

The Art of Contact: Comparative Approaches to Greek and Phoenician Art. By S. REBECCA MARTIN. Philadelphia: UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS, 2017. Pp. 282, illus. \$59.95.

This thoughtful and stimulating book tackles a central issue of the ancient Mediterranean world—the “art of contact”—through focused consideration of the relationship between “Greek” and “Phoenician” art. The author brings to this complex topic both archaeological expertise (from long-time engagement with excavations at Phoenician Tel Dor in Israel) and academic training as an art historian, conjoined skills that shed welcome light on the Classical and Hellenistic eras (fifth to second centuries BCE). Her discussion is well informed by the history of scholarship, and she applies modern theories and models currently framing the understanding of contact between different cultures, smoothly and persuasively. Particularly skillful is how Martin brings out the role of Achaemenid rule in shaping contact between diverse Hellenes and Near Easterners, including Phoenicians, from Darius I through the conquests of Alexander III of Macedon. Her book complements the thoughtful essays in *The Punic Mediterranean* (Quinn and Vella 2014), largely aimed at the central, western, and Roman Mediterranean, while Martin frames the Greek East explored by Bonnet, Elayi, and others (see Aliquot and Bonnet 2015).

Saddled with a Greek name, hostile sources (Assyrian, biblical, and Classical), and a heritage dispersed across multiple ancient and modern nations, “Phoenicians” have long challenged scholars in quest of a material signature. Long credited with the early alphabet (recent discoveries now push its origins back to Bronze Age Egypt, and its adaptation to multiple Mediterranean locales), their home territory in the Levant remains unevenly explored, while their Punic colonies in the western Mediterranean are better known. This book does not present (nor aim to) a comprehensive corpus of Phoenician art; rather, it seeks to unpack how essentialist notions of East and West have created modern fictions of identity pinned loosely to selected works of art. For this goal, she analyzes and rehabilitates several famous works of “Greek” art, with important implications for the history of ancient art.

In her introduction and first chapter, Martin dismantles persistent notions of “Hellenic” and “Oriental,” as oppositional forces predicated on difference and asymmetry, along with the assumption that contact inevitably signals (or explains) change. She then deconstructs the concept of “Phoenician art” as a “fantasy” (p. 30), in terms of the early first millennium BCE aggregate of portable arts (metal bowls, carved ivory and shell, seals) long interpreted as essential and exclusive to Phoenician material culture (canonized in an exhibit in Venice and its catalogue, Moscati 1988). This agenda follows Marian Feldman’s campaign (2014) to disentangle stylistic groupings from presumed regional identities, and builds on Vella’s analysis (2014) of the 1988 exhibit and its fallacies.

While Martin avoids the overworked biblical description of the temple of Solomon in Jerusalem, built by King Hiram of Tyre, and the ancient reputation of Phoenicians for metallurgy, textiles, and purple dye, some realities must lie behind these, if early merchants and craftsmen from Sidon and Tyre became known as skilled in carpentry and luxury arts. Meanwhile, she argues that a collective identity, which she terms “Phoenicianism,” did not emerge until the Achaemenid era, marked by monumental arts and coinage in Phoenician cities. She also admits that ceramics (a medium she knows well) have proved most helpful in defining Phoenicians at various sites, since the Iron Age.

Her second chapter introduces several case studies—the Archaic Greek kouros or nude male statue inspired by Egyptian figures, pictorial mosaics of the Hellenistic period, and the anthropoid sarcophagus (exemplified in the famously inscribed coffin of Ahiaram)—to illustrate how a foreign form can be re-purposed (literally, by re-inscribing Egyptian stone coffins for Phoenicians). Martin revives a notion (p. 58) that armorers in Egypt first developed Greek images of the male body in marble (a theory that would neatly fuse Pharaonic “men of bronze,” or Greek hoplites in Egyptian service [Herodotus II.152], with their representation, however unlikely). Martin recognizes Near Eastern sources for early limestone carving in Crete, which might have led her closer to the northern Levant and Syro-Phoenician models.

