Colonial Engagements in the Global Mediterranean Iron Age

Tamar Hodos

The application of globalization theory to colonial contexts in recent years has emphasized articulations of the colonized and the colonizers. For the Mediterranean Iron Age, focus has been upon expressions of local (colonized) identities, and of regional variabilities of the overseas Greeks and Phoenicians; any attention to the engagements that the Greeks and Phoenicians had with one another during this time has been solely contrapositive in the framing of arguments. The present study examines the background to this circumstance before addressing specifically the engagement between these global cultures on a Mediterranean-wide scale during the period of their overseas foundations. Regarded from the perspective of a globalization framework, the common sets of practices and shared bodies of knowledge reveal a deep complexity of intercultural contact during the Iron Age, reminding us that cultures should never be considered in isolation.

One of the more recent developments in scholarship has been the analysis of the construction and impact of globalization on the socio-cultural groups that participate in world systems (Featherstone 1991; 1995; Holton 1998; Hoogvelt 2001; Robertson 1992). Globalization in a contemporary context refers to the current sense of global compression in which the world is increasingly regarded as a coherently bounded place, and may be defined as the processes whereby the world becomes seen as one place and the ways in which we are made conscious of this process (Featherstone 1995, 81; see also Robertson 1992). Unlike previous meta-narratives, however, globalization does not suggest a unified world society or culture, but rather comprises sets of practices or bodies of knowledge that transgress cultural or national ideas and are shared between those interacting at the global level. At the same time, however, these commonly understood global traits also serve to highlight differences between those cultures that engage with them, for the global commonalities concurrently provoke the sharper delineation of boundaries between the involved groups. The highlighting and reinforcing of cultural heterogeneities is, in fact, one of the paradoxes of the process of globalization (Featherstone 1995, 114).

Understanding the balance between localized constructs of a culture and the shared traits between groups that enables their interaction has recently fascinated scholars of the past, particularly those addressing the impact of cultural mixing in colonial contexts, where geographically bounded co-residency and daily interaction resulted in rapid cultural developments for all the communities involved. The Mediterranean, in particular, is one ideal venue to scrutinize these aspects for, throughout its history, populations have moved, interacted with and influenced one another within this bounded space (e.g. Horden & Purcell 2000). Its Iron Age period serves as a classic example, during which two cultural groups, notably the Greeks and Phoenicians, settled in numbers along other Mediterranean coastlines that were considerably beyond their homelands while nevertheless maintaining close cultural and commercial links with home and with one another. Despite strong evidence for close contact and shared practices that contribute to a pan-Mediterraneanism during this time, the colonization movements of the Greeks and Phoenicians are usually articulated in contrast to one another.

The theoretical interrelationship between diversity and similarity, where settlements may be

Cambridge Archaeological Journal 19:2, 221–41 © 2009 McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research
doi:10.1017/S0959774309000286 Received 29 Jul 2008; Accepted 11 Nov 2008; Revised 10 Feb 2009

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

regarded as individual communities with diverse local practices and concurrently as cultural representatives interacting with one another, accounts for much of the tension between scholarship on the phenomenon of the Phoenician and Greek colonization movements. The post-colonial deconstruction of meta-narratives of very recent years has seen a consideration of the regional variability within each of these broader colonial cultures, especially with regard to the particular localization, as well as the impact upon those populations whose territories were colonized (for Greeks: e.g. Dougherty & Kurke 2003; Lomas 2004; Tsetskhladze 1999; 2006a; for Phoenicians: Aubet 2001; Bierling 2002). In studies of such cultural contacts, concepts such as hybridization, and arenas for neutral engagement, such as the middle ground, have been at the forefront of interpretation (e.g. Antonaccio 2003; Gosden 2004; Hodos 2006; Malkin 2002; 2004). Hybridization, which refers to the social interactions and negotiations that take place between colonists and the colonized (Knapp 2008, 57), and relates actively and directly to the social agents, negotiations and interactions involved in a contact situation (van Dommelen 2005, 116–18; Knapp 2008, 59–60), is now preferred by many to the more passive notion of hybridity, which overlooks the dynamic role of human actors in cultural encounters (Knapp 2008, 57–9). As such, it has become a valuable means through which to interpret local contexts. The concept of the middle ground has also been useful, for it provides the medium through which cultural encounters take place. This is because a middle ground acts as both core and periphery in geographic and social contexts, with an emphasis on mutual accommodation. Those operating in a middle ground act for interests derived from their own cultures while concurrently they must convince those of another culture that some mutual action is fair and legitimate. As a process, therefore, it unites value systems to create a working relationship between them, often resulting in new sets of meanings and interactions over time. In turn, discourse within the middle ground may affect the conventions of the contributing parties, imparting long-term changes in the local cultures (following White 1991; for the Mediterranean, adopted by, e.g. Malkin 2002; 2004; see also Hodos 2006).

The global-local framework has also been called upon recently in the study of identities in colonial contexts, emphasizing not only the articulation of identity of the colonized but also that of the identity of regional colonizers in contrast to previously held monocultural concepts, each as part of the paradoxical phenomenon of the globalization process (Hales & Hodos 2009). In these cases, the global level has been the geographically widespread cultures of the Mediterranean, such as the Greeks and Phoenicians, identified as such through the shared practices across various communities that enable collective description. The local counterpoint has been the variability between those very same communities. The paradox in these examples is seen in the dichotomy between the fact that individual communities will have concurrently shared and sharply different practices despite common cultural identity.

Rarely has attention been given to the interactions which these colonizing cultures themselves had with one another, especially the Greeks and Phoenicians, whose colonial periods were contemporary. This oversight perhaps derives from traditional scholarly divides. The present study examines the background to this scholarly omission before addressing the engagement between colonial Greeks and colonial Phoenicians on a Mediterranean-wide scale. The timeframe in practice is predominantly the early colonial period of the eighth and seventh centuries BC. For the Greeks and Phoenicians, this represents their Middle Iron Age. While their movement to other shores beyond their homeland often brought about rapid cultural change among other populations, it is not the case that other populations' Iron Ages coincided (Hodos 2006, 3–4). The advent of the Sicilian Iron Age is dated to the middle of the ninth century, for instance, while in North Africa scholarship considers the so-called Prehistoric period to extend to the fourth century, despite Greeks and Phoenicians settling in both these regions during the eighth and seventh centuries (or end of the ninth century in the case of Carthage). The term Iron Age is not a fixed chronological indicator, nor is it a statement of specific material practice — the use of iron — since iron use is known from previous periods. Rather, for the Greeks and Phoenicians, the Iron Age marks a break from Bronze Age traditions resulting from the widespread upheavals evident in the twelfth century BC. As such, the term has a certain Mediterranean-wide applicability, at least when discussing Greek and Phoenician communities across the Mediterranean. For this reason, Iron Age in the present context pertains to Graeco-Phoenician chronology.

The balance between global and local interaction, and the paradox of such engagement, can be seen in any number of levels of cultural relationship, which may be conceptualized as several tiers. For the purposes of this study, at the top are the shared practices between cultures across the Mediterranean that serve to create a global Mediterranean culture;

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

this has been called Mediterraneanization, to reflect the dynamic, active process of connectedness in the Mediterranean (Morris 2003, 33; Hodos 2006, 200–204); underneath and contributing to the global construction are Greek, Phoenician and other populations that represent the notion of cultural groups. Each culture is nevertheless formed by a dispersed collection of communities with regional or localized variability. It is the balance between the top two tiers that forms the focus of the present study: it is the Mediterranean in which the Greeks and Phoenicians settled that serves as the global scale, while the local level is our concepts of Greek and Phoenician cultures themselves. Yet we cannot completely overlook the localized variations, with their shared practices and regional differences, which inform our respective notions of Greek and Phoenician culture. Such a framework does not disregard the greater 'world system' that the Greeks and Phoenicians participated in during this period, but rather forms a part of it, since in practice it is the widespread communities that make up and engage in the world systems. Regarded from the perspective of a globalization framework, therefore, the common sets of practices and shared bodies of knowledge between the overseas Greeks and Phoenicians reveal a deep complexity of intercultural contact on multiple levels during the Iron Age, which serve to remind us that cultures should never be considered in isolation.

Generalizations of the 'other' in ancient sources

Terminology and vocabulary betray a range of assumptions that may obscure our abilities to see alternative perspectives. It is not merely an issue of political correctness, as some have complained recently (e.g. Boardman 1999, 268). Rather, concern with terminology reflects a growing awareness of different interpretations. Unfortunately, with regard to the Phoenicians and Greeks themselves, in some regards our terminology has been restricted to the sources we have available to us. While this in itself is not a problem, the difficulty arises when we forget the origin of our vocabulary and why we are so restricted, for the words themselves gain an identity and meaning which it is difficult to shake, especially when they are drawn from ancient sources.

We have extensive records of how the Greeks regarded themselves, especially through their ties to their cities of origin, although full discourse on this complex aspect for the period in question, when the polis was emerging as a socio-ideological framework, lies beyond the scope of the present discussion (see, instead, the numerous volumes produced by the Copenhagen Polis Center). Nevertheless, our ample record for Greek self-identity stands in sharp contrast to that for the Phoenicians (Pastor Borgoñon 1988–90; Morris 1992; Moscati 1993, 9–14). Few Phoenician monumental inscriptions survive, and there are no extant Phoenician texts of length. Rather, the majority of our literary record regarding the Phoenicians appears as passing references in Assyrian, Biblical and Graeco-Roman sources (contributions in Krings 1995), none of which was concerned with providing extensive details since the Phoenicians were largely viewed by these others as an enemy or 'other' only to be conquered, controlled or exploited. Therefore, any notion of Phoenician identity has been sought in the records of others. Using these sources to inform modern interpretation is, however, problematic.

Greek references to the Phoenicians first appear in Homer, who calls the Phoenicians specifically *Sidonoi*.[1] Justinius records that in 1184 BC Sidon founded Tyre (18.3.5); it is known that occupation at Tyre extends to considerably earlier times, therefore one might regard this as a refoundation, perhaps after a period of decline or desettlement that may be tied to the era and activities of the Sea Peoples (Gubel 1994, 341–2; Niemeyer 2006, 146). Sidon was probably the politically and economically dominant city during this period, especially if it was able to refound neighbouring settlements. Furthermore, Astarte, Sidon's protective deity, was popular in a number of Phoenician overseas communities. While this may have been a deliberate link to a motherland deity in colonial contexts, the ancient Greek authors may have regarded it as a reference to an explicitly Sidonian heritage. In this light, Homer's extension of the Sidon accolade to include other Phoenician settlements therefore does not appear unreasonable, even if it is not an accurate reflection of Phoenician circumstances (Niemeyer 2002, 92; Bunnens 1995, 223; Röllig 1982, 18; see also Fletcher 2004).[2]

References in the *Iliad* associate the Sidonians specifically with luxury fabric manufacture and elaborate silverworking, and are in the context of elite/royal gift-exchange (*Iliad* 6.288–95 (fabric) and 23.740–749 (silver)). The elite-luxury connection is best expressed in the tale of the silver bowl set by Achilles as a prize in the funeral games of Patroklos, where the complex history of the vessel's elite ownership and royal gift-exchange is explained. This relationship is echoed in the *Odyssey*, when Menelaos of Sparta gives to Telemachos a silver mixing bowl that had originally been a gift to the Spartan king from his Sidonian counterpart (*Odyssey* 4.614–19). Other early references appear in the *Odyssey*, where the term

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is collectively 'Phoenicians' in the context of their seamanship, sailing and trading practices, and often discussed with negative overtones that are recognized as a literary trope (Winter 1995; Gubel 2006, 86 notes that all Phoenician things noble in Homer are ascribed to the Sidonians, while all other references pertain to generic Phoenicians). Neo-Assyrian annals and the Old Testament also reflect that the composing cultures valued Phoenician textiles, metal crafts and seafaring. Archaeological evidence from numerous sites suggests that a wider range of goods and objects were manufactured, traded or offered as tribute by the Phoenicians, including wine. The eighth-century Tanit and Elissa wrecks off the coast of Israel near Ashkelon, for instance, were laden with Phoenician amphoras containing wine, and the ships themselves were bound for either Egypt or the western Mediterranean (Ballard *et al.* 2002). Mixed cargoes of the late fourteenth and late thirteenth centuries BC from the Uluburun and Gelidonya wrecks respectively imply that early Phoenician material was transported alongside Cypriot and Mycenaean. The absence of maritime evidence dated to between these Late Bronze Age wrecks and the eighth-century examples of Tanit and Elissa renders it difficult to ascertain the extent to which any such collaboration featured in the Iron Age, although there is evidence of mixed cargoes by the seventh century, as suggested by the Kekova shipwreck's assemblage of southeast Aegean and Corinthian transport amphoras alongside Cypro-Levantine basket-handled amphorae (Delgado 2008, 320).

