati, 1980, p. 254) than on one that arriving in Malta from the east veered suddenly north to reach the Tyrrhenian via the straits of Messina. The latter route seems even less probable given that the straits must have been « controlled » in some way by the Greek colonies of Rhegion and Zancle. Furthermore, it should be remembered that differences in the ceramic kit and in other cultural manifestations between one colony and another is not a new thing among the Phoenician colonies of the west. On the other hand, Michel Gras has identified several more points of contact between Malta and Motya/Carthage (Gras, 1985, p. 299-300). Finally, the distribution patterns of the Cypro-Phoenician torch-holders (Tore, 1986) and of the eastern Greek « bird-bowl » (Shefton, 1982, fig. 2, nn. 38-45), does not in fact exclude the possibility, I dare say the probability, of their reaching the Tyrrhenian centres via the Sicilian canal.

In this respect one must, I think, distinguish between the two possible commercial carriers. If the carriers were Greek, the natural route would be, via some intermediary centre in the east (say Cyprus or Rhodes), straight to Greek Sicily and the Messina straits without reference to Malta. If the carriers were Phoenicians, then the more logical route would be through Malta to Carthage or Motya and from there to the other centres of the Tyrrhenian ; unless we want to put aside the notion of the great Mediterranean sea-routes (Moscati, 1966, p. 241) and think of Malta as a backwater depending for its imported needs on the closest *emporium*, be they Greek or Phoenician, in neighbouring Sicily.

Although Ciasca's more recent study (1985) on the distribution of some recognizable Maltese ceramic products of the Phoenician-Punic period is based, as she admits, only on a bibliographical examination of the data, I feel that her conclusions constitute a good starting point for future studies and I would like to repropose to you the results of her investigations because they throw light on the trade patterns in the Tyrrhenian sea in the period under examination.

A Maltese ceramic export which, according to Ciasca, is easily recognizable and which has a fairly wide diffusion is the ovoid, neckless amphora which is documented from the seventh to the third/second centuries B.C. with very little development. This type of amphora, doubtlessly used for storage and transport of liquid or solid foods, has been identified in Camarina (sixth century), possibly in the shipwreck of Porticello (fifth century) and at Gela. Its distribution became much more diffused in the third and second centuries : e.g. Carthage, Lilybaeum, Motya, Ibiza. Therefore, although for the sixth and fifth centuries it is documented only in Sicily, by the end of our period it was widely distributed in the Tyrrhenian trade pattern reaching as far as the Balearics.

Smaller containers of liquids, such as small amphorae and various small jugs in a characteristic red/orange clay with cream/white or ivory/white slip and simple broad-band decoration in reddish-brown (sometimes branches of leaves and flowers, stylized waves or even geometric motifs) whose production can safely be placed in the fourth and third centuries B.C., have so far only appeared in Carthage.

Other Maltese products of the common Punic repertoire (such as bilychne lamps and umbilicated plates) have been traced again at Carthage, Cagliari, Ibiza, Lilybaeum. The same distribution pattern in the Tyrrhenian is confirmed by the occurrence outside Malta of a two-handled vase with a widely splayed conical body and short rounded shoulders which is commonly found used as cinerary urn in Maltese tombs. It occurs in Lilybaeum, Mozia, and in a tomb context at Leptis Magna, while a single example was fished up from the sea off the south coast of Sardinia (Bartoloni, 1981).

The above-mentioned Leptis connection turns out to be only one of the many commercial contacts that must have existed between the Maltese islands and this Tripolitanian city, especially from the end of the fourth to the third centuries B.C. The tomb furniture of the two centres for the fourth-third centuries is so closely related that Ciasca holds that between them Leptis and Malta formed part of a specific area of Punic culture, placed geographically at the eastermost boundaries of the Phoenician colonial world in the western Mediterranean, and having its own particular characteristics (Ciasca, 1985, p. 24, n. 31).

