Shafer-Elliott 2013 = C. Shafer-Elliott, *Food in Ancient Judah: Domestic Cooking in the Time of the Hebrew Bible*, London 2013.
Twiss 2012 = K. Twiss, *The Archaeology of Food and Social Diversity*, in «Journal of Archaeological Research» 20, 2012, pp. 357-395.
Twiss 2019 = K.C. Twiss, *The Archaeology of Food: Identity, Politics, and Ideology in the Prehistoric and Historic Past*, Cambridge 2019.

Ido Koch
Tel Aviv University
idokoch@post.tau.ac.il

L. Bonadies – I. Chirpanlieva – É. Guillon (edd.), *Les Phéniciens, les Puniques et les autres. Échanges et identités en Méditerranée ancienne,* Paris 2019 («Orient & Mediterranee», 31). Editions de Boccard, 236 pp., b/w figs., ISSN 2101-3195 - ISBN 978-2-7018-0569-6.

Phoenician and Punic studies are usually characterised as a relatively young discipline,[1] which has grown, over the past sixty years, in a rather disordered way. Language barriers are often indicated as one of the factors preventing its more uniform development.[2] Other shortcomings can be – for instance – identified in: 1) starkly different national academic traditions, 2) discrepancies in the terminology, chronological frameworks, type, quality and quantity of archaeological data, 3) a divide between scholars working on the eastern and western Mediterranean and 4) a general delay in adopting fresh theoretical approaches and carrying out scientific analysis[3]. However, during the past twenty years or so, many individual and collective works have begun to bridge these gaps, while the number of English-language publications has increased.

In a time when Mediterranean and long-term perspectives are considered the most effective approaches to studying the Iron Age (and not only), the Phoenicians represent the only *file rouge* connecting most of the regions facing Plato's proverbial frog pond. This should imply that Iron Age Mediterranean narratives cannot disregard Phoenician and Punic studies, which may explain the recent growth of works in this field.

The book under review stems from a meeting of almost the same title held in Paris at the Sorbonne University on 13th-14th May 2016, which was organized by the editors of the present volume: L. Bonadies, I. Chirpanlieva and É. Guillon.[4] This is the latest addition to the series *Orient & Méditerranée* of the interdisciplinary research centre "UMR 8167", which brings together various French institutions working on Historical, Philological and Religious Sciences. The structure of this book reflects the organization of those Parisian study days, except for the absence of very few presentations and the addition of some works originally presented as posters, which explains the differences in length between the contributions. Besides a foreword and an introduction, the volume contains sixteen papers (in French, English and Italian) and a brief conclusion. The articles are grouped into three geographic sections: 1) Phoenicia and Egypt, 2) the island of Cyprus and Greece, and 3) the western and central Mediterranean.

1 Vella 2019, p. 27.

2 Gilboa 2012, p. 107.

3 See also the results of the discussion at the workshop "Between foreign hegemony and expansion to the west: Phoenician society and economy from the 12th until the 4th century in its Near Eastern and Mediterranean context"; https://www.vorderasiatische-archaeologie.uni-mainz.de/files/2019/05/Workshop_Discussions_Summary_Final.pdf (30.06.2020).

4 The conference programme is available at https://www.orient-mediterranee.com/IMG/pdf/programme-def.pdf (30.06.2020).

In the foreword (pp. 7-8), the three editors explain the title in relation to the *vexata quaestio* of the Phoenician identity and specify that the conference aimed at bringing together early-career researchers and established scholars working (mostly within French institutions) on various disciplines, debating on new approaches, recent discoveries and current issues of Phoenician and Punic studies.

A proper conceptualisation behind this initiative is offered in the introduction by C. Bonnet and P. Rouillard (pp. 9-16), who reflect on the most important words contained in the title: identity and exchanges[5], the latter to be understood as a reference to both the circulation of cultural elements and the trade of various commodities. They provide the theoretical framework for tackling these issues and a plea for an opening towards multidisciplinary and comparativism as useful ways to enrich a historically driven investigation. Bonnet and Rouillard also describe – according to an anthropologically-informed perspective – the various types of relations and strategies characterising the encounters between locals and newcomers, giving special prominence to R. White's concept of middle ground.