In contrast to the early Greek tendency to generalize Phoenicians as Sidonians, the Old Testament describes Phoenicians through reference to their individual city-state (Sidon, Gen. x. 15; Judges iii. 3; x. 6, xviii. 7; Ezekial 28; I Kings v. 20, xvi. 31. Tyre, Amos 1.9–10; Ezekiel 26–28; I Kings 6g and II Chronicles 3 refer to Tyrenian craftsmen). In Assyrian documents, they are designated by the determinatives URU (city, town) and KUR (land, territory, country), and a Phoenician city may be designated by both in the same document (Oded 1974, 39–40; see also Pastor Borgoñon 1988–90; Moscati 1993). One must therefore regard the Greek tendency to generalize as part of the broader literary trope that contextualizes the Phoenicians as an enemy.[3] The continuation of this trait in later Greek texts relates to the Greek world's conflict with the Persians, and much has been written about how an eastern attribute renders a group an appropriate enemy to the Greeks from the period of the Persian war onwards. For instance, the alleged Anatolian origins of the Elymian communities in western Sicily are first expressed in Greek literature at the end of the fifth century BC, just as the Greeks themselves were engaged in conflict in Sicily with the Carthaginians, themselves eastern in origin and who were allied with the Elymians at the time (Hodos 2006, 92 with refs.). Thus, in the Greek mind of the fifth century onwards, an eastern origin signals an acceptable enemy of the Greeks (Hall 1989; Nippel 2002, 283).

Generalizations of the 'other' in modern scholarship

When one examines the history of scholarship surrounding the Greek and Phoenician colonial movements, a sense of competition between opposing sides emerges. This competition in fact pre-dates the deconstruction of meta-narratives associated with post-modernism and, explicitly, post-colonialist reconsiderations. Despite the fact that both Greeks and Phoenicians founded overseas settlements across the Mediterranean, and sometimes in the same geographical territory (e.g. Sicily), study of their expansion has been divided between disciplines. In Anglo- and much European scholarship, Near Eastern scholars have traditionally focused on the Phoenician colonization process while Classical scholars examined the Greek movement. This disciplinary division may be traced to nineteenth-century Western European scholarship and the respective primacy of ancient Classical and Biblical literary sources accorded by archaeological research in that era. For Classical scholars, the works of Homer and subsequent ancient authors often served as the avenue for research and interpretation as early field archaeologists sought to justify the texts. The most famous examples are probably Schliemann's quest for Troy, especially the stratum associated with the Trojan War, and Evans's search for King Minos at Knossos (Trigger 1989 with refs.). For Near Eastern scholars, the Bible alone served as the leading text, and many invested great effort and scholarship in trying to prove that the Biblical tales recorded historical events and individuals. Such was the case for pioneers like Petrie at Tell el-Hesi, which he mistakenly identified as the biblical Lachish, Sellin at Jericho, Schumacher at Megiddo, Macalister at Gezer, and Koldewey at Babylon. Indeed, this can be summed up by the financial sponsors' view of work at Samaria, carried out by Reisner, which was 'to prosecute Biblical, linguistic, archaeological, and other kindred studies and researches under more favourable conditions than can be secured at a distance from the Holy Land' (King 1983, 27; see also Moorey 1991; Laughlin 2000, 6).

Explicit study of the Greek and Phoenician colonial movements has maintained divided trajectories in scholarship (Greek: De Angelis 1998; Hodos 2006,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

10–12, with refs.; Phoenician: Gras *et al.* 1989; Pastor Borgoñon 1988–90; Moscati 1993; Vella 1996; Lancel 1995, 438–46 specifically for Carthage), expressed with a sense of competition for primacy in colonial innovation ensuing between the two disciplines. Symptomatic of this rivalry has been questions over the dates of the earliest colonies, as if a kind of Mediterranean supremacy depended upon it. According to ancient literary sources, Phoenician expansion in the Mediterranean began in the twelfth century BC, while Greek colonization started only in the eighth century.[4] Since the late nineteenth century, however, Greek-minded scholars have argued that Phoenician expansion could not have begun before the eighth century (e.g. Beloch 1893–1904), for no material evidence could be identified to support such early foundations anywhere in the Mediterranean that the Phoenicians were supposed to have colonized. Boardman recently maintained that

> it is only after the Greeks establish themselves on the Syrian coast that Greece begins to receive and appreciate eastern products; and there is no clear evidence for Phoenician trading colonies overseas earlier than the Greeks ones. For all that, they may have been the carriers of what little did travel into the Greek world from the east before the eighth century. The nature of this trade did not require the establishment of regular trading posts or colonies until Greek example and competition led them to similar undertakings (Boardman 1999, 38).

Similar ideas continue to circulate:

> In the eighth century BC Greeks were moving into the relatively close territories of central and southern Italy, whilst the Phoenicians established small settlements in Sardinia and further to the west and south. The Greek settlements were designed for permanence; those of the Phoenicians disappeared over time, probably absorbed by the locals (Tsetskhladze 2006b, xlix).[5]

Often, discussion of a particular territory is framed in terms of Greek or Phoenician 'priority' without consideration of shared landscapes (e.g. Boardman 1999, 213 with regard to Spain).

Sabatino Moscati, one of the first scholars to discuss in detail Phoenician expansion in the Mediterranean, argued almost defensively in his seminal work on the subject that the lack of material evidence earlier than the eighth century (as was the case until only very recently) was no reason to doubt the Greek and Biblical texts and Phoenician records that attest Phoenician activity far earlier (Moscati 1966). For instance, he regarded the famous bronze Melquart statuette from just off the coast of western Sicily as of a Bronze Age date on general stylistic grounds and therefore considered it indicative of Phoenician presence in Sicily well before the Iron Age (Moscati 1968, 128). This perspective overlooked the more extensive Mycenaean material from the southern and eastern coasts of the island, and influences inland, where local pottery and metal production sometimes adopt Mycenaean forms or decorative motifs (e.g. Thapsos, Cozzo Pantano, Floridia, Molinello, Matrensa, and Milena: Leighton 1999, 170–80). Together, these suggest that the island was more engaged with Bronze Age Greece (most recently van Wijngaarden 2002; Leighton 2005, 276–7) than Phoenicia, although not necessarily exclusively so.[6]

It is now widely acknowledged that from the early Iron Age, Phoenicians were traversing the Mediterranean and engaging with various local communities, especially Greek island and mainland coastal settlements, through the exchange of goods (Botto 2007a,b; see also Nijboer 2005; 2006a,b). The presence of Near Eastern metalwork in tenth-century contexts at Greek settlements such as Lefkandi and Knossos has been attributed specifically by some to Phoenician mercantile activity (e.g. Papadopoulos 1997; 1998; Gubel 2006). Resident or itinerant Phoenician craftsmen on Rhodes (Ialysos), Crete (Knossos, Kommos, Eleutherna), Athens, Lefkandi and Kos from the ninth century have been argued for by many (Coldstream 1969; Shaw 1989; Stampolidis 2003; see also Negbi 1992). This entire period has been described by Niemeyer as a Phoenician merchant venturers phase in the Mediterranean, whereby craftsmen, traders, prospectors and agents traversed the sea in full knowledge of one another and their customers, and one that firmly pre-dates permanent Phoenician settlement on foreign shores (Niemeyer 1990; 1993; 1995; 2006.). This acts as a very precise parallel to Greek pre-colonization activity that is often argued for owing to the presence of Greek pottery in overseas contexts that pre-date the foundation of Greek colonies in that region (beginning with Blakeway 1935; more recently see Dominguez 1989; Ridgway 2004 and contributions in Descoudres 1990, and Tsetskhladze & De Angelis 1994). Thus, Middle Geometric pottery in Etruria, Latium, Campania and Sicily has implied to many that Greeks were active in the region before establishing nearby settlements (Hodos 2006, 94 with refs.). The recent discovery of early sixth-century pottery at an inland Black Sea settlement near where Miletus later founded the colony of Dioskurias has prompted reconsiderations of the chronology of East Greek activity in the region to favour a role for pre-colonial interaction to accord with the literary record of colonization in the region (Tsetskhladze 2006b, xxxiii–xxxiv).

The case of Thapsos ware in Sicily, however,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

represents an excellent example of the danger of using literary sources to guide interpretation in the primary instance. For generations, Thucydides provided the chronology most widely adopted for the foundation of the Greek colonies in Sicily, with Naxos as the first foundation (in 734 BC), closely followed by Syracuse the following year and then Megara Hyblaea five years after that (Thucydides: VI. Dunbabin 1948, 435–71; Coldstream 1968, 322–7; Morris 1996). Thucydides's authority was upset in the 1950s by the publication of a class of pottery from Megara Hyblaea that appeared to be older than anything known from Syracuse. This class is now recognized as Thapsos ware, a product of Corinth (recently Morgan 1999a, 272–7; 1999b, 217–20; De Vries 2003, 152–3). To explain this anomaly, the excavators of Megara Hyblaea turned to the chronology offered by Eusebius, whose high foundation date proposed for Megara Hyblaea's subcolony Selinus would place the foundation of Megara Hyblaea itself at *c.* 750 BC (Vallet & Villard 1952), with Strabo offering additional support (Strabo VI, 267). In the late 1970s, however, near-identical, and thus accepted as contemporary, Thapsos ware was discovered at Syracuse, and the arguments for an earlier foundation date for Megara Hyblaea were withdrawn (Vallet 1978, 151; 1982, 15–16). While this might be a minor note in the debate about source primacy, its repercussions could have been far more substantial, for the significance of this particular debate rests in the fact that the very tight seriation of Corinthian pottery was established from the material found in the substantial and well-preserved cemeteries of Syracuse and Megara Hyblaea. The placement of the foundation of Megara Hyblaea twenty years before that of Syracuse would have required the entire Corinthian seriation and chronology to be reconsidered and adjusted accordingly, and for a period where Corinthian pottery was the primary Greek ware to travel overseas, and which has often been used as the means of dating the contexts of its findspots, which extended across the Mediterranean.

This competition for primacy between Greek and Phoenician scholars arises from a binary perspective of the Mediterranean that related to the tradition of meta-narratives, and one in which pottery was closely equated to people. Their recent deconstruction has enabled the literary and the material to be reconciled more easily within each individual arena, although not necessarily on the global Mediterranean arena of interaction. Take, for example, the issue of Phoenician foundation dates and the notion of pre-colonial activity. Moscati, himself, suggested that initially Phoenicians travelled as small groups in the Mediterranean and limited themselves to landing-stages, leaving behind no material remains, although he still regarded this as a kind of colonization (Moscati 1966, 127–36). This would neatly explain the very early foundation dates mentioned by ancient authors which have not been substantiated archaeologically. It would be, therefore, a second phase of colonization, which dates from the end of the ninth century onwards, which is the first one we can observe in the material record (Aubet 2001, 23).

