

# Travelling objects: cross-cultural exchange and interaction in the Western Mediterranean in the Early Iron Age

Thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

at the University of Leicester

by

Marcella Raiconi

School of Archaeology and Ancient History

University of Leicester

July 2016

## **Travelling objects: cross-cultural exchange and interaction in the Western Mediterranean in the Early Iron Age**

**Marcella Raiconi**

**School of Archaeology and Ancient History, University of Leicester**

My research focuses on issues relating to the dynamics of cross cultural contact and exchange in the Western Mediterranean (in particular, Southern France and North Eastern Spain) between the late seventh and the late sixth century BC, a period of great innovation and changes in both regions. My work focuses on the ways in which some of the objects acquired through encounter with traders from different cultural backgrounds were integrated in the material culture of these regions, how they were perceived in the geographical and social contexts in which they were acquired and how they could be used to establish or maintain identities and statuses.

## **Acknowledgements**

There are many people who have offered me assistance, advice and support while working on this project. I will start with my supervisors, Prof. Lin Foxhall and Prof. Colin Haselgrove, whose guidance and kindness has been crucial. I would also like to thank Prof. Simon James, Dr. Ian Whitbread, Dr. Andrew Merrills and Dr. Neil Christie for their advice and help.

I am extremely grateful to Jean-Michel Pène for allowing me to work on the material from La Liquière and being of great assistance, and Michel Py for the important information about the material.

I would also like to thank Marta Santos and Pere Castanyer, for allowing me to work on the material from Emporion and offering precious advice, information and support.

I am also very grateful to Dr. Ulrike Krotscheck, for letting me consult her PhD thesis.

I cannot thank enough all the wonderful friends I have left in Italy and made in Leicester, who have encouraged me throughout this endeavour. And, of course, my family, for their unwavering love and patience.

## Table of contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| List of tables.....   | i         |
| <b>1. Introduction.....</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 Introduction.....   | 1         |
| 1.2 Research questions and aims.....  | 1         |
| 1.3 The geographical areas covered by the study.....                                  | 2         |
| 1.4 Chronology and related issues.....  | 4         |
| 1.5 Structure of the thesis.....  | 6         |
| <b>2. Research context and literature review .....</b>                                | <b>7</b>  |
| 2.1 Introduction.....   | 7         |
| 2.2 Trade, exchange and connectivity in the ancient world.....                        | 7         |
| 2.3 Cross-cultural interaction, ‘colonialisms’, networks.....                         | 11        |
| 2.4 Material cultural theory.....   | 20        |
| 2.4.1 Consumption and fashion in the ancient world.....                               | 20        |
| 2.4.2 Materiality, entanglement, identities and material culture multilingualism..... | 27        |
| 2.4.3 Object biographies.....   | 32        |
| 2.4.4 Value, luxury and prestige.....   | 33        |
| 2.5 Conclusions: intellectual framework of the thesis.....                            | 37        |
| <b>3. Methodology .....</b>   | <b>40</b> |
| 3.1 Introduction.....   | 40        |
| 3.2 The case studies.....   | 40        |
| 3.3 Case studies in Context and in Comparison .....                                   | 42        |
| 3.4 Issues specific to individual contexts and classes of objects.....                | 44        |
| 3.5 Conclusions.....  | 45        |
| <b>4. The hut L7 from La Liquière.....</b>  | <b>46</b> |
| 4.1 Introduction .....  | 46        |
| 4.2 The village of La Liquière in its regional context.....                           | 46        |
| 4.2.1 Eastern Languedoc in the Early Iron Age... ..                                   | 46        |
| 4.2.2 The distribution of imports in Eastern Languedoc in the Early Iron Age.....     | 48        |
| 4.3 The site.....   | 55        |
| 4.3.1 Structures present on the site.....   | 56        |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| 4.3.2 Productive activities.....  | 59        |
| 4.3.3. The nature of the occupation of the site: issues and debates ....                  | 62        |
| 4.3.4. Imported vases and their distribution in the village.....                          | 64        |
| 4.4 Zone L7 .....   | 67        |
| 4.4.1 The excavation.....   | 67        |
| 4.4.2 Sol 2 and couche 3(Hut L7A), phase I ancien.....                                    | 67        |
| 4.4.3 Material from L7A.....  | 68        |
| 4.4.4 Sol 4 and couche 5 (Hut L7B), phase I recent.....                                   | 72        |
| 4.4.5 Material from L7B.....  | 73        |
| 4.4.6 Sol 7 and couche 8 (Hut L7C), phase II.....   | 77        |
| 4.4.7 Material from L7C.....  | 78        |
| 4.5 The beaded disks and their possible significance .....                                | 84        |
| 4.6 Conclusions.....  | 88        |
| <b>5. The isolated burial of Saint Antoine à Castelnau de Guers.....</b>                  | <b>90</b> |
| 5.1 Introduction.....   | 90        |
| 5.2 The burial of Castelnau de Guers in its regional context.....                         | 91        |
| 5.2.1 Western Languedoc and the lower Hérault valley.....                                 | 91        |
| 5.2.2. The distributions of imports in the Hérault valley during the Early Iron Age.....  | 93        |
| 5.2.3 The funerary customs of Western Languedoc during the Early Iron Age.....            | 102       |
| 5.2.4 Banquet equipment and weapons: a system of markers of status.....                   | 105       |
| 5.3 The isolated burial of Castelnau de Guers.....  | 109       |
| 5.3.1 The funerary equipment.....   | 110       |
| 5.3.2 The funerary ritual.....  | 113       |
| 5.4 Isolated graves.....  | 115       |
| 5.4.1 Isolated graves and their significance.....   | 115       |
| 5.4.2 The composition of the funerary assemblages.....                                    | 116       |
| 5.5 Castelnau de Guers and the funerary archaeology of sub-adults in Southern France..... | 121       |
| 5.5.1 Ritual, structures and funerary assemblages .....                                   | 121       |
| 5.5.2 Status, gender and age.....   | 123       |
| 5.6 Weapons and burials of subadults: warrior graves? .....                               | 124       |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| 5.7 The funerary ritual and the destruction of the grave goods.....   | 130        |
| 5.8 Conclusion.....   | 133        |
| <b>6. The North Eastern Wall cemetery of Emporion.....</b>  | <b>136</b> |
| 6.1 Introduction.....   | 136        |
| 6.2 The cemetery of the North Eastern Wall in its regional context.....   | 136        |
| 6.2.1 <i>The North East of the Iberian Peninsula in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age</i> .....                                      | 136        |
| 6.2.2 <i>Emporion</i> .....   | 140        |
| 6.2.3 <i>The cemeteries of Emporion</i> .....   | 145        |
| 6.3 Cemetery of the North Eastern Wall.....   | 150        |
| 6.4 The Cemetery of the North Eastern Wall and the contemporary material culture of the North East of the Iberian Peninsula.....      | 152        |
| 6.4.1 <i>Comparisons for the imported materials in the North East of the Iberian Peninsula</i> .....                                  | 152        |
| 6.4.2 <i>Vases produced in the Iberian Peninsula</i> .....  | 161        |
| 6.4.3 <i>Other elements of the assemblage</i> .....   | 163        |
| 6.4.4 <i>A look at the material in the cemeteries surrounding Emporion used during the sixth century</i> .....                        | 170        |
| 6.5 Assemblages and associations in the North Eastern Wall Necropolis.....  | 172        |
| 6.6 Material assemblages from the North Eastern Wall necropolis: status, identity and representation.....                             | 180        |
| 6.7 Conclusions.....  | 185        |
| <b>7. Discussion: travelling objects.....</b>   | <b>186</b> |
| <b>Appendixes.....</b>  | <b>191</b> |
| Appendix 1: Exceptional burials of subadults.....   | 191        |
| Appendix 2: Burials utilising an amphora as an ossuary the cemeteries of Grand Bassin II at Mailhac and Saint Julien at Pezénas. .... | 195        |
| Appendix 3: Isolated Burials from the North Western Mediterranean.....  | 201        |
| Appendix 4: The cemetery of the North Eastern Wall at Emporion.....   | 212        |
| <b>Bibliography.....</b>  | <b>226</b> |



## List of tables

Table 1 Chronologies for the Iron Age in the Western Mediterranean, p.5

Table 2 Phases of occupation of La Liquiere, p. 56

Table 3 Percentage of imports at La Liquiere in the various phases, p.65

Table 4 Distribution of Etruscan amphorae in L7A, p. 69

Table 5 Distribution of bronze disks in the different contexts from La Liquiere, p. 84

Table 6 Distribution of amphorae at Agde, Rue Parben, p.94

Table 7 Percentage of finewares on the total pottery at Agde, Rue Parben, p.94

Table 8 Percentage of Etruscan amphorae and Bucchero at La Monediere, p.94

Table 9 Percentage of materials from Bernat 2, Aspiran, during the period between 550 and 525 BCE, p.95

Table 10 Weapon assemblages in burials from Western Languedoc during the Early Iron Age, p. 102

Table 11 Distribution of simpula in the burials from Saint Julien, p. 103

Table 12 Distribution of simpula in the burials from Grand Bassin II, p.103

Table 13 Associations between *soliferrea* and metal vessels in Western Languedoc, p. 104

Table 14 The isolated burial of Castelnau de Guers summarized, p.114

Table 15 Distribution of ornaments and tools in burial of subadults, p.123

Table 16 Pottery distribution in the burials from the Necropolis of the North Eastern Wall (cremations 12 and 16 excluded), p. 178

Table 17 Distribution of the other items in the burials from the necropolis of the North Eastern Wall (cremations 12 and 16 excluded), p. 179



# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Introduction

This thesis deals with issues related to exchange and cross cultural interaction in the Ancient world using case studies from the North Western Mediterranean during the Early Iron Age. This particular area, especially between seventh and sixth century BC, has been the theatre of different types of cross cultural encounters and different responses to it. Therefore, it represents an especially interesting case study to discuss the evolution of material culture through contact with different cultural traditions.

## 1.2 Research questions and aims

The main aim of this thesis is to ask:

- How and why did objects from various foreign cultural traditions become part of the material culture of different areas of the North Western Mediterranean region?
- How, why and to what extent were these objects, crafts and material cultural traditions ‘naturalised’ and embedded in indigenous societies as cultural habits?

These questions can further be articulated:

- a. Archaeologists have moved from the notion of Hellenization in analysing cross cultural contact and the reasons certain goods are desired and acquired. However, new approaches aimed to value indigenous agency have tended to rely on generalised interpretative patterns. Can approaching specific contexts of interaction from a material culture perspective contribute to creating a more nuanced picture?
- b. The discussion on the role of the imports in their new contexts has been focused on whether or not they had specific diacritic qualities and served as a status marker. Is it possible to identify other types of meaning attributed to imports, even if limited to specific contexts and areas? Do the same imports, or imports of similar provenience, have different meanings specific to the communities and individuals who acquire them?
- c. In what contexts are the imports found? Are these contexts extraordinary or do they fit patterns specific to their surrounding region? Does their previous history of production and exchange arguably still influence the way they are perceived and used? Are they used to make specific statements about identity, status and relationships of association and disassociation?
- d. With which other objects are the imports associated? Can we identify criteria based on which specific objects or sets of objects are included in specific contexts or

assemblages of materials? How do they ‘fit’ with the rest of the assemblages and the material culture of the communities in which they are acquired? In what ways might the objects’ specific characteristics have contributed to their entanglement in assemblages and practices?

The discussion of Ancient Mediterranean trade and exchange, especially in the regions discussed in this study, has either focused on detailed analytical descriptions of specific contexts with imports or on the identification of wider regional patterns. In my study, I attempt to bridge the two, testing theories on cross cultural encounter and exchange and also, through the analysis of specific contexts, highlighting some of the ways in which specific classes of objects were used and perceived in specific regional contexts or types of context. I focus on specific contexts from three different areas and discuss assemblages from different cultural traditions, focusing on context and the objects’ specific physical qualities and possible symbolic meanings and the ways in which they ‘fit’ in their contexts. I also contrast this evidence with information about imports in the material culture of the surrounding region, or in specific types of context (for example, isolated burials) across the North Western Mediterranean.

### **1.3 The geographical areas covered by the study**

This study focuses on three case studies from the North Western Mediterranean: the area of the Gulf of Lion, from Provence to Languedoc Roussillon, and to the eastern coast of Catalonia. This area is bordered at the North by the Alps and Pyreneans, and characterized mostly by plains on the coast and a higher hinterland (Beylier 2012a:14). Both southern France and north-eastern Spain are marked by the presence of several rivers, the most important of which are the Rhône, the Hérault and the Ebro, facilitating the connections between the coast and the interior. The Western Mediterranean is characterized by dry summers and abundant rains, but mild temperatures, in autumn and winter (Garcia 2014:18).

During the ninth and eighth century BC, the area between Provence and the Ebro valley is characterized by a degree of uniformity in material culture (Beylier 2012a:16). This fact begins to change during the Early Iron Age when local specificities emerge, partly thanks to the first contacts with the Central and Eastern Mediterranean and because of inter-regional connections (Beylier 2012a: 16; Py 2012: 28-32; Garcia 2015:33).

The first examples of exchange with other areas of the Mediterranean attested in this region are with Phoenician traders, present in Portugal, Ibiza and the southern coast of Spain by the eighth century BC (Dietler 2009: 7, Sanmartì 2009: 54-55). At this time, the presence of Greek merchants has been documented in some sites of the southern coast of Spain (such as Huelva). Phoenicians established several settlements on the coast of Andalusia, and developed a local production of transport amphorae, found on several settlements of southern Spain during the first half of the eighth century BC, as well as introducing the manufacture of iron (Sanmartì 2009: 55). The main objects of this trade, also reaching the Ebro valley in Catalonia were amphorae produced in the colonial settlements of Andalusia or North Africa. Both the quantity of imports and the number of sites in which they were found saw a considerable increase in the second half of the seventh century BC (Sanmartì 2009:61). Between the end of the seventh and the first quarter of the sixth century BC, the Phoenician colonial world undergoes a period of transformations that leads to the decrease and disappearance of imported Phoenician material in the North East of the Iberian Peninsula (Garcia i Rubert and Gracia Alonso 2011).

The presence of Etruscan and Italic material culture in Languedoc and Provence from the late seventh century BC are indicative of Mediterranean trade. These goods, represented mostly, but not exclusively, by wine amphorae and drinking cups, were probably carried along the coast by a navigation of cabotage, and are mostly distributed on the coastal areas of the region, which were the primary buyers of Etruscan wine and drinking cups (Dietler 2009:11). At the beginning of the sixth century BC, the Phocian colony of Massalia was founded in Provence, followed by Emporion (now Ampurias) in Catalonia. Archaeological excavations have allowed the hypothesis of the presence of Etruscan traders at the sites of Saint Blaise over the sixth century BC (Bouloumié 1985) and Lattes (Py 2009).

Other Greek settlements, probably small trading posts, on the coast of the Iberian Peninsula are mentioned from historical sources, for instance La Picola in Alicante (Dietler 2009:10). Arguments for the presence of Greek people at prevalently indigenous sites in southern France, such as La Monédière, Espeyran, Lattes and Arles have been suggested. Massalia also found other small settlements on the French coast from the fifth century BC onwards (including Agde, Espeyran and Nice) (Dietler 2009:11).

Over the course of the second half of the sixth century, several of the classes of imports present in southern France slowly disappear and are replaced by goods distributed by

Massalia, including amphorae of locally produced wine and imported or locally produced colonial pottery (Dietler 2009: 12).

As I discuss, Greek and Etruscan material is present in Catalonia sporadically, and tends to concentrate in the Ampordan (the area surrounding Emporion/Ampurias and roughly corresponding to the current province of Girona), at least until the fifth century BC, when there is an increase in the distribution of Attic pottery (Sanmartí et al 2004, Miró and Santos 2013).

Despite the modern division between Spain and France, the material culture of Roussillon and of western Languedoc (usually designated as the part of the region west of the valley of the river Hérault) presents several similarities with that of Catalonia (Gailledrat 1997, 2004)<sup>1</sup>, whereas eastern Languedoc and western Provence (west of the chain of the Alpilles) are a different cultural group. Eastern Provence is characterized by its own characteristic culture, with very little influence from sporadic Mediterranean contacts (Garcia 2015: 33).

Within these groups, more circumscribed regions maintain specificities, due both in the type and quantity of exchanges at play and to the different development of local material culture. Therefore, different regional traditions and specific responses to cross cultural contact can be observed in eastern and western Provence, eastern and western Languedoc<sup>2</sup>, Roussillon, Ampordan and the Catalan coast above and below the river Ebro (Garcia 2015).

#### **1.4 Chronology and possible issues related to it**

The time period on which this study is focused involves the seventh and sixth century BC, corresponding to the Early Iron Age (Dietler 2005:32, 2010: 82-83, Sanmartí and Santacana 2005:45, Beylier 2012a: 15-16, Py 2012:19, Garcia 2015:8). This differs greatly from the chronology established for the beginning of the Iron Age in the Aegean and in Italy (see Nijboer 2006). The development of iron work technology in the north of the western Mediterranean, accompanied with an increase of contact with central and East Mediterranean regions is in fact datable around the early seventh century BC, despite the fact that objects in iron, usually imported, can be found there from the previous century

---

<sup>1</sup> On the opposite geographical side, on the discussion on whether Andalusia belongs to the same or a different cultural group than the rest of the Eastern coast of the Iberian Peninsula, see Gailledrat 1997:40-42.

<sup>2</sup> Some studies also differentiate between Central Languedoc (between the valleys of the Hérault and Orb) and Western Languedoc (West of the latter). In the chapter in which I approach this region I focus primarily on the Hérault valley, while also making comparisons with the rest of the area.

(Beylier 2012a: 15). As this period partly coincides with the chronology of the Archaic Age in the Greek and Italic world, I occasionally use this term when discussing issues of cross cultural contact and exchange in the Ancient Mediterranean. Different subdivisions of the period between seventh and fifth century BC have been established in different areas of the Western Mediterranean. This is primarily because different regional cultures, and aspects of said cultures, have changed at different pace, making it more or less complicated to pinpoint definite periods in the passage of time. In other instances, this has happened because of a more or less extensive knowledge of how the culture of a region evolved, due to the existence of more excavated and datable sites in different areas and for different periods. Lastly, studies focusing on wider territories have used larger time period to include both regions for which there are detailed studies and others whose chronology is not as well known. Here I provide an overview of some of the chronologies in use in the literature. However, in the discussion of the specific case studies and surrounding regions, I discuss specific cultural and social phenomena and specific contexts offering the chronological references established for them in the literature.

|                                  |                      |   |                               |                              |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Ruiz and Molinos 1993            | Iberian Peninsula    | 600/580-540/530<br>Iberian I            | 540/530-450/425<br>Iberian II |                              |
| Almagro and Ruiz 1992            | Catalonia            | 750-650<br>Beginning of Iron Age        | 650-525<br>Ancient Iberian    | 525-200<br>Full Iberian      |
| Luis, Taffanel and Taffanel 1955 | Languedoc-Roussillon | 750-575<br>Grand Bassin I               | 575-450<br>Grand Bassin II    |                              |
| Py 1990                          | Eastern Languedoc    | 750- 675<br>Bronze- Iron Age transition | 675-625<br>Iron I ancient     | 625-525<br>Iron I recent     |
| Py 2012 (first published 1993)   | Southern France      | 750- 675<br>Bronze- Iron Age transition | 675-625<br>Iron I ancient     | 625-525<br>Iron I recent     |
|                                  |                      |   |                               | 525-425 Iron I-II transition |

**Table 1 Chronologies for the Iron Age in the Western Mediterranean**

There are some potential problems with the chronologies elaborated about north-western Mediterranean sites. They are based on two elements: the typology of the artefacts of local production and, where present, the imports produced in the Greek, Phoenician and Italic world, for which a more detailed chrono-typology is available (Dietler 2005:25-29, Py

2012:17-19). In the case of the imports, even if they include classes of materials that are more easily datable, there would have been a time lapse between their production and their arrival at the site in which they have been found, making them less precise as chronological indicators (Dietler 2005:26, Py 2012:18). In the case of the style of local artefacts, they evolve more slowly than the imports and allow for less precise dating. This also makes it complicated to establish relative chronologies between sites that include imported material and others that do not (Dietler 2005:26-27). Moreover, the quantity of information available from cemeteries and settlements is not always balanced. For example, for the seventh century BC very few settlements are known in Southern France in general, with Eastern Languedoc being slightly better documented than the other areas. Most of the information comes from funerary contexts that are documented in Roussillon and Western Languedoc (Garcia 2015: 57-61). This reflects on the fact that the chronological data for areas and periods primarily known because of burials are potentially less precise, given that an object could live a long life before it was deposited in a grave. Therefore, in the datations provided for the contexts excavated in the North Western Mediterranean there is an element of compromise and interpretation on the part of the archaeologists who published and evaluated the different contexts. However, these regions remains documented by more excavations and a finer chronology of locally produced artefacts than several other areas of Europe (Dietler 2005:25-29, Py 2012:17-19).

## 1.5 Structure of the thesis

**Chapter 2** presents an overview and discussion of the main debates on trade and exchange and cross-cultural encounter in the Ancient Mediterranean, on the evolution of material culture through the assimilation of objects and commodities from different cultural traditions and on the ways material culture has been studied as something that can both signify and modify identities and relationships.

**Chapter 3** is discussion of the methodology, discussing the case studies, the way they have been approached, and the issues specific to each of them aside from the main topic discussed in this work.

In **Chapters 4, 5 and 6**, I present and discuss three case studies: three specific contexts set against the background of the site and the region they are part of.

**Chapter 7** includes a discussion of the three case studies together and some final considerations.

## 2. Research context and literature review

### 2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I briefly discuss the key debates in the scholarly literature on the subjects of exchange of goods and of cross-cultural encounter and interaction in the ancient world and, in particular, in the Mediterranean during the Iron Age. I also discuss the key themes and theoretical approaches in current literature that I incorporated in the development of this project.

### 2.2 Trade, exchange and connectivity in the ancient world

As this thesis deals with imported objects and the way they are treated and perceived, I start with a brief discussion of some of the most important perspectives on trade, exchange and connectivity in the Western Mediterranean. Arguably, the most influential work in the literature of the last twenty years is Horden and Purcell's (2000) essay *The Corrupting Sea*, in which the authors conceptualize the Mediterranean region as a 'peninsula in reverse' (Horden and Purcell 2000:24), fragmented in different 'micro-regions' but unified by the sea, that represented not an element of separation, but one of 'connectivity'. This led, in their opinion, to an 'inside out geography' in which the coastal areas represented the centre and their hinterlands the periphery (Horden and Purcell 2000:133). Horden and Purcell describe the Mediterranean as an area of infinite possibilities in the different micro regions, but also of flexible and fuzzy boundaries as the high connectivity facilitated by the sea meant constant movement of people, things and ideas. In this sense, the foundation of oversea colonies can be seen as a manifestation of the connectivity and of the existence of the Mediterranean *koine* (Horden and Purcell 2000:396) and the ports as the 'nodal points' holding the system together (Horden and Purcell 2000:392). Thus, interregional trade was probably always part of Mediterranean history (Horden and Purcell 2000:120). Their argument was made in response to one of the oldest debates on the nature of Mediterranean economy, opposing 'modernist' historians, who viewed ancient economies as very similar to those of the modern world, and 'primitivist' and 'substantivist' ones, who saw the economy of the ancient world as aimed to the self-sufficiency of individual households and profoundly embedded in and normed by the cultural traditions of the ancient states. A change in this

model of economy would have only happened with the introduction of coinage (see Austin and Vidal- Naquet 1977 and Scheidel and von Reden 2002).