In her concluding paragraphs Ciasca tentatively classifies the vases with ivory/cream slip as « luxury items » for export in competition with various other productions of white-background pottery of the Hellenistic period. She would not exclude the possibility that the Greek centres of Sicily provided the market for these products. In this respect she makes a further very important and valid observation. The wide-ranging trade contacts with the Punic world bear very little reflection in the Maltese context. On the contrary, the Maltese documentation indicates strong links with the Greek colonies of Sicily and Magna Graecia rather than with the rest of the Punic world. As an example she cites the fact that the presence in Malta of foreign Punic commercial amphorae is minimal whereas Greek and Italic amphorae are quite common (Ciasca, 1985, p. 23-24, n. 30). Besides, from the fourth century onwards Greek imports become increasingly South Italian and include fragments of various types of red-figured vases, Campanian ware and others belonging to the Lagynos group. Some jewelry seems to be attributable to Tarentine production. Fragments of sculpture in Greek marble, on the other hand, testify further contact with Greece, more probably with the islands and Ionia (Ciasca, 1970, p. 102).

As for the third component of the theme of the present symposium, the Etruscan one, it is not certain how much weight we ought to give to the absence from Malta of its *bucchero* which is, however, found in Carthage and Mozia. The so-called «Etruscan» or «Tyrrhenian» pirates (Gras, 1976 : bibl.) remind us of the pirates that, according to Cicero (*Verr.* II, 4, 103-104) and obviously before his time, made regular and frequent use of the sheltered harbours of Malta (Busutil, 1971).

The Etruscan identity of the ivory or bone plaques to which the specimen from Ras ir-Raheb (Malta) belongs has been securely determined by Pallottino (1935). In her study of the various workshops producing these plaques and their diffusion Marina Martelli included the Maltese example in her second group together with others from Ruvo, Velia, Locri and Rhodes. She dates this group to the period 540/30-500 B.C. (Martelli, 1985, p. 216-223, fig. 36). Although it ill-fits the archaeological context in which it was found (M.A.R., 1962, p. 6, pl. 4), this bone plaque is a sure evidence of some sort of contact with the Etruscan world.

Contrary to what is stated in the abstract of this paper there is indeed another object of Etruscan origin found in Malta, a plate belonging to the so-called «Genucilia Group». Now preserved in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford (Del Chiaro, 1957, p. 284) it constitutes another testimony of commercial contact between Etruria and Malta, this time during the first half of the fourth century B.C., even though it could have reached Malta indirectly via Carthage. Together with the Genucilia plate found in Cyrene (Bacchielli, 1976) the Maltese plate extends the area of diffusion of this class of Etruscan (or Central Italian) pottery beyond the southeast limit previously set by three such plates discovered in Carthage (Bacchielli, 1976, p. 100, n. 13).

The above observations remain, for the moment, working hypotheses which do, however, open new fields or investigation, in particular on the commercial and cultural interaction between Malta and Greek Sicily, on the one hand, and between Malta and the Punic world, on the other, before the Roman conquest. To make more headway and achieve more concrete results one has to establish firmly the places of origin, the production centres of the classes of pottery mentioned above. In the Maltese case it is imperative to establish whether the types of pottery that are reputed to be of Maltese production — starting from the *Borg in-Nadur* pottery found in Thapsos, Ognina and other sites, through the red-slip ware and down to the ovoid, neckless amphorae — are really so or not. The best way to do this is certainly by the application of scientific techniques, such as the analysis of the fabrics and their constituent elements compared to the geology of the Maltese islands. Such a study is being projected through the intervention of P.A.C.T.

