

The unresolved questions do not end there, but they do call into question the very identity of colonial Tartessos, which is today torn between those who propose identifying Tartessos with a true Phoenician colonization and those who argue that there were in fact two societies in contact with each other, which some believe to have remained separate but others see as having assimilated cultural elements from the other. If we assume a Tartessos with local acculturated populations, as has been repeatedly argued, or a Tartessos of mixed populations, as others suggest, was this a state-like society or a society of complex chieftaincies? Many specific subjects, such as the beginning of jarositic ore cupellation in Tartessos, writing, and so on, are sometimes impregnated with the theoretical positions that the different researchers take in relation to these essential questions. In that respect this book is a good means for perceiving the state of the question: major advances have been made since the late 1960s, but there are still many mysteries to unravel. The reader will therefore gain an accurate idea of the state of knowledge and the different positions taken on a subject that is as exciting as it is elusive: Tartessos.

nrafel@historia.udl.cat

Facultat d'Història, Universitat de Lleida

Il sacro e il profano: cultural entanglements and ritual practices in the classical world

Peter van Dommelen

SIMONETTA ANGIOLILLO, MARCO GIUMAN e CHIARA PILO (a cura di), *MEIXIS. DINAMICHE DI STRATIFICAZIONE CULTURALE NELLA PERIFERIA GRECA E ROMANA. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi "Il sacro e il profano", Cagliari, Cittadella dei Musei, 5-7 maggio 2011* (Archaeologica 169; Giorgio Bretschneider Editore, Roma 2012). Pp. viii + 255, fig. 24, tav. LXIII fuori testo (including colour). ISSN 0391-9293; ISBN 978-88-7689-270-7.

Culture contact, entanglement, syncretism, *mestizaje* and hybridization are but some of the terms that have been proposed and used over the past two or three decades, with more or fewer followers and greater or lesser success, to describe, discuss and understand what goes on when people from different cultural backgrounds not just come across each other but also live and work together as a result of trade, colonization or other kinds of migration. Alongside a wide range of disciplines exploring the convergences, misunderstandings and conflicts that have resulted from such encounters across the globe and in many different periods, colonization and culture change have long been major research themes in classical archaeology, as is perhaps best demonstrated by the fact that these processes were captured early on under the headings of 'Hellenization' and 'Romanization'. Key publications that appeared as long as three or four decades ago, and that remain relevant today, include the conference on *Forme di contatto e processi di trasformazione nelle società antiche*, a comparative study of ancient Greek and mediaeval Spanish colonization, and an anthropological reflection on the very notions of cultural change and Hellenization.¹

1 The three publications referred to are, respectively: the edited volume, *Forme di contatto e processi di trasformazione nelle società antiche. Atti del Convegno di Cortona, 24-30 maggio 1981* (ColloFR 67, 1983); and two articles, S. Gruzinski and A. Rouveret, "Ellos son como niños. Histoire et acculturation dans le Mexique colonial et l'Italie méridionale avant la romanisation," *MEFRA* 88 (1976) 159-219, and C. Gallini, "Cosa intendere per ellenizzazione. Problemi di metodo," *DialArch* 7 (1973) 175-91. See most the most recent discussion in M. J. Versluys, "Understanding objects in motion. An archaeological dialogue on Romanisation," *Arch. Dialogues* 21 (2014) 1-55.

The present volume represents another step in this classical research tradition under yet another heading, as is signaled by its title. Although neither the editors nor the contributors elaborate on the title or its meaning, *meixis*, more commonly spelled *mixis* (μίξις), is a Greek word that literally means ‘mixing’ or ‘mingling’. While it is commonly used to refer to sexual intercourse, in combination with the *dinamiche di stratificazione culturale* of the volume’s subtitle this term is evidently used with reference to the mixing of cultural traditions; this is in line with compound words like μιξάνθρωπος or μιξέλληνες, usually translated as ‘half man’ and ‘half Barbarian’ or ‘mongrel Greek’.² As such, the use of this term neatly fits in a time-honored classical tradition to resort to emic Greek and Latin terms and concepts to describe ancient processes and phenomena; other terms in this category are, for instance, *polis* and *apoikia*. Otherwise, however, this particular use of the term is without precedent. It would appear to represent an attempt to construct an alternative heading under which to discuss social and cultural encounters or entanglements; the adoption of the ancient term may be an attempt to avoid the anachronistic pitfalls that (post)modern concepts like hybridization and *mestizaje* carry.³ It is therefore unfortunate — if not a missed opportunity — that the volume is without introduction or even a preface, and that the editors have not been able to explain explicitly what they intended to express with this title; nor have they set out their intentions for this volume or the rationale for bringing together the specific topics covered by the various contributors. As it is, the volume plunges *in medias res* with detailed discussion of the Phoenician *tophet*.