However, the development of interregional exchanges in the ancient Mediterranean is a complex phenomenon that can be traced in the archaeological record starting from the Bronze Age (for example Sherratt and Sherratt 1990, 1993 and Nijboer 2004, 2006). The objects of these exchanges were not only precious metals and elaborate artefacts, but a wide range of commodities including perfumes, wine, oil and foodstuffs, exported regularly in containers that were clearly standardized and produced in bulk. Moreover, the development of forms of cross-cultural contact across the Mediterranean seems to be independent from the diffusion of coinage. Trade on significant scale begins at a period in which ‘money’ is not yet in use, and, in several areas it continued without the use of coinage, which comes into use only centuries later. It can be inferred that these exchanges happened on a fairly regular basis and on a large scale, and were not limited to the personal bonds of reciprocity among the few members of élite groups. However, at the same time, it represented a type of economy different in character from the monetised economy of the Roman Imperial era.

Another perspective that had been applied to the development of cross cultural exchange in the ancient Europe, and of the Mediterranean in particular, was the so-called ‘core-periphery’ or ‘world system’ theory, a theoretical framework that aimed to describe colonial and postcolonial relationships as inscribed in a global system (most notably Frankenstein and Rowland 1978, Sherratt and Sherratt 1990,1993). These approaches involved large scale models based on the dependency of the ‘periphery’ of the system to the regions seen as the ‘centre’ to describe a ‘global’ economy based on the exchange of goods and commodities for various types of natural, raw materials like metals and wood (Dietler 2009:26). The economic and political evolution of the ‘periphery’ was, therefore, characterized as being derivative from and sustained by the contact and exchanges with the ‘core’ societies.

The application of this type of model has now been mostly superseded because it is too schematic and abstract, with no consideration for agency, especially when dealing with the ‘periphery’ populations. There are also significant definitional issues about what a ‘core’ is and what a ‘periphery’ is, and from whose perspective. This approach is also the result of culturally biased perspectives that sees certain societies, particularly the supposedly ‘more developed’ ones, as the ‘core’ (Arafat and Morgan 1994, Dietler 1989, 1995, 1999, 2009, Purcell 2006). The intensification of interregional dynamics and the gradual integration of new regions in networks of connection of exchange, viewed in a less biased perspective, can



be described as an increase of the connectivity and interdependence between different areas rather than as a process of ‘radiating influence’ (Purcell 2006:28).

This was the approach followed by *The Corrupting Sea* that also highlighted how such connections were complex and articulate, and happened at multiple levels. In Horden and Purcell’s view small scale trade that happened through a navigation of cabotage had always probably been prevalent (Horden and Purcell 2000:144-145, 150). At the same time, they warn against the tendency to underestimate what they call ‘high commerce’ as ‘the frivolous support of the leisured *élite*’, as these exchanges might not have been very frequent but they involved a considerable movement of resources and probably had proportional social impact (Horden and Purcell 2000:148-149). The image of an economy aimed primarily at self-sufficiency reflected in Greek literary sources and used by several previous historians to base their interpretations on was, in their opinion, dictated by ‘normative wishful thinking’ shared by the higher classes and aimed at marginalizing people who engaged in commerce. Therefore, the change of attitude towards trade should not be considered reflective of a change of economy, but of cultural attitudes (Horden and Purcell 2000: 147).

In general, their interpretation of ancient economy is entirely based on the principle of exploitation of the Mediterranean ecology, and productive activities are assumed to have differ in different areas primarily because of the variety of resources available (Horden and Purcell 2000: 351). Specialization in the production of goods was not, in this view, a development of an economy aimed at self-sufficiency but a result of the optimization of resources available in a certain region by the people who controlled it, and ‘conspicuous movements’ the result of the intensification of already existing smaller scale systems of exchange (Horden and Purcell 2000: 366). One of the main criticisms of Horden and Purcell’s work (for example Algazi 2005) has been that they have sacrificed the analysis of social and political environment and structures and the ways they affected aspects of life, including economy, in different regions by assuming everywhere the same rationalistic exploitation of resources available. This is a problematic element of their work which aimed to cover such a large subject in both space and time, and inevitable falls into generalisation. Consequently, Horden and Purcell’s discussion often involves statements on specific ideas of ancient Mediterranean trade that are generalised across the numerous regions and for the whole time span of their analysis. For example, they assume that pottery trade was always a consequence of the need to fill ships that traded primarily agricultural goods (Horden and Purcell 2000: 370-371). This position has been challenged several times (for instance

Krotscheck 2008: 165-173) and seems to be contradicted by the existence of shipwrecks like the one of Pointe Léquin 1A. The shipwreck, dated to the late sixth century BC and excavated in proximity of the northern coast of the island of Porquerolles, is characterized by a cargo was composed for the 94% of finewares (Long and Sourisseau 2002b, Krotscheck 2008:74-89). Besides, their discussion of 'high commerce' is complicated by the fact that this definition seems to be applied both to the exchange of 'luxury' goods in limited quantity (Horden and Purcell 2000:149) and to long distance trade of large quantities of goods (Horden and Purcell 2000: 365-367): in both cases, the definition is used in opposition to short distance trade in smaller cargoes.

On the other hand, their work had the great merit of presenting cross-cultural contact in the ancient world as a complex reality characterized by interactions happening at multiple levels and stages rather than divided in separate, straightforward long-distance movements. This approach is still refreshing as often the debate revolving around inter-regional exchange in the ancient Mediterranean focuses on identifying with precise ethnic identities the people who might have been responsible for introducing given classes of objects and commodities in a particular region, despite the fact that the evidence offered by underwater archaeology often reflects a more complex and varied reality. At the same time, the analysis of the cargoes of ancient shipwrecks suggests the existence of an even more complex and layered reality than the one described in *The Corrupting Sea*, with its opposition between small-scale, cabotage trade and the aforementioned 'high commerce'. These ships were, in fact, not only often carrying cargoes that included objects of different provenience, but could also considerably vary in size and capacity for carrying goods; therefore, along with the two types of commerce imagined by Horden and Purcell, supra-regional forms of exchange probably existed as well (Long et al. 2002, Krotscheck 2008).

In this thesis, I address the ways in which imported objects are incorporated into the material culture of different regions from those in which they were produced at a local level through three specific case studies. I focus on the archaeological contexts and set it against the background of the region to which the context belongs. Therefore, I look at a very different scale of engagement with ancient Mediterranean exchange. However, I do not think these two perspectives are mutually exclusive, and multi-scalar analysis is helpful. Investigating small-scale case studies in depth can to inform the utility and test the validity of broader, general theories by highlighting the dynamics and patterning of nuance and variation in specific contexts.

### 2.3 Cross-cultural interaction, 'colonialisms', networks

Discussing the exchange of objects and commodities also means discussing the encounter and interaction of people from different cultural traditions. In the case of the ancient Mediterranean, it also means dealing with a long tradition of scholarship in which such encounters have not always been seen in an unbiased way. Studies in archaeology and history of the ancient Mediterranean have their roots in a Romano-centric and Helleno-centric traditions that influenced most scholars' approach to antiquity for many centuries. Through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the Graeco-Roman world has come to be identified as the origin of European culture and identity. This view also involved the perception of modern colonialism as the continuation of a legacy of 'civilization' of the more 'primitive' peoples left from the cultural ancestors of modern Europe (Morris 1994b, Dietler 2009).

It is, therefore, unsurprising that encounter and interaction between Greeks and the local populations of the regions they frequented, in which they traded, and, eventually, established emporia and settlements were, for a long time, analysed in terms of 'Hellenization' and 'Romanization' of indigenous populations. The contact with Greek culture, perceived as more sophisticated and better developed, was assumed to result in the desire for Greek objects and Greek lifestyle, and in the 'evolution' of the local cultures through the imitation of several elements of the Greek one (Hodos 2006:9-11, Dietler 2009).

For example, Boardman (1999) still followed the idea that the Greeks in general were a 'more developed' culture, who derived only some superficial elements from the contact with eastern Mediterranean peoples in the early Archaic age (Boardman 1999: 54-55), but overwhelm the 'uncivilized' populations of the West: 'In the West the Greeks had nothing to learn and much to teach' (Boardman 1999:190). This view has been discarded by most modern archaeologists.

Such approaches ignored the degree of cultural exchange going both directions. Moreover, it was based on the assumption of the existence of one, universally desirable, Greek culture. On the other hand, the cultures of different regions of Greece presented very marked variations and, especially during the archaic age, were not so easy to assimilate in a *unicum*. For instance, Greek identities during the archaic age were still in the process of being defined: the relationship with the home-country was as complex as that with other people

living in the areas where colonies were founded, and all those elements played a role in defining the evolution of a culture. Situations of cross cultural encounter, in which groups from different backgrounds interacted, is, if anything, currently regarded as one of the elements that inspired the emergence of ethnic identities (Sherratt and Sherratt 1998: 335). In particular, several historians argue that regional and ethnic Greek identities would have been established in situations of contact (Malkin 2011:57, Demetriou 2012: 8-14 and 236-239). However, the definition of Greek identities- and the representation of the identity of those perceived as not 'Greek'- was probably an even more complex, ongoing process that underwent several redefinitions in different contexts and periods (Skinner 2012:249-257).

The borrowing of elements of the imagined, ideal 'Greek' culture from other populations was also believed to be a natural consequence of its superiority, and not of the fact that specific commodities and activities might have been selected because they appealed to different groups. Hellenization has, therefore, been criticized by later scholarship for being 'a weak concept, lacking in analytical power' (Whitehouse and Wilkins 1989:102). It has also been remarked that it is too schematic to study ancient cultures labelling them as 'local', 'Hellenized' or 'Romanized', as if those were mutually exclusive identities and not different elements of a more complex reality (Curti et al 1996, more recently Wallace Hadrill 2009: 17-19 and 25-27).

One of the consequence of the notions of 'Hellenization' and 'Romanization' being put under scrutiny in the first place was that research became increasingly more interested in analysing the way different cultures started adopting and assimilating elements from one another, and the possible reasons behind such phenomena. Anthropological studies dealing with colonial situations in the modern world have often been the source of new intellectual tools for these studies (for example, Herskovits 1952, Said 1978, and Bhabha 1990).

For instance, the 'acculturation theory', on comparative basis, aimed to establish definitions of the possible types of transformation taking place in societies considered 'simpler' when they came in contact with more 'complex' ones. Cultural contact was regarded as the main, if not the only, cause of such changes. This kind of approach seems to view cultures as monolithic entities more than as a complex ensemble of practices and belief that can influence each other to different degrees and in different modalities (Hall 2002: 109). An example of the acculturation model is a study by Gruzinski and Rouveret (1976) in which they established comparisons between Mexico under Spanish colonization and pre-Roman Sicily and Magna Graecia. They set out a series of patterns through which the acculturation

process is supposed to have worked and apply them to the analysis of the two different contexts. They recognized that the relationship between ‘colonizers’ and ‘colonized’ formed a complex and continuous dynamic, but viewed it as one-sided and affecting only one of the two parties. However, even Greek authors presented the adoption of certain practices and the use of certain goods and commodities- particularly the ones associated with ostentation of wealth- as something the Greeks had assimilated from the contact with other cultures (Nenci 1983).

This failure to acknowledge the agency of societies different from the Greek and Roman ones and simplistic interpretation of power relationships in the description of the contexts studied has led to studies based on acculturation being generally disregarded in contemporary social studies (Cusick 1998).

In the last twenty years the study of cultural encounter in the ancient world has been offered new perspectives thanks to the development of post-colonial studies (see Lyons and Papadopoulos 2002a; van Dommelen 2006, 2012). These studies, initially, focused on the legacy of modern colonialism in the culture of colonized countries. Their application to cross cultural encounter in the ancient world was aimed to value the agency of people other than the Greeks and Romans and to evaluate the specific consequences of cultural contact in different contexts. One of the motivations was the idea that colonialism represented a very fitting subject for comparisons because ‘it is, at the same time, a culturally specific local phenomenon as well as a system that transcends specific regions and time periods’ (Lyons and Papadopoulos 2002b:9).

Gosden (2004) produced a comparative work about colonialism from Mesopotamia to the modern European colonies. In particular, he describes the Archaic age Greek expansion in the Mediterranean as ‘colonialism in a shared cultural milieu’ or ‘colonialism without colonies’, based mostly on the appeal that a particular set of commodities (that derived at least part of their prestige from their origins) acquired in the eyes of the *élites* of the colonized areas (Gosden 2004: 24-39 and 60-65). Such a broad and general description, however, leaves very little room to analysis of what cultural borrowing meant in each of the specific realities in which it took place, and how the agency of the ‘colonized’ people affected the dynamics of interaction. In general, his study appears to be too abstract and schematic to offer real insight in any of the different realities it discusses.

Overall, the comparisons between colonization in the ancient world and modern colonialism have been questioned as an interpretative tool because they could lead to reading the first according to expectations laid by knowledge of the latter, without taking into account the differences in the specific situations, such as the fact that ‘colonialism’ in the Archaic and Classical Mediterranean did not aim to incorporate the other regions to the territory that belonged to the country of the ‘colonists’, or to impose a different civilization and religion on said regions( Dominguez 2002: 65-67, Malkin 2004, Owen 2005). The imposition of assumptions inspired by the history of modern colonialism on the interpretation of situations of cross-cultural contact in the ancient world has often resulted in a lack of attention to the specific ways in which such contact happened and, ironically, in a failure to focus on some of the dynamics of cross-cultural interaction in modern history that could have offered more fitting comparisons (Snodgrass 2005). Some scholars have even argued that the term ‘colonization’ might be misleading when applied to the ancient world, as it is burdened with assumptions that could represent an obstacle to the development of a thorough analysis of ancient world dynamics when applied to them (Owen 2005, Purcell 2005). On the other hand, the importance of comparative studies for humanities and social sciences, where these studies are carried out with awareness of the ways specific aspects of different situations are similar or contrasting, should not be underestimated (van Dommelen 2012). Learning about the complexity of cross cultural interaction in modern history might also prevent archaeologists and historians from making simplistic assumptions about the way in which ‘colonial’ dynamics unfolded and from establishing superficial correlations between the presence of material of ‘Greek’ origin in a certain region and the existence of colonial realities (Nijboer 2006, 2010). Overall, the debate on the usefulness of comparisons with modern colonial history has served to highlight how the perspective from which several Western scholarship approaches phenomenon of cultural contact is still that of someone who identifies with the ‘colonizers’ (Purcell 2005, Nijboer 2010, van Dommelen 2012). Avoidance of this bias and attention to the difference between specific historical contexts and dynamics of cross-cultural interaction are necessary, but several of the theoretical frameworks developed by postcolonial studies can still be useful for archaeology and Ancient history.

One of the new approaches that has resulted from the adoption of postcolonial concepts in archaeology has been an emphasis on new practices and habits that emerged from cultural encounters, and the use of the notions of ‘creolization’ and ‘hybridity’ to conceptualize them. Peter van Dommelen (2006), for example, has highlighted the differences between the

culture of Iron Age and Classical Sardinia as a result of encounter between the local population and the Phoenician and then Punic settlers in the island. In his analysis van Dommelen draws a distinction between the 'appropriation' of some oriental elements in Nuragic Sardinia and the blending that, in the Classic period, takes place between the local culture and the Punic one. He refers to this process as 'hybridization':

Social interaction among the inhabitants of colonial situations gives substance and shape to new traditions, and 'hybridization' denotes precisely these processes of interaction and negotiation between various social groups (van Dommelen 2006:139). The understanding of this process directs our attention to the context of the contact situations, and to the reasons that motivate the populations who come in contact. However, approaches focusing on hybridity have encountered criticisms, being accused of presenting cultures as static until they encounter another one and mix with each other (Dietler 2009: 30) and of having 'too many biological connotations' (Malkin 2011: 47). 'Hybridity' is also too broad and generic a descriptor to encompass the different ways two cultures can influence one another (Gosden 2004:60-61 and 69, Malkin 2004, Hodos 2006: 17), and seems to presume the replacement of 'original' culture by the newly developed 'hybrid' one (Wallace Hadrill 2009: 27). Therefore, hybridity is a problematic concept to adopt as a tool of interpretation for phenomena of culture contact.

Along with 'acculturation', 'Hellenization' and 'Romanization', another concept that has come under discussion has been that 'Orientalizing' (Riva and Vella 2006a). This term was first introduced in Art History during the nineteenth century, to address the presence of craftsmanship styles and techniques, motifs and objects from Egypt and the Near East in Greece and Italy between the eighth and the sixth century BC (Riva and Vella 2006b, Riva 2006, Wengrow 2006). However, it has later been extended to describe various social and cultural changes that took place in the Mediterranean during this era, and the entire period has been labelled as 'Orientalizing'. Some scholars have discussed the usefulness of the term, rooted in artificial division between a 'West' identifiable with Europe and an othered 'Orient' (Purcell 2006, Wengrow 2006), and rooted in eighteenth century mentality (Wengrow 2006). Others have pointed out that a concept of 'the East' was already present in ancient Greek culture, and consciously informed the acquisition and imitation of certain objects, practices and techniques (Morris 2006, Osborne 2006), accompanied by ideas of superiority of their own culture and, arguably, of the ways the objects, ideas and practices derived from other cultures were re-used in it (Nenci 1983, Osborne 2006). More importantly, several studies

have highlighted how ‘Orientalization’ should not be interpreted from a diffusionist perspective, and should not lead to the assumption that the borrowing of objects and techniques would have led to the imitation of cultural and political phenomena (Purcell 2006, Riva 2006). On the contrary, the adoption and re-elaboration of cultural elements was deliberate and followed specific strategies (Morris 2006, Riva 2006, and Osborne 2006). The concept of ‘Orientalization’ can, therefore, only be retained if the complexity of the choices and strategies that composed this phenomenon is understood (Riva 2006).

In recent years, scholars (Wallace Hadrill 2009, Mullen 2013a) have argued for a continued use of the terms ‘Hellenization’ and ‘Romanization’, since no other word has been coined to describe the contact with Greek and Roman culture and acquisition of elements of it. However, it has been pointed out that their continued use would require awareness of the fact that the dynamics of contact between Greek or Roman culture with others were complex and varied, and involved agency on all the parts, often manifested in the deliberate selection of which, if any, elements of Greek and Roman culture were accepted and rejected (Mullen 2013a: 9-10). Along with these terms, Mullen (2013a:11-13) has proposed that of ‘Mediterraneanization’, aimed to describe both the involvement in the network of Mediterranean connectivity described by Horden and Purcell (2000) and the emergence of a series of cultural features that the two scholars consider distinctive of the ancient Mediterranean region. However, she maintains that such a broad definition would encompass many processes resulting in different realities, and that its use should not be an obstacle in the appreciation of such complexity. In her study of epigraphic evidence from pre-Roman southern Gaul (Mullen 2013a), she discusses how the lack of Greek-inspired features in the Gaulish language and the demonstrable influence of elements from the Italian Peninsula and the Mediterranean at large on the development of Gallo-Greek suggest a process of Mediterraneanization rather than of Hellenization of the region, especially outside of the immediate surroundings of Massalia.

I am wary of the return to these past participles: first of all, the fact that not all research or scholarly traditions move at the same pace or in the same way is bound to make the use of these words ambiguous. More importantly, despite the stated intent to take into account the agency of the people and cultures whose ‘Hellenization’ or ‘Mediterraneanization’ would be discussed, by their very definition they seem based on a perspective in which the cultures (or groups of cultures) traditionally regarded as more ‘sophisticated’ are the ones that



modify the others. From this point of view, I do not think that these concepts are comparable to and as susceptible to continuing use as of the term 'Orientalizing'.

Discussing the early Greek colonization in Calabria and Lucania, Osanna (2014) has argued for the adoption of a 'two-way' notion of acculturation that affected both the Greeks and the other populations they came in contact with, as opposite to a one-directional idea of acculturation enforced by the Greeks on the others that could either accept it or reject it maintaining the continuity and primacy of their 'indigenous' cultures. He uses this concept to posit that the presence of 'indigenous' features in a settlement (like domestic architecture and fortification style) is not enough to deem the settlement 'not Greek' since colonists could, too, have adopted some features from different cultural traditions, and to argue that the focus on 'indigenous' agency has resulted, in modern archaeology, in a tendency to wilfully ignore 'colonial' Greek presence and impact in the archaeological record. His discussion, ironically, sounds markedly similar to the reasoning with which other archaeologists have advocated against a 'colonialist' perspective that equates the presence of imported material or of new types of domestic architecture with the presence of a Greek colony (for example, Nijboer 2010). I think, ultimately, the most interesting point both discussions make is that 'colonial' dynamics are complex and varied, and should be discussed without preconceived notions and without equating the presence of specific materials or stylistic features with ethnicity.

One of the theoretical frameworks that recent research has applied to the subject of cross-cultural contact in the ancient Mediterranean is Social Networks Theory (Malkin et al 2007), that 'emphasizes the importance of relations between social entities, and examines the patterns and implications of these relations' (Malkin et al 2007:3). Focusing on relationships instead of individuals or structures is considered by authors following this approach as a more useful tool for the understanding of how said relationships developed. Seeing human interaction as a set of nodes in a network of relationships can be, however, a very mechanistic approach, largely derived from sociological theory of the 1950s and 1960s. It should also be noted that the datasets available to the social scientists that developed this theory were much wider and more complete than those archaeologists deal with, which consist essentially of material objects. Network theory is supposed to allow for a more meaningful perception of the space of interaction, both social and physical (Knappett 2011:9). The application of Social Network Theory to the ancient world has mostly been used in large scale studies about connectivity, centrality and urbanism (such as Knappett et al 2008, Malkin 2011 and Fulminante 2012). For example, Malkin suggests that a collective

Greek identity would have developed because of, and not in spite of, the distance between Greek settlers (Malkin 2011:5), and partly been fuelled by the desire of the colonists to assert, in 'new' areas with no previous Greek occupation, a collective identity that went beyond their cities of origins and extended to all of the Greek world (Malkin 2011:57). The development of the Greek network 'which crystallized commonalities of Greek civilization' was therefore inspired by simultaneous phenomena of cross cultural contact in the different places where Greek colonies were founded (Malkin 2011:33). He also attempts to overcome the contradiction between 'primitivist' and 'modernist' models of ancient economy. In fact, he argues that a shift in the type of network represented by the Greek world would have happened around 500 BC, when it went 'from the mixed, many-to-many, decentralized networks of the Early Archaic Mediterranean to the more homogenized ones of the Late Archaic period' where 'many actors or nodes had fewer links, and few nodes acquired a growing number of link' (Malkin 2011:40). He regards trade in the Western Mediterranean as an example of how Mediterranean trade in the Archaic age operated by agents from different regions would have been replaced after the battle of Alalia by a market divided in 'zones of influence' controlled by Greeks, Etruscans or Phoenicians (Malkin 2011: 157-62). The two different interpretations of ancient economy can be applied to the two different types of network (Malkin 2011:41, 158). However, it is not evident how the dependence or independence of the exchange dynamics from personal relationships and the smaller or larger scale of the commerce would be reflected in the different types of network. A concept Malkin had already adopted from anthropology and applied to the Ancient World in previous works (for example Malkin 2004) is that of the Middle Ground. The definition 'Middle Ground' was first introduced by White (1991) in a study of the dynamics of contact between Native Americans and Europeans colonists in the Upper Mississippi and Ohio valleys between seventeenth and nineteenth century. The Middle Ground describes the region object of the study, but also a style of interaction in which mutual misunderstandings and misrepresentations during negotiation and contact among different groups led to the development of habits and practices that had not existed in the cultures of these groups before. Malkin views the Middle Grounds of the Ancient world, including the coast of Southern France, as 'clusters [...] connecting to the major networks via local hubs' (Malkin 2011: 162). The idea of a Middle Ground allows to overcome the distinction between Greek or Romans and 'Barbarians' still present in the discussion of Ancient colonial situations, and to acknowledge the existence of more complex dynamics. In this sense, it is useful as a metaphor, and it is perhaps applicable to some of the cross cultural encounters between

Greek colonists and other populations, but it does not automatically explain the modalities in which these encounters took place. This would require a careful analysis of specific contexts like the one carried out by White, and then a discussion of whether a comparison is possible and fitting. Malkin, instead, seems to take the idea that any dynamic between colonists and people who live in the proximity of the colonies is a 'Middle Ground' one, once noted the presence in the spaces occupied by the latter of imported material. A similar criticism can be extended to Malkin's book as a whole. His study has been criticised as being 'not Network Theory' (Ruffini 2012: 1644) because it proposes the idea of 'network' as a descriptor for Greek colonial history and discusses specific case studies offering aspects of network theory as a possible interpretation. However, he does not, ultimately, apply Network Theory to the analysis of quantitative data in order to test whether this description is actually fitting, either in the large scale of the Greek world as a whole or in the specific case studies he examines (Ruffini 2012:1644). Malkin's discussion of trade and exchange also lacks any analysis of the materials that were the object of these activities even if, according to White, a discussion of the objects exchanged that does not only follow their distribution but also investigates the meanings they held for people is essential not to misunderstand Middle Ground dynamics (White 1991: 96-97). Therefore, both the concepts of 'network' and 'Middle Ground' are used in an impressionistic fashion, as a metaphor that might –but has not, thus far- been used to really analyse realities of the ancient world.