Colonialist perspectives and accompanying vocabulary have plagued our discourse of the respective Greek and Phoenician colonization movements, as well as discussion of their interactions with one another. Describing the earlier phase of Phoenician activity as colonization, or the early activities of the Greeks as pre-colonization, frames the debate in explicitly colonialist terminology, which immediately pits one against the other teleologically and has contributed to the criticisms against the other. It is the colonialist terminology employed that has framed Lemos's arguments in favour of Phoenician trade and intermarriage over resident Phoenician craftsmen in Greek contexts, and Raaflaub's emphasis on the role played by Greek aristocrats in the dissemination of ideas during this time (Lemos 2003; Raaflaub 2004; Raaflaub's interpretation has been extrapolated by others to the tenth and ninth centuries: Crielaard 1992/93; 1999; Boardman 1999; 2001). One upshot is that the criticisms and counter-criticisms in the quest for primacy are ultimately circular because the teleological aim is the same for both: primacy. In order to break free from this, some advocate abandoning such terminology altogether (Osborne 1998). Indeed, these difficulties have been recognized by Niemeyer, who prefers to avoid the term colonization for either Phoenician phase, regarding the second, settlement, phase as an expansion rather than a colonization, although he also uses it as a means to contrast the Phoenician process of overseas settlement explicitly with the contemporary and parallel Greek process of overseas settlement foundations (Niemeyer 1990, 480; 1993; 1995). Thus, Niemeyer's choice of vocabulary moves away from a direct confrontation because he removes the discussion from a meta-narrative framework, creating instead one that looks exclusively from the bottom (local, non-global) up.

Modern scholarship continues to compete through vocabulary, although, in curious parallel to our ancient literary sources, now it is by means of generalization. Great pains have been taken by scholars of the Greeks in recent years to highlight the differences between the various areas that comprised the Greek

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

world to emphasize the diversities of practices that nevertheless contributed to a broader sense of shared traits that we regard as Greek culture, but they do not accord the same specificity to the Phoenicians. Thus, while various city-states of the Greek world, like Corinth, Athens and Syracuse, shared general attributes that bound them, such as building types, social codes, language and lifeways linked by ritual, political and economic networks, in recent years scholarship has emphasized the noteworthy differences in their individual habitation, urbanism and practices that created diversity between them (papers in Dougherty & Kurke 2003; Lomas 2004; Tsetskhladze 2006a; see also Hall 1997; 2002). Boardman's recent discussion of the Greeks in the East Mediterranean serves as an example in this regard (Boardman 2006). Here, Boardman dissects the roles and activities of varied Greek populations, carefully distinguishing East Greek Ionians from Euboeans in the Levant. Yet with regard to the Phoenician communities, he summarizes their material culture as follows:

> The history of the major Phoenician city-ports is reasonably well established. The finds are plentiful though seldom from effectively excavated sites. The decorative and figurative arts depend heavily on Egypt and always look south, not north (Boardman 2006, 513).

Greek scholarship continues to lump the individual Phoenician city-states together as a single cultural entity even when it comes to their Mediterranean-wide interaction, and stands in sharp contrast to their distinctions between various Greek groups who exchanged and engaged with the Phoenician world (recently, Boardman 2005; 2006; Coldstream 1998; 2000). Phoenician scholarship more often does discuss individual Greek city states (e.g. Markoe 2000; Aubet 2001; various works by Niemeyer), but this is often with regard to ceramic evidence; the ceramic outputs of individual Greek city states are usually quite distinctive, and their study has a longer scholarly history that enables identification and hence facilitates specific discussion.

Nevertheless, just as Athens, Corinth and Syracuse had diverse practices within a broader framework of shared attributes, so did Tyre, Sidon, Byblos, Berytus, Ugarit and Arwad. They were independent city-states, which, like their Hellenic contemporaries, were often in rivalry with one another, except when allied against a common adversary, such as the Neo-Assyrians.[7] Their artistic styles were diverse (Winter 1976; 1981), and their mechanisms for carrying out their trading livelihoods were not uniform, for scholarship does distinguish between specifically Sidonian and Tyrian trade routes in the Mediterranean, as seen with the distribution of Egyptianizing amulets (Fletcher 2004, although some of the archaeological assumptions have been justifiably queried: Boardman 2005, 288–90). Specifically Sidonian artistic motifs found across the Mediterranean during the seventh century BC, such as the four-winged scarab and the nude maiden (Gubel 2006), reflect more nuanced roles of particular Phoenician city-states as agents in the dissemination of cultural elements in the Mediterranean Iron Age.

I am not, however, proposing the disposal of collective descriptions in the wake of the evidence of our abilities to distinguish between individual Greek and Phoenician communities. Firstly, it is not always possible to identify individual communities of origin, and secondly, a collective description remains a valuable tool of expression, especially in academic writing. This is particularly the case in the discussion of modelling, where frameworks for interpretation are outlined. Patterning in data is the basic building block for analysis and interpretation, which is articulated within an interpretational framework. The patterning itself is nothing more than the observation of collective practice. Thus, generalizations, which encompass a notion of the collective, remain a necessary tool of discourse. Indeed, the pull and push between generalizations and diversity in how scholarship discusses the Greeks and Phoenicians reflects the paradox of the process of globalization, as noted above, whereby a result of increased intensity of contact and communication at the global level may be heightened attempts to draw the boundaries more strongly between those different groups engaged with one another on a global arena. While this is normally applied to analysis of the cultures themselves, it can also apply to our own study of these cultures.

The tension between generalizations and diversities that now exists in this discourse reflects the recent deconstruction of the meta-narratives of the Greek and Phoenician colonization movements, which were characterized themselves by generalizations. Traditionally, the colonies themselves were regarded as an extension of the homeland culture (Boardman 1964; Graham 1964; Moscati 1966; 1968). For the Greek world, evidence for this was drawn primarily from two spheres: religion and politics. Dedications at Panhellenic sanctuaries by colonies and common cults between colony and mother-city were regarded as reflections of strong religious ties to the homeland. This was further supported by the ample evidence for extended political interactions between the colonies and their mother-cities, especially with regard to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

contributions to war funds and military support by the mother-cities in aid of their colonies, even several hundred years after their founding. Such is the case especially for Syracuse and Corinth during the fifth and fourth centuries, when Corinth sent troops to assist in Syracuse's internal affairs, with one result that Syracuse agreed to employ a Corinthian general for any future military engagement against a foreign enemy (Graham 1964, 142–9 with ancient refs.). Taras and Sparta during the fourth century represent another example (Diodorus XVI.62.4). Collectively, these fostered in scholars a sense of mother-city hegemony over the colony, resulting in interpretations of the ancient sources as reflections of a '[general belief] that the new community was in many senses an extension of the old' (Graham 1964, 215).

Today, however, Greek colonies are increasingly regarded as independent cultural entities, engaged in the Greek world through general shared practices, which nevertheless articulate their own identities through localized diversity (Antonaccio 2001; in press; Hall 2002; de Polignac 1995). Although they have always been regarded as politically independent, recent scholarship stresses more regional coherence alongside individual distinctions, rather than collectively as part of a meta-culture. Thus, we now perceive that they engage with one another in an explicitly colonial arena, articulated through competition evidenced in material culture, such as pottery forms, burial customs, and local religious practices (Shepherd 1995; 2000; Antonaccio 2001; 2003; 2004; 2005). At the same time, their participation in Panhellenic contexts and military engagements with their founding, mainland, cities, represent their persistence in the arena of the Greek world.

The classic Phoenician example of this paradigm shift is seen in interpretations of the role of the *tophet*, defined open-air ritual precincts where human sacrifice took place as part of Phoenician religious practices; the bones were placed in urns in the precinct. The majority of *tophets* come from beyond the Phoenician homeland. They have been found mostly in the western colonies, although examples from the Near East have also been identified (e.g. Tell Sukas: Aubet 2001, 63). Traditionally, it has been assumed that these reflect homeland practices, despite no *tophet* having yet been discovered in communities in the Phoenician homeland. Moscati, for instance, notes:

> There is no evidence of these sacred places actually in Phoenicia, but there is no doubt that they existed, if we add to the biblical evidence the ample proof provided by excavations in the western colonies (Moscati 1968, 77).

Today, however, more nuanced approaches recognize certain patterns with regard to the *tophet* that may have more significance for regional circumstances (Aubet 2001, 250–56). For instance, the presence of a *tophet* can always be associated with other characteristics of urbanization to an extent that it may be regarded as the first expression of the urban character of the settlement, where it served both the civic and territorial communities and was rooted to concepts of citizenship. Furthermore, in a number of instances in the central Mediterranean, they may have served as the burial grounds for children under the age of two, as well as functioning as a community sacred area. Indeed, Aubet sums up recent thinking by observing:

> although the antecedents of the *molk* sacrifice are encountered in the east, its definitive form and consolidation as a collective practice are of Carthaginian invention. The implanting of the *tophet* in Sicily and Sardinia linked those colonies of the central Mediterranean to the political interests of Carthage (Aubet 2001, 255).

In sum, scholars must take heed of how they present an 'other', especially in discussions that compare and contrast observed practice. In particular, for widespread cultures like the Greeks and Phoenicians, contemporary scholarship must be aware of the multiple stages of 'globality' it analyses, for engagement on several levels is concurrent. We might speak of a global Greek culture or global Phoenician culture, but there were variations within these notions, as well as a global Mediterranean level of engagement each participated in (alongside others). Terminology, therefore, is important. Otherwise we remain susceptible to using generalizations or labels as literary trope to further our own arguments, even if inadvertently, just as we have criticized our ancient written sources for doing.

Shared processes of colonization

While scholars may generalize about the 'other', there is more common ground between the Greeks and Phoenicians with regard to their interactions with each other and other populations in the Mediterranean than is generally acknowledged. An examination of their colonization processes, specifically, betrays a surprising number of similarities and shared practices, despite attempts by their respective scholars to emphasize difference and distinction. Such similarity can only be born from engagement in the global arena of the Iron Age Mediterranean.

Let us begin with discussion of the Phoenicians. It has been argued that the Phoenician provision of metals for the Neo-Assyrians in exchange for politi-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cal independence from this domineering empire was the driving force for the Phoenicians' forays into the Mediterranean during the early Iron Age (Frankenstein 1979; Niemeyer 1990). The hypothesis of tapping into new markets for resources serves to explain the presence of elite merchants and their craftsmen instigating social and commercial exchanges with various communities across the Mediterranean during the tenth and ninth centuries BC (Bondí 1988; Gubel 2006). The consolidation of regularly used strategic landing sites into permanently occupied communities may have been a practical one arising from the commercial nature of this activity. Prospecting for resources and subsequently settling to facilitate resource acquisition is different from exclusively prospecting for suitable land on which to settle, and this difference has been called upon as the reason to consider Phoenician Mediterranean activity as phases of 'expansion', rather than periods of 'pre-colonial' and 'colonial' activity, terminology which implies a premeditated relationship between the two phases to the subsequent territorial occupation (e.g. in the works of Niemeyer; see also Aubet 2001; Gubel 2006).

The establishment of a permanent base at the end of the ninth century at Carthage (Botto 2005; Nijboer 2006a; Niemeyer *et al.* 2007) no doubt capitalized upon Phoenician knowledge of central and western Mediterranean resources. Contemporary dates for Phoenician material in Sardinian contexts (Sant'Imbenia) suggest the Phoenicians had been cognizant of the Tyrrhenian for quite some time. Nevertheless, Carthage was carefully selected with permanent interests and sustainability in mind: its location allowed it to control sea routes between Italy and the West, while the city itself was designed with a city wall to encompass sufficient arable land to support a large population during a time of siege (Turfa 2001; see also Lancel 1995).

