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ABSTRACT
Over the last three decades, there has been wide discussion among archaeologists on the origins of the funerary rituals in South Iberia between the 9th to 6th centuries BC, namely cremations or inhumations. This debate is connected with the existence of social complexity in the region prior to the Phoenician arrival, the emergence of an ‘orientalised’ elite after contact and the adoption of new objects and practices by the local population. In this paper, the Deleuzian concept of ‘deterritorialisation’ is linked to the idea of ‘borderlands’ developed by Gloria Anzaldúa to analyse South Iberian society. In doing so, I explore indigenous funerary data and challenge the strict division between cremation and inhumation in the region, as well as examine the depth and meaning of changes in funerary rituals for local communities.
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RESUMEN
Durante las tres últimas décadas, numerosos/as arqueólogos/as han discutido extensamente sobre el ritual funerario original de las poblaciones del sur ibérico entre los siglos IX y VI a.C., esto es, cremación o inhumación. Este debate está además conectado con la existencia o no de complejidad social antes de la llegada fenicia, con la aparición de una élite ‘orientalizada’ y con la adopción de nuevos objetos y prácticas por las poblaciones locales. En este artículo hago uso del concepto deleziano de “deterritorialización” y lo asocio con el de “frontera” desarrollado por Anzaldúa para interpretar la sociedad del Sur Ibérico. Para ello, analizo la evidencia funeraria indígena y cuestiono la división estricta entre cremación e inhumación en la región; así como examino la profundidad y significado de los cambios funerarios en las comunidades locales.
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1. Funerary practices in colonial situations

The archaeology of death has long been a major topic in the field, particularly in the area known as Tartessos in Southwest Iberia (see Torres Ortiz 1999: 17–24 with references). However, discussions have largely focused on whether inhumation or cremation was the original funerary custom in Southern Iberia, or whether cremation was an indigenous tradition or adopted only after Phoenician contact (Bélén et al. 1991; Bélén and Escacena 1992; Bélén 2001; Torres 1999: 149–151, 2004). The identity of the deceased has also been the subject of heated discussion in archaeological studies of South Iberia; debates on whether tombs belong to Phoenicians or indigenous persons, based on the grave goods and the funerary urns used, are deeply embedded in discussions on Tartessos and the ‘Orientalising’ period in Iberia (Wagner and Alvar 1989: 94–95; Belén 2001; Torres 2002: 354–359, 2004; Escacena 2004; Pappa 2012).

Near Eastern populations established permanent settlements in Iberia between the 9th and the 7th century BC, becoming very active in trade and production with indigenous communities. The Phoenician presence, however, cannot merely be labelled ‘colonialism’ (Vives-Ferrándiz 2008; Marín-Aguilera 2012; see also Osborne 2008; contra Moreno 1999; Wagner 2007, 2011). This is not to say that power relations and economic exploitation did not exist –indeed they did– but power was manifested through the local regime, and not direct colonial rule. In fact, for the period between the 9th and 6th centuries BC, inequality was rife in Southern Iberia—which can be seen in the right to be buried, in funerary structures, as well as in grave goods and rituals—. Phoenician settlers brought enrichment to the local population, triggering social changes best understood

![Fig. 1. Map of Southern Iberia reconstructing the old coastline and showing the location of the most important settlements and the cemeteries cited in the text.](image-url)
by applying the Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s concept of ‘deterritorialisation’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1983). The ‘borderland’ (sensu Anzaldúa 1987) produced by the Phoenician arrival and settlement fostered new consciousness and practices in which settler and local traditions met and collided.