Because human interaction does not involve exclusively humans, but also material culture (Felder 2015:6), a different approach that has attracted the attention of scholars with a more specific focus on archaeology is that of Actor Network Theory (or ANT). Unlike Social Networks Theory, ANT does not limit itself to human individual actors, but extend the word actor-or actant- to non-human entities. 'Whereas social network adds information on the relations of humans in a social and natural world which is left untouched by the analysis, ANT aims at accounting for the very essence of societies and natures. It does not wish to add social networks to social theory but to rebuild social theory out of networks. [...] Social networks will of course be included in the description, but they will have neither privilege nor prominence [...]' (Latour 1998:2)

However, the integration between ANT and SNA (Social Networks Analysis) has rarely occurred in archaeology, which means that the interaction among humans and objects has not been studied symmetrically (Knappett 2011:8). Knappett (2011:145) has argued that focusing more on the role of object and in the networks of objects represented by the

assemblages they form can allow for a better understanding of the dynamics in which both them and human actors were involved. However, studies that follow this approach are still being developed, and the results have been thus far complicated by the elements of imponderability represented both by the fact of working with an incomplete record of the material culture, represented by archaeological evidence and by the lack of absolute predictability in human behaviours and dynamics. Ironically, ANT seems to work best in the cases in which the material evidence is supported by information from different kinds of sources. Moreover, in his own structure Network Theory is more effective in describing relationships than in understanding the reasons for their existence and evolution (Knappett 2011:8).

Research on cross cultural interaction, exchange and connections in the Ancient world has a long and complex history, during which scholars have confronted and tried to overcome numerous biases. Of course, it is an illusion to imagine that scholarship can ever be fully objective, but this history at the very least allows us to understand which perspectives to overcome, which, from my point of view, are mostly the ones that tend to rely on arbitrary interpretations without really analysing the context to which they are applied.

## **2.4 Material cultural theory**

In this section, I discuss different approaches that focus more closely on the material evidence, and on the perspectives applied to its interpretation as a source.

### ***2.4.1 Consumption and fashion in the Ancient world***

The intensified focus on agency and the choices implemented by the non-colonial populations in terms of cultural borrowing that have led archaeologists to the application of another theoretic framework derived from post-colonial studies: the archaeology of consumption.

From the 1980s onwards, studies about consumption have become increasingly more important in the social sciences (see, for example, Miller 1987 and 2005 or Küchler and Miller 2005). These studies have dealt with subjects like the reasons why particular objects and practices are perceived as desirable by individuals and groups, what is their symbolic meaning for the users, how this relates to their social function, how particular objects are used to express wealth, social standing and cultural position, and how concepts like ‘novelty’ and ‘fashion’ affect the way in which items and practices are viewed and consumed.

Generally, in modern social studies there is a tendency to see consumption, especially 'mass consumption' as something that emerged in the Western world, as a consequence of a series of changes that started in the modern times and led to the Industrial Revolution and the development of capitalism (Glennie 1995). More recently, however, focusing on consumption has become a more and more popular approach to the study of exchange and cross-cultural contact in the ancient world, as it presents a series of advantages. First of all, consumption is more clearly attested in the archaeological record and, for certain cultures, in literary documents than production or trade (Foxhall 1998, 2005).

As it has been discussed, archaeological evidence shows how, from the eighth century BC onwards, a wide range of products of Greek, Phoenician and Italic production are exported all over the Mediterranean, with different patterns of distribution. Not all these commodities can be considered 'necessities': in fact, most of them were foodstuffs, wine, perfume, cosmetics and textiles, which Foxhall (1998) describes as 'delicacies' rather than 'luxury' goods. As we know from both Greek and Near Eastern literary evidence, these classes of materials appealed because of specific, desirable qualities related to their provenience. This type of delicacy was probably consumed more regularly and in larger quantities by wealthier people, but they were not unattainable to the others, who probably had access to smaller quantities and in special occasions, perhaps marked by ritual or entertainment.

The consumption of such commodities would seem to be something akin to the modern concept of 'fashion', that is the consumption of products through which the individual links him –or herself to larger, global sets of values and ideologies (Foxhall 1998 :306). We can find evidence for the existence of 'fashion' in literary sources that mention what was regarded as elegant and proper, as well as in the material culture, with the diffusion of imitations of certain kinds of items, especially pottery (Foxhall 2005). All this evidence leads to the conclusion that the concepts of 'consumption' and 'fashion' can be applied to the study of the ancient world.

Social science studies focusing on consumption and the very definition of 'consumption' have come under criticism in recent years (see Graeber 2011). According to Graeber, grouping every activity that is not a form of production leading to exchange under the definition of 'consumption' does not account for the way creativity and individuality inform the use of objects and commodities. At the same time, the assimilation of every selection and use of commodities under the definition of 'consumer choices' does not account for the numerous factors that limit choices depending from social and economic circumstances.

Both of these limits are, in Graeber's opinion, reflections of a capitalist and colonialist mentality that treats 'every form of unalienated experience [...] as a gift granted us by the capitalists of industry' (Graeber 2011: 502). Askegaard (2014) replied to Graeber's objections to the adoption of consumption as a framework for interpretation by comparing this term with one like 'usage' that, in his opinion 'seems to imply that material resources are 'just there' to be picked up and applied' (Askegaard 2014:3). He argued that, precisely because the concept of 'consumption' is connected to those of 'production' and 'exchange', it allows for a discussion of the ways people select, use and evaluate objects and commodities that keeps into account the economic and social background in which this happens. This is especially true for archaeological studies of consumption, in which the analysis of the ways in which objects and commodities are acquired and the factors that influenced their selection are frequently as important as the ways in which objects and commodities are used. Archaeological studies have also often contributed to highlight how marginalized people and people belonging to cultures traditionally viewed as passive and unsophisticated have exercised their creativity and agency in the use of objects to express identity and values and even oppose resistance to oppressive social and cultural situations (see examples in Mullins 2011 and Panich 2014). The cultural processes and practices associated with consumption are, in fact, among the elements that make the agency in the assimilation of alien commodities and goods by individuals and groups visible. Desire for commodities is not just a mechanical response to their availability, but is directed to objects and practices that are perceived as meaningful and appealing (Dietler 1999, 2009). However, the meaning and the attraction these commodities had for the people who acquired them is not to be discovered in the context in which the commodities were produced, but in the cultures in which they were assimilated. Archaeological evidence shows that imported items did not, per se, carry with them the system of practices and beliefs they were part of, but rather were integrated into the lifestyles of the people who acquired them. They could very possibly be used in a different way that they would have been used in the place in which they were produced: a classic example is the great metal kraters, like the one from Vix, exported in regions in which they were accustomed not to mix wine, but where they served instead as markers of *élite* status (Osborne 2007).

In the 1980s, Morel (1983a), confronting the Archaic material of Etruscan provenience found in different regions of the Mediterranean, had observed that different types of items have different patterns of distribution. This led Morel to suggest that the goods traded overseas were produced to be sold, and to be sold to a specific market. In another article

(Morel 1983b), he argued that the patterns of geographical, chronological and quantitative distribution of pottery, as well as the diffusion of imitation and derived types can be used as a clue as to the way trade developed in different regions of the ancient world (a recent study that updates the result of Morel's in the specific context of the Iberian Peninsula is Botto and Vives Ferrandiz 2006). Osborne (2001) observed how the preferences of a specific market might even determine a change in the production of goods: for example one sixth century Athenian pottery workshop developed shapes imitated from the ones of the traditional Etruscan *bucchero* pottery, and even specialized in the production of different shapes for different local Etruscan markets. Recently, chemical analyses performed on a sample of 'Ionian' cups from the excavations of Marseille and Emporion and from the shipwrecks of Pointe Lequin A1 (excavated on the northern coast of the island of Porquerolles) and Cala Sant Vincenc (on the coast of the island of Mallorca) have shown that these vessels were probably produced in the same workshop, most likely to be placed in the Italian Peninsula or in Sicily (Krotscheck 2008:151-152). Therefore, it is possible to imagine that large scale trade from a centre of production to different regions, where these artefacts were expected to be in demand, was a reality in the sixth century BC (Krotscheck 2008:160-161).

For the study of Iron Age in the Western Mediterranean, a decisive contribution focused on the study of consumption has been offered by Dietler (2005). In his study of colonial encounters during the Early Iron Age in the Rhône basin of France, he argues that the highly selective nature of the Mediterranean imports (primarily objects related to the consumption of wine) is the proof that cultural borrowing does not happen indiscriminately, but that the objects and practices that are incorporated in the local lifestyle are chosen because they are thought to have a relevant meaning (Dietler 2005). Focusing on what commodities were consumed and on the way in which consumption happened is, therefore, a useful instrument in the understanding of how indigenous agency operated in this context. Since the Mediterranean imports in the Rhône basin were primarily related to wine consumption, Dietler attempted to understand the different patterns of selection and consumption of these goods on the basis of ethnographic comparisons. He distinguished different types of feasts in which alcoholic beverages could be consumed: empowering feasts (in which host tries to achieve high status by showing their capacity to offer feasts for the community), patron- role feasts (offered by high-rank individuals to lower rank ones, often as a compensation for labour and aimed to reassert and legitimize the patron's high status) and diacritical feasts (not open to the entire community, but exclusively to high status individuals,

whose social position is reaffirmed partaking in the consumption of exclusive goods, or goods consumed in an exclusive fashion). These different types of banqueting practices are indicative of different social dynamics, and being able to identify similar patterns of feasting can, therefore, be helpful in understanding the societies in which they were in use (Dietler 2001). The typology and distribution of imports in his two areas of study (the Hallstatt region and the lower Rhône basin) is interpreted by him as reflective of two very different societies (Dietler 2005: 173-181). Hallstatt society was characterized by more centralized and institutionalized political power, therefore the rare and costly imports found in this region had diacritical function and were used to reinforce the high status of the people who owned them. On the other hand, in the lower Rhône basin the interest was primarily in wine as a commodity and the vessels for its consumption that were incorporated in already existing feasting practices. This happened because the society was characterized by a more egalitarian ethos. In this context, the trade with foreign merchants as well as the adoption of Greek potting technique boosted the local economy and radically changed the mode of production of the pottery, but it was all in response to specific local and political dynamics rather than a consequence of 'Hellenization' (Dietler 2005: 173-181).

Dietler's approach, however, is not unproblematic because his models of feasting, built upon anthropological study of African societies, have been superimposed to the Iron Age Mediterranean ones, despite the fact that his model could not be representative of some kinds of feast, or that types of feast could consist in an overlap of the types he individuated. Besides, it has been pointed out that, even if most of the imports were objects and commodities linked to commensality, and draw some of their symbolic meaning to a set of values that were displayed in the context of feasting, it is possible that this was not their only use (Walsh 2014: 177). It is also worth pointing out that his focus on the most relevant classes of imports leaves out other objects from the same cultural traditions. This is probably to be expected from a general regional analysis, but imports other than the drinking vessels have not been object of much theoretical discussion after Dietler.

More recently, Walsh (2014) approached the subject of consumption of Greek pottery in the Western Mediterranean and Transalpine Europe between 700 and 350 BC by mapping the distribution of the vases, in an attempt to individuate specific patterns of consumer choices and identity representation. The differences in the distribution of different types of materials allowed him to, yet again, confirm that precise consumer choices were in act in different regions. However, Walsh interprets the different situations present in his study in



a single framework: the fact that several vases were found in sanctuaries and burials (where they had been deposited after being used in funerary rituals) leads him to identify the display of Greek pottery in these context as a form of ‘wasteful advertising’ or ‘costly signalling’. In his opinion the vases would have been easily recognised because of their formal characteristics and identified as ‘luxury goods’ (Walsh 2014:84-88 and 177-178). This would have shown that the person who displayed them had access to rare items and knowledge to select them according to locally meaningful criteria and use them in locally appropriate ways (Walsh 2014: 180). The differences in the extent of the distribution of pottery in various areas would depend on different scale of social competition, regional or local when the objects were distributed in very limited areas (Walsh 2014: 178-182). However, offering one possible explanation for realities that appear quite varied seems reductive. Walsh admits that in some of the regions involved in his study Greek vases would not have had a great diacritical power, even if display of diacritical items is his main explanation for the acquisition of the vases in general. He also specifies that his work focused only on Greek pottery and should be integrated with similar studies about the different materials that contributed to form the same assemblages Greek imports were part of to reach a better understanding of the choices that led to the formation of these contexts (Walsh 2014: 181). This is definitely something to take into account when discussing the results of his study, especially for the Archaic age, because the Greek vases and containers are not the only, or even the most numerous, imports present in the regions he discussed, and other types of imported material present at the same time in some of the region he analysed have very different qualities and patterns of distribution.

In order to avoid falling in schematic and preconceived approaches, researchers have become more and more aware of the need to focus on the specific contexts in which cross-cultural encounter took place. While broad studies that aim at a ‘global’ perspective on the dynamics of cultural encounter, colonialism and exchange can provide a good theoretical base, ‘it has become clear that the generalizations they encourage can be deconstructed on a more localized level’ (Hodos 2006: 23). Hodos (2006) published a comparative study among three ‘microregions of coresidentiality’ (Hodos 2006:23), North Syria, Sicily and North Africa, in which both Greek and Phoenician presence is attested during the Iron Age. The comparison of the evidence for these three case studies shows that not only the reactions of the different peoples Greek and Phoenician colonists interacted with were different, but also that the colonists developed different colonial identities partly as a result of the different situations they came in contact with (Hodos 2006: 200). The very different

ways in which the presence of external elements affected (or did not affect) the culture of the non-colonial populations of the regions under analysis highlights the importance of agency, and of the research about local context. Only in this way it is in fact possible to try to understand why the populations in question were drawn to elements of a foreign culture, why those elements in particular, and how these elements were integrated and adapted in their own local culture.

In a more recent work, Dietler (2010) has expanded the part of his study that focused on the lower Rhône valley discussing a wide set of material evidence (including pottery classes attested in the area but also architecture, settlement organization, the patterns of development of fortification and the iconography of lithic sculpture) over a period between the foundation of Massalia and the Roman conquest of Southern France. His conclusion is that it is not possible to talk about ‘Hellenization’ of the Rhône valley: it does not appear that indigenous people simply started imitating Massaliote customs and styles of architecture and craftsmanship. On the other hand, the way the presence of the Phocæan colony and the development of networks of exchange with the Mediterranean world did affect local culture in several complex ways: for example, the development of fortified settlements over the sixth century BC did not follow Greek models, but did start in the immediate proximity of Massalia, and is possibly an indication of tensions in the area surrounding the colony, attested by the apparent violent destruction and abandonment of several sites in Provence over the centuries (Dietler 2010:330-332). Dietler (2010: 183-256) observes that local eating and cooking habits were not changed by the encounter at all, aside from the adoption of wine and some particular types of drinking and to a lesser extent, serving vessels and mortars, that he thinks would have been used primarily to grind spices to add to wine. The most significant cross cultural exchange during the Early Iron Age would then have been that of very specific commodities: wine was incorporated in local feasting rituals of the inhabitants of the Rhône valley, while the Massaliote acquired from them barley and wheat that were prepared in traditional Greek fashion after the late sixth century BC (Dietler 2010:255-256).

Vives Ferrandiz (2008) has discussed patterns of interaction between Phoenician traders and eastern Iberian populations between the rivers Ebro and Segura in the period between eighth and sixth century BC. He integrates the concept of ‘hybridity’ in practices and rituals with Dietler (2005)’s idea of imported commodities as a diacritical instrument that allows individuals and families to offer empowering feasts and acquire social prestige. According

to Vives Ferrandiz, in fact, each of these interpretative frameworks is adaptable to the study of cross cultural contact in different areas of the region object of his study. He argues that different responses to colonial situations are to be understood taking into account different types of encounter as well as the ways in which the use of material culture allowed each group to negotiate and express identity through daily practice. Most importantly, each group responded to situations of cross cultural contact in ways that were rooted in their own worldview and practices, and ‘cultural dispositions and values perceived as correct’ (Vives Ferrandiz 2008: 266), even when integrating new elements in them. I find his flexible approach very interesting, because I think it allows for a much nuanced understanding of the different ways in which objects from a different cultural tradition can be assimilated in material culture. As discussed above, comparative studies can be very useful, but only when rooted in a thoughtful analysis of the specific situations to which they are applied.

#### ***2.4.2 Materiality, entanglement, identities and material culture multilingualism***

In the last 20 years a concept that has become more and more popular in archaeology has been the idea that material culture can ‘constitute as well as reflect relationships’ and ‘helps make culture in an active sense’ (Hurcombe 2007:103). Objects have active lives of their own and affect human relationships (Dobres and Robb 2005, Hurcombe 2007: 103-105, Joy 2010). This happens because objects, materials and spaces can convey meaning and have affordances (Gibson 1979, Knappett 2005, Hurcombe 2007: 105, Hodder 2010: 48-50). Affordances are intended as an intersection between the objects’ physical qualities and the potential for interaction they offer with humans’ knowledge (effective or perceived) of the possibilities they present. This is usually based on humans’ former experiences and capacity to take advantage of them. When this knowledge (or perceived knowledge) is shared among humans, objects can express, but also influence and actually contribute to establish and develop, relationships among humans.

Another interesting conceptual tool introduced recently in material culture studies is ‘entanglement’ (Hodder 2012). Entanglement represents the sum of the interrelations existing among things, among people and among things and people. These interrelations can take multiple forms and reach different levels of complexity, from the simple sensorial experience of something, to the development of relationships of interdependence among human and things, things and things and humans and humans.

In the interrelations among things and among things and people, an important role is played by the things' specific properties and affordances (Hodder 2012: 113). However, Hodder expands the concept noting that the objects' affordances make them coherent both with the practical activities in which they are used, and the ideas that humans associate to said activities (Hodder 2012: 113). Therefore, affordances and coherence are closely tied, linking the practical and material aspect of interaction among humans and things with the symbolic and conceptual one. Entanglements, in fact, involve ideas and concepts as well as physical objects. On the other hand, ideas and concepts are often entangled with different ones in people's mentality, which leads to the development of even more complex interrelations (Hodder 2012: 119). The entanglement of humans and things is compounded by conceptual abstractions but also by what Hodder calls 'resonances', the combination of the physical sensations associated with the interaction with the materials, due to their specific properties, and the abstractions and conceptual associations linked to them by people (Hodder 2012: 125-137). As discussed above, for people and things, material and immaterial, to become entangled in relationships they must be coherent with each other. Hodder describes this situation as 'fittingness'.

The concepts of fittingness and coherence are very helpful in examining how variations and evolutions take place in material culture, as these changes do not happen only on the basis of rationality, practicality and efficiency (Hodder 2012: 147-148, 156-157). Therefore an attempt to interpret material culture variations based on these criteria alone- which are, themselves, relative- might be unsuccessful. This perspective is especially interesting for a discourse focusing on the different ways different objects and types of commodities become integrated in the material culture of a new region.

A focus on materiality has characterized some of the recent discussion on cross cultural interaction and exchange in the ancient world. For example, the studies collected in a recent volume (van Dommelen and Knapp 2010) have attempted to explore problems of identity and cultural differences in various 'contact zones' (Rowlands 2010: 238) of the Ancient Mediterranean looking at material culture as an indicator of the everyday reality of cross cultural contact and borrowing and the development of new practices, styles and techniques. The authors have also tried to overcome the rigid opposition between 'colonizers' and 'colonized', exploring the development of new identities in areas of cultural contact. In general, the focus on specific contexts was used to study the consequences of 'processes of

interaction and hybridity and different forms of mobility and connectivity and their resolution over long time periods' (Rowlands 2010:236).

The papers in question have approached themes such as the way the daily interaction in areas of contact can influence practices, taste and the expression of identities through the study of cross cultural interaction in the Alicante coast during Iron Age (Vives Ferrandiz 2010), the materiality of Etruscan trade in the Western Mediterranean as an expression of dynamics of interaction and their effect in the way the very objects and commodities traded were used and perceived (Riva 2010). Therefore, these studies show that a focus on materiality and an attention to specific contexts of interaction can allow us to achieve a deeper understanding of dynamics of interaction and exchange in the ancient world, and the ways the objects, commodities and practices assimilated during such processes, or born from these encounters, were used to express individual and group identities.

One of the most meaningful ways in which material culture affects human relationships is, in fact, its capacity to assert identities and render social relationships tangible (Sofaer Derevenski 2007). Identity can be defined as the way individuals and groups identify on the basis of difference socially regarded as significant (Diaz Andreu and Lucy 2005:1-2). It encompasses different categories such as status, gender, age and ethnicity and is not a fixed and static quality, but an ongoing process. It is, therefore, fluid and often context specific (Diaz Andreu and Lucy 2005:1-2, Sofaer Derevenski 2007, Winther-Jacobsen 2013). It is constituted by a plurality of values, perceptions of the self, and performances and experiences (Dunn 2008:158). Identity is construed and maintained through the interaction among individuals, and the process of defining oneself requires agency and deliberate choices. Because of this fluid nature and of the fact that it is constantly defined and affected by interaction, the processes and choices through which it is defined and maintained need to be contextualized in order to understand them (Dunn 2008:159). In archaeology, in particular, the investigation of identity happens through the study of material culture and the specific ways individuals engage with the material world (Diaz Andreu and Lucy 2005:11, Sofaer Derevenski 2007). Because of their potential to convey meaning, objects can establish and perpetuate identities (Sofaer Derevenski 2007), and different assemblages of objects can allow individuals and groups to explore and establish their possible identities in space and time (Knappett 2011: 168-169). For these reasons, I think that a focus on identity, and on the way it is negotiated and expressed through material culture, can be an useful tool in investigating dynamics of cross cultural interaction and their impact on individuals and

communities. Looking at the use of material culture to assert different aspects of identity can, in fact, highlight the different ways in which objects are incorporated in specific assemblages.