The first section starts with an article by L. Bonadies and L. Marti (pp. 19-41), who address – by considering textual data and imagery – the issue of how the Egyptians and the Assyrians saw those that are nowadays known as the Phoenicians. They also analyse two stone vases from Assur, which bring them to emphasize the difficulty in identifying the workshops that manufactured these objects.

A. Baaklini, L. Bonadies and A. Venanzi (pp. 43-50) offer a synthetic overview of the connections between the Phoenicians and the Arameans, which are recognized in some red slip wares, common language features before the 8th century BC and an alleged similarity between their artistic productions.

G. Pierrat-Bonnefois (pp. 51-71) attempts to re-evaluate some groups of artefacts (i.e. faience vases, scarabs, scaraboids and amulets, and stone vessels) that are traditionally considered of Egyptian manufacture. She observes that, while an Egyptian influence on Phoenician art and craftwork is usually recognized, the opposite view is rarely suggested. Accordingly, she sustains that Levantine motifs and schemes can be identify in what have been traditionally assumed to be Egyptian artefacts. Pierrat-Bonnefois argues that the mixture of Egyptian and Near Eastern styles and traditions could be a marker of Levantine craftsmanship, as she proposes for three groups of objects: 1) low relief vases (e.g., flasks, amphoriskoi) attested from the 8th century BC in Egypt and other Mediterranean regions (e.g., Cyprus, Rhodes, Etruria, Sicily); 2) scarabs, scaraboids and other amulets with mixed style, which were probably produced in the Delta region during the Third Intermediate period; and 3) calcite alabaster amphorae, which have been so far mostly found outside Egypt, especially in Spain and Sudan. According to Pierrat-Bonnefois, the Phoenicians are still hostages of their nineteenth-century definition as imitators or copiers of foreign styles and artisanal productions.

S. Marchand (pp. 73-100) gives an overview of foreign types of vessels that are adapted in Egypt. She first addresses terminological and methodological issues, then distinguishes three ways of locally adapting foreign shapes (i.e., "imitation", "assimilation" and "transposition") and explains the differences in meaning between them. There is a subtle distinction between the first two terms, while the latter implies differences of material between model and copy (e.g., a stone vase that reproduces a pottery shape or vice versa). Additionally, she provides a detailed description of how to proceed in the investigation of this phenomenon, giving attention also to technological and petrographic aspects, which are usually underestimated in this type of study. Overall, Marchand adopts a long-term perspective summarising the main typologies, mostly transport containers, documented between the 4th and the 1st millennium BC. However, the section on the 1st millennium BC, which is based on her personal work on the so-called "torpedo" jars, basket-handled amphorae and those of Aegean-type, is more exhaustive and represents an example of her method of research, which combines petrographic and morphological study with the analysis of the spatial distribution of specific types of transport containers.

5 The reference to the debated notion of a "Phoenician-Punic world" should be intended as an observation on the original subtitle of the conference, which – in the process of publication – was evidently changed and simplified.

The second part on Cyprus and the Aegean starts with J. Daccache's re-examination (pp. 103-121) of a stone monument (c. mid-7th century BC) – on display at the Louvre museum – reportedly from a sanctuary at Pyla/Palaeokastro, to the north-east of Kition. It consists of a pyramidal cippus, which bears a three-line Phoenician inscription and is surmounted by a Bes-like bearded head, mixing human and feline elements. This ex-voto was dedicated to the god Reshep, whose name was followed by the letter *shin*, completed in Š[D] by M. Sznycer and traditionally interpreted as a double theonym Reshep-Shed. Based on a personal examination of this monument, Daccache, who recognizes an *ayin* before the fracture, suggests instead integrating the text as Šʿ[R] and interpreting it as an epithet "gate-keeper [of the netherworld]", which is explained in relation to some Ugaritic ritual texts.

C. Ioannou (pp. 123-128) also deals with epigraphic sources. After briefly summarising the few inscriptions mentioning political roles in Iron Age Cyprus, she focuses on those containing the Phoenician word MLK for "king", which are attested during the Cypro-Classical period (c. 480-310 BC). She argues that the Phoenician-speaking rulers of these phases were probably already part of the local communities, as these cities showing features similar to the other Cypriot centres would demonstrate.