Some information can nevertheless be gleaned from the concluding discussion by M. Torelli, who looks back at the contributions (cf. below). The first point is that the book represents the proceedings of a conference, as indeed the subtitle of the volume makes clear: the conference ‘Il sacro e il Profano’ held at Cagliari in 2011;⁴ Torelli adds (238) that it was one of a series of three conferences organized between the universities of Perugia, Messina and Cagliari as part of a national Italian research project that explored cultural interaction in the classical world with particular attention to religious dimensions. The present volume in fact complements two previously published books.⁵ As might be expected, the three share a focus on Greece and the Greek world of S Italy and Sicily, and an emphasis on ritual and religious matters. The present volume has an even more specific regional focus, which the subtitle defines as *la periferia greca e romana*. The 14 contributing chapters cover Etruria, S Italy, Iberian (SE) Spain and, especially, Sardinia, which is home to 8 of the case studies presented. While the absence of Sicily is somewhat unexpected, the volume otherwise neatly skirts around Rome and Latium. The inclusion of one prehistoric (Manunza) and 4 Phoenician-Punic studies (Xella; Bernardini; Stiglitz; D’Oriano and Pietra) further strengthens the volume’s peripheral perspective. The chapters are organized geographically, starting with Xella’s opening paper that discusses the W Phoenician world as a whole. Next come 3 Etruscan chapters (Giuman and Pilo; Minoja; Massa-Pairault), one on Magna Graecia (Lippolis), one on Iberia (Olmos *et al.*) and the 8 on Sardinia, before Torelli’s final reflections.

Rather than summarizing all these chapters, in what follows chiefly I consider them in the light of the presumed overarching theme of cultural interaction, while highlighting several secondary topics that from my reading may seem to run through the volume.

2 LSJ *s.v.* μιξ and μίξις.

3 See, e.g., S. Owen, “Analogy, archaeology and archaic colonization,” in H. Hurst and S. Owen (edd.), *Ancient colonisations: analogy, similarity and difference* (London 2005) 5–22.

4 The conference flyer is still (Sept. 2015) available at <http://people.unica.it/mgiuman/files/2011/04/programma-convegno-Cagliari-copia.jpg> but it does not give any further information on the conference objectives. Torelli is the only contributor to the volume who did not attend the conference. The present reviewer participated in the conference but did not contribute to the publication.

5 C. Masseria and D. Loscalzo (edd.), *Miti di guerra, riti di pace. La guerra e la pace: un confronto interdisciplinare* (Bibliotheca Archaeologica 22; Bari 2011); A. Calderone (ed.), *Cultura e religione delle acque. Atti del convegno interdisciplinare ‘Qui fresca l’acqua mormora ...’* (S. Quasimodo, *Sapph. fr. 2,5*) (Archaeologica 167; Rome 2012).

Hardly surprising, given the religious focus, is that nearly half of the contributions discuss a temple of one kind or another. While at first sight that might seem rather conventional, this choice is readily vindicated by the variety and richness of the case-studies that go from the famous (or perhaps infamous) Phoenician open-air tophets, Nuragic cult buildings and an Iberian élite burial tomb to a conventional Greek temple and classical architectural decorations in S Italy and Sardinia. As these chapters vividly remind us, shrines (or, more generally, places of ritual activity) are prime locations for cultural interaction.

This point is well made in the Sardinian case-studies presented by A. Stiglitz and P. Bernardini, who use quite different types of evidence at very different scales to make more or less the same point: that Sardinia, its coastlands in particular, constituted a privileged area of cultural encounters and entanglements in the first millennium B.C. – what M. L. Pratt has termed a “contact zone” that is instrumental in cultural encounters and processes of cultural change and adaptation.⁶ Stiglitz shows how an originally prehistoric Nuragic monument was re-used and adapted for ritual purposes in later Hellenistic (Punic) and Roman times. He suggests that fragments of statues and incense-burners found at *nuraghe S’Urachi* demonstrate not only that the monument had become a center of rural cult activities, but also that these drew on a variety of cultural traditions that included the Egyptian god Bes, the Greek goddess Demeter, and Punic ritual practices – all brought together in a Nuragic monument. Bernardini, by contrast, takes the high road and argues that the first centuries of the first millennium B.C. saw the development of distinctive cultural traditions that were as much rooted in the local and older Nuragic way of life as they were influenced by contacts with the external world in the broadest sense of the term – be they Sardinians travelling abroad or foreigners, whether Greek, Phoenician, Iberian or Etruscan, frequenting or even settling on the island’s shores. Persuasively suggesting that the lifesize statues of Monte Prama might be compared to Homer’s heroes, he succinctly sums up his arguments by describing the Sardinian Iron Age as an epic transformation of Sardinian society, albeit one that lacked its own Homer to sing these heroes’ tales.