Phoenician overseas settlements are often characterized as ports of trade to contrast them with the explicit quest for land and hinterland often assumed of the Greek overseas settlements, and in light of the fact that the phenomenon of the foundation of Phoenician overseas communities coincides with expanded trade between the Phoenician homeland and the areas of settlement (Niemeyer 2002, 99). It has been suggested that they were 'designed and established only to consolidate and secure these early trade relationships which were threatened by the new and aggressive colonization movement of the Greeks' (Niemeyer 1990, 485, 488; see also Niemeyer 1993, 341; Boardman 2001; 2006). Niemeyer argues that such foundations were not colonies in a strict sense[8] primarily because the hinterland of the community was not a politically or administratively dependent territory. Instead, he cites several decisive criteria for a choice of Phoenician overseas settlement: a not-too-large settlement area within natural borders; an area that is easy to defend, such as an island or spit; good harbours; proximity to navigational aids; easy access to adjacent and more distant hinterlands. It is these traits that reflect that the Phoenicians had 'dramatically different goals from the Greek colonization movement, which mainly focused on the gain of arable land' (Niemeyer 2002, 100, Carthage being the notable exception to this). These traits are certainly shown in evidence from the far western Mediterranean. A common characteristic of Phoenician settlements in this region was that the settlement be either on an offshore island or, more commonly, positioned on a river delta for communication and mercantile purposes as well for access to fertile lands and the possibility of irrigated crops, while cemeteries were situated outside the city walls and/or separated from the colony by a channel of water. Such is the case at Gadir; Toscanos, Morro, Lagos, and Almuñécar (Aubet 2001, 314, 256–346, with references). Further afield, Ibiza town, Motya, Tharros and Nora are similarly situated (Aubet 2001).

These characteristics are replicated in many contemporary coastal Greek settlements as well, and actually reflect simple common sense. Greek settlements were also often of modest size and naturally bounded by water or elevated landscape, such as Pithekoussai, Siris and Syracuse. As such, they were also easily defensible. Furthermore, they were often within navigable site of mountains or peaks like Etna in Sicily (Naxos, Leontini, Syracuse, Megara Hyblaea) or the Gebel Akhdar of Cyrenaica (Cyrene, Barca, Euesperides), while others, such as Massalia and Taras, were located where major rivers met the sea. In all these examples, access to arable land — either immediately or through relations with strategically sited, perhaps dependent, settlements (e.g. Pithekoussai and Punta Chiarito: De Caro 1994; Gialanella 1994) — is a recurring trait. Cemeteries were similarly located away from the urban environment, whether separated by a body of water, as in the case of Syracuse, or beyond city walls (e.g. Megara Hyblaea, Akragas, Metapontum, Cyrene: Boardman 1999; papers in Tsetskhladze 2006a). One can easily argue, therefore, that the general typology of these early settlements, whether Greek- or Phoenician-founded, is remarkably similar. Differences are thus more appropriately attributed to specific local conditions rather than to broader ideological reasons. The fact that there are few areas where Greeks and Phoenicians co-existed territorially betrays knowledge of the 'other', and therefore sug-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

gests that the similarities are, in fact, shared practices born from extended global engagement.

As noted above, the presence of a hinterland has been one of the main distinctions between descriptive models of Greek and Phoenician colonization. Many have observed that one of the defining characteristics of a Greek colony lies in the fact that it had its own agricultural land, and that the autonomy of the colonial structure depended upon such territorial control and organization (Aubet 2001, 348; Hodos 2006, 21–2). It is often argued that in contrast only rarely did an overseas Phoenician settlement have any kind of political or administrative control over its hinterland as a dependent territory; instead, it has been suggested that economically the settlement would have been dependent on newcomers (Niemeyer 2002, 96; 2006, 155).[9] Closer examination reveals that both assumptions can be deconstructed.

For the ancient Greeks, their choice of terminology to describe a settlement reflects a more complex circumstance that was dictated by context of discussion rather than mere definition (summaries of recent discussion with references: Tsetskhladze 2006b, xxxviii–xlii; Hodos 2006, 19–20; Hansen & Nielsen 2004). The two most common terms used by ancient authors to describe the Greek overseas settlements are *apoikia* and *emporion*. The former is defined as a home away from home and possesses polis-related socio-political characteristics, especially laws (papers in Harris & Rubenstein 2004a), as well as physical ones, most notably a *chora*, or hinterland, to provide the necessary agrarian base for the settlement's self-sufficiency (Malkin 1997, 27; see also Morris 1991; Malkin 1994; Wilson 1997). In contrast, an *emporion* is explicitly commercial, and since Greek commerce was largely focused on the sea, physical characteristics of an *emporion* include a harbour, quay, warehouses, and associated administrative buildings (characterized by Herodotus's description of Naukratis, 2.178–9; Hansen 2006). Modern scholarship presumes that an *emporion* will have no call upon a *chora*, especially since no references to hinterland usage are made by ancient authors when they discuss *emporia*; only one example of a named *emporion* possessing a hinterland is known — Pistiros — and only from an inscription that dates to the mid-fourth century (Hansen 2006, 32–4).[10] Yet settlements can be both, and the contexts of such terminology is enlightening for the fluidity of description and the inappropriateness of modern scholarship to assume fixed meanings. For example, Herodotus cites Olbia in the Black Sea as the *emporion* of Borysthenes (4.17.1), although its citizens are *Olbiopolites* (4.18.1) (Hind 1995/96, 116–17; 1997). Herodotus is not describing Olbia and its residents as specific to a type of settlement city, but rather his choice of terminology in each passage serves to emphasize specific characteristics that are relevant to his context. In the former, the context of the reference to Olbia is its coastal location, so it makes sense that he would emphasize the site's function as a port, hence his choice of a term that is associated with ports engaged with trade is appropriate. In the latter passage, it is the colonists themselves he discusses in the context of his geographical tour of where the various Scythian tribes live in relation to the Greek settlements along the River Bug. Here, part of the significance for Herodotus is the fact that Greeks adhere to the ideals of the polis, for obedience to the rule of law is one of the traits that distinguishes the civilized Greeks from their barbarian neighbours (Harris & Rubenstein 2004b, 1, with examples). Therefore, literary context determines the choice of terminology, rather than a fixed definition of the settlement itself.

The relationship between the two may be seen in practice at Megara Hyblaea (De Angelis 2002). Five silos have been identified within the urban environment, three in association with late eighth-century houses, and two in the context of the seventh-century agora. The silos were of such a capacity as to be able to store double the yearly cereal requirement of a family during its life-cycle. That three are associated with domestic contexts suggests that those households served a role in the community involving grain redistribution, perhaps indicative of civic leadership. The silos in the agora more certainly were of a civic nature. De Angelis regards this early agricultural storage as a complement to contemporary trading activities, for he considers this to reflect a nascent trade in grain. Thus, agriculture forms a basis for trade at Megara Hyblaea, rather than just serving the needs of the community.

For the Phoenicians, their colonies are often characterized explicitly as a trade diaspora, which has been defined as interregional exchange networks composed of spatially dispersed specialized merchant groups that are culturally distinct, socially independent and organizationally cohesive from the communities in which they have settled (Stein 2002; Cohen 1971; Aubet 2001, 350–51, drawing upon the work of Curtin 1984; Vives-Ferrándiz 2008). One characteristic is that they will retain close economic and social ties with related communities who define themselves in terms of the same general cultural identity. With regard to the Phoenicians, this is apparent in the political and material ties their Mediterranean communities held with Carthage, in particular. A ceramic koine is apparent between Carthage, Sicily, Sardinia and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Ischia (Hodos 2006, 132–3 with refs.; see also Culican 1982b; Anderson 1990), and a secondary one in Spain (Aubet 2001, 329–33). The Punic dialect and its written representation by the sixth century BC reflects another regional koine (Markoe 2000, 114); even in the sphere of religion, the child immolation in a *tophet* is a feature more readily found in the Phoenician colonies of the far west than in the homeland.

Yet there is an increasing amount of evidence that many Phoenician settlements also exploited the land for agrarian reasons that are interlinked with trade, and for territorial control. For instance, in Spain, it has been demonstrated that the Phoenician settlements in the region of modern Malaga were engaged more with agrarian output for their own self-sufficiency as well as for commercial agricultural gains, since the region is not connected easily to the more metal-rich areas of Spain. A high percentage of bovine bones from Toscanos indicates that cattle were raised for human consumption as well as serving as draught animals, which indirectly provides evidence for agricultural practices along the Vélez river, while the faunal record from Cerro del Villar demonstrates that intensive animal husbandry was practised, through the grazing of larger livestock such as pigs and cattle. Millstones, quantities of wheat and barley, and extensive cropping suggest cereal growing in a regional radius of 18 km; there is also evidence that wine was produced and marketed (Aubet 2001, 315–24; Wagner & Alvar 1989; see also Sagona 2004). The establishment of agricultural communities within the hinterland, evident especially by the sixth century, consolidated territorial control for larger settlements (Aubet & Delgado 2003). In Sardinia in the middle of the eighth century BC, the Phoenicians first founded the coastal settlements of Nora and Tharros along the south and western coasts respectively, and Sulcis on the southwestern offshore island of Sant'Antioco. During the later seventh century, new sites were established to facilitate contacts with the interior. The locations of these reflect a strategic awareness of routes between the coast and the interior, which was rich in mineral resources, and thus avenues of territorial control, and include hilltop strongholds. Some were also clearly located to secure easy and direct access to inland fertile plains. The geographical distribution of these sites and the subsequent spread of Phoenician pottery throughout the island reflect increased Phoenician involvement in the internal affairs of Sardinia (van Dommelen 1998; 2006a,b; Tronchetti & van Dommelen 2005). The concept of a trade diaspora does not need to be an exclusive model to characterize the Phoenicians; subsistence remains closely related, for it provides a means of maintaining the settlements that were engaged in trade and formed part of the trading network. In sum, Greek and Phoenician settlements engaged with agriculture, directly through secondary settlements and indirectly through interaction with existing communities. The issue of territorial control is not a separate and distinct one, therefore, but closely inter-related. Thus, these overseas communities were not too dissimilar in their reasons for and methods of exploitation of the landscape.

It is significant that Phoenician agricultural activity is most evident in geographical areas where there were no Greek colonies to contend with directly. The Greeks did not have a foothold in Sardinia, and they were able to establish an interest in the far west only in the sixth century, by which time the Phoenician settlements themselves were losing their commercial strength as a result of the fall of Tyre, the collapse of the silver trade between Tartessos and the east, and the political rise of Carthage, which began to change the dynamics of their diasporic interaction. In contrast, in places like Sicily, where Greeks and Phoenicians were territorially co-resident, it is the Greeks who appear to have expanded faster and further, but not to the exclusion of the Phoenicians, although Phoenician territorial control in such regions is often overlooked by scholarship or eclipsed by the actions of the Greeks. In Sicily, for instance, Palermo and Solunto were established during the sixth century BC, thereby circumscribing the northwestern corner of the island in terms of Phoenician territorial control, much as Syracuse did with regard to the southeast corner of the island during the seventh century through the foundation of Helorus, Acrae, Casmenae and Camarina. We know little about the political relationships between Palermo, Solunto and Motya, but it is most likely that Motya founded and controlled, or at least heavily influenced, the other two, although all three were subject to Carthage (as implied by Thucydides 6.2.6 and Diodorus 20.58.2 and 51.1; Aubet 2001, 231–4). While no doubt all three served as trading stations, their locations also ensured good agricultural land, and the development of local industries from the early days of each suggests that they served functional purposes beyond mere trade. At Motya, for instance, iron working and purple dye production are attested from the seventh century (Aubet 2001, 233; Hodos 2006, 91). Ceramics manufactured at Solunto have a distribution stretching from Motya and Palermo to Sabucina, Colle Madore, Himera and Lipari, suggesting that the locally produced contents — most likely wine, oil, and perhaps garum — were popular across Sicily and its islands (Hodos 2006, 132). If the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

systematic expansion to control territory is regarded as land hunger, of which the Greeks are often accused, whether for commercial or agricultural purposes, then the Phoencians must be found equally guilty of such practices. The establishment of various industries at Motya and mainland Sicilian Phoenician cities suggests that closer study of the hinterland may provide a better understanding of such activities.[11]