The next three articles represent a group of its own, as they deal with similar topics in a diachronic way. By combining archaeological data and a speculative approach, S. Sherratt (pp. 129-158) examines the evidence for Phoenician activities in the Aegean during the 11th-9th centuries BC. She starts by pointing out the distribution of eastern Mediterranean faience and glass artefacts in the Aegean during the late 11th to 10th centuries BC. Scanty evidence of east-west connections is also identified in Lefkandi-Skoubris tomb 46, which contains a Levantine-type dipper and a possibly Cypriot iron dagger, and in Early Protogeometric bowls from Tyre stratum XIV and Tell es-Safi. As Tyre appears as the major and earliest recipient of Euboean and Attic pottery in the Levant during the 10th-9th centuries BC, Sherratt argues for Tyrians as main carriers of these ceramics from the Aegean, in contrast to scholars connecting this evidence to Cypriot seafarers or suggesting an Euboean initiative to search for metals. She explains this suggestion in relation to a Phoenician need for silver (in exchange for prestige goods), although acknowledging that to date few silver objects are known from the Early Iron Age Aegean. This would account for the current distribution of eastern Mediterranean finds, as Lefkandi is located at the crossroad of a sea route leading to two regions of silver and/other metal sources in eastern Attica and the northwest Aegean. Sherratt also tries to reconstruct the routes and the stops followed by the Phoenicians within the Aegean during these phases. From the late 9th century BC, Attic pottery accompanied the Euboean skyphoi and plates in the western and central Mediterranean, which Sherratt again connects – given their distribution and associated artefacts – to Phoenician carriers, which is the same answer she gives to the old question about whether it was the Phoenicians or the Euboeans who took the initiative.

N. Kourou (pp. 159-177) examines the appearance of Attic Middle Geometric pottery outside the Aegean from the late 9th/early 8th century BC. During the MG, there is an increase in Near Eastern-type artefacts found in Attica, where a Levantine influence on local metal and especially goldworking technology can be observed. Kourou explains it in relation to a Phoenician frequentation of this region due to the silver mines at Lavrion, which would account for the Phoenicians as the carriers of these Attic ceramics and the role of Tyre in their redistribution within the Levant. In her analysis of MG Attic exported ceramics, she identifies only two shapes: the pedestalled crater (rarely attested probably because of the difficulty in its overseas transport) and the far more common skyphos, which represented the typical Athenian dinner set. In the west, she distinguishes two routes: Euboean and Atticizing Greek vases are more frequently attested in the central Mediterranean, while Attic MG vases are more common further west. Among the consequences of the diffusion of the Athenian dinner set, Kourou includes the phenomenon of the Phoenician adaptation of the skyphos.

I. Chirpanlieva (pp. 179-195) explores – from a long-term (c. 8th-4th centuries BC) and Mediterranean perspective – the Phoenician/Punic imitation of Greek open shapes. She distinguishes three ways of adapting foreign ceramic types, depending on being more or less faithful to the originals in shape, decoration and technique. As this phenomenon is attested in Cyprus earlier than in the Levant, a major issue to be address is whether the examples found in the Levant (e.g., the so-called Al Mina ware) should be considered local or imported products. Chirpanlieva is open to both possibilities, but the most recent petrographic analysis points to their production in eastern Cyprus.[6] She also briefly mentions the opposite phenomenon that of the local imitation of Phoenician-type plates in central Italy (i.e., Pithekoussai, Cumae).

The third part begins with a paper by M. De Jonghe (pp. 199-222), who tackles the issue of identity through the archaeological record of some western Phoenician cemeteries. She first introduces a few definitions of identity, with a special regard to the perspective of various scholars of Phoenician and Punic studies who have sustained the necessity of a shift from an a priori (etic) definition to a local (emic) one. She then emphasizes the relevance of funerary practices as a field of research to gain an inside perspective on Phoenician identities and summarises some methodological and theoretical issues raised by this type of investigation. In her study, De Jonghe moves from general to particular, starting with a Mediterranean scale, going then to a regional focus and finally examining a specific cemetery. She explores the ceramic assemblages from the necropolis of Utica by applying a statistical method of analysis and distinguishes seven groups showing the occurrence of the same type of vessels. De Jonghe wonders if these groups may be connected to individual or communal identities.