More prosaically, R. D’Oriano and G. Pietra have sifted through dozens of minor and some major rescue excavations at Olbia on the NE coast of the island to bring together decades of painstaking salvage excavations and to construct an emblematic instance of “cultural stratification”. Piecing together a large number of dispersed finds and find-contexts, they not only show how the town went through successive Phoenician, Greek, Punic and eventually Roman phases, but also argue that cult and ritual continuities may be traced around Melqart-Herakles-Hercules and Ashtart-Afrodite-Venus. M. R. Manunza and D. Artizzu’s excavation at a Nuragic site overlooking the coastal plains around Cagliari (*Karalis*) might represent a comparable situation, but the available evidence points only to cultural contacts with the late Phoenician world.

S. Angiolillo discusses what one could consider the rural counterpart of such cultural stratifications in the Roman period, as she presents a small but remarkable category of Late Republican and Early Imperial funerary *stelae* that are dispersed over a large tract of mostly W Sardinia. They are often referred to as the Viddalba *stelae* after a small cemetery in N Sardinia, where a large number of these stones have been encountered. They are defined by a stylized face, below which a brief Latin inscription may be found. While the use of Latin obviously testifies to contemporary Roman influence, the *stelae* themselves and their iconography are much more reminiscent of Punic traditions, while the names include Roman, Punic and other (presumably Nuragic) elements. Collecting mostly epigraphic evidence of Roman cults for large swaths of the mountainous interior of the island, E. Trudu has, by contrast, found a relative dearth of indigenous influences in the dedications, which he suggests may imply limited cultural interactions in these inland regions – despite the Nuragic roots of nearly all the sites he lists.

A most remarkable case of what may be interpreted as conscious cultural stratification, if not manipulation, is presented by R. Olmos and colleagues, who have excavated and studied a fascinating élite burial in the late Iberian cemetery at Piquía, Jaén (SE Spain). One particularly lavish burial, appropriately labelled ‘princely’ and dated to the 1st c. B.C., stands out not

6 M. L. Pratt, *Imperial eyes. Travel writing and transculturation* (New York 1992) especially chapt. 1.

so much because of its wealth of grave goods, but rather because these include 7 Attic kraters and 1 (fragment of a) kylix that date to the turn of the 5th/4th c. B.C. As a convincing argument can be made that the 7 vases are also united by the topics they depict, the conclusion has to be that the 1st-c. Iberians were using old and clearly significant vases to create a new and possibly mythological past to anchor their present. While this is not a straightforward encounter between locals and outsiders, it is undisputedly a cultural exchange across time.

A less varied but no less compelling situation is presented by E. Lippolis, who explores the temple and associated grounds of Saturo on Puglia's Ionian coast. While the site might appear a 'proper' Greek sanctuary to all intents and purposes, careful consideration of the evidence on the ground points to a number of organizational elements that can be related to pre-existing indigenous traditions of the wider Taranto district, even though they are shaped in an entirely Greek architectural fashion.

Two comparable and closely-related cases concern the architecture, and specifically the decorations, of two temples in Sardinia under Republican rule. G. Manca di Mores has re-examined and reconstructed the ceramic friezes and other sculptural fragments of the temple dedicated to *Sardus Pater* at Antas. As is evident from its dedication and its remote location high in the Iglesias mountains, where there are few traces of Roman settlement around, this shrine is highly unusual. The conventional view is that it constitutes a deliberate attempt by the Roman Republic and its representatives on the island to establish their authority over this mineral-rich area. While Manca di Mores' proposed dating of the architectural sculptures to the Late Republic (late 2nd/early 1st c. B.C.), and the many architectural and sculptural connections she traces to the central Italian mainland, would seem to confirm this interpretation, her identification of specifically regional Hellenistic and Punic iconographic choices adds to the complexity of this remarkable site and calls for a much more nuanced understanding. The temple at the Via Malta in the center of Cagliari stands by contrast in a very urban setting, not just today but also in the Late Republican period: as at Antas, this complex was closely related architecturally to contemporary 'theatre temples' on the Italian mainland, and as such embodies once more how Sardinia increasingly became more closely connected to, and perhaps integrated in, the Roman Republic by the 1st c. B.C. Unlike the temple at Antas and its Nuragic roots, however, the temple of the Via Malta was imposed on a Punic cultural base; and, as at Antas, these connections can be traced.