It must be noted that in this paper, I will focus only on the funerary data of the Lower Guadalquivir, without discussing the traditional label of ethnicity of these indigenous communities, i.e. ‘Tartessos’ (see Fig.1). There are already many publications addressing this issue (see for instance Schulten 1972; Maluquer 1990; Torres 2002; Alvarex 2005; Celestino 2014), and I believe that such an ethnonym is far more confusing than reassuring (see particularly Pappa 2012; Ferrer 2014). In what follows, I will consider the potential of the concepts of ‘deterritorialisation’ and ‘borderlands’, exploring what these terms can provide to the archaeological interpretation of colonial situations. Southern Iberia funerary data will be examined in order to test the validity of the cremation/inhumation equation for its communities, in terms of chronology, ethnicity, and social differentiation. The Deleuzian and Anzaldúa concepts will then be applied to analyse social changes in the region that relate to Phoenician presence. In so doing, I hope to open up new discussions regarding burial practices and social differentiation in Southern Iberia between the 9th and 6th centuries BC.

2. Deterritorialisation in the borderlands

Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari developed the concept of ‘deterritorialisation’ in their influential Anti-Oedipus (1983). Although the origin of the term is spatial, deterritorialisation does not require territory or spatial movement per se, for it can exist on the cultural, ideological, economic, social, and political levels of structural transformation (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 508). Deterritorialisation is the movement out of a territory, object, or phenomenon into a new combination of energies, i.e., a ‘reterritorialisation’, a change (Parr 2010: 69). In fact, the line of flight or deterritorialisation is part of a rhizome where all lines are tied back to one another, so it may also provoke deterritorialisations in other elements of that rhizomatic composition (Deleuze and Guattari 1987: 9–10). Such movements can be relative or absolute. Relative deterritorialisation is a movement towards fixity for what happens on a molar plane, in which the system achieves balance from a previous ‘territorial’ pattern (Parr 2010: 69–70). On the contrary, absolute deterritorialisation is an ontological movement, for it occurs on a molecular level, where lines of flight may push the system towards chaos or a ‘death zone’, or may force the system to create new attractors representing new behaviours (Protevi 2006: 23). Nevertheless, system transformations around new attractors are never total, so traditional attractors may continue through time in one way or another, or may disappear and then reappear (Sassen 2006). In fact, a multiple combination of lines is the most common response, where the organisation of the elements which compound such a system is not hierarchical but rhizomatic (Deleuze and Guattari 1987).

A deterritorialisation movement can have different causes, but it is especially widespread in situations involving colonialism, imperialism, wars, natural catastrophes, and socioeconomic exploitation (Barañano et al. 2007: 66). Colonial situations are indeed cultural and political borderlands, where different populations come together. Anzaldúa describes these borderlands as landscapes of ambiguity, where two or more cultures struggle and clash with each other resulting in mental and emotional perplexity, which leads to the emergence of a new consciousness, a mestiza-je (Anzaldúa 1987: 78). As a result, borderlands are in-between situations of psychic and physical restlessness, where people of different origins occupy the same territory, and where lower, middle, and upper classes converge (Anzaldúa 1987: Preface). Inhabited by disparate individuals and groups with different experiences and identity, borderlands are dynamic and creative places, but they also mean conflict spaces where tension and opposite ideologies and practices reside (Anzaldúa 1987; Zartman 2010; Naum 2012, 2013). As such, certain questions need to answered. Where the Iberian case is concerned, did the Phoenician presence create a borderland? Was there deterritorialisation in the region due to the Phoenician contact? And if so, what kind of ‘system combination’ emerged?