Archaeologists have recently started to investigate the possibility of discussing material culture and, in particular, the ways in which people express multi layered identities through it, using concepts developed in linguistics and aimed at the study of bi or multi linguistic texts. A phenomenon that has proven particularly interesting for archaeologists is code switching (Wallace Hadrill 2009, Lomas 2013, Mullen 2013b, Petersen 2013, Revell 2013, Shepherd 2013, Winther-Jacobsen 2013). Code switching is the passage from one language to another, in writing or speech. This can happen in the form of the insertion of an exclamation or an expression from one language in a sentence in a different one, but also by a switch of languages between sentences or in the midst of the same sentence (Mullen 2013a:76-78, 2013b). The two languages are, therefore, used in the same text, without contributing to the creation of a different language or being transformed in a new one (Shepherd 2013). Code switching occurs to and is used by both people who have equal knowledge of the two languages and those that speak prevalently one of the two (Mullen 2013a:77, 2013b). The switch between two languages, especially when there is an existing power relationship between the two, is often motivated by specific strategies (Wallace Hadrill 2009: 63-64), and performed making specific linguistic choices (Lomas 2013, Petersen 2013). Applying this concept to the analysis of material culture allows a more flexible interpretation of the numerous processes that can lead to the coexistence of features from different cultural traditions. For example, it allows for a more sophisticated analysis of material assemblages that does not necessarily equate the co-existence of materials of different origins in the same contexts with the development of a new 'hybrid' material culture (Wallace Hadrill 2009:78, Lomas 2013, Shepherd 2013). In fact, one might very well switch between well know and established elements of different cultures (Lomas 2013, Petersen 2013). It also allows us to achieve a more flexible understanding of people's performance of their social selves through material culture: as discussed, identities are not fixed. A person and a community can embrace multiple cultural identities and this can be reflected in the material culture they use to represent themselves (Wallace Hadrill 2009:73-78, Lomas 2013, Petersen 2013, Revell 2013). In particular, code switching has the potential to highlight similarity and difference, inclusion and exclusion to different groups, encompassing different expressions not only of cultural identity but also of status and class (Petersen 2013, Shepherd 2013).

On the other hand, the adoption of concepts borrowed from linguistics in archaeological studies presents a series of complications, primarily owing to the fact that objects can acquire meaning but are not created primarily or exclusively to communicate, and that the symbolic values they can assume are tied to the context in which they are used or displayed and the perception that different people have of them (Mullen 2013b, Winther-Jacobsen 2013). Moreover, languages obey to a set of rules that occasionally make it possible to decipher even incomplete and damaged texts; incomplete material assemblages represent a bigger challenge for those who try to interpret their meaning (Winther-Jacobsen 2013).

Burial contexts are among those which best lend themselves to analogies between material culture and language, because they represent the result of a series of deliberate choices aimed at the display of different elements of identity such as status, affiliations and relationships in a public event like that of a funeral (Petersen 2013, Shepherd 2013, Winther-Jacobsen 2013). Petersen (2013:69) also points out how the individual occurrence in which the funerary equipment was displayed during the ritual represents a very fitting parallel for the individual event of the utterance of a multilingual speech. Mullen (2013b) has proposed to also apply different concepts derived from linguistics to the analysis of material culture: borrowing, which is the adoption of elements of one language into another, and interference, which happens when elements from one language being unintentionally transferred in another one by a less skilled bilingual (for example, when an Italian person speaks English transferring elements of Italian syntax on to it, as in 'I know her since two years', literal translation of 'la conosco da due anni', rather than 'I have known her for two years').

She compares the first phenomenon to the consumption of tea in British society, where it 'functions as a native element, i.e. it is thoroughly integrated' and the second to the 'effort to drink wine in Greek fashion in the Iron Age by non-Greek communities'. This would represent a form of interference because said communities 'through lack of full knowledge of the culture of Greek wine-drinking, drink the wine unmixed as they might their own beverages'. Therefore, they involuntarily transferred features of their own culture while trying to engage in another. I do not agree with this comparison: first of all, because not all non-Greek Iron Age people drank wine the same way, but also because different non-Greek groups would have probably had different levels of awareness of the way Greeks consumed wine, and different degrees of interest in participating in the same activity and in the same way as Greeks did. Therefore, there might have been cases of interference, but there might have also been cases of borrowing the features of Greek wine-drinking that were considered

appealing and desirable and of their integration in local banqueting rituals. In fact, the latter would have probably been more likely to happen, especially in areas of contact and interaction. Regardless of the specific examples selected by Mullen, I do think borrowing and interference represent interesting ideas to approach the study of material culture assemblages that include elements from different cultural traditions. However, differentiating between these two phenomena and code switching in material culture is bound to be complex, since the level of awareness that people belonging to one cultural tradition have of the one from which they are using elements is something that might prove difficult to assess through material culture. For example, several Western people who are aware that ramen is usually eaten with chopsticks in Japan do not know how to use them and still choose to eat ramen with a fork even in restaurants that offer both options.

Reasonable hypotheses can, however, probably be formulated examining the frequency of cross cultural contact, the quantity of material from different traditions present in the specific site and regional context a given assemblage is found in and, more importantly, the likeliness for local people to have observed how it was used in the original culture. Regardless, seeing material culture as language and trying to interpret the different phenomena through which different 'languages' compose assemblages can, in my opinion, offer interesting insights to the discussion of the development of material culture in areas of cross cultural contact.

### **2.4.3 Object biographies**

A useful conceptual tool in assessing the way different uses and meanings were associated to objects in different contexts, and the ways in which their efficiency in defining identities changed is represented by object biography. The notion that objects, like humans, have 'lives' that can be described in a biographical form was first put forward by Kopytoff (1986:66-68). This approach has become increasingly popular in archaeology (see Marshall and Gosden 1999, Joy 2009, 2010, Hodder 2012: 192), since it offers the possibility of interpreting social and cultural relationships based on the material finds. According to Kopytoff, the life of an object is composed of different stages, during which the object's use and meaning might change because of the passage of time, but also of changes in the social and cultural context it is part of. Aside from the passage of time, exchange and circulation are seen as 'the primary means by which objects accumulate meaning and value' (Joy 2010:8). Several studies that follow this approach have focused on how the same objects are viewed differently in different contexts (examples in Peers 1999, Saunders 1999, and Seip 1999).



However, other dynamics, such as, for example, ceremonial performance can alter the biography of an object (Marshall and Gosden 1999:174-175). The main problem with the adoption of a biographic approach in archaeology is the fact that the methodology suggested by Kopytoff, consisting of following the object's life from its production to its 'death' (Kopytoff 1986: 66-68), represented by the cessation of the relationships in which the object is involved (Holtrorf 1998), is usually impossible to apply to archaeological evidence (Joy 2009, 2010: 9). For this reason, studies of this type have primarily been developed in historical archaeology or focusing on special, monumental objects, often using supplementary information collected from sources other than the material evidence itself. Not only is such an idea of biography impossible to track in the archaeological record, but it is also often unsatisfactory, since the same object can have several different lives, depending on the relationships it has with different individuals or groups. Rather, an object can outlive the meaning associated with it (Foxhall 2000: 485), and it can 'die' and then be 'resuscitated' in a different context (Joy 2010:9-12). An object can even acquire specific meanings from the fact that it is assumed to have a rich biography, but part of this biography is unknown and left to speculation (Eckardt and Williams 2003). These problems can, however, be solved if we chose to see the biographical narrative not as linear and chronological, from birth to death, but as a series of non-linear relationships or 'clusters' of relationships (Joy 2010:12). While most of the events in the object's life won't be possible for us to identify, aside from the traces they have left on the object (such as wear and damage) the context in which the object is found tells us about at least one stage of that existence (Joy 2010). Identifying some of the practices with which the objects have been associated, and the meaning that they acquired in the contexts in which they 'lived', can offer an insight in the wider social and cultural dynamics in which the objects were involved. This means that objects cannot provide us with useful 'biographical' information if they are not placed in their contexts, both in the social and cultural sense and in the physical, material one. On the other hand, approaching objects from a biographical point of view is very helpful in reconstructing the ways in which they were perceived, invested with meaning and interacted with, and the relationships they contributed to create.

#### **2.4.4 Value, luxury and prestige.**

One of the key elements of the study of objects involved in cross-cultural exchange is the question of the new meanings and, possibly, value they were given by the people who acquired them. In the case of the objects of this study, I will also discuss whether some of

them were, or were part of the same assemblages as, 'luxury' and 'prestige' items. Therefore, these concepts will be briefly discussed in this section.

Probably the most influential analysis of the reasons people value objects in modern sociology has been realized by Appadurai (1986). In discussing the concept of 'value', Appadurai followed Simmel (1978:63)'s observation that 'value' is not a quality that is inherent to objects, but a 'judgement' formed on them by people. In particular, 'we call those objects valuable that resist our desire to possess them' (Simmel 1978: 67). It is possible to satisfy this desire through exchange, by sacrificing a different good to receive the desired one in return. The economic value of objects is, therefore, variable and determined by these exchanges and sacrifices. Appadurai (1986) took Simmel's ideas as a starting point to argue that what links value and exchange in the social histories of objects<sup>3</sup> is politics. In his view, the desire for goods, which leads people to value them, is the result of 'a variety of social practices and classifications' (Appadurai 1986:29). As a consequence, demand is not universal and only conditioned by the possibility to acquire things (Appadurai 1986:29-31). Exchanges are possible because of a 'broad set of agreements' that concern 'what is desirable, what a reasonable "exchange of sacrifices" comprises and who is permitted to exercise what kind of effective demand in what circumstances' (Appadurai 1986:57). Therefore, social context creates the parameters through which individuals and communities attributed value to things.

As said at the beginning of this section, value is not an inherent quality of objects. However, some of the inherent qualities they do possess, along with affordances and resonances, can make objects and classes of objects more likely to be valued in a specific cultural context. Saunders (1999), for example, pointed out how the indigenous populations of America at the eve of European contact valued 'brilliant' objects because the creative and transformative power of light manifested itself through them. The objects considered 'brilliant' included pearls, emeralds, gold and silver, but also iridescent feathers, mirrors and shards of glazed pottery. In the eyes of Europeans, however, only some of these objects were valuable, and for entirely different reasons. Pearls, in particular, were valued by Europeans for light colour and regular shape, and because, in Europe, they materialized wealth, power and direct or indirect control over colonial possessions (Saunders 1999:253). Therefore, a thorough analysis of the ways in which specific objects (with their

---

<sup>3</sup> While specific objects, as discussed, have biographies, classes of materials have social histories. Appadurai (1986:34) defined them as longer-term and larger-scale evolutions of the dynamics and relationships that classes of objects are involved in.

characteristics, affordances, entanglements and resonances) ‘fit’ in the assemblages they are included in, and of the ways in which the assemblages ‘fit’ in the general context of the material culture of their wider context of discovery can offer interesting insight on the value the objects had in that context.

Appadurai noted that the social frameworks that define the value of objects are often breached, because not all the components of a society are interested in keeping them in place. One of the reasons that can upset the *status quo* is the demand for luxury goods from the people in power, who use the display of these goods as a means for social competition (Appadurai 1986:57). For Appadurai (1984:38), in fact, luxury goods as goods ‘whose primary use is *rhetorical* and *social*, goods that are simply *incarnated signs*’. These goods are, in his view, characterized by their difficulty of acquisition, restricted availability, semiotic complexity (their capacity to communicate complex social messages), close linkage to the body, person and personality of their consumer and by the fact that they require specialized knowledge to be consumed ‘properly’. The function of these goods is primarily that of reinforcing and displaying high social status. A similar reading of luxury goods had been given by Douglas and Isherwood (1979) who also had argued that luxury items can convey diverse meanings, relating to different fields of social interactions, but the ways to consume them that are regarded as ‘proper’ tend to become very standardized (Douglas and Isherwood 1979: 105-106). Being affected by social and ideological frameworks, concepts of luxury and value can be very culturally specific, and this can lead to instances in which the value of the same goods is judged very differently by individuals from different cultural backgrounds (examples in Saunders 1999: 246-257 and 249-250 and MacLean and Insoll 2003: 564-565 and 567). As a consequence of this specificity, even identifying the goods regarded as luxuries by a given group might be difficult for people who do not belong to it (MacLean and Insoll 2003). In instances like this, it is much easier to identify goods that have been imported from elsewhere. This might lead archaeologists to assume that ‘exotic’ items are also the ones regarded as the most valuable and exclusive, when the two things might not necessarily coincide (MacLean and Insoll 2003: 568). The idea of luxury is, by its nature, also dynamic and subject to development. Goods can, in fact, change status over time. In a same context, things initially perceived as luxuries can enter the realm of what is deemed necessary as they become more widely available (Douglas and Isherwood 1979: 69-71, Appadurai 1986:40, Berry 1993:18, van der Veen 2003: 409).

The idea of 'luxury goods' thus far described is similar to that of 'prestige artefacts' as defined by Hayden (1999). Prestige artefacts are, in fact, goods whose purpose is 'not to perform a practical task, but to display wealth, success and power' (Hayden 1999:11). These artefacts are likely to be made of materials that are scarcely available, difficult to obtain and have high manufacturing costs (Hayden 1999:41, Trubitt 2003: 247-248). The realization of these goods is also likely to require considerable labour and competence, with the purpose to display the owner's economic, aesthetic, technical or other skills (Hayden 1998:11). Prestige items might have complex shapes and decorations, but their aesthetic qualities can vary greatly, as they are closely linked to the ideological and cultural values of the society that produces them (Hayden 1999: 41-43). Therefore, the messages about status, wealth and power that these objects convey are the result of the combination of several variables (raw materials, technique of realization, decorations, shape and imagery) but also of the way in which these elements are viewed by their owners and the people they interact with.

Because exceptionality is a desirable quality in prestige items, their acquisition through cross-cultural exchange can increase their value (Helms 1993: 101, Trubitt 2003:248). Moreover, the fact of having acquired the objects from outside the community can add to the positive way in which they reflect on the owner, by materializing their knowledgeability of exclusive goods and involvement in wider networks of contact (Helms 1993:101). The exchange of objects both parties consider prestigious and desirable can, on the other hand, contribute to create or support relationships between groups and individuals (Hayden 1999:12). As discussed, material culture can express association through similarity and disassociation through difference (Shepherd 2013). Therefore, drawing from different cultural traditions in the accumulation of elements of material culture regarded as valuable and prestigious can contribute to establish not just high social status in the community one belongs to, but also participation in networks of individuals of high social status (Shepherd 2013).

Berry (1993), on the other hand, formulated a definition of luxury goods that articulated the one offered by Appadurai, focusing not only on their social function, but also on their appeal and capacity to provide pleasure. In his definition, a luxury is 'an indulgence', a good that is widely regarded as 'pleasing' and, usually, desired by many people but available to few (Berry 1993:40-42). These goods also represent a refinement or a higher quality variable of a type of good that satisfies universal basic needs (Berry 1993: 3-42). He identified four categories of these needs: food and drink, shelter, clothing and leisure. Berry also argued that 'luxuries' and objects whose consumption is aimed to the display status do not necessarily coincide,

even if consumption aimed to display of high status and wealth will involve goods perceived by others as luxuries. As goods whose possession is aimed to the display of prestige and rank are instrumental to achieve or maintain status, they might even become a necessity for the person who possesses them (Berry 1993:30-31).

As mentioned, Foxhall (1998) pointed out that the majority of items exported from the Greek, Phoenician and Italic world in the various regions of the Mediterranean from the eighth century BC onwards were goods like foodstuffs, wine, perfume, cosmetics and textiles. Expanding on Berry (1993)'s definition of luxury, Foxhall (1998) describes these goods as 'semi-luxuries' or 'delicacies'. These commodities in fact, represented 'pleasing' refinements of necessities like food and clothing, that would have been consumed more abundantly and regularly by the very rich, but also be accessible to others in smaller quantities and during special occasions, perhaps characterized by ritual or entertainment. The fact that the consumption of these goods was associated to social and religious events contributed to their significance and the value they were given by the people who consumed them (Foxhall 1998, van der Veen 2003:409).

## **2.5 Conclusion: intellectual framework of the study**

Having discussed several of the big scale theories applied to the subject of trade in the Ancient Mediterranean, I believe that testing them focusing on specific contexts can offer useful insights in the articulations of the ways objects were selected, invested of meaning and incorporated in material culture, and contributed to express and establish relationships among people and among people and objects. Recent studies have highlighted how responses to situations of cross cultural encounter can be very different, even in areas that are geographically close to one another, because they depend from both the context in which they take place and the different type of relationship that is established. As a consequence, this thesis has a flexible approach that uses different conceptual tools to discuss the different case studies, on the basis of what we know of the context in which the objects have been found, of the dynamics of encounter at play and of issues relating specifically to the individual context. The tools in question will be the ones discussed in the final section of the chapter: a discussion on the ways the objects are used to consolidate, create and assess identities (that are, in some of the cases discusses, complex and layered), and on their coherence and fittingness with what is possible to know and reconstruct of the specific contexts in which they are integrated, based on the objects' specific properties and possible life histories and symbolic meanings. I also attempt to analyse the ways in which the

acquisition of different imported objects in different context can be discussed in terms of borrowing, interference and material cultural multilingualism, testing whether these concepts derived from linguistics are convincing when applied to the study of material culture, at least in this specific geographical and chronological context.

Some clarification for the terminology that are used:

‘Luxury’ is a very complicated term to define, as it is certainly relative and context specific. However, in this thesis it is used to discuss objects that are characterized either by being realized in materials that would have been expensive and of scarce availability, by the fact of being rare and of limited dissemination (at the very least in context in which they appear) or by the fact that they offer the possibility to convey complex symbolic meanings.

I use ‘prestige’ to refer to a distinction and separation from others due to higher social rank, conveyed through material culture, imagery and concept associations. On the other hand, I use ‘value’ in a more variable and context-specific way, as an indicator the different ways in which different things are invested of meaning and used to convey it, relating to social stance, but also relationships, associations and disassociations with people and concepts.

With ‘*élite*’ I refer to people pertaining to high ranking social groups, and the things and activities pertaining to them. This definition is deliberately vague, as I attempt to fill it in and articulate it in the discussion of specific geographical and social contexts.

While I approach the discussion of cross cultural interaction trying to avoid aprioristic dichotomies among ‘colonial’ and ‘local’ people and traditions, sometimes definitions referring to cultural traditions are used: ‘Etruscan’ and ‘Greek’ describe materials belonging to productions developed in workshops located in Italy and in the Greek colonial world. I use ‘local’ and ‘indigenous’ for materials belonging to crafting traditions developed in the areas object of the study before the beginning of the cultural contact, or without apparent input derived from it.

In the case of settlements, I use the term ‘Greek’ for the ones for which both archaeology and literary sources offer evidence of their colonial nature, Massalia and Emporion. In terms of burial traditions and cemeteries, I use the terms ‘Greek’ and ‘indigenous’ to refer to the ones that present characteristics that seem to make it possible to associate them with either cultural tradition. In the chapter about Emporion, in particular, these attributions and the

way in which the groups of burial to which they are traditionally applied have been discussed in the literature will further, and specifically, be addressed.

### 3. Methodology

#### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter will discuss how I will approach the research questions formulated in Chapter 1, in light of the intellectual framework set out in Chapter 2. As highlighted, my study will be implemented through the analysis of specific contexts from the Western Mediterranean dated to the seventh and sixth century BC that include imported material. These contexts are investigated with a focus on this material culture, both in the sense of discussion targeting the composition of the assemblages as well as the specific characteristics of the objects that compose them, and in the sense of analysing and comparing these with the material culture of the regions of which they are a part. I present a series of problems specific to each of the case studies, discussed in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. This is done in order to understand better the meanings different objects would have acquired in their contexts, the practices and dynamics they were involved in and the elements that determined the coherence of the assemblages that they were part of. Following these different levels of analysis, we are able to better understand and compare the different assemblages of social interactions through which objects and commodities became embedded in the material culture of the regions in which they were acquired, and to some extent why these processes of embedding imports occurred.

#### 3.2 The Case Studies

The specific case studies represent contexts from the north-western Mediterranean, dated to the seventh and sixth centuries BC and including material from different cultural traditions.

The first case study comprises Hut L7, a domestic structure at the village of La Liquière, in eastern Languedoc. The hut is discussed in all three phases of its occupation, between the late seventh and the first half of the sixth century BC. La Liquière represents one of the few settlements in Mediterranean France at which various (in this case eleven) Early Iron Age domestic structures have been excavated, as well as one of the earliest sites in southern France in which Mediterranean, in particular Etruscan, imports have been attested aside from sporadic finds (Py et al. 1984a, Py 2015). Hut L7 is also an interesting context because the three different periods of occupation, along with some of the structures and the material associated to each of them have been identified. Therefore, discussing these three different contexts allows for an overview of how specific classes of materials became embedded in the local material culture over time. This case study is the focus of Chapter 4.



The second case study (Chapter 5) is an isolated, presumably monumental burial excavated at the location of Saint Antoine at Castelnau de Guers, on the western Languedoc side of the Héault valley. Isolated burials are attested in the North Western Mediterranean, and primarily in Western Languedoc, during the seventh and sixth centuries BC. Approximately 15 Iron Age burials from the Western Mediterranean have been considered isolated ones, but there are doubts on the nature of several of them. The burial of Castelnau de Guers is dated to the half of the sixth century BC and the funerary equipment includes both imported objects and weapon (Houlés and Janin 1992; Landes 2003). The types of imports present in the assemblage include a set of objects that, during the sixth century BC, became part of the standard funerary assemblage for a limited group of *élite* burials in Western Languedoc (Dedet 2006; Ugolini and Olive 2006). The assemblage also includes a different imported object that is not as popular, allowing for a discussion of the different meaning that items from different cultural traditions could have in the same contexts.

My third case study discusses the North-Eastern Wall Necropoli at Emporion (Chapter 6). This is a cemetery composed of 17 cremations and at least 2 inhumations. It is located to the west of the Phocian colony of Emporion, founded in north-eastern Catalonia during the second quarter of the sixth century BC. The North-Eastern Wall necropolis has been traditionally interpreted as pertaining to indigenous people. The cemetery commenced with the foundation of the colony, but saw its main usage in the last half of the sixth century (Almagro 1955; Barberà 1990; Aquilué et al 2012). The material culture displayed in several of the burials, comparing them with both the contemporary indigenous cemeteries of Catalonia and what is known of the burials surrounding the colony and attributed to the colonists is presented in Chapter 6. I analyse the ways in which the dynamics of cross cultural encounter taking place in the territory of Emporion led to the development of relationships that are materialized in the different assemblages. All three of these case studies present very distinctive characteristics that allow me to focus on different themes relevant to the main subject of this thesis, as well as providing more information with which the selection and use of the imports can be contextualized. Crucially, these case studies have been selected because they lend themselves particularly well to the type of detailed contextual analysis I had planned that includes a focus on the materiality of imported objects and the specificities of their archaeological contexts. Most importantly, each of the case studies has strong publication, with good levels of detail about both the materials and the structures and graves in which these were discovered. This information has also been supplemented by personal

inspection of the finds materials. Moreover, in the case of the assemblages from funerary contexts, these are generally believed to be complete and coherent<sup>4</sup>.

Despite being often referenced in the literature, my case studies have seen limited post-publication discussion and specific, detailed analysis of the assemblages of materials included in them and of the social dynamics that these assemblages materialize. The social dynamics embodied in the formation of these selected-assemblages of materials and the association between the materials and their context of discovery offer good scope for comparison, as discussed in Chapter 7. Overall, I compare the social processes by which these three assemblages were formed, including the entanglement of imported objects, not to compare these three different assemblages and their artefacts directly with each other (although there are connections at a very broad regional level). The case studies selected are two different funerary contexts and a domestic one. This mix is at least in part a reflection of the archaeological documentation available: for example, not many burials datable to the seventh and sixth centuries BC from eastern Languedoc are known, and imports do not appear to represent a significant element of the funerary material culture of the region (Dietler 2005: 103-123). Similarly, very few settlement contexts from southern France of this specific period have been both investigated documenting entire domestic structures and/or published extensively (Py 2012: 309-311). Choosing a case study of a different nature would have been difficult because of the rarity of seventh and sixth century BC sites in which entire structures had been excavated and of sites published with sufficient detail for a precise contextual analysis in general (see Sanmartí and Santacana 2005 and Py 2012). Whilst two of the contexts selected are funerary ones, they have specific characteristics that allow me to address very different issues that will be outlined in section 3.4.