The evidence demonstrates that the fundamental practices of Greek and Phoenician overseas settlers and communities in terms of situation and function as reflected by material culture patterning may not have been as dramatically different as scholars divided by disciplines have traditionally argued. Shared practices during this period should not really come as a surprise given the long history of common discourse between the Greeks and Phoenicians that can be traced back to at least the tenth century (recently Hodos 2006; Coldstream 1998; 2006). During this earlier period, Cyprus must have served as a lynch pin with its Greek, Phoenician and Cypriot residents, and there is substantial evidence for elite interaction and exchange between Cyprus and both the central and eastern Mediterranean at this time (Crielaard 1998; Sherratt 2003; Knapp 2008, 281–97). These contacts gave rise to a shared language of ritualized gift-giving that required knowledge of the cultural codes of one another (Crielaard 1998; Coldstream 2000; Luke 2003; Hodos 2006). Temporally, this correlates with the period of Phoenician merchant venturers and Greek pre-colonial Mediterranean activity. Taking a more global perspective, however, we can now recognize this as a time of pan-Mediterranean elite exchange. The foreign objects of this period in Greek, Phoenician and Near Eastern contexts were always deposited in high-status contexts, especially elite burials in Greece and palace settings in the Near East (e.g. Niemeyer 2003; 2004). By the eighth century, when Phoenicians and Greeks were regularly establishing permanent bases across the Mediterranean, this exchange gives way to the more regular, quantifiably greater and less exclusive exchanges that we view as commercial trade, rather than elite gift-exchange. The shared values that make such exchanges appreciable, equitable and significant to both elites and non-elites should push us to consider more closely where collaboration may have taken place to have fostered these global appreciations, such as via the scribal class in the exchange of knowledge about writing, or the seafaring class who were traversing the Mediterranean.[12] The story of Odysseus seeking safe passage on a Phoenician ship to evade capture (*Odyssey* 14.285–313) implies that Greek and Phoenician collaboration on cargo ships was not an uncommon occurrence (Boardman 2001). Collaboration rather than overt conflict appears to be a common theme during this period. Conflict was more often against other populations, such as between the Greeks and the Sikels or the Etruscans, at least according to literary evidence, rather than directly between the Greeks and Phoenicians. Such aggressions between the Greeks and Phoenicians are more characteristic of the fifth and fourth centuries, and later, when their respective socio-political conditions, and ambitions, were markedly different.

The mutual cultural understandings highlighted above gave rise to a similar tradition of foundation myth for Phoenician as well as Greek colonies by later classical authors. Obviously, we cannot take such sources at face value, for they were written hundreds of years after the alleged events for an audience with different social practices and political concerns by authors with their own literary agendas. Therefore, there is always an element of interpretation required when using such sources to understand past events and practices. Nevertheless, the shared characteristics ascribed by later authors in Phoenician foundation tales imply that they regarded these settlements as of similar type or similar historical standing as the Greek ones. For example, the tale of the foundation of Carthage is conveyed to us by Flavius Josephus (*C. Ap.* 1.125) and Justinius (18.4–6), who explain that its establishment was a means of settling a political conflict in Tyre in 814 BC: ancient sources record a politically stratified population led by a king. The death of the king before his heirs come of age results in conflict between the elder sister Elishat (Elissa; Dido) and her younger brother Pumayyaton (Pumai; Pygmalion) over who will rule. The sister is the one to depart with her aristocratic supporters to establish the colony of Carthage.[13] This late ninth-century foundation date has very recently found support in radiocarbon results from five bone samples from the earliest levels of occupation, in the area of the Decumanus Maximus, contexts which do not appear to belong to any pre-Phoenician settlement that might have existed theoretically on the site prior to the Phoenician-founded settlement (Docter *et al.* 2005; Niemeyer *et al*. 2007).

More significantly, the similarity of trope between Phoenician and Greek foundation myths betrays a recognition and appreciation of shared traits and experiences between Greeks and Phoenicians that enabled ancient writers to discuss these tales with confidence that the implications behind the stories would be understood by contemporary readership. Political stasis at home is a theme commonly found

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

amongst the foundation tales of many Greek colonies, such as Syracuse and Cyrene (Syracuse: Plutarch 772c–773b; Cyrene: Herodotus 4.150–58). In fact, the role of stasis and the result of aristocratic departure seen in the Carthage tale match very closely indeed the tale of Syracuse's foundation as recounted by Plutarch, in which Archias, a member of the elite Herakleidai, was rejected in his effort to win the love of the young Aktaion. Archias's followers attempted to abduct the boy, who was torn to death in the struggle between his abductors and saviours. The boy's father committed suicide at the loss of his son, but not before invoking wrath upon the city, which resulted in drought and famine. A Corinthian delegation, including Archias, consulted the Delphic oracle. To avenge the death of Aktaion, Archias took voluntary exile from Corinth to Sicily, where he founded Syracuse. This tragic love story may be regarded as an allegory for political stasis among the aristocratic ruling class.[14] As such, this particular trope creates a sense of par between Carthage and Syracuse that reflects a respected balance in terms of political strength and influence. This is both despite and because Carthage was a city with which the Greeks had been directly engaged in conflict in Sicily at the end of the fifth century BC; by the time its tale was first recorded two centuries later,[15] ancient classical authors acknowledged it as a worthy opponent, and recognized its 'imperialistic' expansion as a parallel for Athens' own fifth-century actions (Bartoloni 2003, 200).

The shared practice of aristocratic colonial foundations, as evidenced by the Carthage and Syracuse tales, is not the only common basis for overseas foundations, and the Carthage foundation myth is not the only Phoenician example that has come down to us. Strabo compiled tales of the Phoenician colonies in Spain, such as Gadir (3.5, 5), for which we are told the Tyrians set forth to found the site on the order of an oracle, who gave precise directions. Oracular foundation myths are common among Greek colonies, as well, such as for Syracuse, Croton, Taras, Alalia, Cyrene, Tarentum, and Rhegium (Malkin 1987, 17–91).[16] Alternative tales of Gadir's foundation talk of a great storm or chance that led to the settlement's foundation. Natural disasters also play a role in the foundation myths of Greek cities, including Cyrene, Rhegium, and Syracuse (Cyrene: Herodotus IV.151.1; Rhegium: Strabo VI.257; Syracuse: Plutarch 772c–773b).

Such interplay extended beyond Greeks and Phoenicians, and impacted upon other populations with which they co-existed. The global arena of such discourse can be clearly illustrated in the actions of Sicily's Ducetius. During the middle of the fifth century, Ducetius established himself as leader of a Sikel confederation after leading a successful Sikel-Syracusan alliance against Catania in 461 BC as revenge for having stolen Sikel territory (Diodorus Siculus 11.76.3). In 459 BC, he founded Menai and redistributed the surrounding territory to his settlers in a manner akin to those of earlier Greek colonists and subsequent Greek tyrants. In the same year, he destroyed the city of Morgantina ostensibly for being too overtly Greek, and he politically refounded it. In 451 BC he moved against Inessa, threatening territory in the region of Akragas. In a protective military manoeuvre, he was forced to flee and did so by entering Syracuse, heading for the marketplace and sitting down in the altars of the gods. He was exiled to Corinth — at the fiscal expense of Syracuse — and remained there for three years, when he escaped and returned to Sicily, pardoned and armed with an oracle from Delphi instructing him to found a new settlement, which he did at Kale Akte.

Ducetius's actions themselves also work on multiple levels of discourse concurrently. Diodorus's descriptions of his deeds match exactly those of an oikist or tyrant, as noted by Malkin, Demand, Antonaccio and others. He obtains foundation oracles, refounds cities and parcels out lands. His actions are, in fact, very Greek, albeit in the name of Sikel hegemony. Or rather, his actions have been described in a manner that would have been understandable to the readership of Diodorus. While interpreting historical actions from later sources is always problematic, as noted above, this must indicate nevertheless some form of historical action that Diodorus, himself, could recognize and relate to in his own day. More significantly for the present discussion, Ducetius uses his understanding of Greek ways to manipulate the political situation in Sicily during this time. His exile to Corinth and return armed with a foundation oracle, in particular, demonstrate his deep understanding of Greek myth-politics, heroization and political control, allowing him to act in a manner understandable to the Greeks, and to interact with the Greeks using concepts they would understand. In other words, Ducetius in this sphere forms part of the global sense of Mediterranean culture during the fifth century through shared practices. At the same time, his focus on Sikel hegemony provides the counterpoint of the global discourse through his articulation of Sikel identity at a local level. The balance between the two is reflected in Ducetius's assimilation of Greek notions and styles, which he then transforms to result in a reassertion of the Sikel identity.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Conclusions

There is clearly a substantial corpus of shared characteristics between the Greek and Phoenician colonies, from typological traits of the physical settlements, their mutual functions and mechanisms of territorial control, especially when not in direct competition with one another, as well as shared foundation myth tropes. No doubt the dissemination of the Phoenician alphabet to the Greeks, and knowledge of one another from long-standing elite relations from at least the tenth century reflect shared knowledge and understanding of the 'other', which may extend to shared ideologies, although this is more difficult to substantiate. With common discourse clear on so many material and historical levels, the similarities between the physical and socio-economic characteristics of respective Greek and Phoenician colonies should come as no surprise. Land hunger for agrarian reasons and opportunities for commercial gain are additional shared traits, as are the mechanisms to achieve these aims. Thus, the overarching concepts of Greek and Phoenician colonization processes possess a number of shared characteristics that relate to a global Iron Age Pan-Mediterraneanism.[17] Even at a very basic material level, Greek and Phoenician goods have been found in each other's colonies, suggesting shared material interests and perhaps social values, and thus socio-cultural knowledge of the 'other' (Docter & Niemeyer 1994; Niemeyer 2003; 2004). These mutual understandings and shared practices contribute to a sense of active, Mediterranean-wide (global) connectivity, or Mediterraneanization. These are shared traits, however, rather than identically replicated practices, and this nuanced point is significant to the ideas of globalization, for at the same time it enables us to acknowledge and address the local variations observed alongside and even within these shared characteristics. Furthermore, by their very nature, these components are continually evolving, and therefore any discussion of mutuality must be temporally contextualized. Nevertheless, when defining what it was that made the 'other', past cultures were at the same time defining themselves and developing their own identities. Materially, these are reflected as the more localized variations apparent in the archaeological record. These are the very real and practical expressions of socio-cultural identity by individuals. For the Iron Age, therefore, one may classify the Mediterranean itself as a kind of global-scale middle ground for such interactions, exchanges and competitions (for the ancient world, see also: Hodos in press with refs.; Antonaccio in press; papers in Hales & Hodos 2009). In such a context, the Mediterranean serves as the means of interpreting the physical, material and social interactions of the Phoenicians, Greeks, and others, and enables us to conceptualize their interactions in which everyone had agency and mutual need.

The balance between the local and the global results in difficulties in modelling, especially the application of a single model to account for the observable diversities within groups than can concurrently be generalized, as van Dommelen has recently pointed out with regard to the Phoenician world (van Dommelen 2005), and as can be argued for Greek settlements (e.g. papers in Tsetskhladze 1999; Lomas 2004). The 'local' role in this study has been Greek culture and Phoenician culture, with the Mediterranean serving as the 'global' arena of engagement. In this framework, we can see the paradox of the globalization model. Thus, while unifying characteristics are apparent, the Phoenician colonies collectively cannot be categorized by a single means of definition. Some were clearly established to capitalize upon trade opportunities for metal resources, like Gadir and, to a lesser extent, settlements in Sardinia, while others clearly served other purposes, such as to control sea routes, like Carthage, or for agricultural output, such as the Malaga coastline settlements and perhaps those of Sicily and Sardinia. López Castro's recent study of Egyptian alabaster vases in Phoenician funerary and urban contexts in Spain highlights that locally, these colonists were engaged in achieving social advancement through the use of prestige objects, irrespective of the primary function of their settlements with regard to Mediterranean exchange (López Castro 2006). In sum, these settlements, and their Greek counterparts, responded to and engaged with their local conditions, particularly if there was competition with other populations with pan-Mediterranean interests. Hence, the diverse circumstances of each region of colonization defy collective generalization.