Anthony BONANNO  
University of Malta Classics Dept  
M - MSIDA Malta

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BACCI, G., 1978, *Ceramica dell' VIII e VII secolo a.C. a Messina*, in *Cronache di Archeologia e di Storia dell'Arte*. Catania. Università, 17, p. 100-103.
- BACCHIELLI, L., 1976, Un « Piattello di Genucilia ». I rapporti di Cirene con l'Italia nella seconda metà del IV sec. a.C., in *Quaderni di Archeologia della Libia*, 8, p. 99-107.
- BALDACCHINO, J.G., DUNBABIN, T.J., 1953, *Rock Tomb at Ghajn Qajjet, near Rabat, Malta*, in *Papers British School of Rome*, 21, p. 32-41.
- BARTOLONI, P., 1981, *Un'urna punico-maltese dal canale di Sardegna*, in *Rivista di Studi Fenici*, 9, supplemento, p. 1-5.
- BONANNO, A., 1977, *Distribution of Villas and Some Aspects of the Maltese Economy in the Roman Period*, in *Journal of the Faculty of Arts*, IV, 4, p. 73-81.
- ID., 1983, *The Tradition of an Ancient Greek Colony in Malta*, in *Hyphen*, IV, 1, p. 1-17.
- BONDÌ, S.F., 1979, *Penetrazione fenicio-punica e storia della civiltà punica in Sicilia. La problematica storica*, in *Storia della Sicilia*, I, Napoli, p. 163-225.
- ID., 1983, *I Fenici in Occidente*, in *Modes de contacts et processus de transformation dans les sociétés antiques* (Coll. École Française de Rome, 67), Pisa-Rome, p. 379-400.
- BREGLIA, L., 1966, *Le antiche rotte del Mediterraneo documentate da monete e pesi*, Rome.
- BUSUTTIL, J., 1971, *Pirates in Malta*, in *Melita Historica*, V, 4, p. 308-10.
- CAMERATA SCOVAZZO, R., CASTELLANA, G., 1980, *Necropoli punica di Palermo*, in *Sicilia Archeologica*, 45, p. 43-54.
- CIASCA, A., 1970, *Ricerche puniche a Malta*, in *Ricerche Puniche nel Mediterraneo Centrale (Relazioni del Colloquio in Roma, 5-7 Maggio 1969)*, Rome, p. 91-109.
- ID., 1971, *Malta*, in *L'espansione fenicia nel Mediterraneo (Relazioni del Colloquio in Roma, 4-5 Maggio 1970)*, Rome, p. 63-75.
- ID., 1982, *Insediamenti e cultura dei Fenici a Malta*, in *Phönizier im Westen. Die Beiträge des Internationalen Symposiums über « Die phönizische Expansion im Westlichen Mittelmeerraum »*, Köln vom 24. bis 27. April 1979, (ed. H.G. Niemeyer), Mainz, p. 133-154.
- ID., 1985, *Nota sulla distribuzione di alcune ceramiche puniche maltesi. (II<sup>e</sup> Colloque International sur l'Histoire et l'Archéologie de l'Afrique du Nord, Grenoble, 5-9 Avril 1983)*, in *Bulletin Archéologique*, 19, 1983, fasc. B, p. 17-24.
- CULICAN, W., 1961, *Aspects of Phoenician Settlement in the Western Mediterranean*, in *Abr-Nahraim*, 1, p. 36-55.
- ID., 1982, *The Repertoire of Phoenician Pottery*, in *Phönizier im Westen*, Mainz, p. 45-82.
- DEL CHIARO, M.A., 1957, *The Genucilia Group : a Class of Etruscan Red-Figured Plates* (*University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology*, III, 4).
- EVANS, J.D., 1971, *The Prehistoric Antiquities of the Maltese Islands : a Survey*, London.
- GRAS, M., 1976, *La piraterie tyrrhénienne en mer Égée : mythe ou réalité ?* in *L'Italie préromaine et la Rome républicaine (Mélanges offerts à Jacques Heurgon)*, Rome, p. 341-369.
- ID., 1985, *Trafics tyrrhéniens archaïques*, Rome.
- HÖLBL, G., 1986a, *Ägyptisches Kulturgut im phönizischen und punischen Sardinien*, Leiden.