### **3.3 Case Studies in Context and in Comparison**

My analysis of the case studies operates at different levels. Before addressing the specific contexts, I discuss the material culture of the regions surrounding the sites I have selected, with a particular focus on the types of imports attested in them and on the contexts in which said imports are found, as well as on the information known about the type of cross cultural encounters and exchange taking place in each region during the Early Iron Age. For two of the case studies (La Liquière and Emporion), I also address more specifically the known data

---

<sup>4</sup> There are some exceptions among the burials of the cemetery of the North Eastern Wall. In this case, I specify in the chapter in which I discuss the cemetery the possible problems with the completeness and coherence of the assemblages.

about the settlement of La Liquière and of Emporion and the cemeteries surrounding it other than the one of the North Eastern Wall. I then discuss the three contexts selected as case studies, focusing on both the specific characteristics of the contexts themselves and on the objects and combinations of objects included in them. In doing so, I draw from the theoretical tools presented in the previous chapter. I focus on consumption and deposition patterns to assess how common or uncommon the imported objects or classes of objects are in each of the territories the case studies are part of. I also discuss how the materiality of the different objects and classes of objects, their specific characteristics, affordances and life histories (or perceived life histories) contributed to their entanglement in specific practices and in their association with ideas about identity and status. Then, I compare the results of this discussion at a wider level with the specific contexts selected as case studies, examining whether what happens at regional level is reflected in each of these three assemblages and ensembles of assemblages or whether they represent exceptions, and why this might be. This is done taking into account the specific characteristics of each of the case studies, and focusing on issues relating to each of them in particular that are discussed in section 3.4. However, I also examine the individual objects present in the various contexts, including both the imports and the other objects, and the ways in which they relate to one another and create situations of fittingness and entanglement. The patterns derived from linguistics and outlined in the previous chapter are useful in describing the different ways in which identities can be performed through material culture and, in particular, the association of objects from different cultural traditions, and how this process is affected by different dynamics of cross cultural interaction.

These different levels of analysis converge in a discussion of the processes through which the objects became embedded in different cultures from the ones in which they had been produced. It was important for this thesis to select case studies that had been published with a good quantity of information about both contexts and the materials, and the way in which they related to each other. This very detailed look at the assemblages allow me to understand in depth the process of incorporation of different elements in different regional material cultures.

At the end of the thesis, I draw comparisons across the social processes, exploring the assemblages of social interactions through which different objects and classes of objects became embedded in the material culture of the regions in which they were imported. While the specific meanings that the same objects acquire in different areas might be different, the

processes through which they become entangled in different cultures are, in fact, similar and comparable, as discussed in Chapter 7.

### **3.4 Issues specific to individual contexts and classes of objects**

La Liquière is, of course, markedly different from the other two case studies because it is a domestic context rather than a funerary one. Therefore, my approach to the assemblages from the three contexts I examined involved reading them as the materialisation of a series of activities, rituals and choices rather than as a deliberate representation of identity. Contextualizing the material meant, in this case, also discussing the domestic structures of the site, and, in particular, the different phases of the one I focused on, and the ways in which the known elements of the structures and the objects composing the assemblages could have been involved in the same practices and rituals.

Some of the imports present in this hut are among the most widely distributed in the North Western Mediterranean: amphorae and drinking cups. However, this case study also allows me to talk about a less discussed class of imports (Etruscan bronze disks) in one of the contexts where the earliest and most numerous examples have been found (as it will be discussed in the chapter about La Liquière, more examples have been found only at the site of Mas de Causses, in what is widely seen as a ritual space) (Buret 2003, Feugère and Newman 2010, Anwar and Curé 2011).

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, isolated graves like the one of Castelnau de Guers are attested in various North Western Mediterranean sites during the seventh and sixth centuries BC. This class of graves has been the subject of several discussions, but their interpretation is still debated (see Mauné 1998a, b, Graells 2010:137-179, 2015, Mazière 2012, with bibliography). Therefore, I will discuss isolated graves comparing the one selected as a case study to the others in term of the assemblage that characterizes it, but also of what is known of the structure, of the position in the territory, of the ritual and of the age and gender of the people buried in them. The discussion of isolated burials overlaps, in fact, with that of two other classes of burials the Castelnau de Guers grave belongs to: burials with weapons and burials of subadults. This grave is considered an oddity because it represents an overlap of both of these categories; therefore I discuss both of them in terms of the documented archaeological record for Mediterranean France in the Early Iron Age, but also in terms of the assumptions that are generally associated to both in the literature.

Something that both this case study and the necropolis of the North Eastern Wall have in common is, of course, the fact that the assemblages reflect a series of conscious choices aimed at the realization of specific statements on the identity of the deceased and, possibly, of the people associated to them. In both case studies, the assemblages will also be examined in combination with the funerary ritual and, in the case of the necropolis, of possible variations in the funerary ritual and in the deposition of the remains.

However, in order to contextualize the assemblages from the North Eastern Wall necropolis of Emporion, I also discuss what is known both from literary sources and the archaeological record of the dynamics of interaction among the colony of Emporion, in the earliest phase of this installation, and the neighbouring Iberian communities, and compared the material culture of the necropolis both with other indigenous cemeteries and with the ones identified as Greek. While the materiality of cross cultural interaction and exchange is the focus of the thesis in general, this case study allowed for a discussion of the evolution of tastes, practices and identities in situations of particularly close and frequent connection among people from different cultural backgrounds.

### **3.5 Conclusion**

In summary, my analysis will be carried out on multiple levels. I will discuss individual assemblages after having delineated a general background of the material culture of the region they belong to and, in particular, on the distribution of Mediterranean imports in them and on the types of contexts in which they are found. I will then proceed to discuss the assemblages selected as case studies, taking into account both the specific characteristics of the contexts and those of the objects and assemblages of objects included in them, not exclusively the imports. This will be done to better gauge the internal logic, associations and coherence of the different assemblages, which in turn will offer insight in the role of the different imported objects in them, contributing to a more nuanced understanding of the logic leading to their selection, exchange and use.

## 4. The hut L7 from La Liquière

### 4.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on hut L7 from the village of La Liquière (Calvisson, Gard). This is one of the few Early Iron Age sites in Mediterranean France where multiple domestic structures, documenting a period of occupation that ranges between 610 and 550 BCE, have been excavated and published. La Liquière also represents one of the earliest sites in France where Mediterranean imports are attested, aside from occasional discoveries. As such, it has often been part of the discussion of regional patterns of consumption of imports (Py 1990, Dietler 2005, 2011, Dedet and Py 2006) and discussions on whether the early chronology of the site and the fact that the earliest imports attested in it are Etruscan can prove that Etruscan traders reached Southern France before the Phocaeans (Bats 2006 and Dedet and Py 2006, with previous bibliography).

In this chapter, I provide an overview of the archaeology of Eastern Languedoc, and of the cross cultural encounter taking place in the area. I then discuss the history of the site, of the domestic structures present in it and of the debate that still exists on the nature of its occupation. Then, I present the material encountered in the excavation of one of the domestic structures in the three phases of occupation documented in the site. In doing so, I focus on the different assemblages of which the imported objects are part and the various objects that composed them, as well as what has been identified and reconstructed of the structures they were part of. By focusing on the materiality of the assemblages in the huts, placed in the larger context of the site, I attempt to reconstruct the progressive integration of Mediterranean materials in the practices and the material culture in the site, and also to distinguish some specific instances in which some of the imports were used.

### 4.2. The village of La Liquière in its regional context

#### 4.2.1 *Eastern Languedoc in the Early Iron Age*

The valley of the Vaunage, where La Liquière is, occupies the area between the province of Nîmes, to the East, and the valley of the river Vidourle, to the West (Py 2015:7).

The site is placed between the coast of Eastern Languedoc, characterized by a series of lagoons that made the navigation easier, and the interior region of the Garrigues. The period between the Late Bronze and the Early Iron Age in Eastern Languedoc is characterized by a material culture called ‘Suspendien’ from the site of the Grotte Suspendue (Py 2012:30). Along with the Grotte Suspendue, La Liquière represents one of the most important sites

in which the evolution of the repertoire of handmade pottery attributed to it has been documented (Py 1984d:234-237). The two sites are remarkably similar in both the types of vases and the proportion among closed and open shapes, albeit with some differences in the specific types of vases attested (Py 1984d:237-239).

The decades between the late seventh and the early sixth century BCE, documented on the settlement, are attested in the region by a limited quantity of sites, including a series of small villages on the coast, in the area of the Maguio Lake (Dedet and Py 1985, Py 1990:45-74, 2012:30-31). The typology of handmade vases attested here includes shapes that are all present in the repertoire of La Liquière (Py 1984d:234-242).

Especially in the hinterland of the region, during the seventh and sixth century BCE is attested the occupation, probably temporary, in caves, in use since the Prehistory (Py 2012:65). This period, however, also sees a rapid development of small settlements in the open (Py 2012:65-67). The prevailing structures are huts in perishable material, with walls in wattle and daub supported by wood posts. The pavement was created digging a shallow pit in the soil where possible, otherwise taking advantage of a lower surface in the rock or cutting away part of it (Py 2012:70-71). The houses appear to be similar to one another for dimensions, structural characteristics and assemblages contained in them in most known sites (Py 2012:91-92).

During the last quarter of the sixth century BCE, several new settlements were founded, and there was a new occupation of sites that had been frequented before (Py 2012:142). At the end of the sixth century and in the early fifth century BCE are attested houses with walls in bricks over a foundation of stone. The same periods also sees the spread of defensive walls around the villages (Py 2012:116-123 and 142, Garcia 2014:67-78 and 86-89).

From the second half of the eighth century and the first of the following one, cremation is attested in Eastern Languedoc along with the ritual that was already in use, inhumation (Dedet 2012b:211). By the sixth century BCE, it becomes the most common form of burial in this region (Dedet 2012b:211). In Eastern Languedoc during the seventh century BCE, the two rituals coexisted, (Dedet 2012b:211-213). There is a noticeable difference in the information available for the interior region of the Garrigues, where several burial groups are documented, and the coastal plains of Eastern Languedoc, where very few graves are known (Dedet 2012b:213, Py 2012:173-175). In the Garrigues, burials are collected under burial mounds or *tumuli* built in rocks (Dedet 2012b:213-215). The existence of visible

external structures like the *tumuli* is one of the reasons why several burials from the interior had been excavated in the nineteenth century and are scarcely documented, or had been found already looted (Dedet 2012b:215). Most funerary assemblages are not marked by a very big difference in the type or quantity of materials included in them (Dedet 2012b, Py 2012:141-143).

#### **4.2.2 The distribution of imports in Eastern Languedoc in the Early Iron Age**

The first Mediterranean imports in Eastern Languedoc are attested in the later years of the seventh century BCE (Dedet and Py 2006, Py 2012:138-140). The type, chronology and proportion of imports that, as it will be discussed, are present at La Liquière are mirrored in the sites in the proximity of the coastal Maguio Lake (Dedet and Py 1985:70, 2016, Gras 2000:222-224). These sites have been investigated through sondages, and the most important ones that have layers corresponding to the chronology of La Liquière are Tonnerre I (documented between the last quarter of the seventh century BCE and the third quarter of the sixth century BCE) and La Rallongue (first half of the sixth century BCE) (Dedet and Py 1985:69-79). The quantity of imports in these sites, like in La Liquière, is not very high, always remaining between 10% and 20% of the total pottery between 625 and 550 BCE (Dedet and Py 1985:70).

At the end of the seventh century BCE, in the coastal area are documented only Etruscan amphorae and *bucchero*, but Etruscan material decreases going towards the period between 550 and 525 BCE, when it represents between 20% and 30% of the imports (Dedet and Py 1985:71). In general, between the last quarter of the seventh and the first three quarters of the sixth centuries, the only *bucchero* vases present in Eastern Languedoc are *kantharoi* type B-NERO Ct3e, with *oinochoai* found at La Liquière, la Rallongue and Lattes as the only exceptions (Dedet and Py 2006:121). It has been noted that at all the sites where *bucchero* has been found dated to the first half of the sixth century BCE Etruscan amphorae are attested, but not all the sites where the amphorae are attested also contained *bucchero* (Dielter 2005:51).

Between the beginning and the third quarter of the sixth century BCE, 'Ionian' cups are attested at la Rallongue, Tonnerre I, Camp Redon and Forton. Other imports attested in this site include small quantities of Corinthian and Rhodian pottery along with 'Ionian' amphorae (probably produced in Southern Italy, see Sourisseau 2011) and, possibly, two fragments of amphorae from Chios (Dedet and Py 1985:73-74).



From the second quarter of the sixth century BCE in the lacunar sites are also attested the most popular colonial pottery classes: vases in Grey Monochrome pottery (especially carinated cups, but also some *plats an marli* and an *oinochoe*) and Pseudo Ionian pottery or Massalian Cream Ware (various *oinochoi* and *olpai* belonging to over 8 vases and over 22 cups imitating the 'Ionian' B2 one) (Dedet and Py 1985:74).

It should be noted that, in most of the sites from the coast and the immediate hinterland, Grey Monochrome pottery becomes the most common among the finewares from the half of the century, in which it appears in pretty much all documented sites, without ever overtaking local handmade pottery as the most abundant class of vases (Dietler 2005:96-101). Of the different Groups, identified by Arcelin Pradelle (1984), the one that is attested at most settlements of the hinterland, including La Liquière, is group 3, produced in a series of indigenous workshops of the Rhône valley (Arcelin Pradelle et al 1982, Dietler 2005:100-101). On the other hand, sites on the coast included vases from a variety of workshops, including Group 2 aspect 1, that was probably produced in Massalia (Dietler 2005:100-101). La Liquière is a rare example of a site in the hinterland where this group is well documented (Arcelin Pradelle et al 1982).

Less popular, but still widely distributed from the second quarter of the sixth century BCE is Psuedo-Ionian pottery, another type of 'colonial' pottery that was produced in both Massalian and indigenous workshops. The most popular shapes in this production were cups, imitated after the 'Ionian' ones, despite the fact that in the area surrounding Massalia this type of pottery is available in a variety of shapes for banqueting activities (Dietler 2005:80-89).

For the amphorae, Etruscan ones are, both the earliest attested and the ones that remain present in larger quantities than the other types, even if their quantity decreases from the 600 BCE onwards (Dedet and Py 1985:72). They belong to all the classified types, but primarily to the type A-ETR3 of the Dicocer, probably produced in Caere (Dedet and Py:73). Massalian amphorae are present in relatively small quantities in the area throughout the second and third quarter of the sixth century (Dedet and Py 1985:74). From the half of the sixth century BCE are also attested very few fragments of Punic amphora and of painted Iberian vases (Dedet and Py 1985:73).

As noted above, imports present in the sites around the coastal lakes are very similar to what can be observed at La Liquière. This is one of the arguments that have led Dedet and Py

(1985:76-77) to imagine a semi-permanent occupation of all these sites, with alternating occupation of the coast and of the interior. The other hypothesis suggested to explain the presence of similar classes and proportions of pottery (for example by Gras 2004:221-223) is the existence of intra-regional trade along the course of the river Vidourle. La Liquière is located between the course of this river and the source of the Rhony, a position that would have facilitated connections with the coast (Gras 2004:221). At the moment, the only site known downstream, and where considerable imports have been found is Le Cailar, dated between late sixth and fifth centuries BCE (Gras 2004:221). This leaves open the question of whether traders would have made their way towards the inland or if there was, from the last quarter of the seventh century BCE, some intermediary site that has yet to be discovered. On the other hand, as it will be discussed later, at La Jouffe, a site placed even more towards the interior than La Liquière, sondages have attested the presence of imports from the second quarter of the sixth century BCE (Dedet 1995:284-285). Therefore, it seems possible that the valley of the Vidourle had functioned as an avenue of connection.

On the same plateau as La Liquière is the site of Font de Coucou. The only parts of its Early Iron Age phase of occupation that have been excavated are the two levels of use of a house and a nearby deposit (Py and Tendille 1975). The earlier phase of the house has been dated by the excavators to a period slightly more recent than the last occupation of La Liquière. The more numerous amphora fragments from this layer are Massalian ones (Py and Tendille 1975:37), while Etruscan amphorae only appear in the oldest layers of use of the house, and include the types attested in the most recent layers from La Liquière (Py and Tendille 1975:39). Finewares consist of a fragment of Attic pottery and various vases in Grey Monochrome pottery, especially cups (Py and Tendille 1975:39-45). These represent the most ancient imports attested at Font de Coucou with one exception: a fragment of 'Ionian' cup type A1 of Vallet and Villard, dated around 630-600 BCE but found in the layers corresponding to the most recent occupation of the house. The excavators (Py and Tendille 1975:43) deemed it either residual from the previous occupation or a cup that, because of its rarity, had been kept for a period of 50-100 years.

Other sites near Font de Coucou and La Liquière are only known from surface survey. Because of the presence of Etruscan, Greek, Italic and early Massalian amphora fragments it has been possible to date them at least to the sixth century BCE (Py 2015:62-63).

On the Eastern side of the area between the Garrigues and the coast, the most important site that overlaps chronologically with La Liquière is Le Marduel, placed on the Western

shore of the river Rhône. This site has known different phases of occupation and an Early Iron Age one (dated between the late seventh and the half of the sixth century BCE) has been detected, albeit in a limited part of the settlement, corresponding to a possible section of the walls and two successive phases of occupation of a hut (Py et al 1994:213-218, Dedet and Py 2008:86-87). The structure of the hut and the material in it show similarities with the structures and imports from La Liquière: it includes a fragment of bronze disk with beaded rim, of probable Etruscan production, a *bucchero kantharos*, a 'Ionian' A2 cup, two fragments of Pseudo Ionian pottery and various vases in Grey Monochrome pottery: a including a cup shape GR-MONO 5c and a vase shape GR-MONO 7, also present at La Liquière. The only fragments of amphora attested are Etruscan (Py et al 1994:214-216). The hut was partly obliterated by a building belonging to a new phase of occupation of the site dated to the end of the sixth century BCE (Py et al 1994:217 -236, Dedet and Py 2008:87).

On the other hand, on the Western extremity of the area between the coast and the Garrigues, the site of Gardies, investigated through test pits, seems to have been occupied from the last third of the sixth century BCE (Raynaud and Roux 1983:34). The material datable to this period includes fragments of 'Ionian' amphorae and of a 'Ionian' B1 cup, some fragments of *bucchero*, and numerous fragments of Etruscan amphora (Raynaud and Roux 1984:34-39).

In the Garrigues, imported material is attested in several sites, mostly on the Southern part, either North of La Liquière, Font de Coucou and the Maguio lake or along the course of the Rhône river, the places where the connections with the coast would have been easier (Dedet 1995:297-299). Imported material only became diffused throughout the whole region during the fifth century BCE (Dedet 1995:297).

Several findings are from surface survey or were present in Museum collections. La Jouffe, explored with a series of sondages, is the only site where a long occupation in the sixth century BCE is documented. It was, in fact, occupied from the second quarter of the sixth century to the early fourth century BCE (Dedet 1995:284). Another important site in the Garrigues is the aforementioned Grotte Suspendue at Collias (Dedet 1995:288), a cave was occupied during prehistoric times, but around 600 BCE some vases were deposited in a pit excavated in it. Other isolated fragments are attested at the end of the sixth century BCE and during the fifth (Dedet 1995:288).

The typology of imports found in the Garrigues is easily comparable with the ones from La Liquière, but the quantities and proportions differ (Dedet 1995). The earliest finewares attested in the area are nine *bucchero kantharoi* documented among four sites, and all datable between the late seventh and the first half of the sixth century BCE (Dedet 1995:293). Other finewares are present in proportionally lower quantities: a 'Ionian' cup, two rhodian *skyphoi* and two Attic cups in four different sites (Dedet 1995:295-296). All the Grey Monochrome pottery is dated to the sixth century BCE, as is the Pseudo Ionian one (Dedet 1995:296 and 297). As for the amphorae, are attested Etruscan, Massalian and 'Ionian' ones (Dedet 1995:297).

At La Jouffe, the only site documented consistently enough to make comparisons, the proportions of amphorae and finewares are different from what happens on the coast and in the intermediate area (Dedet 1995:299-301). Amphorae (prevalently Massalian, and therefore more recent than the earlier ones from La Liquière or the Maguio lake area) compose a lower percentage of the total of documented in the sixth century fragments than the finewares (respectively 2,58% and 3,58%). This information might not be representative of all of the Garrigues, but scarcity of amphora sherds in surface surveys seems to confirm it (Dedet 1995:301). It is possible that wine was carried towards the interior in different containers, but Dedet is sceptical about this because the route between a site like La Liquière and the interior does not seem to present difficulties in carrying pottery containers, as shown by the much wider distribution of amphorae in the Garrigues during the fifth century BCE (Dedet 1995:301).

Etruscan bronze basins are attested in the Garrigues at Roquemaure and Serre de Fontaines. This second item is the only one present in a funerary context in Eastern Languedoc (Dedet 1995:287, Dedet and Py 2006:122).

On the coast, eight other bronze basins, of which only two have been preserved, were found in the site of Soriech, without context of discovery (Pernet 2010). They might have represented a votive deposit, or have been part of a particularly rich burial that has not been preserved (however, the basins do not show signs of having been intentionally damaged or placed on a funeral pyre) (Pernet 2010). Bronze basins are also attested at Le Marduel and Sextantio, this time in a settlement context (Dedet and Py 2016:122).

The last quarter of the sixth century BCE and the beginning of the fifth, after the end of the last phase of occupation documented at La Liquière, represents a period in which a change

in both settlement patterns and distribution of imports is noticeable (Dedet and Py 2006:123). These years see a considerable increase in the imports attested on the coast as well as in the Southern part of the Garrigues. Especially amphorae arrive to be the 27% of the attested material (Py 2012:141).

On the other hand, the nature of the imports changes, in particular because of the appearance and diffusion of Massalian amphorae, that represent the majority of the imported vase in most of the sites documented for this period, and reached more numerous sites that imported containers had before (Dedet and :Py 2006:136-137). The wider distribution of imported pottery was probably related to the existence of various settlements devoted to trade in this phase. The village of La Cougourlude, on the coast, is currently considered by the archaeologists a trading post (Daveau and Py 2015:37, Gailledrat 2015:32). The imports present at La Cougourlude are very varied, suggesting the idea of a site engaging in exchanges involving people from various areas of the Mediterranean (Daveau and Py 2015, Gailledrat 2015:32).

From the last quarter of the sixth century can be dated Lattes, very close to La Cougourlude (Py 2009, Gailledrat 2015:39-47). It is currently believed that Lattes hosted Etruscan merchants. What has been discussed is whether the settlement was created by these merchants or whether it was a multicultural environment that could have also hosted people of different foreign origins (as suggested by Daveau and Py 2015:38, who also point out that only in the 0.5% of the settlement the earliest layers have been excavated).

Near La Cougourlude, in the site of Mas de Causses, a possible sanctuary has been identified (Davueau and Py 2015, Gailledrat 2015:32-34). A big hoard of objects in metal has been identified under an enclosure dated to the late fifth or fourth century BCE (Feugère and Newman 2010, Anwar and Curé 2011:196, Gailledrat 2015:34). The hoard will be discussed later in the chapter, but the most numerous objects in it were bronze disks with beaded rims.