The funerary evidence of South Iberia is still very fragmented, and derives greatly from old
The first ritual can be seen in the necropolis of Los Praditos, Mesas de Asta, and at Tumulus I in Las Cumbres (Torres 2004: 426–428). Inhumations are displayed at Fondo 4 in Vega de Santa Lucía in Córdoba (Murillo 1994: 127–131), and at Peña de Arias Montano in Huelva (Gómez et al. 1992). In the case of cremation, ash urns were surrounded by grave goods in the form of carinated bowls and casseroles, and sometimes cups. All of these are hand-made and characteristically burnished, and used for ritual consumption and offerings (Torres 2004: 427–428). Carinated bowls and casseroles also accompanied inhumations, along with biconic urns (Gómez et al. 1992: 48, 51–52; Murillo 1994: 127–131). Other items, such as jewellery, belt buckles, and brooches (fibulae) are also present in some of these tombs, but in this paper I will focus only on the material culture related to the funerary banquet. As noted above, social stratification was established in the right to be buried, evident in the limited number of tombs. This stratification can also be seen in funerary structure—some of the tombs were burial mounds, as in the cases of Los Praditos and excavations, although commercial archaeology is recently changing the situation (Fernández et al. 2014). Tomb looting is a special guest in this equation, because several graves were found without any material culture associated to it, making it more difficult to study burial changes and chronology. Dating is indeed an important problem, because tomb chronology depends on ceramic typology, with the exception of La Angorrilla (Fernández and Rodriguez 2007: 88-90; 2009: 3071, notes 13 and 14). In any case, radiocarbon dates are not especially reliable for this period of time, due to the ‘Hallstatt’ plateau in the calibration curve (Reimer et al. 2004: 1057; Hajdas 2008: 16). Nevertheless, funerary rituals in South Iberia have been studied for more than a century and there have been many publications that address this matter—the most comprehensive being a study conducted by Mariano Torres (1999), in which the tomb dating of this section is fundamentally based (see also Ruiz 1989; Ruiz and Pérez 1995; Torres 2004).

Cremation and inhumation are both present from the 10th to 9th centuries BC (see Table 1).
Las Cumbres, while others were pit-graves, as in the case of Mesas de Asta.

Between the end of the 9th century and the end of the 8th century BC, cremation seems to be the only accepted burial ritual. Although hand-made carinated bowls, casserole, and burned bowls conform the great majority of grave goods, some Phoenician plates and perfume amphules begin to appear for the first time in the local cemeteries of Setefilla in Seville, and Las Cumbres in Cádiz (Aubet 1976; Ruiz and Pérez 1989: 292). As with the former period, the number of tombs is reduced, so it is likely that only the local elite could be buried (Torres 1996, 2004: 431). In fact, at Tumulus A in Setefilla, there are 45 tombs for over a century of use, which works out to about 11 burials per generation. The same circumstances define Tumulus B in the same cemetery, where 33 tombs have been found, or approximately 8 burials per generation. There are, however, simple tombs at Setefilla next to the ‘aristocratic’ barrows dated to this period, in which the deceased were buried or incinerated, and their ashes put into a single urn with no funerary vessels except weapons (Bonsor and Thouvenot 1928: 31–32). Less wealthy tombs have been also found at Mesas de Asta in Cádiz (Ruiz and Pérez 1995: 193-194, 220-221) and Rabadanes in Seville (Pellicer and Escacena 2007).

At the end of the 8th century BC, indigenous cemeteries showed several changes concerning the introduction of new objects as grave goods, and the emergence of new social actors. By this period, almost a century would have passed from the time the Phoenicians established their first colonies in the area (Aubet 2001: 372–381; Pin- gel 2006), and their relationships with the locals were already well noted in several necropolises. Where the end of the former period is marked by the discovery of pottery of Phoenician tradition in only some of the tombs in Setefilla and Las Cumbres, this pottery is a constant presence in most of the elite burials from the 8th century onwards.

From the end of the 8th century till the 6th century, inhumation and cremation were both practiced simultaneously in Southwest Iberia. Scholars have traditionally defined two types of cemeteries for these two centuries, namely the ‘aristocratic’ and ‘plain’ necropolises. The first group of cemeteries is characterised by remarkable burial structures and wealthy grave-goods, consisting of bronze and ceramic vessels of both local and Phoenician tradition (Aubet 1984: 446–447). The most well-known examples of these are cremation tombs 16 and 17 of the La Joya necropolis, in Huelva, where Phoenician red slip plates and bowls, pithoi, amphorae, and alabaster jars were added to sets of local vessels (Garrido and Orta 1978: 49–124). Similar grave goods appear at both the Acebuchal and the Alcantarilla cemeteries (Torres 1999: 75–76, 79).