- ID., 1986b, *Egyptian Fertility Magic within Phoenician and Punic Culture*, in *Archaeology and Fertility Cult in the Ancient Mediterranean*, (ed. A. Bonanno), Malta, p. 197-205.
- M.A.R., 1905-..., *Museum Annual Reports*, 1905-..., Malta, 1906-...
- MARTELLI, M., 1985, *Gli avori tardo-archaici : botteghe e aree di diffusione*, in *Il commercio etrusco arcaico (Quaderni del Centro di Studio per l'Archeologia Etrusco-italica*, 9), Rome, p. 207-248.
- MISSIONE, 1963-1970, *Missione Archeologica Italiana a Malta, Rapporto Preliminare della Campagna 1963-1970*, Rome, 1964-1971.
- MOSCATI, S., 1964, *Un pilastrino da Tas-Silg*, in *Rivista degli Studi Orientali*, 39, p. 151-154.
- ID., 1966a, *Alcune colonette da Tas-Silg*, in *Oriens Antiquus*, 5, p. 15-18.
- ID., 1966b, *Il Mondo dei Fenici*, Milan.
- ID., 1970, *Un avorio di Tas-Silg*, in *Oriens Antiquus*, 9, p. 61-64.
- ID., 1980, *La Civiltà Mediterranea*, Milan.
- MÜLLER, K., 1885, *Geographi Graeci Minores*, I, Paris (repr. Hildesheim, 1965).
- PALLOTTINO, M., 1935, *Scritto tarquiniese con rilievi d'avorio arcaici*, in *RIASA*, 5, p. 37ff.
- PELAGATTI, P., 1978, *Siracusa. Elementi dell'abitato di Ortigia nell'VIII e VII secolo a.C.*, in *Cronache di Archeologia e di Storia dell'Arte*, Catania. Università, 17, p. 119-133.
- PURPURA, G., 1981, *Sulle vicende ed il luogo di rinvenimento del cosiddetto Melqart di Selinunte*, in *Sicilia Archeologica*, 46-47, p. 87-93.
- SHEFTON, B.J., 1982, *Greeks and Greek Imports in the South of the Iberian Peninsula, The Archaeological Evidence*, in *Phönizier im Westen*, Mainz, p. 337-370.
- TAMBURELLO, I., 1971, *Palermo punico-romana*, in *Kokalos*, 17, p. 81-96.
- ID., 1978, *Palermo antica (III)*, in *Sicilia Archeologica*, 38, p. 42-53.
- TORE, G., 1986, *Intorno ad un « torciere » bronzo di tipo cipriota da San Vero Milis (S'Uraki)-Oristano*, in *Atti del I Convegno di Studi « Un millennio di relazioni fra la Sardegna e i paesi del Mediterraneo »*, Selargius-Cagliari 1985, Cagliari, p. 65-76.
- TRUMP, D.H., 1966, *Skorba*, London.
- TUSA, V., 1979, *La problematica archeologica relativa alla penetrazione fenicio-punica e alla storia della civiltà punica in Sicilia*, in *Storia della Sicilia*, Napoli, p. 145-161.
- ID., 1983, *La statua di Mozia*, in *La Parola del Passato*, 38, p. 445-446.

## DISCUSSIONS

Michel GRAS

L'exposé d'Anthony Bonanno n'est absolument pas marginal par rapport au thème du colloque. Malte, par sa position géographique unique en Méditerranée, revêt une extrême importance pour l'histoire des échanges...

Deux aspects de Malte me frappent, qui se complètent : le faciès archéologique de l'île au VII<sup>e</sup> siècle à une dimension « orientale » marquée, comme l'a souligné Bonanno : j'ajouterais à ce qu'il a dit la morphologie particulière des amphores de la tombe de Ghajnejja dont il est encore difficile de déterminer le centre de production, mais qui, même si elles sont occidentales (ce qui est fort possible à mon avis) imitent des types orientaux de la Phénicie.

Malte est aussi, d'une certaine manière, très liée à la Sicile orientale toute proche et aux colonies grecques de cette région. Prenons la tombe de Ghajn Qajjet. La coupe protocorinthienne basse et la *bird* sont du milieu du VII<sup>e</sup> siècle (en dépit des datations erronées qui se rencontrent sur ce point dans la littérature archéologique) et proviennent, selon moi, du milieu colonial grec de Sicile orientale. N'oublions pas que des plats en *red slip* (nombreux à Malte) ont été récemment identifiés à Syracuse, Megara Hyblaea et Messine. Enfin, lors du dernier congrès de Tarente, une amphore de type phénicien (proche des Cintas 268) a été découverte au Sud de Reggio (elle est exposée au musée de cette ville) : mais elle est plus proche d'exemplaires de Metauros et Mylai que de la documentation amphorique maltaise.

Rien n'atteste encore un rôle de Malte dans les relations Étrurie-Carthage aux VII<sup>e</sup> et VI<sup>e</sup> siècles. L'avenir dira s'il s'agit d'un hasard ou non. Mais Motyè me semble de ce point de vue mieux placé que Malte.

Werner JOHANNOWSKY

Le tazze rodie ad uccelli rodie rientrano nella prima metà del VII secolo. Una delle kotylai della tomba nella rosa di Rabat è del protocorinzio medio, l'altro mi sembra etrusco-corinzio e della fine del VII — inizio VI secolo a.C. Anche i Greci usavano evidentemente una rotta in mare aperto partendo da *Kriou Metapon* all'estremità S.O. di Creta, dov'è stato trovato un altare fenicio databile al più tardi all'VIII secolo, che è stato riconosciuto nella sua importanza da Di Vita.