In the Garrigues, imports are attested in very few burials, but it is difficult to determine how representative this information is. In the Southern part of the area the chronology of most documented graves is not precisely known (Dedet 1995:302-303). Imports (an Etruscan bronze basin dated between the end of the seventh and early sixth century BCE, a cup of Grey Monochrome pottery and a Western Greek cup dated to the second quarter of the sixth century BCE, possibly an imported cuirass) are in graves characterized by larger assemblages than the others (Dedet 1995:280-284, 287, 303). They are also accompanied by

weapons and placed under particularly large *tumuli* (Dedet 1995:303). This has led Dedet (1995:303) to wonder if the rarity of graves that can be dated to the end of the seventh and the sixth century BCE is related to the fact that, in this period, burial under *tumulus* was generally allowed only to few individuals of especially high rank (Dedet 1995:303).

On the other hand, in the Northern part of the Garrigues only 18 burials are known and 13 are dated to the sixth century BCE. Imported objects (consisting of Grey Monochrome vases of types attested in the last three quarters of the sixth century BCE), are attested in three (Dedet 1995:291-292 and 302-303). The assemblages the vases are part of are not different from the others, aside from the presence of the wheel thrown pottery. According to Dedet, during the sixth century BCE, in the North burial under *tumulus* was in use for longer and regarded as less exceptional than in the South. The imports included in the are all more recent than the ones documented in the South, probably belonging to a period in which finewares would have been considered less unusual (1995:303-304).

On the same plateau where La Liquière and La Fount de Coucou are, in the location of Bergerie Hermet, have been excavated some very damaged cremation graves.

One of the burials, dated to the second half of the sixth century BCE, included an Etruscan amphora of the type A-ETR 3 or A-ETR 4. Other two, dated to the later sixth or early fifth, included respectively an Attic C cup along with an unusual vase or cauldron support in Grey Monochrome pottery and fragments of a Massalian amphora (Dedet and Py 1973, Py 2015:57-58). Surface survey in the area has suggested the possibility that the small necropolis included other graves: among the materials encountered are the lip of an Attic cup C, of a bronze brooch, of a Grey Monochrome vase and of a cup in Psuedo Ionian pottery (Py 2015:58).

Another burial from Eastern Languedoc that is dated to the second half of the sixth century BCE and is noticeable for the imports it includes is the isolated grave of La Céreirède, about 2 kms North of Lattes (Chardenon and Bel 2010). This tomb will be discussed in Chapter 5. For the purpose of this chapter, however, it will be noted that the funerary equipment included an iron dagger, a bronze *patera* and a strigil. An Etruscan amphora of the type A-ETR3A was used as an ossuary. This is uncommon in Eastern Languedoc. Besides, the strigil is the only one found in pre-Roman France outside of a Greek context. Because of the unusual characteristics of the burial and its proximity to Lattes, various archaeologists (Py

et al 2006:599, Py 2009:49-50, Gailledrat 2015:34-36) think it might represent the grave of an Etruscan individual.

Summing up, La Liquière represents one of the earliest sites that were involved in cross cultural exchange and interaction in Eastern Languedoc. The site was probably part of a network of regional connection that involved a navigation of cabotage with the coastal sites as a destination, from which imported goods were redistributed through the valley of the Vidourle. The object of this trade was primarily wine, accompanied by vases, primarily drinking cups, which were initially acquired in small quantity, but led to an enrichment of the pottery repertoire. What is interesting is that, at least up to La Liquière and Le Marduel, these connections were very effective, as the types of imports are very similar to the ones encountered on the coast.

As discussed in Chapter 2, one of the most important studies about imports in Eastern Languedoc (and Provence) during the Early Iron Age has been done by Dietler (2005), who compared the pattern of distribution of Mediterranean imports in these two adjacent regions and in the Hallstatt zone. He noted that in Eastern Languedoc and Provence imports tend to be spread over numerous sites of different size and to consist primarily of amphorae and, in smaller quantity, of pottery related to wine consumption (Dietler 2005:155-182). Therefore, he argued against the idea that the acquisition of wine represented the proof of the ‘Hellenization’ of the Iron Age populations of the lower Rhône basin, because the wine seemed to have been incorporated in local banqueting rituals without any attempts, from the people who consumed it, to emulate Greek sympotic rituals. Moreover, he argued against Mediterranean wine and wine drinking vases being ‘prestige goods’ in Eastern Languedoc and Provence. Rather, he observed that the lack of visible patterned differentiation in both settlements and burials would characterize the society of these regions as having an ‘egalitarian ethos’. In this context, wine would have become an important political significance because it afforded people the possibility to redistribute it and to offer feasts in order to assess one’s social status (Dietler 2005:173-181).

#### **4.3 The site**

Only a small portion of the village, corresponding to circa 11 houses, has been excavated and the overall structure of the site, which occupied a space of two hectares circa, is still unknown (Py 2003a:107). The village was located on the North-East side of a limestone plateau slightly inclined towards the West overlooking the valley of Vaunage, in the

proximity of a water source and at the southern margin of the internal region of the Garrigues.

The excavations have focused on several huts placed on the border of the plateau and others that have been identified on it, by test pits or survey (Py 1984a:9). None of these activities has led to the identification of fortifications (Py 1984a:11).

The site has been known since the early twentieth century, when it was identified as an '*oppidum anihistorique*' because of the remaining visible structures (a summary with bibliography of the earlier studies in Py et al 1984b:13). The first excavations were carried out by B.Chertier and O. Rappaz in 1950, mostly on the border of the plateau, on the South East of the settlement. The records of the excavations remain unpublished (Py 1984a:13). The most important findings are, however, discussed in Py 1984b.

One of the most interesting characteristics of the settlement is that it was most likely occupied between 610 and 500 BCE and rarely inhabited afterwards (there are traces of occupation that can be attributed to the first century BCE and, then, to the fourth AD) (Py 1990:290), though it is possible that traces of the later stages of life of the settlement have been destroyed by the intense agricultural works in the area (Py 1984c:210-211).

The life of the site has been divided by the excavators in a series of consecutive phases. The first three correspond to three phases of occupations and abandonment. The the last one is a 'theoretical' phase (Py 1984c:206-209, Py 2015:31), corresponding either to a later frequentation of some areas of the site, or to a later occupation destroyed by agricultural work, and identified only in some areas of the excavation (Py 2015:31).

| Phases           | Chronology  |
|------------------|-------------|
| I <i>ancien</i>  | 610-590 BCE |
| I <i>recent</i>  | 590-570 BCE |
| II <i>ancien</i> | 570-540 BCE |
| II <i>recent</i> | 540-500 BCE |

Table 2 Phases of occupation of La Liquière, from Py 2015:31

#### 4.3.1 Structures present on the site

In this paragraph, I discuss what is known of the domestic structures of La Liquière and of the activities that took place in them. Some of the general characteristics here described are



shared by the ones used as case studies, but their specific features will be discussed in detail later in the chapter.

The part of the settlement explored corresponds to a series of buildings in wattle and daub. The nature of the plateau on which they have been built has made it possible to identify them, as the foundations were carved into the limestone and, in the case of some huts their traces were still visible in the stratigraphy. The huts are all separated by open spaces (Py et al 1984b:296). The surface of the natural rock was levelled either removing several stone layers in the direction in which they developed or cutting off the irregularities of the rock. The first method meant that the location, orientation and often irregular shape of these first huts were influenced by the direction in which the limestone layers were deposited (Py 1984f:301).

As the settlement developed, the inhabitants tended to build new huts over the foundation of the previous ones. In various areas of the site two or three huts have been excavated corresponding to different phases. At least in the explored area, it is likely that the general organization of the settlement did not change much throughout its life, and that the areas dedicated to various activities, roads and open spaces might have remained the same (Py 1984f:296).

The plans of the five huts attributed to the first phase are irregularly shaped, vaguely identifiable as oval or rectangular, with an area of between 10 and 16 m<sup>2</sup>. The phase I *récent* is represented only by three huts, whose area ranges between 15 and 18 m<sup>2</sup>, and the phase II by three huts whose area is between 18 and 25 m<sup>2</sup> (Py 1984f:300). Occupying an intact part of the limestone plateau was the preferred way to expand the surface, leading to pavements in which the adapted part and the 'new' one are on different levels (huts L1B, L7C and L11C). Exceptions are represented by the pavement of the huts L11B and L3C, obtained by levelling a large portion of the natural rock (Py 1984f:301). While in the earlier phase of the life of the site the floors of the huts are represented by the natural limestone, more or less levelled, in the other two phases the floors are constructed in compressed earth, either brought to the spot or obtained pressing the layers corresponding to the previous hut, and sometimes levelled by arranging small rocks over them (Py 1984f:302).

In several huts fragments of clay mixed with straw have been found that could have belonged to walls in wattle and daub. Two have the marks of branches and of a post impressed on them respectively, which has led the archaeologists to suppose that the walls

of the huts were made of this material, supported by wood posts or a lattice of thin branches. Posts were not the main form of support for the walls, because the presence of postholes in the huts is rare. They seem to be used for very specific functions such as corner pillars or door jambs, or, in one case (the second phase of the hut L10), to support the cover that surrounded a clay hearth, creating a sort of 'chimney' (Py 1984f:304). The layers of destruction covering the remains of some of the huts belonging to the first two phases (the layers of destruction for phase II were too damaged by agricultural works) include abundant stones and particularly rich, easy to model clay that does not seem to be local to the village (Py 1984f:303 note 460). Such materials were probably part of walls in clay (supported by branches), or used to plaster walls in wattle and daub (Py1984f:304). Natural cracks in the rock were used to place the support of the wall, which was held in place with rocks, either placed vertically in the crack (an example of this is the earlier hut of the zone L7), or horizontally in a nearby irregularity of the limestone (Py 1984f:304 and 306). Partition walls were either supported by accumulations of rocks held together by soil or by small rock and soil walls (Py 1984f:305 and 306). The roofs of the huts were probably made of thatch or reed, but no evidence of this material has actually been found in the excavations (Py 1984f:309, 1990:628-633).

The internal organization of the huts is very hard to reconstruct because the settlement developed by building new huts on the places where the previous ones stood. One element that has been identified in several structures is the presence of hearths. Several of them had been destroyed and have been only discovered because of the traces of charcoal and burnt soil left by their presence. Among the ones preserved, the most numerous are 'lenticular' hearths (burnt patches of a roughly oval shape), whose presence is attested by concentrations of charcoal on a reddened area (Py 1990:635). These hearths are generally placed at the bottom of the hut, in one of the corners, and at a distance from the walls: it is supposed that they were near the door, to have an outlet for the smoke (Py1984f:310). On the other hand, in the two huts in which 'built' hearths have been found (L7B and L10 B, both belonging to the phase I *récent*), the fireplaces were placed in the center of the structure, so they were likely associated with an opening in the roof, either supported by a structure held in place by four posts, as in L10B, or created between two rafters, as Py (1984f:310) supposes was the case for L7B. The hearths consisted of a clay platform that with time was hardened by the action of the fire, built over a basis of pottery sherds. This kind of platform hearth is attested in Languedoc since late Bronze Age (Py 1990:635) but became more common during the fifth and fourth centuries BCE. It is possible that the sherds the hearths were built on came from

vases that had been used and destroyed as part of foundation rituals for the house (Py 1990:784-785, Belarte and de Chazelles 2011:183).

#### 4.3.2 *Productive activities*

Domestic activities taking place in the area surrounding the hearth can be deduced from the presence of fragments of pierced bottom and bell-shaped calotte of dome ovens in adobe, and ‘crowns’, donut-shaped elements in the same material. (Py 1984f:310)

Ovens with pierced bottoms and adobe ‘crowns’ have been found during excavations in several sites of the Nîmes province, as well as of Languedoc in general and Provence dated between late Bronze Age and the fourth century BCE (Py 1990:466). It has been debated whether or not these ovens could have been used for firing pottery, considering that from the fragments excavated it seems clear that they were not big enough for the firing of the bigger vases (Py 1990:468). Experimental studies (Andrieux 1976 and Garidel 2011) have demonstrated that inside these ovens it was possible to achieve temperatures sufficient for the firing of pottery, so there is a possibility that they were utilized in the production of the smaller vessels, while the bigger ones were fired in bigger ovens (Py 1984g:217-219 and Py 1990:467-468), like the ones excavated in Bezouze (Py 1979) and Saint-Jean-de-Caps (Boisson 2002), that were arranged in pits where the vases were fired either in direct contact with the ground or over slabs. In these large ovens, the vases were fired in the near the fuel, in a closed environment in which the smoke accumulated, which explains why the local hand modeled pottery is often not of an homogeneous color and quite often part of the surface appears black in parts(‘*coups de feu*’ as Py 1984g:217 calls this characteristic). Neither the oven of Bezouze nor the one of Saint-Jean-de-Caps were located in villages, so it is not surprising that a similar structure has not been encountered during the excavations at La Liquière. Py (1984g:319-320) deems it possible that the adobe ovens with pierced bottom, which have been located in the huts L10A and L11B, were utilized at least partially to fire vases, but the other ovens found during the excavation were used only for cooking. From the shape of the fragments found during the excavations and comparisons with items from other Iron Age contexts, he infers that they were dome shaped, with a circular opening on the top to place flatbreads to bake inside.

Because the ‘crowns’ have often been found in the proximity of ovens it has been suggested that they might have been used in the firing of the vases, but it is also possible that were used to keep cooking pots in place during the preparation of meals, or as a support for smoking foodstuffs (Py 1990:468).

Another indication that the manufacture of pottery was one of the activities practiced in the huts is provided by the presence on the site of 'smoothers', green pebbles of green whose surface had been smoothed on the sides so that they could be used to polish the surface of the vases before firing. They have been found in L1 B, L7A, L1 1A and in L9 (Py 1984g:324, n.550).

The presence in several huts of scraps of iron and metallic objects that looked like possible misfires has also led to the suggestion that metallurgy was practiced on the site. However, the wide distribution of these items allows us to think 'plutôt à un "bricolage" qu'à un artisanat' (Tendille 1984:293). The only area in which a concentration of metal scraps and possible misfires has been found is the zone L8, which does not correspond to a hut but an open area, and in which a hearth dissimilar to the ones found in the houses has been excavated (Tendille 1984:293-294).

Another productive activity that could have taken place in the village is, according to Py (1984g:323), the treatment of leather, since numerous metal *appliques* identified as belonging to leather goods have been found in the excavations. In the huts several spindle whorls in terracotta have also been discovered, which seems to indicate that textile activities were taking place in the structures excavated as well.

In terms of food preparation, remains found in the huts include animal bones bearing the signs of cutting and cereals and acorns, often found near the hearths or mixed with the ashes inside (Py 1984f:310). The grains and acorns were probably roasted before being consumed or stored (Py 1984g:320). Fragments of querns big and small have also been found in the huts and in the levels of abandonment (Py 1984g:319). None of them was complete, but it has been possible to identify one kind of quern, composed of a saddle shaped slab as a basis and a mobile crusher. This item is attested since Bronze Age in Languedoc, and it was used to make flour to prepare flatbreads, loafs of bread and soups (Py 1984g:319 and Py1990:435-436).

Among the grains found on the site, barley represents 74% (Erroux 1984, Py 1984g:319), with two different types of wheat forming the rest. These three crops were the most common in Eastern Languedoc and Provence during Iron Age, although they are attested in different proportions at different sites (Dietler 2005:145). Instruments for agriculture are very rare in Iron Age Southern France and, in the case of La Liquière, were probably taken

away during the successive abandonments of the site (Tendille 1984:282- 292, Dietler 2005:145-146).

In the huts have been found abundant bones, mostly from domesticated animals that represent 77.7% of the total in the Phase I *ancient*, 76.2% in the *récent* and 76% in the Phase II (Columeau 1984). In terms of percentage of individuals, the vast majority (always over the 60% of the remains) is represented by sheep and goat, followed by pig. Game is present in much lower percentage. However, calculating the average amount of food that total number of individuals would have provided, the majority of the meat consumed in the three phases is represented by cattle, followed by deer. This is especially true in the first phase, while the following two see a progressive proportional increase in sheep and goat and pig respectively (Columeau 1984)..The presence of cheese strainers in various contexts of the settlement seems to indicate that cheese was another of the foods produced and consumed on the site (Py 1984g:322-323).

The waste resulting from the domestic activities in the hut, in particular the ashes and remains from the cleaning the hearth, were accumulated in specific places of the structure, generally the corners or the back (Py 1984f:311).

The fact that fragments of large pottery containers have been found in all the huts and that they also represent a high percentage of the material proceeding from the best preserved layers (*Sol* 3 of hut L1, *Sol* 2 of hut L7 and *Sol* 2 of hut L10) seems to suggest that an important part of the space available in the huts was used to store supplies (Py 1984f:310-311). Additionally, Py (1984g:320) argues that it was not possible to dig subterranean pits (silos) in the limestone rock on which the village was built, so the big vessels must have represented the main location for storage. This has led him to suggest that the production of cereals was very modest. However, it is also possible to imagine that containers that would have not survived in the archaeological record, such as wooden boxes or cloth sacks, would have been used for storage. Similar containers were used for grain in other sites of Mediterranean Languedoc, both east and West, from the Late Bronze Age (Garcia 1987:46). Their capacity did not exceed 100 liters on average (Garcia 1987:46).

Two sectors of the excavation, L4 and L8, have been interpreted as external areas of activities. Both these areas hosted a hearth and seemed to have been connected to huts L3 and L7 respectively. The hearth of L8 had a peculiar shape, being built on a circle of

potsherds and surrounded by a wall, that might characterize it as a kiln for metalwork (Py 1984f:312).

#### ***4.3.3 The nature of the occupation of the site: issues and debates***

In the stratigraphy of the site, each phase of occupation is followed by a layer of destruction on all the areas investigated, with the same areas of the site being periodically re-occupied. Because of this, Py has suggested that the site could have been used in a discontinuous way (Py 1984c:212-214 and Py 1984g:327-329). He regards the fact that the architecture in perishable material remained in use all through the Iron Age, without being replaced by the construction of buildings with walls in stone and brick, as it happened, for example, in Lattes, as proof of the deliberately impermanent nature of the occupation of the site (Py 1984g:328). At the same time, the fact that the inhabitants practiced agriculture seems difficult to reconcile with the idea of transhumance or nomadism. Therefore, Py mediates defining the type of occupation of the site as 'semi-permanent' (Py 1984g:328-329). Garcia (2009:59), however, maintains that his idea of a 'semi-nomadic' form of occupation of the settlements of Eastern Languedoc, including this one, is problematic when compared with the evidence provided by these same sites for an agro-pastoral economy.

It should be noted that only a part of the area occupied by the village during its life has been excavated (5 huts for the earliest phases, 3 for each of the other two). It is, therefore, impossible to determine whether the site was completely abandoned in the hiatuses between the known phases.

Dietler (2005:132, 2010:270) has argued against this interpretation, which he considers the result of a 'preconceived' association between wattle and daub architecture and impermanence. Like Garcia, Dietler observes that the type of agro-pastoral economy practiced on the site was most compatible with permanent residence in it, or, at least, that the activities practiced on the site did not radically differ from the ones that took place in the settlements characterized by architecture in mudbrick walls with stone bases (Dietler 2005:132, 2010:269-270).

Dietler observes that Iron Age French settlements whose architecture has stone wall foundations, like Saint Pierre Le Martigues, still underwent periodic refurbishment and reorganization, and others, like L'Arquet, were occupied for a shorter period of time than La Liquière. Before the half of the sixth century, houses in mudbrick with a stone foundation were built only in three sites in the lower Rhone valley, all on the coast and in Provence, in

the proximity of Massalia: L'Arquet, Tamaris and Saint Blaise. During the second half of the century and the fifth century, several sites on the coast adopted the mudbrick architecture, but others, even very close to Massalia like Le Baou Roux, kept to the wattle and daub tradition (Garcia 2014:67-94, Dietler 2010:266).

As mentioned above, the similarity in the type of Mediterranean imports as well as indigenous material culture between La Liquière and the contemporary settlements of the coastal region surrounding the Maguio lake has led Py to imagine that the same populations occupied 'semi permanently' both areas, possibly migrating from one to the other (Py 1984g:330-331, Dedet and Py 1985:76-77). Py (1984g:330), having noted that Mediterranean imports in the Gulf of Lion tend to remain on the coasts, believes that the presence of these imports in a site at the outskirts of the Garrigues would be better explained imagining that the population moved there periodically from the coast, where it acquired the imported goods. On the other hand, Dietler (2005:139) believes that the similarity in material culture can be explained with the existence of a network of exchanges between the coast and the hinterland. He observes that there is no decisive evidence for the movement imagined and, in particular, notes the lack, in the site of La Liquière, of shellfish or other material that could constitute evidence of frequent direct exchange of people and objects from the coast (Dietler 2005:139-140). As discussed earlier, the valley of the Vidourle probably represented an avenue of connection between the coast and the Garrigues (Gras 2004:221).

Py interprets the passage from huts in wattle and daub to mudbrick architecture with a 'sedentarization' that would have taken place over the course of the sixth century, after the end of the occupation of La Liquière and due to the need to practice more intensive agriculture in order to be able to participate in exchange with the Mediterranean traders (Py 2012:135, 141-142). However, the change in architecture is not always mirrored by the presence of numerous imports in the sites, as this theory would suggest (Dietler 2010:271). Dietler suggests that the transition to mudbrick architecture might have happened in some sites earlier than others because of the deforestation around some of the settlements, which would have made it harder to procure the wood for the structures (Dietler 2010:271). Besides, over the course of the sixth century, an increasing preference for regular, rectangular buildings (and their organization in rows separated by streets) emerged, and mudbrick architecture might have made it easier to create buildings with regular shape (Dietler 2010:272).

#### 4.3.4 *Imported vases and their distribution*

From the first phase of occupation of the site, imported material is attested in La Liquière: in this period, they consisted exclusively of Etruscan amphorae and *bucchero* (Py 1984d:262). In later stages, various types of Greek pottery (Attic, Corinthian and 'Ionian') and Eastern Greek and 'Ionian' amphorae are occasionally attested (Py 1984d:268-271). In Phase II make their appearance 'colonial' productions such as Pseudo Ionian pottery or Massalian Cream Ware and, especially, Grey Monochrome pottery, that becomes the most common fineware on the site (Py 1984d:272-273). On the other hand, only scarce fragments of Massalian amphorae are attested in La Liquière (Py 1984d:274).

While analyzing the material from the various contexts of the site, Py (1984c:202-204) sampled the distribution of three meaningful classes of materials (imported finewares, imported amphorae and handmade local pottery) in the four areas of the excavation in which all the three phases of life of the site are documented. One of these areas, as stated above, was L7. He also sampled the distribution of the material in the individual layers excavated in these areas. The tests showed that the distribution of the material on the site is fairly consistent in the two periods included in phase I, while phase II differs from the previous two because of the increased variety of the material and presence of more and different types of finewares, and the more significant number of amphorae other than the Etruscan ones. When comparing the distribution of wheel-thrown and handmade pottery in the individual huts, the result was, again, a situation of great homogeneity in the first two phases and a different situation, with more difference in the distribution of the various classes of materials, in the Phase II (Py 1984c:205-206).

Calculating the proportional relationship between wheel-thrown (colonial and imported) pottery and handmade, local wares in the assemblages of the various areas of the site, Py (1984e:260) determined that, while the overall quantity of the imports is low when compared to the local material, it is possible to observe a slow and regular increase in the presence of wheel-thrown vases. Interestingly, the proportional quantity of amphorae do not increase as much as that of finewares, and even decreases in the last phase.



| Phases                 | Wheel thrown vases on the total | Amphorae on total of vases | Finewares on total of vases |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Phase I <i>ancient</i> | 7.4 %                           | 6.4%                       | 0.9 %.                      |
| Phase I <i>recent</i>  | 13.1 %                          | 9.02%                      | 4.1 %,                      |
| Phase II               | 17.2 %                          | 9.5 %                      | 7.6 %                       |

Table 3 Percentage of imports at La Liquiere in the various phases, from Py 1984e:260-262

For what pertains to the shapes of imported pottery, almost all the *bucchero* vases found in context are *kantharoi*, except for one *kylix* and a fragment of *oinochoe*, both from Phase II. The latter is part of one of the contexts that will be discussed more in depth later in this chapter.