Nevertheless, single models can still play a role in our discussion of the colonization movements of the Iron Age, and for this, the framework of globalization comes into play, for our means of expressing the common traits shared by a culture and between cultures may be better regarded as the essences of shared notions of identity rather than explicit descriptions of identically replicated practices. Such an interpretation allows us to think about those common elements collectively seen as Phoenician or Greek culture while at the same time allowing for the variations within each. The focus, therefore, becomes explicit practices as expressions of identities in various social, cultural and even physical contexts (e.g. papers in Hales & Hodos 2009).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In such cases, the duality between the local and global is evident. Despite regional differences, there are nevertheless shared indicators of a common identity that may be considered at a broader level. For the Phoenicians, these would be the use of the Phoenician alphabet, despite regional written versions, worship of Melkart, but again with regional variation, and widely-used shapes and styles of pottery that are Phoenician in origin. In each case, the same could be said about the Greek world: the Greek language had regional written and spoken forms, yet is still acknowledged as a common language; religious practices had regional differences and collective similarities; pottery forms were at the same time common in form and motifs yet not identical, and always with localized variations. Thus, the use of a single model can still be appropriate as a means of identification, but the difficulties become apparent when it is used for classification, since regional differences and local variations require sub-division that dilute the overall sense of similarity. In the case of Greek and Phoenician colonization, it is clear that the traditional metanarratives can no longer be substantiated in their dualist forms. The frameworks emerging here move us away from the traditional circular quest for primacy by embracing concurrently the balance between and duality of local and global notions on several scales. As such, they enable us to discuss collectively and individually the varying levels of global interactions, and serve as a way forward for better understanding the Iron Age Mediterranean.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Peter van Dommelen, Silke Knippschild, colleagues and students at Bristol and Gothenburg Universities, and the anonymous reviewers, whose stimulating questions and suggestions have contributed to the arguments expressed in the present paper.

Tamar Hodos
Department of Archaeology and Anthropology
University of Bristol
43 Woodland Road
Bristol
BS8 1UU
UK
Email: t.hodos@bristol.ac.uk

Notes

1. It has been observed that *Sidonoi* scans better in Homeric hexameter than the Tyrian equivalent: Culican 1982a.
2. Place names of *phoinikous* in the Mediterranean may imply the presence of settled Phoenicians, but it may also refer to nothing more than purple dye manufacturing, for *phoinix* — from which the term *Phoenician* derives — is Greek for purple-red or crimson. As an example of the limitation of ascribing an ethnic association based upon names, it should be noted that in the *Iliad* 9.425, we are told that the old horseman and mentor of Achilles, who is named Phoinix, hails from Hellas.
3. As opposed to describing a territorial acquisition, as is the case with the Neo-Assyrian records, which may account for the more geographical precision.
4. Cadiz in 1110 BC: Velleius Paterculus I, 2, 3; Utica in 1101 BC: Pliny, XVI, 216; African colonies in the twelfth century: Pliny, XIX, 63 and Diodorus V, 20. Thucydides suggests that the Phoenicians had been settled around the Sicilian littoral before the Greeks arrived and occupied the eastern coastline, forcing the Phoenicians to congregate on the western side of the island: Thucydides VI.2.6; see also Moscati 1968, 127–36; Aubet 2001; Botto 2005. For Greek colonization dates, see most recently, Tsetskhladze 2006b, lxvii–lxxiii, with refs.
5. This statement is narrow in focus and factually incorrect, for it overlooks the enduring Phoenician settlements of Sicily and North Africa, and contemporary Greek communities that failed to survive. Phoenician foundations were no less 'permanent' than Greek ones. Tsetskhladze also echoes Boardman's words from the epilogue chapter of the 1999 edition of *The Greeks Overseas*, p. 269.
6. Recent excavations at the southern coastal site of Cannatello have produced Bronze Age Cypriot wares alongside Mycenaean ones in habitation contexts (De Miro 1999), while Cypriot Late Bronze Age pottery is known from grave contexts at Thapsos (Leighton 1999, 171). Albanese Procelli has suggested that Bronze Age Cypriot contacts inspired the production of a ware similar to red lustrous wheel-made ware (2003, 82) and locally imitated base ring (2003, 81 & 105). Sheet-bronze bowls from Milena and Caldare may be Cypriot in origin (Leighton 1999, 178). These Cypriot findspots are in central Sicily, rather than western.
7. The first recorded such alliance dates to the battle of Qarqar in 853 BC, in which several Phoenician city-states united against the Assyrian army of Shalmaneser III (858–824 BC), meeting in the territory of Hamath. The account of relations between the Phoenician cities recorded in the El-Amarna letters of the Bronze Age, however, implies long-term strife and competition between the individual Phoenician cities in their own political and commercial interactions.
8. E.g. 2006, 155, although he does not define what that strict sense is. He implies it, however, in 1990, 484 through comparison with criteria for a polis. Such a comparison is unfair, however, because the physical and political ideals of the polis concept were not yet fully developed during this period.
9. A reliance on newcomers makes little practical sense, for newcomers arriving with supplies who stay will rely upon yet more newcomers to bring additional supplies. Such supply lines could not have been maintained in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

this manner throughout the year because sailing across the Mediterranean was a seasonal activity. Therefore, additional locally-available resources must have been essential for the settlement's sustainability.

10. The inscription is *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 43, 486,10–12. Our terminology derives mainly from the Classical period, and it may be questioned as to how appropriate it may be to apply these terms to settlements of the Archaic period: Hansen 2006, 2–3.
11. Albanese Procelli's distributional study of pilgrim flasks and other Phoenician pottery types in non-Phoenician Sicilian contexts during the eighth and seventh centuries (2006) — interpreted for now as evidence of commercial activities — may in due course be reconsidered in light of additional study of the hinterland of the Sicilian Phoenician settlements.
12. Not all of this can be ascribed to collaboration, for a sense of competition must have also existed between the Greeks and Phoenicians, whether for commercial success or territorial acquisition. The patterning of settlement implies knowledge of the 'other' and an explicit desire to avoid direct conflict through competition for territory. Evidence of competition, therefore, may be better sought in commercial arenas. It has been suggested that goods from diverse cultures at a particular site may be a reflection of competition at particular markets, rather than co-operative ventures (Winter 1995, 254–5). Such competition itself demonstrates precisely the global network of shared knowledge and common discourse, reflecting not only awareness of the demands of the user (or desirer: Foxhall 1998), but also awareness of the competition, in order to successfully compete. Full discussion lies beyond the scope of this article.
13. The tale is accepted by Phoenician scholarship: Aubet 2001, 214–18; Niemeyer 2006, 161.
14. Factions among the elite of Corinth are evident in that Archais is specifically a Herakleidi, and that it is presumed he is a Bacchiad, who ruled Corinth at this time: Graham 1964, 220, n. 2; see also Dougherty 1993, 17 for a parallel.
15. The Carthage foundation tale is first recorded by Timaeus of Taormina at the beginning of the third century BC. The story is repeated by Menander of Ephesus in the first half of the second century BC, whose notes were collected by Flavius Josephus. See also Lancel 1995, 22–3.
16. Chronological inconsistencies with regard to religious practices or archaeological material lie beyond the scope of the present discussion.
17. Elements of these global traits are also found in the other Mediterranean populations of the Iron Age with whom the Greeks and Phoenicians were in contact: see Hodos 2006, which is dedicated to this particular aspect.

References

Albanese Procelli, R.M., 2003. *Sicani, Siculi, Elimi*. Milan: Longanesi and Co.

Albanese Procelli, R.M., 2006. Pilgrim flasks dalla Sicilia, in *Across Frontiers: Etruscans, Greeks, Phoenicians and Cypriots. Studies in Honour of David Ridgway and Francesca Romana Serra Ridgway*, eds. E. Herring, I. Lemos, F. Lo Schiavo, L. Vagnetti, R. Whitehouse & J. Wilkins. London: Accordia, 111–25.

Anderson, W.P., 1990. The beginnings of Phoenician pottery; vessel shape, style, and ceramic technology in the early phase of the Phoenician Iron Age. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 279, 35–54.

De Angelis, F., 1998. Ancient past, imperial present: the British Empire in J. Dunbabin's *The Western Greeks*. *Antiquity* 72, 539–49.

De Angelis, F., 2002. Trade and agriculture at Megara Hyblaia. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 21(3), 299–310.

Antonaccio, C.M., 2001. Colonization and acculturation, in *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, ed. I. Malkin. Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press, 113–57.

Antonaccio, C.M., 2003. Hybridity and the cultures within Greek culture, in *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, eds. C. Dougherty & L. Kurke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 57–74.

Antonaccio, C.M., 2004. Siculo-geometric and the Sikels: identity and material culture in eastern Sicily, in *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean*, ed. K. Lomas. Leiden: Brill, 55–81.

Antonaccio, C.M., 2005. Excavating colonization, in *Ancient Colonizations: Analogy, Similarity and Difference*, eds. H. Hurst & S. Owen. Bristol: Duckworth, 97–113.

Antonaccio, C.M., in press. (Re)defining ethnicity: culture, material culture, and identity, in *Material Culture and Social Identities in the Ancient World*, eds. S. Hales & T. Hodos. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aubet, M.E., 2001. *The Phoenicians and the West: Politics, Colonies, and Trade.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aubet, M.E. & A. Delgado, 2003. La colonia fenicia del Cerro del Villar y su territorio, in *Ecohistoria del paisajo agrario. La agricultura fenicio-púnica en el Mediterráneo*, ed. C. Gómez Bellard. Valencia: Univeristat de Valèncía, 57–74.

Ballard, R.D., L.E. Stager, D. Master, *et al.*, 2002. Iron Age shipwrecks in deep water off Ashkelon, Israel. *American Journal of Archaeology* 106(2), 151–68.

Bartoloni, P., 2003. The Phoenicians and Carthage in the central Mediterranean between the 8th and the 5th centuries BC, in *Ploes: Sea Routes: Interconnections in the Mediterranean, 16th–6th* c. BC: *Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Rethymnon, Crete, September 29th–October 2nd,* 2002, eds. N.C. Stampolidis & V. Karageorghis. Athens: University of Crete and the A.G. Leventis Foundation, 197–200.

Beloch, K.J., 1893–1904. *Griechische Geschichte.* Strassburg: Trübner.

Bierling, M.R. (ed.), 2002. *The Phoenicians in Spain.* Winona Lake (IN): Eisenbrauns.

Blakeway, A., 1935. Prolegomena to the study of Greek commerce with Italy, Sicily and France in the eighth and seventh centuries BC. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 33, 170–208.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Boardman, J., 1964. *The Greeks Overseas.* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Boardman, J., 1999. *The Greeks Overseas.* 4th edition. London: Thames and Hudson.

Boardman, J., 2001. Aspects of colonization. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 322, 33–42.

Boardman, J., 2005. Al Mina: notes and queries. *Ancient West and East* 4(2), 278–91.

Boardman, J., 2006. Greeks in the East Mediterranean (south Anatolia, Syria, Egypt), in *Greek Colonization: an Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, ed. G.R. Tsetskhladze. Leiden: Brill, 507–34.

Bondí, S.F., 1988. Problemi della precolonizzazione fenicia nel Mediterraneo centro-occidentale, in *Momenti precoloniali nel Mediterraneo antico*, ed. E. Acquaro. Rome: Consiglio Nazionale della Richerche, 241–55.

Botto, M., 2005. Per una riconsiderazione della cronologia degli inizi della colonizzazione fenicia nel Mediterraneo centro-occidentale, in *Oriente e Occidente: metodi e discipline a confronto. Riflessioni sulla cronologia dell'età del ferro in Italia, Atti dell'Incontro di studi, Roma, 30–31 ottobre 2003. Mediterranea, 1 (2004)*, eds. G. Bartoloni & F. Delpino. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 579–628.