As a result, hand-made bowls, casserole, and cups, along with Phoenician red slip plates, metal jugs and handled receptacles of Oriental style, constitute the ritual assemblage in these elite or aristocratic tombs. The second group of necropolises is defined by less complex burial structures, such as pit-graves, single-urn graves, and bustum or cremation fossa. Their ceramic ware is composed mainly of hand-made local style pottery, with the inclusion of few Oriental items (Torres 1999: 166–167, 2004: 434, 436–438). Representative of this ‘plain’ burials are the necropolises of Bencarrón and Cruz del Negro (Torres 2004: 436). Although there is evidence of inhumations in both necropolises, cremation is the most common burial ritual for ‘plain’ cemeteries (Lazarich 1985; Torres 1999: 70–71, 82). Grave goods are fundamentally hand-made vessels made in the local tradition, such as casserole, cups, and bowls, with a minor presence of Phoenician red-slip ware, and jewellery of Oriental style (Torres 1999: 69–72, 80–84, 2004: 436–437). The same applies to the pottery assemblage found at the Osuna and Mesa de Algar cemeteries (Aubet 1971: 112–118; Lazarich 1985: 103–104).

From the middle 7th to the 6th centuries BC, both cremations and inhumations appear in ‘aristocratic’ and ‘plain’ necropolises. The cemeteries of La Joya, El Palmarón, and Parque Moret in Huelva, Campo de las Canteras, and Tumulus B, C and D at Huerta del Cabello, Tumulus G at Acebuchal, and Tumulus H at Setefilla in Seville are included in the former group. Their grave goods are similar to the ones in the former century, although metal jugs and vessels have become more common. ‘Rhodian’ pitchers are also seen in place of Phoenician jugs, perhaps due to the influence of Greeks in Iberia during this period, as in the case of Tomb 5 at La Joya (Garrido 1970: 23–32). Plain necropolises of this period include the Necropolis of Cruz del Negro, El Judío and Cañada de las Cabras (Torres 1999: 166, 2004: 440–441), and probably La Angorrilla (Fernández and Rodríguez 2007: 82-90; 2009: 3065)3, all in Seville. The grave goods at these cemeteries show a continuation with the former century, al-
4. Cremation vs. inhumation? Challenging the divides

Traditionally, inhumation was believed to have been the burial ritual of the indigenous communities in Southern Iberia, i.e., Tartessos (Aubet 1977: 95–96; Pellicer 1979: 327–329; Wagner 1983: 21–23). According to this interpretation, cremation was a later introduction. Torres Ortiz believes, however, that cremation was the main funerary ritual in Southern Iberia from the 11th to the 6th centuries BC (Torres 1999: 149, 2004: 443). Indeed, there is enough data to support the claim that indigenous communities practiced cremation as early as the 10th century BC (Torres 1996, 1999: 149–150, 2004, 2005). Nevertheless, there is no unanimity on the issue of whether cremation was adopted after Phoenician settlement (Blázquez 1986: 169; Wagner 1986: 138–139; Belén and Escacena 1992), after Greek contact during the Sea People migration (Bendala 1995: 261), or by its spread from the Iberian Levantine coast (Gonzálezez 2000) or from the Northeast Urnfield Culture (Almagro Basch 1952: 225–230; Almagro Gorbea 1986; Torres 1996, 1999: 149–150). This issue, along with that of the identity of the deceased in several tombs based on grave goods and ash urns, have led to an interminable debate in Spain for over three decades (Cfr. Wagner and Alvar 1989: 94–95; Belén et al. 1991; Belén and Escacena 1992; Belén 2001; Torres 2002: 354–359, 2004; Pappa 2012).