But the point of the kouros exercise is to recognize deliberate emulation by Greek elites of foreign models. In contrast, the first picture mosaics in the Mediterranean illustrate the opposite process, according to Martin: a truly international invention, inspired by Macedonian pebble floors and Greek painting, but first found in Hellenistic Egypt, Italy, and Delos. Her prime example, in the House of

the Dolphins on Delos, is a mosaic of marine creatures, signed by a Greek-named Phoenician from Arwad, in the peristyle court adjoining a vestibule whose floor was inlaid with the sign of Tanit (fig. 11; ironically, this unmistakably Semitic sign was adopted by Greece's national handicrafts organization to advertise products of "Hellenic origin" nearly twenty years ago: Morris 2003: 10-12, fig. 2).

Finally, Martin's third case in this chapter returns us to Phoenicia proper, where the Sidonians brought three stone anthropoid sarcophagi looted(?) from Saïte Egypt under Cambyses, two of them (re)inscribed for royal burials. These relocated Egyptian coffins inspired hundreds of Phoenician versions, some in Greek marble and with faces carved in distinctively Greek style, to which Martin restores their Phoenician identity and handiwork, in her third and lasting lesson about the complexity of assigning roles within the "art(s) of contact."

Chapter 3 confronts more broadly the notion of a collective identity among ancient peoples, and considers whether this can be detected within the contours of ethnicity, race, and other troubling categories. Martin argues that mistaken methods and entrenched attitudes have produced stereotypes (expressed in her chapter title) of "exceptional Greeks" and "phantom Phoenicians," which do little to advance our understanding of ancient identities or their interaction. She is far from the first to do so (Vella 2014; Bonnet 2014: 283-84), but successfully stakes her overall argument on dismantling these assumptions, for a robust re-appraisal of major monuments.

The fourth chapter delivers the real one-two punch of her book, as she argues for the emergence of a genuine "Phoenicianism," or collective sense of Phoenician identity, in monumental art and coinage of the Classical and Hellenistic Levant. At least one recent appraisal of Achaemenid Phoenicia (Jigoulov 2010) missed much in material culture (Suriano 2011, Martin 2012). Here Martin builds on valuable first-hand knowledge of monuments in Syria, Lebanon, and Israel (regions divided by modern politics and seldom studied by the same scholars) and of important recent discoveries and publications (for example, in Beirut). Her discussion of coins minted by the four major Phoenician cities is engaging in its analysis of the choice and use of motifs—for example, the owl emblematic of Athens and its silver tetradrachms becomes a Tyrian coin device, enhanced by Egyptian and Persian images, as the city forges new symbols of power.

But did these products advertise individual cities, rather than collective Phoenician identity, and did the common standard of weight adopted by three of the cities reflect shared commercial and mercantile interests, not economic autonomy from Persia? For it is still Greek texts, albeit in bilingual inscriptions (CIS I, 115 = KAI 54), that identify "Phoenicia(ns)" rather than natives of Tyre, Sidon, or Ashkelon (cities which long competed for priority as "mother" of each other, and of Carthage). Martin uses the model of peer-polity interaction to navigate this "conversation among rivals," and admits that Phoenician collective identity eludes confirmation, but the reader takes away the interesting idea that Persian conquest could have shaped Phoenician identity, much as it did Greek self-image.

In her fifth and final chapter, Martin invokes two leading models of cultural contact—Homi Bhabha's hybridity and Richard White's "middle ground"—to analyze two major works of "Greek" art, respectively—the Alexander sarcophagus from the necropolis of Sidon, and a statue group from Delos, the so-called Slipper Slapper—as the products of a particular Phoenician engagement with multiple traditions. She is not the first to apply these frames to the art of Achaemenid and Hellenistic Phoenicia (and cites work by her fellow student at Berkeley, Jessica Nitschke). Yet she moves the discussion of the carved and painted marble sarcophagus, decorated with reliefs of hunt and battle, beyond its alleged patrons and artists, to align it with multiple sources (Greek, Macedonian, Persian, and Phoenician) for Sidonian elite identity.