Jean-Paul MOREL

Anthony Bonanno a signalé un plat de Genucilia trouvé à Malte, indice modeste mais indubitable d'un rapport entre la mer Tyrrhénienne et cette île. Qu'il me permette de rappeler que cette production extrêmement peu diffusée en Méditerranée occidentale est aussi représentée à Carthage, où trois exemplaires en ont été trouvés (*Antiquités Africaines*, 15, 1980, p. 67-68) : on peut y voir un témoignage supplémentaire d'analogie entre Malte et le monde punique.

Anthony BONANNO

Ringrazio l'amico Gras per le sue osservazioni con le quali sono pienamente d'accordo e soprattutto per l'indicazione della recentissima scoperta di un'altra anfora di tipo fenicio trovata nelle vicinanze di Reggio. Dagli scritti recenti di Michel Gras sono al corrente dell'abbassamento della datazione della kotyle corinzia e della coppa ad uccello rispetto a quella proposta dal Dunbabin e susseguentemente dal Culican.

Sono grato anche al Dr. Johannowsky per aver chiamato la mia attenzione all'altare fenicio sulla costa meridionale di Creta e al materiale fenicio di Knosso, i quali mi rendono meno titubante nella mia proposta di una linea di navigazione a mare aperto che da Creta si sarebbe diretta verso Malta e oltre.

Grazie anche al collega Morel per il suo intervento. Vorrei solo chiamare la sua attenzione ad un altro esemplare di piatto di Genucilia, questa volta trovato a Cirene, pubblicato da Lidiano Bacchielli, a cui facevo riferimento nella parte della mia relazione che ho dovuto saltare per motivi di tempo.

18. 1987. *La protection des monuments archéologiques dans les zones à risques sismiques.* Cours intensif européen, 5. Ravello, décembre 1985. Edité par J. Bonnin, T. Hackens et Br. Helly, 274 p. 3000 FB
19. 1988. *A Bibliography on Cremation. Leichenbrand Bibliographie.* Coeditors : M. Lange, H. Schutkowski, S. Hummel, B. Hermann, 165 p. 1200 FB
20. 1988. *Navies and Commerce of the Greeks, the Carthaginians and the Etruscans in the Tyrrhenian Sea.* Acts of the European Symposium held at Ravello, January 1987. Edited by T. Hackens, 510 p. 4000 FB
21. 1988. *Il primo ferro nel Mediterraneo. The First Iron in the Mediterranean.* Atti del Convegno di Populonia/ Piombino, 1983. Coeditor : G. Sperl, 199 p. 2000 FB
22. 1988. *Wood and Archaeology. Bois et archéologie.* Actes du Symposium Européen tenu à Louvain-la-Neuve, Octobre 1987. Edited by T. Hackens, A.V. Munaut and Cl. Till, 400 p. 3000 FB
23. 1989. *Technologie et analyse des gemmes anciennes. Technology and Analysis of Ancient Gemstones.* European Workshop, Ravello, November 13-16th 1987. Edited by T. Hackens. Sous presse
24. 1989. *Geology and Palaeoecology for Archaeologists. Palinuro I.* European Postgraduate Course, 6. Ravello. Application on the Site of Palinuro. September 1986. Co-editors : Tony Hackens and Urve Miller, 213 p. 2000 FB
25. 1990. *Volcanologie et Archéologie.* Actes des ateliers européens de Ravello, 19-27 novembre 1987 et 30-31 mars 1989. Co-éditeurs : Claude Albore-Livadie et Fr. Widemann, 277 p. 3000 FB
26. 1991. *La préparation alimentaire des céréales.* Rapports présentés à la Table ronde, Ravello au Centre Universitaire pour les Biens culturels, avril 1988. Ed. D. Fournier et Fr. Sigault, 136 p. 1400 FB
27. 1990. *Le commerce maritime des Romains.* Actes du symposium organisé à Barcelone, mai 1988, à la Mémoire de N. Lamboglia. Edités par T. Hackens et Marta Miro. Sous presse
28. 1990. *La protection du bâti ancien dans les zones à risques sismiques.* Cours intensif européen, 7. Ravello, décembre 1987. Co-éditeurs : P. de Maisonneuve, F. Ferrigni, Br. Helly. 3000 FB
29. 1990. *<sup>14</sup>C and Archaeology.* Proceedings of the Second International Symposium held at Groningen, September 7-11th 1987. Coeditor : W.G. Mook, 459 p. 4000 FB.
30. 1990. *Archeologia e tecnologia storica del ferro.* Cours européen postgradué, 8. Ravello- Ile d'Elbe- Populonia, mai 1989. Ed. par G. Sperl. Sous presse.
31. 1990. *Impact of Prehistoric and Medieval Man on the Vegetation : Man and the Forest Limit.* Report of the meeting held in Ravello, December 9-10th 1989. Co-editors : D. Moe and S. Hicks. 116 p. 1000 FB.
32. 1991. *Etude de cas de vulnérabilité sismique : les temples de Paestum.* Atelier européen, Ravello-Paestum, juin 1989. Ed. par G. Tocco. Sous presse
33. 1991. *Airborne Particles, their Negative Effects on the Cultural Heritage and its Environment.* Round Tables, Ravello, December 1989 and 1990. Ed. Sheila Hicks, Urve Miller, Siwert Nilsson, Irmeli Vuorela. Sous presse
34. 1991. *D'Epidaure à Salerne et à Montpellier.* Symposium européen, Ravello, 1990. Ed. Antje Krug. Sous presse
35. 1991. *Vie et survie des monnaies anciennes.* Atelier européen, Ravello, octobre 1990. Ed. T. Hackens, Gh. Moucharte et A. Stazio. Sous presse
36. 1991. *Time and Environment.* Acts of the Symposium held at Helsinki, October 1990. Edited by Högne Jungner. Sous presse
37. 1992. *Estonia : Nature, Man and Cultural Heritage.* Proceedings of a Round Table held at Tallinn, at the Estonian Academy of Sciences, April 1991. Co-editors : T. Hackens, V. Lang and Urve Miller. 173 p. 1800 FB
38. 1992. *Sources and Resources. Studies in honour of Birgit Arrhenius.* Edited by H.A. Nordström et alii.