But the discussion does not end there. Since Punic populations practiced inhumation from the 6th century onwards, indigenous inhumations dated to the end of the 7th and 6th centuries BC are interpreted as emulations or imitations of Phoenician and Punic customs (Ramos 1990: 80–85; Torres 2002: 365, 2005: 432–433), or actual Phoenician and Punic tombs (Wagner and Alvar 1989: 94–95; Torres 2004: 441–442). Although these explanations might be true, they are extensively built on essentialist conceptions of culture, in which: (i) the pottery of Phoenician tradition in local cemeteries are used to identify Phoenicians deceased, as if only Phoenicians could use that type of ceramic, and (ii) changes in funerary rituals are due to Phoenician/Punic contact, based on the assumption that community practices are static.

4.1. Who is who in Southern Iberia?

Phoenician funerary grave goods are always composed of two types of jugs –trefoil rimmed and mushroom-lipped jugs– as well as plates or bowls and oil-lamps in the Levant and in Iberia (Rodero 2001: 79; Aubet 2010: 146–149, 152 fig. 14a–b). The Phoenicians probably stuck to their original tradition for religious and/or identity reasons, similar to the behaviour of other immigrants in new settings (Pastor and Mayer 2000; Garcia 2002: 533–546; Abu-Shams 2008). Prior to Phoenician arrival, southern communities practiced a funerary ritual that included the consumption of food and drinks in handmade bowls, cups, and casseroles. Phoenician vessels were never included, save for red-slip plates and amphorae on occasion from the end of the 8th century onwards. Moreover, handmade pottery of local style and grey ware were more abundant compared to Phoenician ceramic in most of the tombs from the 10th century BC until the 7th and 6th centuries BC–even at Tomb 17, one of the richest in the La Joya cemetery (Garrido and Orta 1978: 66–124).

As such, the presence of new objects and practices do not necessarily mean that Southern Iberia necropolises are actually Phoenician and not indigenous (Escacena 1989: 437, 2001: 92, 2004). Burial practices change for many different reasons, because communities are not frozen in time. However, some Phoenicians could have possibly been integrated into local settlements, and thus may have buried their deceased in local cemeteries, loosely adapting their funerary customs to local ones. In any case, there is a continuation of handmade bowls and casseroles of local style in South Iberian necropolises until the 7th or 6th centuries BC meaning that Phoenician, local, or mixed families who buried their dead were consuming food and making offerings in indigenous traditional vessels.

Where burial rituals are concerned, both cremations and inhumations are present in South Iberia from the 10th until the 6th centuries BC, with the exception of the period between the last quarter of the 9th century and the last quarter of the 8th century BC (see Chart1). The number of inhumations and cremations in local cemeteries is only slightly different as shown in the chart, so it seems that Southern communities did not have any special ties to any of the two rituals. And neither did Phoenicians in their homeland. They commonly practiced both cremations and inhu-
mations in the same cemetery, and even in the same tomb (Gras et al. 1991: 162; Gasull 1993; Sader 2004). At Tyre Al-Bass, however, the cremation ritual was absolutely dominant (Aubet 2004, 2010). This funerary custom is the one that characterised Phoenician cemeteries in Iberia from the 9th to 6th centuries BC (Ramos 1990; Rodríguez 2001), which could be related to the allegedly Tyrian origin of the colonists (Aubet 2001). It is possible then that some of the tombs at Cruz del Negro were Phoenician (Wagner and Alvar 1989: 94–95; Torres 2004: 441–442; Pappa 2012: 10–11), with both Oriental and local vessels used for their funerary banquet.

Yet cremation and inhumation are not mutually exclusive. In fact, there are many examples in which they were practiced simultaneously within the same groups (Toynbee 1996: 39–42; Kuz’mina 2007: 339–340; Williams 2011, 2014). Divergent burial customs may depend on a wide range of motivations such as personal decisions (Rebillard 2009: 79), social differentiation (Bremmer 2002: 74–81; Iglesias 2003: 236), hygiene (Lindsay 2000; Lamont 2013), colonialism (Greene 2002: 61–82; Yao 2008), gender (Ruiz-Gálvez 2007; Brück 2009), or religious beliefs (Rebay-Salisbury 2012; Nešpor 2013), among other reasons.