On the mainland, Etruria and Campania offer equally rich evidence of cultural stratifications. In both cases it is decorated pottery that offers an interesting insight into the interplay between different cultural strands. M. Giuman and C. Pilo focus on a single type of tableware, the *kyathos*, which was produced in Attica in the 6th and 5th c., but which has almost exclusively been found in Etruria. Tracing and 'unpacking' the iconography of the decorations, they show how the Attic workshops resorted to very specific decorative choices, which would appear to be more Etruscan-inspired than drawn from Greek traditions. In a rich but densely-argued chapter, M. Minoja homes in even more specifically on a single theme within Black-Figure Campanian pottery — namely, the altar. Through this lens, he shows how the decorative choices of the Campanian workshops draw on local ritual traditions but all the while remain more or less within the iconographic bounds of Greek-style figurative pottery, thereby offering a convincing case-study of cultural adaptation and entanglement. This contact dimension remains unfortunately rather subdued in F.-H. Massa-Pairault's otherwise fine and well-informed case study of the decorative framework of the early 4th-c. *Tomba dei Pigmei* at Tarquinia.

The opening paper of the volume is dedicated to the Phoenician *tophet*, which, as P. Xella demonstrates in a tightly argued and rich essay, is so unlike any other ritual site of the classical world that it practically embodies the peripherality and otherness of the Phoenician world. The *tophet* is in all respects not just an eminently and specifically Phoenician phenomenon and site, but, even within the Phoenician world, its distribution was restricted to just the central N African coasts and the islands of Malta, Sicily and Sardinia in the central Mediterranean. At the same time, however, its cultural and ritual logic is not without parallels elsewhere, as Xella demonstrates in his discussion of the controversial question of whether children were offered

or not at the *tophet*, arguing conclusively that these sites were not used as burial grounds but that young children or animals were presented to the gods Tinnit or Baal Hammon in fulfillment of a specific and individual vow.⁷

At the other end of the book, M. Torelli looks back on the chapters. While most of his contribution is taken up by detailed comments and elaborations on the descriptions and arguments offered by their authors, he bookends his discussion with reflections on the volume's wider theme and its significance in the field of Mediterranean and classical archaeology. He uses his opening pages (237-38) to contextualize the volume, pointing out in particular how it picks up on the debates about culture contact and culture change that first emerged in the 1960s: he highlights in particular the very first conference organized by the Istituto per la Storia e l'Archeologia della Magna Grecia at Taranto in 1961 that examined interactions between Greek colonizers and indigenous inhabitants in S Italy.⁸ Torelli returns to the broader picture in his final 2^{1/2} pages, noting in particular that the Sardinian contributions not only adhere closest to the culture contact theme, but that they also add up to a remarkably long history of cultural connections and adaptations on the island that may be traced throughout the first millennium B.C.

In conclusion, if we cobble together all the pointers that can be found, this book may surely be defined as a study of culture contact and hybridization. It is equally clear, as forcefully underscored by Torelli, that the Sardinian chapters offer particularly rich evidence to investigate these themes in a variety of settings and over a *longue durée*. We may also surmise that the editors' apparent insistence on taking seriously the periphery has resulted in a notable collection of studies that steer away from the usual regions and topics of classical studies, and instead have brought marginal areas and lesser-known sites to center-stage. On the whole, this volume has much to offer to studies of colonialism, exchange and migration. It will surely turn out to be useful for many scholars, even if they have to navigate it themselves without the benefit of the suggestions from or knowledge of the intentions of its editors.

Peter_van_Dommelen@brown.edu

Joukowsky Institute for Archaeology and the Ancient World, Brown University

7 For a recent and more detailed discussion of this controversy, see P. Xella, J. Quinn, V. Melchiorri and P. van Dommelen, "Phoenician bones of contention," *Antiquity* 87 (2013) 1199-207.

8 P. Romanelli (ed.), *Greci e Italici in Magna Grecia: Atti del primo convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto 1961* (Naples 1962).