Botto, M., 2007a. Da *Sulky* a Huelva: considerazioni sui comerci fenici nel Mediterraneo antico. *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli (AION), Archeologia e Storia Antica* 11–12 (n.s.) 2004–2005, 9–27.

Botto, M., 2007b. I rapport fra la Sardegna e le coste mediotireniche della Penisola Italiana: la prima metà del I milennio a.C, in *Etruschi, Greci, Fenici e Cartaginesi nel Mediterraneo centrale. Atti del XIV Convegno Internazionale di Studi sulla Storia e l'Archeologia dell'Etruria*, ed. G.M. Della Fina. (Annali della Fondazione per il Museo 'Claudio Faina' 14.) Florence: Edizioni Quasar, 75–136.

Bunnens, G., 1995. Histoire événementielle. Partim Orient, in *La civilisation phénicienne et punique. Manuel de recherche*, ed. V. Krings. (Handbuch der orientalistik I. Abt. Bd. 20.) Leiden: Brill, 222–36.

De Caro, S., 1994. Appunti per la topografia della chora di Pithekoussai nella prima età coloniale, in *Apoikia: Scritti in onore di G. Buchner*, eds. B. d'Agostino & D. Ridgway. (AION n.s. 1.) Naples: Istituto universitario orientale, 37–45.

Cohen, A., 1971. Cultural strategies in the organization of trading diasporas, in *The Development of Indigenous Trade and Markets in West Africa*, ed. C. Meillassoux. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 266–81.

Coldstream, J.N., 1968. *Greek Geometric Pottery.* London: Methuen.

Coldstream, J.N., 1969. The Phoenicians of Ialysos. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 16, 1–8.

Coldstream, J.N., 1998. The first exchanges between Euboeans and Phoenicians: who took the initiative? In *Mediterranean Peoples in Transition. In Honor of Professor Trude Dothan*, eds. S. Gitin, A. Mazar & E. Stern. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 353–60.

Coldstream, J.N., 2000. Exchanges between Phoencians and early Greeks. *National Museum News* 11, 15–32.

Coldstream, J.N., 2006. Other peoples' pots: ceramic borrowing between early Greeks and Levantines, in various Mediterranean contexts, in *Across Frontiers: Etruscans, Greeks, Phoenicians and Cypriots. Studies in Honour of David Ridgway and Francesca Romana Serra Ridgway*, eds. E. Herring, I. Lemos, F. Lo Schiavo, L. Vagnetti, R. Whitehouse & J. Wilkins. London: Accordia, 49–55.

Crielaard, J.P., 1992/93. How the West was won: Euboeans vs Phoenicians. *Hamburger Beitrage zur Archaologie* 19/20, 235–60.

Crielaard, J.P., 1998. Surfing on the Mediterranean web: Cypriot long-distance communications during the eleventh and tenth centuries BC, in *Eastern Mediterranean: Cyprus-Dodecanese-Crete 16th–6th C BC*, eds. V. Karageorghis & N. Stampolidis. Athens: University of Crete and A.G. Leventis Foundation, 187–204.

Crielaard, J.P., 1999. Production, circulation and consumption of Early Iron Age Greek pottery (eleventh to seventh centuries BC), in *The Complex Past of Pottery*, eds. J.P. Crielaard, V. Stissi & G.J. van Wigngaarden. Amsterdam: Gieben, 49–81.

Culican, W., 1982a. Discussion contribution, in *Phönizier im Westen*, ed. H.G. Niemeyer. Mainz: von Zabern, 28.

Culican, W., 1982b. The repertoire of Phoenician pottery, in *Phönizier im* Westen, ed. H.G. Niemeyer. Mainz: von Zabern, 45–78.

Curtin, P.D., 1984. *Cross-Cultural Trade in World History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Delgado, J.P., 2008. Nautical and maritime archaeology, 2006–2007. *American Journal of Archaeology* 112, 307–35.

Descoudres, J.-P. (ed.), 1990. *Greek Colonists and Native Populations.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Docter, R.F. & H.G. Niemeyer, 1994. Pithekoussai: the Carthaginian connection. On the archaeological evidence of Euboeo-Phoenician partnership in the 8th and 7th centuries BC, in *Apoikia. Scritti in onore di G. Buchner*, eds. B. d'Agostino & D. Ridgway. (AION n.s. 1.) Naples: Istituto universitario orientale, 101–15.

Docter, R.F., H.G. Niemeyer, A.J. Nijboer & J. van der Plicht, 2005. Radiocarbon dates on animal bones in the earliest levels of Carthage, in *Oriente e Occidente: metodi e discipline a confronto. Riflessioni sulla cronologia dell'età del ferro in Italia, Atti dell'Incontro di studi, Roma, 30–31 ottobre 2003. Mediterranea, 1 (2004)*, eds. G. Bartoloni & F. Delpino. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 557–77.

Dominguez, A.J., 1989. *La colonizacion griega en Sicilia: griegos, indigenas y punicos en la Sicilia arcaica; intraccion y aculturacion.* (British Archaeological Reports S549.) Oxford: BAR.

van Dommelen, P., 1998. *On Colonial Grounds: a Comparative Study of Colonialism and Rural Settlement in First Millennium BC West Central Sardinia.* Leiden: Faculty of Archaeology, University of Leiden.

van Dommelen, P., 2005. Colonial interactions and hybrid practices, in *The Archaeology of Colonial Encounters*, ed. G.J. Stein. Santa Fe (NM): School of American Research Press, 109–41.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

van Dommelen, P., 2006a. The orientalizing phenomenon: hybridity and material culture in the western Mediterranean, in *Debating Orientalization*, eds. C. Riva & N. Vella. London: Equinox, 135–52.

van Dommelen, P., 2006b. Punic farms and Carthaginian colonists: surveying Punic rural settlement in the central Mediterranean. *Journal of Roman Archaeology* 19, 7–28.

Dougherty, C., 1993. *The Poetics of Colonization.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dougherty, C. & L. Kurke (eds.), 2003. *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dunbabin, T.J., 1948. *The Western Greeks.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Featherstone, M., 1991. *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism.* London: Sage.

Featherstone, M., 1995. *Undoing Culture: Globalization, Postmodernism and Identity.* London: Sage.

Fletcher, R., 2004. Sidonians, Tyrians and Greeks in the Mediterranean: the evidence from Egyptianising scarabs. *Ancient West and East* 3(1), 51–77.

Foxhall, L., 1998. Cargoes of the heart's desire, in *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, ed. N. Fisher & H. van Wees. London & Swansea: Duckworth & the Classical Press of Wales, 295–309.

Frankenstein, S., 1979. The Phoenicians in the far west: a function of Neo-Assyrian imperialism, in *Power and Propaganda: a Symposium on Ancient Empires*, ed. M.T. Larsen. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag, 263–94.

Gialanella, C., 1994. Pithecusa: gli insediamenti di Punta Chiarito. Relazione preliminare, in *Apoikia: Scritti in onore di G. Buchner*, eds. B. d'Agostino & D. Ridgway. (AION n.s. 1.) Naples: Istituto universitario orientale, 169–204.

Gosden, C., 2004. *Archaeology and Colonialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Graham, A.J., 1964. *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Gras, M., P. Rouillard & X. Teixidor, 1989. *L'Universe Phenicien.* Paris: Arthuad.

Gubel, E., 1994. Phoenician foundations in archaeological perspective, in *Nuove fondazioni nel Vicino Oriente Antico: realta e ideologia, Atti del colloquio 4-6 Diciembre 1991 Pisa,* ed. S. Mazzoni. Pisa: Giardini, 341–55.

Gubel, E., 2006. Notes of the Phoenician component of the orientalizing horizon, in *Debating Orientalization: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Change in the Ancient Mediterranean*, eds. C. Riva & N.C. Vella. London: Equinox, 85–93.

Hales, S. & T. Hodos, eds., 2009. *Material Culture and Social Identities in the Ancient World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, E., 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition Through Tragedy.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hall, J., 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, J., 2002. *Hellenicity.* Chicago (IL): Chicago University Press.

Hansen, M.H., 2006. *Emporion*, in *Greek Colonization: an Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas,* ed. G.R. Tsetskhladze. Leiden: Brill, 1–39.

Hansen, M.H. & T.H. Nielsen (eds.), 2004. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis: an Investigation Conducted by The Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harris, E.M. & L. Rubenstein (eds.), 2004a. *The Law and the Courts in Ancient Greece.* London: Duckworth.

Harris, E.M. & L. Rubenstein, 2004b. Introduction, in *The Law and the Courts in Ancient Greece*, eds. E.M. Harris & L. Rubenstein. London: Duckworth, 1–18.

Hentschel, F., 2004. The 2004 Ancient Shipwreck Survey in Turkey. *INA Quarterly* 31(4), 10–13.

Hind, J., 1995/96. Traders and ports-of-trade (*emporoi* and *emporia*) in the Black Sea in Antiquity. *Il Mar Nero* 2, 113–26.

Hind, J., 1997. Colonies and ports-of-trade on the northern shores of the Black Sea: Borystyhenes, Kremnoi and 'other Pontic *emporia*' in Herodotus, in *Yet More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis,* ed. T.H. Nielsen. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 107–16.

Hodos, T., 2006. *Local Responses to Colonization in the Iron Age Mediterranean.* London: Routledge.

Hodos, T., in press, Local and global perspectives in the study of social and cultural identity, in *Material Culture and Social Identities in the Ancient World,* eds. S. Hales & T. Hodos. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holton, R.J., 1998. *Globalization and the Nation-State.* London: Macmillan Press.

Hoogvelt, A., 2001 [1997]. *Globalization and the Postcolonial World.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Horden, P. & N. Purcell, 2000. *The Corrupting Sea.* Oxford: Blackwell.

King, P.J., 1983. *American Archaeology in the Mideast: a History of the American Schools of Oriental Research.* Philadelphia (PA): American Schools of Oriental Research.

Knapp, A.B., 2008. *Prehistoric and Protohistoric Cyprus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krings, V. (ed.), 1995. *La civilisation phénicienne et punique. Manuel de recherche.* (Handbuch der orientalistik I. Abt. Bd. 20.) Leiden: Brill.

Lancel, S., 1995. *Carthage: a History.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Laughlin, J.C.H., 2000. *The Bible and Recent Archaeology.* London: Routledge.

Leighton, R., 1999. *Sicily before History*. London: Duckworth

Leighton, R., 2005. Later prehistoric settlement patterns in Sicily: old paradigms and new surveys. *European Journal of Archaeology* 8(3), 261–87.

Lemos, I., 2003. Craftsmen, traders and some wives in Early Iron Age Greece, in *Ploes: Sea Routes: Interconnections in the Mediterranean, 16th–6th c. BC. Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Rethymnon, Crete, September 29th–October 2nd, 2002,* eds. N.C. Stampolidis & V. Karageorghis. Athens: University of Crete and the A.G. Leventis Foundation, 187–93.

Lomas, K. (ed.), 2004. *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean: Papers in Honour of Brian Shefton.* Leiden: Brill.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

López Castro, J.L., 2006. Colonials, merchants and alabaster vases: the western Phoenician aristocracy. *Antiquity* 80(307), 74–88.

Luke, J., 2003. *Ports of Trade, Al Mina and Geometric Greek Pottery in the Levant.* Oxford: Archeopress.

Malkin, I., 1987. *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece.* Leiden: Brill.

Malkin, I., 1994. Inside and outside: colonization and the formation of the mother city, in *Apoikia: Scritti in onore di G. Buchner*, eds. B. d'Agostino & D. Ridgway. (AION n.s. 1.) Naples: Istituto universitario orientale, 1–9.

Malkin, I., 1997. Categories of early Greek colonization: the case of the Dorian Aegean, in *Il dinamismo della colonizzazione greca*, ed. C. Antonetti. Naples: Loffredo, 25–38.