4.2. Differential ritual practice for different social groups?

In the 1970s, María Eugenia Aubet noted that social status could well be a distinguishing factor for the selection of burial rituals in Southern Iberia (Aubet 1975: 105, 107-108, 1977: 95-98). According to Aubet, the elite would bury their dead in a burial chamber following the Bronze Age inhumation ritual, while the rest of the population would incinerate their deceased. Mariano Torres has lately reiterated this association between inhumation and elite burials for the 7th and 6th centuries BC (Torres 2004: 438–443). Although intriguing, Aubet’s explanation does not account for the higher ratio of cremation under barrow. In only five cases burial mounds contained inhumations exclusively, while in eight necropolises they cover cremations. At Campo de las Canteras and Bencarrón, both cremation and inhumation are present under the burial mound. Moreover, one of those five inhumations (Cañada de las Cabras), one of the cremations (El Judío), and one of the mixed cemeteries (Bencarrón) are considered ‘plain’, and not ‘aristocratic’. Besides, the period between the 8th and the 6th centuries BC, in which the majority of wealthiest necropolises are displayed, shows a close correlation of incinerations and inhumations for both ‘aristocratic’ and ‘plain’ cemeteries (see Chart 2).

In addition, grave goods related to funerary banquets are quite similar for cremations and inhumations. From the 10th to the 9th centuries BC, handmade biconic urns, carinated bowls, and cas-
seroles of local tradition were common, as seen in La Nicoba and Los Praditos. In the following century, Phoenician plates appeared for the first time in local necropolises—all cremations—along with the local tables and drinking ware. From the 8th to the 7th centuries BC, à chardon vessels and grey ware were added to the local sets of pottery and Phoenician plates and amphorae, such as in the La Joya and Castilleja de Guzmán cemeteries. Finally, from the last quarter of the 7th to the end of the 6th century BC, bronze-handled receptacles and jugs, pitchers of Greek tradition, as well as jugs and amphorae of Phoenician style compose the common funerary banquet in both cremation and inhumation burials at El Palmarón and Tumulus H at Setefilla. Thus, if social differentiation is not a matter of ethnic origin (Cruz del Negro is less rich than the cemeteries of La Joya and Acebuchal, for instance), and neither is the use of cremation or inhumation, how then is social differentiation marked in Southern Iberia?

5. Defining social differentiation in Southern Iberia cemeteries

There are four types of burial structures in Southern Iberia between the 10th and 6th centuries BC: pit graves, single-urn graves, bustum or cremation fossae, and burial mounds. All of these are present in ‘plain’ and ‘aristocratic’ necropolises, although not always simultaneously (see Chart 3). Burial mounds are characteristic of elite cemeteries from the beginning of the 6th century BC, as shown in Chart 3b. However, there are also burial mounds in ‘plain’ necropolises as demonstrated earlier, but only from the 7th century onwards, and always fewer in number. ‘Plain’ necropolises display a great variety of burial structures in each century, while ‘aristocratic’ necropolises only show that heterogeneity from the 8th to the 7th centuries BC. This century in particular saw the number of cemeteries increase from two to nine, and a greater representation of burial mounds. This is probably related to the emergence of different aristocratic lineages that attempted to legitimate their social position (Aubet 1984; Almagro Gorbea 1996: 41–76; Torres 1999: 186–187, 2004: 444). It is interesting to note, however, that burial mounds are not present in outstanding ‘aristocratic’ necropolises of this period, such as La Joya.