The only perfume vases present on the site are two Etrusco Corinthian *aryballoi* from Phase I *recent* (described as Corinthian in Py 1984e:268, Py 2015:42), one of which was found in L7. Together with a cup from Lattes they represent the only examples of this type of pottery in Eastern Languedoc (Frère 2006:261).

To this phase are also dated a few fragments of Corinthian vases, including the handle of an *oinochoe*, which has a comparison at the site of Forton, on the Maguio lake (Py 1984e:268, 2015:42). To Phase I *recent* are also dated a fragment of dish in Rhodian style, the handle of a 'Ionian' *hydria*, and fragments of two cups in grey pottery that have been considered Eastern Greek by the excavators (Py 1984e:269-271, 2015:42).

Six 'Ionian' cups have been found in contexts of Phase I *recent*, and three in layers of the Phase II. 'Ionian' cups are a debated class of material, as imitations are attested in several contexts starting from the seventh century BCE (for example, see van Compernelle 1999 for South Italy and Boldrini 1999 and Bagnasco Gianni 2006, 2007 for Etruria).

To Phase II belong the fragments of Attic pottery attested on the site, belonging to three table amphorae (Py 1984e:269, 2015:42) as well as two Corinthian pouring shapes: an *olpe* and an *oinochoe*.

In Phase II are first attested vases in Grey Monochrome pottery. This class of pottery, by number of fragments, represents 28.6 % of the wheel thrown vases in this phase (Py 1984e:272). The attested items belong to three of the groups identified in Arcelin Pradelle 1984. Several belong to aspect 1 of the group 2. Vases belonging to group 2 are most common in Provence, and aspect 1 was probably produced by a Massalian workshop. This

production can be placed between the second quarter of the sixth century and the end of the fifth century BCE. In Eastern Languedoc, vases belonging to this group and aspect are attested from the beginning and La Liquière in particular is the site where most fragments of this type of pottery have been found (Arcelin Pradelle et al 1982:35 and 54). This is probably due to the higher chronology in comparison with other sites excavated in the region. In particular, this is the site in Eastern Languedoc in which the most cups type GR\_MONO2 of Dicocer (8) and beakers type GR-MONO7 (circa 13) were identified (Arcelin Pradelle et al.1982:34, Py 1984e:272). These shapes are also by far the most popular among the vases of this production, with shape 7 being the most popular Grey Monochrome vase on the site (Py 1984e:272-73). Shape 2 is a simple bowl, and shape 7 a large open vase, possibly inspired to the shapes of local handmade pottery. Among the other shapes attested are cup type 1(1 vase), the *plat a marli* type 4(3 vases) the cup type 5, inspired to 'Ionian' cup B2 (2 vases), the urn type 6(3 vases) and the *oinochoe* type 8 (1 vase) (Py 1984e:272-273).

The second best represented group is group 3. It is a production common in all the lower Rhône valley, where it was likely made in an indigenous environment (Arcelin Pradelle et al 1982:27, Arcelin Pradelle 1984:128-129). The production is attributed to several different workshops. The vases belonging to this group, are, too, produced between 575 BCE and the end of the following century (Dietler 2005:94). Cup type 5 is the most common of this production on the site (Py 1984e:273), followed by cup type 3(8 vases), a very similar shape. Not as well represented are the bowl type 2 (2 vases), *plat a marli* type 4 (4 vases), urn type 6 (3 vases), *oinochoe* type 8I (1 vase) and the urn type 12 (2 vases), aside from two cups that do not belong to the typology (Py 1984e:273). There are also a cup, an urn and a *plat a marli* that do not belong to any of the recognized groups (Py 1984e:273).

Also present in Phase II is Pseudo Ionian pottery. Vases of this type are not very numerous on the site, and most were too fragmented to be identified. However, imitations of 'Ionian' B2 cup and fragments of *oinochai* have been recognized (Py 1984e:272-273).

To the 'theoric' Phase II récent have been attributed fragments of Attic cups of the type Agora 398-413 (Py 1984e:269).

Despite a certain variety in the repertory, then, from a functional perspective the majority of the finewares attested on the site are drinking cups, occasionally accompanied by other types of vases. However, during Phase II the repertoire of vases becomes more complex,

and, in particular, large vases whose shape is possibly influenced by that of local handmade urns are added to it.

#### 4.4 Zone L7

As a case study for this work, zone L7 will be here discussed in detail. This area has been selected because it was occupied during all the phases of the life of the site, and because the level corresponding to the earliest phase, *sol* 2, is considered among the best preserved in the stratigraphy of the site. Moreover, the imports included among the material from this area are among the most varied found in the village, and some of the surviving elements of the phases of the hut are particularly interesting.

##### 4.4.1 The excavation

Zone L7 was excavated during two campaigns. In 1968, the central and the southern parts of the huts have been explored. In 1971, the excavation was completed on the north side and the study of the stratigraphy was refined, revealing some partitions and post-holes that defined the limits of the earliest stages of occupation of the area (Huts L7 A and B). (Py et al 1984b:79)

L7 is situated at the border of the plateau that La Liquière is on, with a level difference in its pavement. The cut in the rock delineates the bottom of a hut, with three different levels of occupation, on three different platforms of limestone (Py et al 1984b:79).

##### 4.4.2 *Sol 2 and couche 3(Hut L7A), phase I ancien*

The first phase of the hut was built directly over the rock, following a sloping platform of limestone (*Sol* 2). (Py et al 1984b:80-82). In the South-West angle of this hut was a hearth, as shown by the presence of an oval accumulation of charcoal. Covering this hearth and the whole corner was a thick (more than 0,5 m<sup>3</sup>) mass of ash, mixed with charcoal, pottery sherds, grains and acorns, together with fragments of ‘crowns’ in clay and fragments of the walls of an oven in the same material. This has been interpreted as the result of the sweeping of the hearth and accumulation of the resulting waste in the South-Western corner (Py et al 1984b:82). The presence of grains and acorns seems to suggest that this oven was used for cooking (Py 1984g:319-320). Samples of the grains that were not too damaged by the fire have been identified as wheat and barley (Erroux 1984:349).

On the other extremity of the limestone platform, an arrangement of stone slabs in a crack in the rock held in place a post that marked a corner of the ancient hut. The corner was also delimited by a wall whose construction has been detected for at least 1m.

In the central part of the hut, the *sol* 2 included numerous bones and fragments of pottery and 'crowns'. Several fragments scattered between the two levels of the limestone platform belong to the same vases. *Sol* 2 is a continuous layer, deposited on a sloping surface, delimited on the West by the progressive rise in the level of the rock, and at North-West by the presence of a post, which Py et al (1984b:82) regard as possibly indicating the presence of a door, opening on the nearby zone L8.

*Sol* 2 is covered by a newer layer, *couche* 3, a soil with a high component of rich, sticky clay mixed with stone and pot sherds, mostly from vases whose other fragments have been found in *sol* 2. Fragments from the same vase were rarely found together, as they were mostly dispersed all over the surface of the hut, showing that this material was likely not in its original place of use. For this reason, Py et al (1984b:82) have interpreted *couche* 3 as the layer corresponding to the abandonment of the house attested by *sol* 2 and the leveling of material from the equipment of the house and the building itself before the construction of the more recent one.

#### 4.4.3 Material from L7A

The most abundant material found in these layers is represented by sherds of pottery, mainly Etruscan amphorae and handmade vases (Py et al 1984b:87-90). The only finewares found in this context are represented by two small fragments of *bucchero* from two *kantharoi* (Py 1979:149- 150 n.4 and 5, Py et al 1984b:87). One of them is a sherd of the lip of a *kantharos*, decorated with two horizontal lines. The second fragment corresponds to the carination of a *kantharos* decorated with notches. Both belong to type 3e of Rasmussen 1979 and B-NERO Ct3e of Dicocer, or *kantharos* with trumpet-shaped foot, one of the most commonly exported Etruscan objects. In particular the fragments belong to the type B-NERO Ct3e1, decorated by two horizontal lines incised on the lip and ornamental motives, most frequently diamond notches, impressed on the carination. These drinking vessels are dated between 625 and 575 BCE. In this phase, *bucchero* is the only imported fineware attested on the site, with 5 vases among the different huts.

For the amphorae, a total of 202 fragments and vases have been counted (according to Py et al 1984b:87). Several diagnostic fragments were present and one amphora and parts of others have been reconstructed.

All the vases were broken in sherds and scattered across the area of the hut, so the reconstructed shapes have been put together from several fragments. The identifiable fragments belong mainly to the type Py2 (characterized by pink clay with beige slip) and Py

1 (very similar to the previous type, but the clay is grey-yellowish). Given the similarity between the two types, they have lately been brought together as type A-ETR 1/2 for the Dicocer. These amphorae, probably produced in Vulci, are found primarily in Eastern Languedoc (Dedet and Py 2006). However, several fragments can also be attributed to the type Py3 (thicker, with orange or red clay and a cream slip), probably produced in Caere.

| Typology (Py and Py 1974) | Typology (Dicocer) | Whole amphorae | Diagnostic Fragments                                |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------|---|
| 1                         | A-ETR ½            | 1              | 1 lip, 1 base, 4 handles                            |
| 2                         | A-ETR ½            | 2              | 1 upper part, 1 lower part, 1 lip, 1 base, 1 handle |
| 3A                        | A-ETR 3A           |                | 6 lips, 6 handles                                   |
| 3B                        | A-ETR 3B           |                | 1 upper part, 1 handle                              |

Table 4 Distribution of Etruscan amphorae in L7A (from Py et al 1984b:87)

For handmade pottery, the most abundant type of vases is closed shapes ('urns'), of which 64 fragments and vases have been found. The larger group (33 fragments and vases) is represented by the series of urns that, in the classification for this site (Py 1984a:16-19) has been called A: vases with flat base, high shoulder, and a low neck that forms an angle with the body. Vases with a similar shape in Early Iron Age France have been interpreted as cooking vessels used to boil or stew food. They were placed directly on the surface of the hearth, and surrounded by fuel (Dietler 2010:236), and the flat base and straight opening were probably useful to absorb and preserve heat. They could, however, also be used for storage of grain or water and for brewing beer. Four urns of this type have been reconstructed. Two of them are decorated by motifs on the shoulder and neck (Py et al 1984:90).

Fragments of urns of this type include various different types of lip (either everted or straight) and fragments of different decorative motifs placed on the shoulder of the vases. The second largest group (18 fragments and vases) is represented by series C, very simple, neckless vases with inclined walls. Like the series A, there are multiple interpretations possible for their use. The vases have often a decoration impressed in the higher part of the body. This type of urn often has small handles (pierced 'buttons' or in the shape of *oreilles lunées*) (Py et al 1984b:90). 12 other fragments have been identified as belonging to the series

B, vases with ring foot, carinated profile and tall, flaring neck. This type of urn, which is closer to Bronze Age shapes, was most likely used for keeping and serving beverages, though analysis of the content in vases of similar shape have not been performed (Dietler 2010:236). Two of the vases present decorations on the shoulder (Py et al 1984b:90).

In terms of open shapes, in the classification of the material from this site they have all been identified as ‘cups’ (*coupes*), though other classifications of handmade pottery in Mediterranean France (for example Arcelin 1971:21) divide these shapes in different categories: *jattes* (pots with low body and flat base, that can sometimes have a pouring spout or handles), which could be used as cooking pots-to stew and simmer- but also to mix or grind food, *écuelles*, cups with lips that turn inward, in order to limit the splashing of liquids, and *coupes*, which had a straight or everted rim. Both kind of vase are generally interpreted as being for serving and communal eating. The term *coupelles*, small cups, is often used to describe smaller bowls of the *coupe* type, and interpreted as individual vases for eating or drinking (the latter especially when they have a ring foot) (Dietler 2010:245).

In this particular context the majority of the ‘cups’ (28 out of 55 fragments and vases) is represented by vases of the series H, analogue to the *écuelles*. The second most popular kind of open vase (17) are the cups of the series G, with rectilinear or everted opening (Py et al 1984b:90). Also represented are several types of cup, carinated on the inside or the outside of the body and two small cups (series J) with umbilical foot. The equipment of this context also included six *coupes* of the series N, large, low basins with flat base or *jattes*. One is complete: it has a diameter of the opening of 34 cm, and two handles *à oreilles lunées* situated at the half of the height of the body, with the hollow side upwards (Py et al 1984:95). The preparation of food in the hut was documented not only by the cooking pots but also by the presence of fragments of bases of saddle querns, one in basalt and two in sandstone. Another stone instrument, a ‘smoother’ in green stone, was probably used for polishing handmade vases (Py 1984g:324 note 550). Textile activity probably took place in the hut, since the material included two terracotta spindle whorls, one cylindrical (identifiable with type B of Castro Cured 1980) and one tronco-conic (type Da of Castro Cured 1980). Both shapes are very common during the Iron Age in the province of Nîmes (Py 1990:453-455) and in Southern France and Northern Spain in general (Castro Cured 1980:132). The material from this context also includes two iron objects, a small handled adze and an iron bar with circular section that had been bent in two. The function of the second item has not been

determined with certainty, but it has been suggested that it could have been used to even the surface of limestone in combination with the adze (Py 1984f:301).

Metal objects are generally rare in the site, but tools are among the rarest: for this phase, the only other documented is an iron knife. For the later phases, a razor and tweezers are documented in the layers from Phase I *récent* and another knife and an axe for Phase II (Tendille 1984:280-281). It is likely that these objects were considered particularly valuable and not left behind during the abandonment of the huts.

The bronze items found in the levels associated with this phase of zone L7 are both elements of ornament: half of a ring with a round section made from a bivalve mold, and a fragment of a *serpentiiforme* brooch (Py et al 1984b:95). The brooch is missing the pin and part of the hinge. The body is decorated with incisions *a tremolo*. Brooches with this type of bow are attested in Italy in contexts dated from the ninth century BCE (Tendille 1984:290). However, it is also well documented in Languedoc during Iron Age, for example in the cargo of metallic material present on the shipwreck of Rochelongue and in the necropolis of Grand Bassin I (Tendille 1978:79-81). Based on comparisons with similar items from the necropolis of Grand Bassin I, Tendille 1978 (79-81 and p.1, n.5) dates it to the second half of the seventh century BCE, and identifies it as an object produced in Languedoc. One example of brooch very similar to the one in La Liquière was also found of the necropolis of Chiavari (Tendille 1978:79). Gras has seen the presence of brooches of this type in Italy and Italic ones in other sites in the Gard department as an evidence of ‘chieftain’s trade’, because the exchange of elements of ornament like brooches is, in his eyes, indicative of a more personal dynamic of exchange that would seem more justified in this early phase of Mediterranean trade (Gras 2004:221-222). This interpretation seems to derive from an excessively schematic desire to interpret exchange in the Archaic age following the models of *prexis* and *emporion* as delineated by Mele (1977). In this early stage, the majority of the imports present on the site, as well as in Tonnerre I, are amphorae and their distribution among the huts is rather even (Py1984e:259-262), which does not seem to indicate exchange of few ‘luxury’ items as the modality of cross cultural exchange at work on the site. On the other hand, the presence of the brooch could be indicative of the meeting of different people, even if this could also have happened at a different stage, before the arrival of the goods in the village (as admitted by Gras himself, 2004:222).

#### 4.4.4 *Sol 4 and couche 5 (Hut L7B), phase I récent*

The leveling of the first phase of the hut coincided with the establishment of a new one, L7B, on *sol* 4, which was immediately above *couche* 3. The hut L7B occupied roughly the same area as the previous one (Py et al 1984b:83-87). The hearth of the second hut was a built one, made of clay and was found intact at the center of the house. It was roughly rectangular and built over a base of pottery sherds and small stones, deposited one next to the other in circle. The shards were covered by a layer of clay hardened by the fire. The surface, originally polished, had been very damaged, probably by prolonged use (Py et al 1984b:83). Py argued that this hearth was placed in correspondence of an opening in the roof of the hut, created between two rafters. (Py 1984f:310)

Among the sherds that composed the base of the hearth were the upper part of a big urn and the foot of a vase that had been intentionally pierced after firing at the center and through the walls at two parallel points (Py et al 1984b:83). The placement of vessels with pierced foot near the hearth has been associated by Larderet (1957a:31-34) with religious practices involving the offering of libations. Vases with pierced foot placed in various areas of the house, especially on the threshold and the corners, have been excavated in other Iron Age contexts and interpreted as related to this type of ritual (Belarte and de Chazelles 2011:177-178, 183 with specific mention of La Liquière). In particular at La Monédière, in Western Languedoc, in house A, was excavated a pit containing ashes and several vases that had intentionally been deposited inside. The pit was covered with amphora sherds (Nickels 1976:114).

On the site, pierced vases have also been found in the hearths in zones L4 and L11B (Py 1990:785). In the area of the Gulf of Lion several rituals that took place in the domestic environment have been documented. They seem to show a desire to protect the household through amulets and ritual offerings (Feugère 2007, Anwar and Curé 2011, Belarte and de Chazelles 2011). This type of ritual included depositing food (mostly, parts of sacrificed animals, but also eggs and grains) under the foundation of a house, burying a small animal (snake, bird or fish), also as part of a foundation ritual, or placing under the pavement some objects believed to have prophylactic value, including tools, objects of jewelry and also a class of materials that will be discussed more extensively later in this chapter, disks with beaded rim (Feugère 2007, Anwar and Curé 2011, Belarte and de Chazelles 2011) or, in the case of a house in Martigue, a big vase that had been ‘killed’ by hitting it with a blade or a spear (Chausserie- Laprée 2005:230-231, 2011).



Py (1990:784-785) is skeptical about the ritual interpretation of the pierced vase in connection with the hearth of L7B, suggesting that it could also have served to hold pots over the fire. However, he observes that the presence of fragments of vases at the base of the hearth might be related to their use and destruction during foundation rituals, especially relating to the creation of the hearth. As will be discussed later in the chapter, a ritual interpretation of the arrangement of the fireplace might be fitting for other reasons, related to the material present in the domestic structure.

*Sol* 4 was covered by a layer of earth mixed with ash, charcoal and burnt stones. This layer, *couche* 5, included small quantities of very fragmentary material and several fragments of clay. Some bear the impression of a wooden post and have, therefore, been interpreted as part of the lining of a main wall (Py et al 1984b:100). *Couche* 5 is covered by *couche* 6. This layer, unlike the previous one, is not the result of a protracted occupation but the testimony of a precise event: the previous phase of occupation being covered by a bed of big rock slabs, among which can be found a dark soil, without traces of human activity. The slabs are arranged horizontally, one next to the other, probably to consolidate *sol* 7 of phase L7C. They were, in fact, never used themselves as a level of occupation (Py et al 1984b:85).

#### 4.4.5 *Material from L7B*

This phase of the occupation of the area has offered a small quantity of material compared to the previous one, because of the particular history of this context.

In spite of these circumstances, the fragments of finewares are more numerous and more varied than in the previous hut. *Bucchero kantharoi* are still present: in this case, the carination decorated with notches of type 3e of Rasmussen 1979 (B-NERO Ct3e in Dicocer) and part of the handle and of the rim of another *kantharos*, too fragmentary to identify the type (Py 1979:150 n.6 and n.7, Py et al 1984b:97). These two vases correspond to half of the *bucchero* vases found on the site for phase I *récent*, documented only in two other huts and in sondage L5 (Py 1984c:199-201).

This context also included a fragment of the lip of an 'Ionian' cup of the type A1 of Vallet and Villard 1955 and GREC-OR KyA1 of Dicocer. Fragments of another *kylix* of the same type have been found in the nearby zone L8 at a level dated to the same period as L7B.

L7B is also one of the two contexts in the entire site where fragments of a perfume vase have been found. In particular, it is the middle and lower body of a globular Etrusco-Corinthian *aryballos* (ETRU-COR Ar2B1 of Dicocer, type B1 of Payne and type 4 of Cerchiai

1990)(Py 1972:283 and Py 2003 a:112, 7-8).The perfume vase has a painted decoration picturing an aquatic bird turned towards the right. The bird is surrounded by rosettes, cross motives and dots. Py suggests that a decoration visible on the right was part of the horns of an herbivore (Py 2003a:112, 7-8). Details in the design of the bird (feathers, line of the neck) are characterized by incisions, and so are little crosses that run through the rosettes. The vase has been attributed to the Cycle of the Facing Cocks, produced in Vulci (Szilagy 1992:634), because of the general style and of one precise characteristic, the way the bird's feathers are depicted as being connected to the body by one vertical line. It is dated around 575 BCE.

None of the amphora fragments (98) present in this context were diagnostic except for the lip of an Etruscan amphora Py3a (A-ETR3A). The remaining fragments belonged to Etruscan amphorae of the types A-ETR1/2 and A-ETR3. Py et al 1984b:97) also report the presence of a fragment of 'Ionian' amphora. They are relatively rare on the site, but still represent 16.2% of the total amphorae in this phase (Py 1984e:271). Therefore, the assemblage in L7 seems to show a particular preference for Etruscan containers.

The repertory of handmade pottery is more limited than in the preceding phase, and the vases are more fragmented. Of 832 fragments found, only 49 have been attributed to precise shapes, 27 'urns' and 22 'cups' (Py et al 1984b:96).

Among the urns, the most numerous are the ones belonging to series A (there are 18 identifiable). The majority of them (7) have an everted lip with rectilinear, rounded rim. Some vases are decorated on the upper body with motifs of vertical incisions or oval impressions. In particular, the upper part of one these urns formed part of the base of the hearth of the hut. The surface of the urn is partly burned and darkened. It was a big vase with diameter of the opening of 36.5 cm. The presence of urns of series B is attested by four rims, and by the shoulder of another vase (Py et al 1984b:97). Lastly, series C is represented by five vases and a button shaped handle that can be attributed to one of them (Py et al 1984b:97)

Among the open shapes, 13 are cups of series H, with convex profile, or *écuelles*. The second largest group is represented by 5 cups of class G, with flat base and everted rim, with a convex profile. One of these cups also has a spout, made by applying the pressure of the potter's finger on the rim. There are also two fragments of cup of series K, similar to G but with carination under the lip, and a fragment of the body of a cup of the series L, decorated

with horizontal incisions (Py et al 1984b:97-100). Fragments of vases that have not been reconstructed include both flat and ring feet.

As noted above, L7B includes a relatively diverse set of imports compared to the material present on the site overall, but its quantity is still very limited in comparison with the containers and the handmade vases. The material of L7B might be particularly interesting if compared to other, similar contexts of the same chronology. Bagnasco Gianni (2006:221-222) has observed that, starting in the sixth century BCE, 'Ionian' cups are used for ceremonies in Gravisca, a sanctuary related to the emporion where Etruscan and Greek people interacted. In the 'complesso monumentale' of Tarquinia, petrographic analyses have illustrated the development of a local production of vases inspired by Eastern Greek models, in particular 'Ionian' cups, during the sixth century BCE (Bagnasco Gianni 2006:221, 2007).

She has also observed that vases in light pottery resembling the 'Ionian' model, in particular cups, are found together with *bucchero kantharoi* in various non funerary contexts scattered between Roussillon and Provence and dated to the first half of the sixth century BCE, where they are part of a very small selection of finewares, accompanying a much larger quantity of handmade pottery and Etruscan amphorae. One of these contexts is L7B (Bagnasco Gianni 2006). The presence of both *bucchero* and Ionian-style pottery in contexts where a much larger quantity of the material is represented by containers, allow us to ask whether these assemblages responded to the need, local or appropriated by the local communities, for a specific set of materials representative of trade connections that involved people and objects of different origins (Bagnasco Gianni:226). In particular, the indigenous contexts in which these assemblages of materials were found can perhaps be read as spaces used for, if not dedicated to, the meeting of people from different backgrounds and the exchange of goods, representing the equivalent for these context of a series of areas excavated at Massalia, that seemed to have been devoted to this function.