I. Oggiano and T. Pedrazzi (pp. 223-257) examine the early connections/contacts between Phoenicia and Sardinia through the data offered by Sant'Imbenia-type amphorae. They start with a diachronic and very detailed introduction on the Early Iron Age I-IIA in the Levant and offer a synthesis of the Early Iron Age interactions across the Mediterranean, which highlights Cypriots and Levantines as primary players in long-distance trade, but also emphasizes the importance of Sardinia. This section, which may have also justified the inclusion of this article in the first part of the book, aims at setting the archaeological evidence from the village of Sant'Imbenia in a far wider frame. The foreign frequentation of this village on the north-western coast of Sardinia from the end of the 9th century BC is explained in relation to a phase when Levantine merchants were pursuing sea routes leading to metal-rich areas. It is not surprising, then, that copper, iron, silver and lead mines are located in the Nurra region, where eastern Mediterranean-type objects are also documented. Based on non-local ceramics found at Sant'Imbenia, Oggiano and Pedrazzi argue that wine consumption played a remarkable role in the encounter between newcomers and locals. Among the consequences of this interaction, they recognize an increase in the production and trade of Sardinian wine, which is presumed to have been exported using a type of hybrid container first recognized at Sant'Imbenia (hence its labelling), but currently attested in other parts of Sardinia (where petrography suggest the existence of multiple production centres), as well as in central Italy, North Africa and the Iberian Peninsula. In their analysis of the Sant'Imbenia amphorae, Oggiano and Pedrazzi focus on their morphology, fabrics and manufacture techniques.

Moving on to another island, M. Quartararo (pp. 259-266) examines a child burial (c. 2nd century BC) from cemetery A at Entella, an indigenous settlement in western Sicily. Tomb 178 contains the skeleton of a child between 1 and 6 years old, which was accompanied by a black glaze skyphoid cup, two plain ware juglets and three glass paste beads. According to Quartararo, some of these burial goods find parallels at Lilybaeum and in other Punic graves from North Africa, Sardinia and the Iberian Peninsula, which stands out against the background of a region that had been under Roman control for some time.

6 Vacek 2020, p. 1176, note 1, p. 1180.

Ibiza is the object of É. Guillon's article (pp. 267-280). Contrasting with the view of the Mediterranean as a middle ground for the encounters between newcomers and locals, this island was uninhabited before the arrival of Phoenician-speaking groups from the south-eastern coast of the Iberian Peninsula around the mid-7th century BC. Guillon raises the issue of what kind of cultural processes occurred on such an island located at the crossroads of many sea routes and how its inhabitants built a local identity. In order to address these topics, her analysis is based on the brief examination of two local productions: transport amphorae and coroplastic artefacts. The first shows the extent of trade networks including Ibiza, the latter is instead considered to reflect mostly local ritual and funerary practices. Guillon argues that Ibiza (and Formentera) is an example of "glocalisation", namely the coexistence and merging of the local with the global. According to Guillon, the global sphere depends on the insertion of this island into the Punic network, which is attested by the use of Punic writing, the support given to Carthage during the Second Punic War and some aspects of the material culture and rituals. The elaboration of a local original culture is especially recognizable in clay statuettes and other meaningful objects used in cult and funerary contexts from the end of the 6th/5th centuries BC.

M. Luaces (pp. 281-302) focuses on the strait of Gibraltar between 206 BC and 44 AD, with the aim of understanding whether the political development of this region after the Second Punic War determined some changes in the local culture, especially in relation to economic activities. In order to accomplish this task, he analyses Gadir, Carteia and Lixus: the first two became Roman cities after the Second Punic War, while western Mauretania was ruled by local kings. He points out that Phoenician elements persisted in the economic activities of the region during this period, but they survived longer in Mauretania, probably because of its later incorporation into the Roman provincial system.