From the 8th century onwards, ‘aristocratic’ tombs exhibited a rich set of vessels related to the funerary banquet—serving, drinking and tableware—made in both local and Phoenician tradition, as well as dress adornments, and jewellery. After a century of interactions with Phoenicians, indigenous populations began to incorporate foreign items to their local sets with the introduction of new forms (plates, jugs, amphorae) and new ritual practices (perfume ampules, oil lamps). Contact with Oriental immigrants also affected other social groups among Southern communities, because ‘plain’ necropolises increased in number and in wealth during this century as well. By the end of the 7th century BC, ‘aristocratic’ necropolises were almost exclusively burial mounds. This type of burial structure also appeared in ‘plain’ cemeteries, although busta and single-urn grave burials were also represented. However, the bronze set of ritual vessels (piriiform jugs, handled receptacles, thymiateria) and Greek pottery (Rhodian jugs) can only be found in elite tombs, such as tomb 5 at La Joya, Tumulus 2 at Parque Moret, and the barrow at El Palmarón cemetery, all in Huelva.

From the 10th to the middle of the 7th century BC, social stratification was established by the right of being buried, the quantity of funerary vessels, and the funerary structure of the tomb,
i.e., a burial mound. From the 7th until the end of the 6th century BC, other social sectors could afford and/or had the right to bury their deceased in burial mounds. As a consequence, social status was characterised by the display of specific metal objects, or more ‘exotic’ ceramic than Phoenician pottery—Greek and lately even Etruscan vessels, as the ones found at Cortijo de Alcurrucén in Córdoba (Marzoli 1991: 215).

However, a complex funerary structure did not determine per se inclusion in the selected elite group. La Joya necropolis, for instance, is always interpreted as ‘aristocratic’ although burial mounds do not cover their tombs (Aubet 1984; Torres 1999: 187–188). On the contrary, the barrow at El Judío is listed as ‘plain’ or ‘rural’ (Torres 1999: 166, 2004: 442). Similarly, wealthy grave goods do not determine whether a tomb or a necropolis was ‘aristocratic’ or not. In fact, Cruz del Negro and Bencarrón are thought to be ‘plain’ cemeteries (Torres 2004: 436), and their funerary vessels are more numerous and alien than the ones found at the allegedly ‘aristocratic’ burial mounds of Alcantarilla and Campo de las Canteras (Torres 1999: 165, 2004: 434). Based on this evidence, there must have been different ways for the elite to show their wealth and legitimate their status—such as burial mounds, rich grave goods, or both. More importantly, there should have been disparate social levels within both the ‘aristocratic’ and the ‘plain’ groups. Agency and the relationship with Phoenicians probably played an important role in that matter.

6. Life in the borderlands: Phoenician contact and deterriorisation in Southern Iberia

Social inequalities were familiar to Southern population in Iberia before the arrival of Phoenicians (Aubet 2001: 136; Delgado 2013), which were further strengthened by economic relationships established with Oriental immigrants. During the 10th to the 9th centuries BC, the right of being buried was the key to social stratification among only a handful of the indigenous population. Slightly later in the 9th century, and especially from the 8th century onwards, a significant social change occurred. Phoenician trade gave new opportunities to the other segments of the Iberian communities who had not the chance to obtain that level of prosperity before. This ‘new’ sector of the indigenous population may not have been part of the elite group, but they become rich enough to challenge that social position. There were families who buried or incinerated their deceased at the Setefilla cemetery next to the wealthy burial mounds in the 8th century BC, and at the Mesas de Asta and Rabadanes cemeteries. As a consequence, at the end of the 8th century BC, the elite families began to include Phoenician pottery along with local funerary vessels in order to maintain their social prestige and distinguish themselves from the new social group. Since the right to be buried was not that exclusive anymore, the local elite introduced new practices to their local funerary rituals. Phoenician incense burners and perfume ampules were for the first time present at Setefilla and Las Cumbres during this time. They also practiced libation rituals at the last cemetery, where local broken cups and Phoenician incense burners were found together (Ruiz and Pérez 1988: 43).