39. *L'homme et la mesure du temps*. Symposium européen organisé et publié à la Mémoire de Jacques Soustelle, Ravello, Octobre 1990. Ed. Yeter Göksu, Edmund Buchner, M. Hutchinson.
40. *Céramiques anciennes et traditionnelles*. Cours postgradué européen, 11. Ravello, mars 1990. Ed. J. Boardman, J.P. Morel, T. Hackens.
41. *Laminated Sediments and Archaeology*, Proceedings of a European Workshop held at Ravello, December, 1990, Ed. Sheila Hicks, U. Miller, M. Saarnisto.
42. *Garden History : Garden Plants, Species, Forms and Varieties from Pompei to 1800*. Symposium Ravello, June 15th-17th 1991, Ed. Dagfinn Moe, J. H. Dickson and Per Magnus Jørgensen.
43. *Flottes et commerce hellénistiques en Méditerranée*. Symposium européen, Ravello, janvier 1989. Ed. T. Hackens.
44. *L'homme et la mesure du temps*. Symposium EURETHNO, Strasbourg, septembre 1991. Ed. Jocelyne Bonnet.
45. *Second Archaeometry Conference of South Eastern Europe*. Delphi, 19-21 April 1991. Ed. I. Liritzis.

*Progress and Preservation. Economy of Heritage and Sustainable Cultural Development. International Seminar, Barcelona, 7-8th April 1992.*

*Archéologie et paysage*. Cours postgradués de télédétection appliquée à l'archéologie. Paestum-Ravello, 1987 et 1988, Empuriés, 1989. Ed. M. Guy. En préparation.

*Palinuro II : Excavations and Analysis*. European intensive course, 9. Ed. Urve Miller, Dagfinn Moe and the Soprintendenza ai beni archeologici, Salerno.

*Archeologia e tecnologia del rame antico*. Cours postgradué européen, 10. Ravello, Massa Marittima, mai 1990. Ed. G. Sperl.

*Technologie et analyse des gemmes anciennes et modernes*, II. Atelier européen, Ravello, décembre 1990. Edité par J. Boardman et T. Hackens.

*Les risques des Biens culturels en Europe orientale*, Ravello, mai 1991. Ed. Nina Kaucisvili.

**Adresse de commande :**

**Orders should be forwarded to :**

PACT Belgium, Avenue Léopold, 28a B-1330 Rixensart (Belgium).