M.G. Amadasi Guzzo (pp. 303-318) explores the question of identity through multilingualism in North Africa between the 2nd century BC and the 1st century AD. During this period, writings and languages of various origin (i.e., neo-Punic, Greek, Libyan and, soon after, Latin) were simultaneously employed. When several types of languages and writing systems are attested within the same region, their use implies a choice, which is assumed to depend on an ethnic, social or other type of identity. According to Amadasi Guzzo, in 1st century AD Tripolitania, language and writing of Phoenician origin are used to express a local (non-ethnic) conscience, while onomastic designations serve to specify, from a social or ethnic point of view, different origins and/or attributions of group membership. On the contrary, she points out that further west, in the Numidian and Mauretanian kingdoms, identity was express through Libyan writing and language. She also identifies a few examples of Greek being used as a marker of ethnicity and of professional status.

V. Boschloos, E. Gubel and R. Docter (pp. 319-323) give a summary of the ongoing project aiming at the preparation of a Corpus of Phoenician and Punic Antiquities (CAPP) in Belgian and Dutch collections. This is part of an international initiative dedicated to listing, studying and publishing the main Phoenician/Punic artefacts in museums and private collections. So far, the CAPP network also includes Italy, Tunisia, Spain and Portugal. In this case, a website[7] already works as a platform to inform about the collections, recent activities and publications preceding the final edition of the corpus.

The book ends with a short conclusion by the three editors (pp. 325-327), who reflect on the results of this meeting and corresponding book, emphasizing the necessity to get away from monolithic and/or binary approaches when tackling the issue of cultural encounters.

This collection of essays certainly deserves praise for the variety of approaches adopted and topics investigated, which represent the most positive feature of the book as a whole. Particularly, the editors have extended the geographic and chronological focus of the investigation to less-explored fields. This book in-

7 http://uai44-capp.be (30.06.2020).

cludes a region such as Egypt that – even though it is widely recognized to have played a major influence on the Phoenicians and a textual tradition suggests a Phoenician presence there – has not been tackled in recent handbooks. At the same time, some scholars (Quartararo, Luaces, Amadasi Guzzo) focus on the study of Punic elements in later phases or more generally in the period following the fall of Carthage, which have – only very recently – begun to attract more attention.[8]

Of the lines of investigations mentioned in the title, identity appears as the least explored, which is curious as it is probably the most popular topic at the moment in Phoenician and Punic scholarship.[9] However, the contribution by Amadasi Guzzo will surely play an important role in identity research and hopefully will inspire other scholars to use epigraphic data as a starting point in a similar way. At the same time, the absence of a specific work on Phoenicia in a volume generally emphasizing emic perspectives over etic ones appears quite bizarre.

Most of the articles concern material culture and its use to address both trade and cultural exchanges. As stated by Bonadies and Marti, «la culture matérielle ne peut pas être considérée comme un élément toujours suffisamment fiable pour reconnaitre l'identité d'un peuple» (p. 34). However, objects cannot be fully understood without taking into account social and ritual practices, which – especially in contexts of mobility and migration – may give insights into the identity of groups and the dynamics of cultural encounters. Renowned examples are R. Docter's observations about the practice of ceremonial breakage at the cemetery of Pithekoussai[10] or the explanation provided for the Levantine artefacts from Sant'Imbenia. As Oggiano and Pedrazzi have remarked, it is very likely that wine consumption – and more generally feasting – could have been a way to establish commercial partnerships and seal agreements. Wine consumption has been also mentioned as the most likely argument for the import of Euboean and Attic drinking bowls and the phenomenon of their adaptation. It seems likely that also the dipper juglet from Lefkandi should be connected to this practice, as also attested by similar finds from some Cypriot cemeteries. At the same time, technology emerges – especially in the articles by Marchand, Oggiano and Pedrazzi – as a useful way to study cultural encounters. As these scholars have emphasized, technology has the potential to highlight cultural traditions and the mixing of cultural elements, but its study requires an integrated and multidisciplinary approach including scientific analysis. The same approach may also be profitably used to characterise who, where and how certain groups of objects were produced that have been traditionally studied solely on stylistic grounds (e.g., the stone vessels, and – more generally – local adaptations of foreign artefacts).

The book is well edited and produced, with a very nice cover drawing. Illustrations are apt and generally of sound quality; in many cases they consist of original photos, maps and artefact drawings. The only exception is the chronological table of the pottery horizons in the Aegean (p. 131, fig. 1), which has some formatting problems. Additionally, it would have been useful to have site names in Sherratt's map showing the distribution of "eastern faience and glass objects" (p. 133, fig. 3). The number of typos and errors in a volume 330 pages long is remarkably few. The most glaring, perhaps, are the list of abbreviations of Kourou's article, which has been inserted before Sherratt's bibliography, and the misspelling of some scholars' names.