Malkin, I., 2002. A colonial middle ground: Greek, Etruscan, and local elites in the Bay of Naples, in *The Archaeology of Colonialism,* eds. C.L. Lyons & J.K. Papadopoulos. Los Angeles (LA): Getty Research Institute, 151–81.

Malkin, I., 2004. Postcolonial concepts and ancient Greek colonziation. *Modern Language Quarterly* 65(3), 341–64.

Markoe, G.E., 2000. *The Phoenicians*. London: British Museum Press.

De Miro, E., 1999. Un emporio miceneo sulla costa sud della Sicilia, in *Epi ponton plazomenoi. Simposio italiano di studi egei (Roma 1998),* eds. V. La Rosa, D. Palermo & L. Vagnetti. Roma: Scuola archeologica italiana di Atene, 439–49.

Moorey, P.R.S., 1991. *A Century of Biblical Archaeology.* Cambridge: Lutterworth Press.

Morgan, C., 1999a. *Isthmia, Excavations by the University of Chicago under the Auspices of the American School of Classical Studies*, vol. VIII: *The Late Bronze Age Settlement and Early Iron Age Sanctuary*. Princeton (NJ): The American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

Morgan, C., 1999b. Some thoughts on the production and consumption of Early Iron Age pottery in the Aegean, in *The Complex Past of Pottery*, eds. J.-P. Crielaard, G.-J. van Wijngaarten & V. Stissi. Amsterdam: Gieben, 213–59.

Morris, I., 1991. The early polis as city and state, in *City and Country in the Ancient World*, eds. J. Rich & A. Wallace-Hadrill. London: Routledge, 25–57.

Morris, I., 1996. The absolute chronology of the Greek colonies in Sicily. *Acta Archaeologica* 67, 51–9.

Morris, I., 2003. Mediterraneanization. *Mediterranean Historical Review* 18(2), 30–55.

Morris, S., 1992. *Daedalos and the Origins of Greek Art.* Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press.

Moscati, S., 1966. *Il Mondo dei Fenici.* Milan: Il Saggiatore.

Moscati, S., 1968. *The World of the Phoenicians.* London: Cardinal.

Moscati, S., 1993. Nuovi studi sull'identita fenicia. *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Memorie della Classe delle Scienze Morali Serie* 9(4), 3–89.

Negbi, O., 1992. Early Phoenician presence in the Mediterranean islands: a reappraisal. *American Journal of Archaeology* 96, 599–615.

Niemeyer, H.G., 1990. The Phoenicians in the Mediterranean: a non-Greek model for expansion and settlement in antiquity, in *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*, ed. J.P. Descoudres. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 469–89.

Niemeyer, H.G., 1993. Trade before the flag? On the principles of Phoenician expansion in the Mediterranean, in *Biblical Archaeology Today 1990*, eds. A. Biran & J. Aviram. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 335–44.

Niemeyer, H.G., 1995. Expansion et colonization, in *La civilisation phenicienne et punique. Manuel de recherche*, ed. V. Krings. (Handbuch der Orientalistik I. Abt. Bd. 20.) Leiden: Brill, 247–67.

Niemeyer, H.G., 2002. The early Phoenician city-states on the Mediterranean: archaeological elements for their description, in *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-state Cultures*, ed. M.H. Hansen. Copenhagen: Diet Kongelige Danske Veidenskabernes Selskab, 89–115.

Niemeyer, H.G., 2003. On Phoenician art and its role in trans-Mediterranean interconnections ca. 1100–600 BC, in *Ploes: Sea Routes: Interconnections in the Mediterranean, 16th–6th c. BC. Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Rethymnon, Crete, September 29th–October 2nd, 2002*, eds. N.C. Stampolidis & V. Karageorghis. Athens: University of Crete and the A.G. Leventis Foundation, 201–7.

Niemeyer, H.G., 2004. The Phoenicians and the birth of a multinational Mediterranean society, in *Commerce and Monetary Systems in the Ancient World: Means of Transmission and Cultural Interaction. Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project, held in Innsbruck, Austria, October 3rd–8th 2002*, eds. R. Rollinger & C. Ulf. Stuttgart: Steiner, 245–56.

Niemeyer, H.G., 2006. The Phoenicians in the Mediterranean. Between expansion and colonization: a non-Greek model of overseas settlement and presence, in *Greek Colonization: an Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, ed. G.R. Tsetskhladze. Leiden: Brill, 143–68.

Niemeyer, H.G., R.F. Docter, K. Schmidt & B. Bechtold, 2007. *Karthago. Die Ergebnisse der hamburger Grabung unter dem Decumanus Maximus.* Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

Nijboer, A.J., 2005. La cronologia assoulta dell'età del Ferro nel Mediterraneo, dibattito sui metod e sui risultati, in *Oriente e Occidente: metodi e discipline a confronto. Riflessioni sulla cronologia dell'età del ferro in Italia, Atti dell'Incontro di studi, Roma, 30–31 ottobre 2003. Mediterranea, 1 (2004)*, eds. G. Bartoloni & F. Delpino. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 527–56.

Nijboer, A.J., 2006a. An interpretation of the radiocarbon determinations of the oldest indigenous-Phoenician stratum thus far, excavated at Huelva, Tartessos (southwest Spain). *BABesch* 81, 31–6.

Nijboer, A.J., 2006b. The Iron Age in the Mediterranean: a chronological mess or 'Trade Before the Flag,' part II. *Ancient West and East* 4(2), 255–77.

Nippel, W., 2002. The construction of the 'other,' in *Greeks*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and Barbarians, ed. T. Harrison. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 278–310.
Oded, B., 1974. The Phoenician cities and the Assyrian Empire in the time of Tiglath-pileser III. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 90, 38–49.
Osborne, R., 1998. Early Greek colonization? The nature of Greek settlement in the West, in *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, eds. N. Fisher & H. van Wees. London: Duckworth, 251–69.
Papadopoulos, J.K., 1997. Phantom Euboians. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 10(2), 191–206.
Papadopoulos, J.K., 1998. From Macedonia to Sardinia: problems of Iron Age Aegean chronology, and assumptions of Greek maritime primacy, in *Sardinia and Aegean Chronology: Towards a Resolution of Relative and Absolute Dating in the Mediterranean*, eds. M.S. Balmouth & R.H. Tykot. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 363–9.
Pastor Borgoñon, H., 1988–90. Die Phönizier: eine begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. *Hamburger Beitrage zur Archaologie* 15/17, 37–142.
de Polignac, F., 1995. *Cults, Territory, and the Origins of the Greek City-State.* Chicago (IL): University of Chicago Press.
Raaflaub, K.A., 2004. Archaic Greek aristocrats as carriers of cultural interaction, in *Commerce and Monetary Systems in the Ancient World: Means of Transmission and Cultural Interaction. Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project, held in Innsbruck, Austria, October 3rd–8th 2002*, eds. R. Rollinger & C. Ulf. Stuttgart: Steiner, 197–217.
Ridgway, D., 2004. Euboeans and others along the Tyrrhenian seaboard, in *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean,* ed. K. Lomas. Leiden: Brill, 15–33.
Robertson, R., 1992. *Globalization, Social Theory and Global Culture.* London: Sage.
Röllig, W., 1982. Die Phönizier des Mutterlandes zur Zeit der Kolonisiergun, in *Phönizier im Westen*, ed. H.G. Niemeyer. Mainz: von Zabern, 15–28.
Sagona, C., 2004. The Phoenicians in Spain from a central Mediterranean perspective: a review essay. *Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 41, 240–66.
Shaw, J.W., 1989. Phoenicians in southern Crete. *American Journal of Archaeology* 93, 165–83.
Shepherd, G., 1995. The pride of most colonials: burial and religion in the Sicilian colonies. *Acta Hyperborea* 6, 51–82.
Shepherd, G., 2000. Greeks bearing gifts: religious relationships between Sicily and Greece in the Archiac period, in *Sicily from Aegean to Augustus: New Approaches in Archaeology and History*, eds. C. Smith & J. Serrati. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 55–70.
Sherratt, S., 2003. Visible writing: questions of script and identity in early Iron Age Greece and Cyprus. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 22(3), 225–42.
Stampolidis, N.C., 2003. On the Phoenician presence in the Aegean, in *Ploes: Sea Routes: Interconnections in the Mediterranean, 16th–6th c. BC. Proceedings of the International Symposium held at Rethymnon, Crete, September 29th–October 2nd, 2002,* eds. N.C. Stampolidis & V. Karageorghis. Athens: University of Crete and the A.G. Leventis Foundation, 217–30.
Stein, G., 2002. Colonies without colonialism: a trade diaspora model of fourth millennium BC Mesopotamian enclaves in Anatolia, in *The Archaeology of Colonialism*, eds. C.L. Lyons & J.K. Papadopouls. Los Angeles (LA): Getty Research Institute, 27–64.
Trigger, B.G., 1989. *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Tronchetti, C. & P. van Dommelen, 2005. Entangled objects and hybrid practices: colonial contacts and elite connections at Monte Prama, Sardinia. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 18(2), 183–208.
Tsetskhladze, G.R (ed.), 1999. *Ancient Greeks West and East.* Leiden: Brill.
Tsetskhladze, G.R. (ed.), 2006a. *Greek Colonization: an Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas.* Leiden: Brill.
Tsetskhladze, G.R., 2006b. Revisiting ancient Greek colonization, in *Greek Colonization: an Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas,* ed. G.R. Tsetskhladze. Leiden: Brill, xxiii–lxxxiii.
Tsetskhladze, G.R. & F. De Angelis (eds.), 1994. *The Archaeology of Greek Colonization.* Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology.
Turfa, J., 2001. Review of G.E. Markoe, *The Phoenicians*. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2001.05.09.
Vallet, G., 1978. Interventi. *Cronache di archeologia e di storia dell'arte, Università di Catania* 17, 150–52.
Vallet, G., 1982. Position des problèmes, in *La Céramique grecque ou de tradition grecque au VIIIe siècle en Italie centrale et méridionale*. Naples: Institut français de Naples, 11–19.
Vallet, G. & F. Villard, 1952. Les dates de fondation de Megara Hyblaea et de Syracuse. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 76, 289–356.
Vella, N., 1996. Elusive Phoenicians. *Antiquity* 70, 245–50.
Vives-Ferrándiz, J., 2008. Negotiating colonial encounters: hybrid practices and consumption in eastern Iberia (8th–6th centuries BC). *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 21(2), 241–72.
De Vries, K., 2003. Eighth-century Corinthian pottery: evidence for the dates of Greek settlement in the West, in *Corinth: the Centenary 1896–1996*, eds. C.K. Williams & N. Bookidis. (Corinth series 20.) Athens: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 141–56.
Wagner, C. & J. Alvar, 1989. Fenicios en occidente: la colonización agricola. *Rivista di Studi Fenici* 17(1), 61–102.
White, R., 1991. *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650–1815.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
van Wijngaarden, G.J., 2002. *Use and Appreciation of Mycenaean Pottery in the Levant, Cyprus and Italy (1600–1200 BC).* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
Wilson, J.P., 1997. The nature of Greek overseas settlements in the Archaic period: *emporion* or *apoikia,* in *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, eds. L.G. Mitchell & P.J. Rhodes. New York (NY): Routledge, 199–207.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Winter, I., 1976. Phoenician and north Syrian ivory carving in historical context: questions of style and distribution. *Iraq* 38, 1–26.
Winter, I., 1981. Is there a South Syrian style of ivory carving in the early first millennium BC? *Iraq* 43, 101–30.
Winter, I.J., 1995. Homer's Phoenicians: history, ethnography, or literary trope? [A perspective on early Orientalism], in *The Ages of Homer: a Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*, eds. J.B. Carter & S.P. Morris. Austin (TX): University of Texas Press, 247–71.

Author biography

Tamar Hodos is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Archaeology and Anthropology, University of Bristol. She is the author of *Local Responses to Colonization in the Iron Age Mediterranean* (London: Routledge, 2006) and co-editor (with S. Hales) of *Material Culture and Social Identity in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: CUP, 2009).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774309000286 Published online by Cambridge University Press