From the 7th century onwards, the emerging social group began to include Phoenician oil lamps, amphorae, and red–slip plates to their local set of vessels—handmade bowls and cups made in the local tradition. This is when ‘plain’ tombs started to be covered by burial mounds, as in the case of Bencarrón, El Judío, and Cañada de las Cabras. Animal sacrifices appeared for the first time in both ‘aristocratic’ and ‘plain’ cemeteries at the necropolises of Bencarrón, Acebuchal, Cruz del Negro, Parque Moret, and Setefilla (Bonsor and Thouvenot 1928: 17; Garrido and Orta 1989: 37; Sánchez 1994: 79, 144; Torres 1999: 82), which meant the introduction of new rituals during funerary banquets. With such proximity in ritual practices, and thus in wealth and prestige access, aristocratic families began to include Greek pitchers, as well as bronze receptacles and jugs in their tombs—so as to replace the Phoenician pottery, which was beginning to be included in ‘plain’ burials. In fact, they displaced the Phoenician traditional funerary set, with mushroom–lipped jugs, trefoil–mouth pitchers, plates, and incense burner made in ceramic by a bronze piniform jug, a handled receptacle and a thymiaterion (Aubet 1984: 452), and these were place together with the local table ware.

Phoenician contact thus created a borderland that stimulated a deterriorisation in Southern Iberia at the end of the 9th century BC. Since then, people of different origins occupied the same territory, and thus different social groups (elite, subalterns) converged. Such coexistence created new trade possibilities and specialisations derived from the Oriental newcomers needs, bringing en-
richment opportunities not only to the local elite, but also to other social segments of the indigenous populations. As a consequence, indigenous communities shifted from a society divided into two different and separate groups—the elite and the subalterns—to a new one in which a third social group firmly emerged. Such absolute deterritorialisation forced the indigenous social system to create new behaviours and social meanings. In fact, the local elite modified their funerary rituals in order to maintain their social pre-eminence over the new social actors that were disputing their position and prerogatives, i.e., the use of complex funerary structures, access to alien objects and practices, and thus to wealth and power.

The ontological movement that took place in Southern Iberia affected originally one of the lines, i.e., the funerary line, with the reinterpretation of traditional rituals, and the social ‘competition’ between the elite and the new emergent group through funeral vessels and practices. Nevertheless, the rest of the rhizomatic system was quickly struck by those social changes. The same process can be seen indeed in several local settlements, where particular houses turned from oval or circular huts into rectangular structures following the Phoenician model from the 7th century onwards (Dies 2001). However, system transformation around new attractors—in this case Phoenician objects, techniques, and practices—is never total, and so the indigenous society showed a combination of attractors of both traditional and Oriental origin (first Phoenician, then Greek). And true to tradition, both the elite and the new social group continued to consume food and drinks in their indigenous bowls and casseroles during their funerary banquets, probably linked to local cuisine and thus to community identity (Marín-Aguilera forthcoming). Even though the local elite decided to introduce Oriental style bronze jugs and handled receptacles in the tombs of their deceased, the numerous handmade and grey bowls of local style suggest that for ritual consumption, even the opulent groups preferred traditional vessels and not Phoenician ones (Jiménez et al., 2005), as they had been doing since the 10th century BC.

Similarly, traditional huts, as well as rectangular structures influenced by Phoenician architecture were used simultaneously in most of the indigenous settlements until the end of the 7th and the beginning of the 6th century BC (Ruiz and González 1994; Izquierdo 1998; Fernández 2003: 37–41). Likewise, the majority of cooking and table vessels were either grey ware or handmade pottery of local tradition, not Phoenician ceramic (Ruiz and González 1994: 221; Vallejo 2005; Sanna 2009). The Phoenician colonial borderland was consequently a creative and dynamic place with the creation and modification of cultural and religious practices, as in the case of South Iberian funerary rituals; but it was also a political, economic and social landscape where social conflict resided and thus was liable to changes, as in the case of the new emergent social group, and probably new power relationships.

Notes
1. I am currently affiliated with the Department of Archaeology at the University of Ghent in Belgium.
2. I could not have access to the most recent publication of La Angorrilla necropolis (Fernández Flores et al. 2014). Consequently, the data gathered in this paper concerning grave goods in that cemetery is not complete (cfr. Fernández Flores and Rodriguez Azogue 2007: 82-90; 2009).
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