To sum up, this volume is not only aimed at scholars of Phoenician and Punic studies, but it will be useful to all those widely engaging with the Iron Age Mediterranean. Accordingly, it certainly belongs in university libraries.

8 *E.g.*, some of the chapters in Quinn – Vella 2014.

9 See, for instance, Quinn – Vella 2014, Quinn 2018 and the volumes published by the project "Transformation and crisis in the Mediterranean. Identity and Interculturality in the Levant and Phoenician West", which is directed by G. Garbati and T. Pedrazzi.

10 Docter 2000.

References

Docter 2000 = R.F. Docter, *Pottery, Graves and Ritual I: Phoenicians of the First Generation in Pithekoussai*, in P. Bartoloni – L. Campanella (edd.), *La ceramica fenicia di Sardegna dati, problematiche, confronti. Atti del Primo congresso internazionale Sulcitano* (Sant'Antioco 19-21 settembre 1997), Roma 2000 («Collezione di Studi Fenici», 40), pp. 135-150.

Gilboa 2012 = A. Gilboa, *Review of: Ceramics of the Phoenician-Punic World: Collected Essays by Claudia Sagona*, in «BASOR» 368, 2012, pp. 107-112.

Quinn 2018 = J.C. Quinn, *In Search of the Phoenicians*, Princeton 2018.

Quinn – Vella 2014 = J.C. Quinn – N. Vella (edd.), *The Punic Mediterranean: Identities and Identification from Phoenician Settlement to Roman Rule*, Cambridge 2014 («British School at Rome Studies»).

Vacek 2020 = A. Vacek, *Ugarit, Al Mina, and Coastal North Syria*, in I. S. Lemos – A. Kotsonas (edd.), *A Companion to the Archaeology of Early Greece and the Mediterranean*, Hoboken 2020, pp. 1163-1184.

Vella 2019 = N.C. Vella, *Birth and Prospects of a Discipline*, in B.R. Doak – C. López-Ruiz (edd.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Phoenician and Punic Mediterranean*, Kettering 2019, pp. 23-35.

Adriano Orsingher
Biblisch-Archäologisches Institut, Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen
adriano.orsingher@uni-tuebingen.de

Paolo Xella, José-Ángel Zamora (edd.), *Inscriptions phéniciennes inédites ou peu connues dans la collection de la Direction Générale des Antiquités du Liban*, Beyrouth 2018 («BAAL Hors-Série», 15). ISSN 1683-0083. 170 pp., b/w-figs.

We are pleased to welcome the publication of the fifteenth volume of the *Bulletin d'Archéologie et d'Architecture Libanaises* (BAAL) Hors-Série dedicated to the unpublished or little known Phoenician inscriptions preserved in the Collection of the Directorate General of Antiquities of Lebanon, edited by Paolo Xella and José Ángel Zamora with contributions from some of the most eminent scholars in the field.

The present volume collects a total of 31 inscriptions. The material is organised in two sections: the first one gathers together inscriptions stored in the depots (II) (pp. 13-100); the second one includes inscriptions *in situ* (III) (pp. 103-118). The first section is further divided in subsections: A. Inscriptions on metal (pp. 15-17), B. Inscriptions on stone (pp. 17-52), C. Inscriptions on pottery (pp. 53-100). False and dubious inscriptions are separately presented in an Appendix (pp. 121-126). Paleographic tables (pp. 129-133), a glossary (pp. 135-138) and bibliography (pp. 159-170) are also included. Arab index can be found at the end.

The entry for each inscription follows a standard format: initials of the author's name in capital letters, inscription number, descriptive title, place where the inscriptions were found, text, translation and commentary, drawing and photograph. Archaeological and iconographic data related to inscribed objects are analysed by Ida Oggiano.

I. In the short introduction (pp. 11-12) we are told about the publication's project, and a list of International Research Centers and authors involved in this publication is included: Maria Giulia Amadasi Guzzo, Ida Oggiano, Hélène Sader, Paolo Xella, José Angel Zamora López.