In her second case, White's "middle ground" (used for the Punic West by Irad Malkin and by Corinne Bonnet for Phoenicians east and west) is fruitfully applied to the island of Delos, a literal middle ground between Italy, Greece, and the Semitic East. The Hellenistic statue group of Aphrodite, Pan, and Eros is seen by Martin as a transformation of Astarte, Ba'al-Hammon, and Adonis into a cult triad for the maritime cult of Poseidon, celebrated in a building exclusive to Beirut Phoenicians (including Dionysios, patron and benefactor of *koinon* and sculptures). Despite a clearer picture of Phoenician mercantile cults and wealthy patronage, we still lack a definition of "Phoenician" art, which Martin tackles in her conclusion. Here, she turns the troubled concept of "originality" back to her first

case studies (kouros, mosaics), rejecting the term “appropriation” in favor of agency in art, to explain Phoenician response to Greek forms.

While those seeking a comprehensive study of Phoenician art will not find it in this book, readers have much to gain from Martin’s hope that Greek and Phoenician art remain “contested spaces,” and may well learn as much about the Achaemenid world as about Greece and the Levant. Throughout her wide-ranging investigation, Martin pays close attention to Phoenician inscriptions, including bilingual texts from Greece cited and analyzed in full (the funerary stele from the Athenian Kerameikos would have benefitted from an illustration). The illustrations, especially the color plates, are excellent and greatly appreciated; errors are few (largely mistyped names in references), style throughout is clear, and this book deserves its modest price.

SARAH MORRIS
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

REFERENCES

- Aliquot, J., and C. Bonnet, eds. 2015. *La Phénicie Hellénistique: Actes du colloque international de Toulouse (18-20 février 2013)*. Lyon: Maison de l’Orient et de la Méditerranée—Jean Pouilloux.
- Bonnet, C. 2014. Phoenician Identities in Hellenistic Times: Strategies and Negotiations. Pp. 282–98 in Quinn and Vella 2014.
- Feldman, M. 2014. *Communities of Style: Portable Luxury Arts, Identity, and Collective Memory in the Iron Age Levant*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Jigoulov, V. 2010. *The Social History of Achaemenid Phoenicia: Being Phoenician, Negotiating Empires*. London: Equinox Press.
- Martin, S. 2012. Review of Jigoulov 2010. *Review of Biblical Literature*. Society of Biblical Literature. www.bookreviews.org.
- Morris, S. 2003. Islands in the Sea: Aegean Politics as Levantine Neighbors. In *Symbiosis, Symbolism and The Power of the Past: Ancient Israel from the Late Bronze Age through Roman Palestine*, ed. W. Dever and S. Gitin. Pp. 3–15. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Moscatti, S. 1988. *I Fenici*. Milan: Bompiano.
- Quinn, J. C., and N. Vella, eds. 2014. *The Punic Mediterranean: Identities and Identification from Phoenician Settlement to Roman Rule*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Suriano, M. 2011. Review of Jigoulov 2010. *JAOS* 131: 688–90.
- Vella, N. 2014. The Invention of the Phoenicians: On Object Definition, Decontextualization and Display. Pp. 24–41 in Quinn and Vella 2014.

Edith Porada zum 100. Geburtstag: A Centenary Volume. Edited by ERIKA BLEIBTREU and HANS ULRICH STEYMANS. *Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis*, vol. 268. Fribourg: ACADEMIC PRESS, 2014. Pp. xv + 642, illus. FS 184.

So much has been written about Edith Porada (1912–1994), *Doyenne der Vorderasiatischen Archäologie*, that one wonders whether a review of another memorial volume could contribute any new observations on either her or her work. Before her death in 1994 there had already appeared two *Festschriften*, Farkas, Harper, and Harrison (1986) and Kelly-Buccellati et al. (1986). A memorial volume, Owen and Wilhelm (1995), was published soon after her death, and many obituaries have been written by her former students. Like so many of my peers, however, my own early intellectual development was deeply influenced by Dr. Porada’s scholarship, and I spent one year (1988–1989) visiting her in the famous apartment on 119th Street in New York City, the two of us poring over photographs of the seals from the Fortification archive from Persepolis. The arrival of *Edith Porada zum 100. Geburtstag: A Centenary Volume* was in fact a refreshing and rewarding opportunity to engage in a concerted man-