In the area of Place Pistoles has, in fact, been excavated a building which was in use during the middle two quarters of the sixth century. It is characterized by a central hearth and long benches running around the wall, most likely devoted to banqueting. A nearby building, of rather unusual round plan, included a rich and diversified collection of banqueting vases (Santos and Sourisseau 2011:229-230). Similarly, the concentration of Etruscan pottery in the rue de la Cathedrale in the first half of the sixth century might indicate that the area was frequented by Etruscans, maybe for ritual purposes (Riva 2010:224). In Saint Blaise,

assemblages of materials similar to the ones described above have also been identified in closed contexts (Bagnasco Gianni 2006:225-226).

Unfortunately, phase L7B of the hut is the period of its use for which there is less information, having been levelled to build phase L7C over it. The type of indigenous vases present in the hut is difficult to evaluate in terms of their use for feasting as the various shapes are conservative and had multiple uses.

Looking at the animal bones present in L7B, this is one of the contexts in which the cattle, the largest animals and the ones more likely to be consumed in a banquet, are absent (Columbeau 1984:346). However, the hut included bones of the other larger animal eaten on the site, such as deer, as well as most of the other classes of animals that were consumed in La Liquière.

It seems, however, appropriate to return to the discussion to the possible ritual nature of the arrangement of the hearth in the hut L7B. It would be excessive to assume that this particular hut was built to host ceremonies of exchange and that the initial ritual, also attested in other contexts, was connected to it. On the other hand, the potential for making ritual offerings could have been used during such transactions. Michel Gras (1986:355) had already noted that drinking cups, whether in *bucchero* or of Greek type, even in smaller numbers, tend to accompany amphorae, and wondered if they represented the instrument through which negotiation between traders and ‘clients’ happened. This allow us to look back at the first phase of occupation of the hut and wonder if, without involving the ‘Ionian’ cup, the presence of the *kantharoi* in an overall larger assemblage composed mainly of containers could be interpreted in a similar fashion.

In particular, Gras (1985:158) pointed out that the cup, not the *kantharos*, is the drinking vase most commonly portrayed in representations of banquet in Etruscan art. The *kantharos*, on the other hand, is a vase that lent itself to be passed among different people during the banquet because of its handles and that was used to perform ritual offerings, therefore being the perfect vessel for ‘échange qui s’accomplit sous le regard des dieux’ (Gras 1985:158). The process would have, therefore, been facilitated by a ceremony that involved an indigenous ritual and structure and ‘foreign’ vase, possibly associated with the idea of buying wine, if not necessarily with its consumption (as attested from the material overall present in both the hut and the site, wine would probably have been often consumed using local pottery shapes).

As it will also be discussed in the chapter on Castelnau de Guers, the *kantharos* has a distinctive and easily recognizable shape, which, in the examples found in the Western Mediterranean, is not complicated by decorations more articulate than incisions on the lip and, occasionally, notches on the carination. This would have easily conferred to this type of vase 'iconic' status (see on the subject Knappett 2011:162), allowing us to identify it as the specific vase connected to exchange and wine consumption. 'Ionian' cups have a similar distinctive shape, and the quantity of production emulating it shows that it was very easily recognizable. These characters might have made these vases especially appropriate to be used in rituals related to transactions and cross cultural exchange as they would have been easily recognized and associated to these activities.

The situation of L7B is, also, not exclusive to this hut as *couche* 4 of sondage L5, dated to the same phase as hut L7B, has offered a sample in which the majority of the material is represented by Etruscan amphorae, but a *bucchero kantharos* and an Ionian cup are documented as well (Py et al 1984b:74). It is, therefore, possible that similar transaction would have happened in more than one hut at different times, among those which have the facility for performing ritual offerings during the exchange. This seems more plausible than presuming that one of the huts had been specifically dedicated to this function.

The presence of an unusual object like the perfume vase in hut L7B context might also be related to its occupation by non-indigenous people, or represent another aspect of the ritual performed in the house.

#### **4.4.6 Sol 7 and couche 8 (Hut L7C), phase II**

*Sol* 7, which was only a few cms over the layer of stone slabs covering the levelling of the phase L7B, consisted of clay, and was characterized by the presence of scarce and dispersed material. The area occupied by this phase of the hut is larger than the previous two, and the extent of the area occupied by the hut L7C has not been precisely established (Py et al 1984b:85-87). Traces of a much damaged lenticular hearth in clay have been identified roughly in the center of the supposed area of the hut. Traces of a third hearth, circular and formed of charcoal, were found on the upper platform. *Sol* 7 occupied a bigger area than that of the two previous huts. Above this area has been excavated *couche* 8, a layer of dark earth, mixed with charcoal fragments and with very small and dispersed sherds (Py et al 1984b:85-87).

#### 4.4.7 Material from L7C

Phase II sees a considerable increase in the quantity and types of finewares present on the site (Py 1984e:260-262). In L7, wheel thrown pottery is comparatively more abundant than in the previous two phases.

*Bucchero* is still present among the finewares, with nine fragments that have been attributed to five vases (Py 1979:152 n.11, 155 n.26 and 27, 156 n.32, 157 n.38, Py et al 1984b:101-102). Four of these vases are *kantharoi*, and at least two of them are type 3e of Rasmussen 1979 (B-NERO Ct3e and B-NERO Ct3e1 of Dicocer respectively). The remaining parts of the first one are a fragment of lip and of a ribbon handle. The only remaining part of the second one is a fragment of the lip, decorated with the incision of two parallel lines. Another fragment of *kantharos* is just a sherd of a ribbon handle. Of the last *kantharos* survived only two fragments of the trumpet shaped foot.

The only *bucchero* object that is not a *kantharos* is, possibly, the most interesting in the group. It is represented by three fragments initially attributed to a big globular bowl (in Py 1979:157), without handles. However, Py observed that the surface of the vase was polished and smoothed on the exterior, while, unusually for an open vase, the inside appeared rough, with irregularity and streaks as if it had been smoothed by the fingers of the potter. He later realized that the 'bowl' was actually an *oinochoe* type 7 of Rasmussen 1979 (the lack of neck and handle make it impossible to individuate the subtype), B-NERO Oe7 of Dicocer, that had been reused as a bowl after the body had been cut horizontally at the point in which its diameter was largest. The fracture had then been purposely smoothed. The chronology for this type of pitcher, with globular body and low ring foot, corresponds to the first half of the sixth century BCE. Only one other *bucchero oinochoe* has been found in La Liqueüre: an out of context sherd from the Rappaz collection. Other than these two pitchers, all the *bucchero* found on the site corresponds to *kantharoi* and one *kylix* found in sector L8 (Py 1984e:263). However, it is true that, in Phase II, some pitchers in Grey Monochrome pottery, Massalian Cream ware and Corinthian pottery are attested on the site (Py 1984e:269-273).

This vase represents an interesting example of an object having 'multiple lives' and different uses and meanings (see, for example, Moreland 1999, Peers 1999 and Seip 1999). The *oinochoe* was an unusual vase in the settlement, and its use in this context probably differed from the way in which it would have been used in the context of production. On the other hand, it was also considered valuable, probably because the appearance of the *bucchero* might have still been appealing in shapes other than the *kantharos*. Therefore, after it had been broken,

it was turned into a very different kind of vessel, possibly used to consume not just wine or other alcoholic beverages but also food. Taking into account the popularity of simple open shapes both in the traditional handmade repertory and among the colonial wares, it is even possible to wonder if the pitcher was purposely modified to be used in a fashion that the people from La Liquière were familiar with were used, along the lines of the several types of hemispherical cups produced in local handmade pottery.

Hut L7C is the one in which colonial pottery makes its first appearance. Fragments of two vases in Pseudo-Ionian pottery are present in this context. The first is the lip of a bowl with converging rim, possibly of the type 5 or 18 of Py1979-1980, the latter corresponding to CL-MAS 237 of Dicocer. From what is possible to reconstruct from the surviving fragment, it was a vase possibly reminiscent of the bowls with in-turned lips popular among the handmade vases in all the phases of the settlement. The other fragment corresponds to the rim with flattened lip of a big vase.

This is also the only context of L7 in which Grey Monochrome pottery has been found. The first sherd from L7C is the lip of a big hemispherical bowl with converging walls of the type II of Arcelin Pradelle 1984 (GR-MONO2 of Dicocer) one of the shapes inspired by those common in the local handmade pottery (Py 2012:445, Dietler 2005:93). The material found in L7C also included a fragment of the juncture between neck and body of a beaker shape VII of Arcelin Pradelle 1984 or GR-MONO 7 and a fragment of lip of a big vase, whose precise shape is not distinguishable (Py et al 1984b:101). Several fragments of this same vase have been also found in the most recent levels of the nearby zone L8. Shape VII is another example of pottery shape made using the wheel to create a vase that is inspired by indigenous urns, with their carinated bodies and large, everted lips (Py 2012:445, Dietler 2005:93).

All these vases belong to aspect 1 of the group 2 of Arcelin Pradelle 1984. These shapes are also by far the most popular among the vases of this production, with shape VII of Arcelin Pradelle 1984 being the most popular Grey Monochrome vase on the site (Py 1984e:272-73).

There is also a *kylix* with horizontal handles (shape V of Arcelin Pradelle 1984, GR-MONO 5 of Dicocer). The model for this type of vase is the 'Ionian' B2 cup. This cup belongs to Group 3, aspect 1 of Arcelin Pradelle 1984. In this case, too, the shape is the most common of this production on the site (Py 1984e:273).

The majority of amphora sherds are still Etruscan (Py et al 1984b:101). They consist of amphorae type A-ETR1/2, but especially A-ETR3. There are also 5 non diagnostic fragments of 'Ionian' amphora (Py et al 1984b:101).

790 fragments of handmade pottery are present, and 80 vases have been identified (47 'urns' and 33 'cups', one of which with incised decoration) (Py et al 1984b:100). The best represented series of urns is, again, A, with 31 fragments of lip individuated as belonging to it. (Py et al 1984b:101) The series B is represented by 6 lips. The shoulder of a vase decorated with horizontal lines is also attributed to this series (Py et al 1984:101). Series C is, as in the previous two phases, the second best represented, with 10 vases identified (Py et al 1984b:101).

For open shapes, the series H, bowls with lip turned towards the interior, is yet again the best represented, with 15 vases identified. Series G, bowls with diverging walls, is represented by 9 vases (Py et al 1984b:101).

The series N, the *jatte*, is present with one vase with button-shaped handles and rectilinear lip. The foot of the vase is missing but it was probably flat in order to place the *jatte* on the hearth for simmering or frying. As in the previous two phases, in the most recent moment of habitation of the hut the presence of a quern is attested (Py et al 1984b:103).

A noticeable difference from the previous phases is the relative abundance of small cups of series J: in this case there are at least six of them, plus one bearing incised decoration. One was complete, and it is a shape 462 of Dedet and Py 1975, a low cup with rounded, convex profile and hollow base. Another cup has been reconstructed: it is smaller than the other but belongs to the same type, only with a flat base (Py et al 1984b:103).

Lastly, one cup of series J presents incised decoration. This technique is used in the Nîmes province throughout seventh and sixth century BCE (Py 1990:348 and 358). This cup is shape 5 in Dedet 1980's typology of these vases and is incised with a decoration à *chevrons* surmounted by small squares on the body (Dedet 1980:31, n.48, Py et al 1984b:103).

A horizontal handle with circular section that probably belonged to a cup (preserved L:6 cm) is very different from the button-shaped handles of the other handmade vases in this context. It resembles the handles of 'Ionian' cups and Massalian imitations. If this is a handle inspired by these models (it is described as such in Py et al 1984b:103, and M. Py confirmed the information in pers. comm.), it would be a very early example of imitation, as Py



(1990:403-404, picture 79 n.2 and 7) places the first example of vases inspired by the wheel-thrown ones in indigenous contexts in the Nîmes province in the early fifth century BCE, mentioning a cup from Nîmes and an *oinochoe* from Le Marduel as the earlier examples.

In general, the repertoire of the pottery appears to have changed from the previous phase, but in a rather specific way. The imported and colonial vases are more numerous but, with the exception of the *kantharoi* and of the cup V of Arcelin Pradelle 1984, the shapes that prevail are simple, hemispherical cups that had always been among the most popular shapes in the handmade repertoire and large vases whose shape is reminiscent of that of the ‘urns’, now made using the wheel. In this light, even the modification of the *oinochoe* might represent a way to reuse a damaged object by turning it into something useful and familiar, but could have also represented a deliberate way to make it ‘fit’ with the remaining pottery service in use in the house.

At the same time, during this phase of occupation of the hut there seem to be an increased preference for small, individual cups, attested not only in the more numerous imports but also in the increase of the handmade *couppelles* shape J that were, most likely, individual and used specifically for drinking (Dietler 2010:245). This does not necessarily mean that the ways of consuming alcoholic beverages had changed in general. Shape J is an indigenous one that existed in the repertoire of the site since the earliest phase, and their increase does not reflect a general trend for the settlement (Py 1984e:222-223). However, along with the relatively varied assortment of imported and colonial drinking vases in the hut might suggest that, in the specific context of this hut, practices involving the consumption of beverages were quite diversified. The presence of some traditional shapes along with several imported and colonial ones and, possibly, an attempt at recreating the handles ‘Ionian’ B2 cup in local handmade pottery allows us to think that different forms of drinking, perhaps involving different beverages and corresponding to different occasions, would have taken place in L7C. Therefore, the materiality of this assemblage (and of the ones from the other huts) shows us the everyday articulation of the drinking practices at La Liquière, which was definitely a phenomenon that happened in modalities familiar to the local community, but also developed as a consequence of the exchanges and interaction that had been taking place on the site since the first phase of occupation.

L7C had a clay hearth, like the previous phase of occupation, but this structure was much damaged and it is impossible to determine whether, in this context, it would have been possible to offer libations as it happened in the previous hut. This could, however, still have

been one of the rituals in which the imported vases, especially the *kantharoi* and the Grey Monochrome cup inspired by Ionian model, could have been used.

In contrast, the ways of cooking and eating seem to have remained quite consistent, seeing that the same shapes keep recurring in the repertory of cooking pots and larger cups. This is a phenomenon present in the site overall, as Py (1984d) observed that the repertoire of handmade pottery on La Liquière is quite conservative both in the type and the variety of the shapes used. Differences can be perceived between the Phase I and II, but the evolution deducible from these variations is what Py calls ‘negative’ (Py 1984d:234), since it consists mostly of the less common shapes becoming less frequent or disappearing, while the most common ones become even more prominent.

Phase II of La Liquière presents the most variety in terms the presence of imported and colonial vases in the assemblages, compared to the previous phases, in which the finewares especially are rare and not very diverse. However, it is difficult to assess the ways in which this diversity was distributed. There are, in fact, very few comparable contexts for this phase of the site: L1 and L5 have been partially investigated, L4, L8 and L9 do not correspond to domestic structures and the stratigraphy of L3 and L11 seems to include more recent material, which Py has attributed to the phase LII *recent*. Only the hut L10B is a house dated to phase II that did not include later material (Py 1984c:203-209).

Taking into account these caveats, looking at the fine wares L7C reflects the trend of the prevalence of Grey Monochrome pottery, but included also the most numerous *bucchero* vases out of all the huts dated to this phase. On the other hand, the assemblage does not include any of the Attic or Corinthian vases dated to the phase II of La Liquière. This is especially interesting when noting that a higher quantity of *bucchero* than the average also characterized the assemblage of the previous phase of occupation. This does not seem enough evidence to imagine continuity in the use of the area L7 or a connection among the people that occupied it, especially taking into account the small quantity of finewares present in the site overall in the first two phases and the general prevalence of *bucchero* in the first two phases, but allows at least to consider the possibility of continuity. While it is credible that the type of exchange that brought imports to the different households would have been centralized and redistributive (Py 2015:64-65), there might have been an element of choice afforded to the various households in terms of the selection of the objects.

It is worth pointing out that the assemblage of wheel thrown vases in L7C might have been richer and more diversified, as several vases in *bucchero*, pseudo-Ionian and, especially, Grey Monochrome vases along with some fragments of 'Ionian' and Eastern Greek pottery have been identified in the layer of L8 corresponding to the same time period (Py et al 1984b:116-119).

As mentioned earlier, in L7C has also been found a terracotta ring that Py (1984g:323) describes as a loomweight. This interpretation of the object is perplexing since this would have been the only loomweight present in the hut, with no traces of other similar items in it, in the adjacent area L8 or on the site in general. Besides, while pierced terracotta rings, which are usually interpreted as loomweights, are present in various contexts of Languedoc (Py 1990:454-459) from the late Bronze Age to late Iron Age, they are generally made by cutting the walls of a big container and piercing the disk so obtained in the center, while this particular ring seems to have been intentionally modeled in the shape of a thick ring of clay with smooth section (Py 1990:457).

Several bronze items were part of the material found in this context, some of them being personal ornaments: a pin (Py et al 1984b:103), a filiform bracelet with circular section, decorated with incisions of horizontal lines (Tendille 1979:62 and Py et al 1984b:103), and a band bracelet with quadrangular section decorated by a motif *à chevrons* (Tendille 1979:73 and Py et al 1984b:103). Band bracelets are known in France since Early Iron Age, but are quite rare in Mediterranean France, and the majority of the examples of this type of ornament seem to come from contexts of the interior (Tendille 1979:71, some examples and bibliography in Py 1990:490 n.348). The presence of this object might be an indication that La Liquière played a connective role between the coast and the hinterland.

The most interesting bronze elements found in this context are, however, five disks made from circular, thin sheets with 'beads' embossed on the border, likely using an instrument with a dull edge and, at the center, a similar decoration in the opposite direction, which creates an hollow 'bead' (Py 1972:27-30 and 34). The disks have concave shape, which Py (1972:28) attributes to the decoration embossed on it since the hollow is in correspondence of the central 'bead'. Two of the disks, that have a diameter of ca. 7 and 5 cms, have a suspension hole in place of one of the decorative 'beads'. Another one, smaller in size (the diameter is circa 4 cm) instead of a precise suspension hole made when it was created, has an irregular cut made with a blade between the rim and the center, that could have been used for suspension. However the piercing, traces of which are present on several disks like

this one found in Mediterranean France, could have been performed as part of a ritual to ‘kill’ the objects (Py 1990:805, 2003a:111, 2015:52). The pierced disk is also decorated by a series of parallel incisions forming ‘rays’ that connect the center of the disk with the ‘beads’ on the margin, for circa one fourth of the surface. These incisions have been made with a blade, probably at the same time as the cut since they are only on the part of the surface that is not occupied by it (Py 1972:28-30). The remaining disks have diameter of circa 4, 5 and 3 cm, and they lack any kind of suspension hole.

#### 4.5 The beaded disks and their possible significance

Over forty of these items have been found in contexts from La Liquière. 24 are out of context, from the Rappaz excavations (Py 1984b:192-195), the others are scattered among the contexts dated to the last phase of occupation of the site (Py 1984c:213), and area L8, that has a very mixed, stratigraphy. However, the layer where the disks were found in this area contained fragments from the same vases found in L3C and L7C (Py et al 1984b:111).

| Context           | Number of disks |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| Rappaz collection | 24              |
| L1B               | 2               |
| L3C               | 8               |
| L5C               | 2               |
| L7C               | 5               |
| L8                | 4 or 5          |

**Table 5 Distribution of bronze disks in the different contexts from La Liquière (from Py et al 1984b)**

As noted earlier, hundreds of disks of this kind have been found in sites of Southern France, primarily in Provence and Eastern Languedoc and mostly in villages and votive contexts, with two exceptions found in graves (Buret 2003:55). The contexts in which some of the disks have been found seems to suggest that they had strong symbolic and ritual meaning: a disk of this type has been found deposited under a vase in a granary in Pègue (Lagrang and Thalmann 1973:54), and has been interpreted as ‘prophylactic amulet’ (Py 1990:805). Another one was part of the material from the sanctuary of Roquepertouse (Py 1990:804-805). Others were found in a possible votive deposit of objects in the proximity of the sanctuary of Entremont (Willaume 1993:131-134) and one was buried in the foundation of a house at Martigues (Chausserie- Laprée 2005:230-231, 2011:192, Belarte and de Chazelles 2011:176). 313 disks of this kind, as mentioned earlier, formed part of a votive deposit dated to the fifth century BCE in the area of Mas de Causse, near Lattes (Feugère and Newman

2010, Anwar and Curé 2011:196). This is the only site where so many of these objects have been found, while previously the largest number of them was documented at La Liquière and Mauressip (where between 15 and 20 of these objects are documented) (Buret 2003:57). The rest of the deposit was composed of personal ornaments, and, aside for brooches, they consisted of round objects that were open at the center (bracelets, rings) or that had been pierced (the disks). Feugère and Newman (2010) see the deposit as related to a female cult, but there is no specific evidence to support this. Gailledrat (2015:34), on the other hand, has suggested it might have been a sanctuary connected to the nearby trading settlement of La Cougourlude. Py (2015:52) notes how the piercing of the disks happened both in this deposit and at La Liquière.

Py (1990:805) also notes that bronze disks of this kind were present in the foundation deposit of the sanctuary of *Mater Matuta* in Satricum, but it is doubtful that they were specifically related to this cult and would have maintained this characteristic in a different context.

These objects are extremely rare in funerary context: only two have been found in burials and both are considerably later than the settlement here discussed. One, from the Herain collection, had been probably found in the necropolis de La Catalane at Baux-de-Provence (published as a possible mirror in Arcelin and Arcelin Pradelle 1973:180) dated to the second century BCE. Another disk was part of the assemblage in a burial dated between second and first century BCE in the necropolis of L'Arcoule at Beaumes-de-Venise, in Provence (Arcelin 1979:146-148).

The disks are considered to be of Etruscan or at least Italic origin, because the presence of several disk-shaped bronze ornaments is documented in Italian contexts dated to Iron Age and Bronze Age (Py 1972:41-55). Most of these disks are characterized by more complex decorative motifs than the simple 'beads' around the border and at the center, with concentric circles or crosses embossed, but others are more similar to the ones found in France (Py 1972:55). Another argument in favor of this notion is the fact that, in the particular site we are discussing, as well as in Mauressip, another site where several bronze disks have been excavated, Etruscan productions represent the majority of the imports (Py 1972:61 and Tendille 1984:289-290). As mentioned above, the greatest known quantity of disks has been found in the deposit of Mas de Causse, very close to Lattes and to the possible trading post of La Cougourlude (Feugère and Newman 2010, Anwar and Curé 2011:196, Gailledrat 2015).

Additionally, the presence of seven disks with embossed beaded motif in the shipwreck of Grand Ribaud F, whose cargo included Etruscan amphorae and bronze basins, along with cooking pots inscribed in Etruscan alphabet, has lent more strength to the idea that these items were of Italic origin (Buret 2003:55; for the shipwreck: Long and Sourisseau 2002b and Long et al. 2006).

In general, it is believed probable that at least part of the earliest examples of disks with beaded rim (dated between the sixth and early fifth century BCE), were of Italic production, but latest examples dated to the fifth and fourth century BCE can be regarded as imitations. (Buret 2003:56, Py 2003a:111). The iron disk from L1B might represent an early local imitation (Tendille 1984:289). The decorations on the Italic examples of these objects have been interpreted as having a meaning connected with sun iconography, that they would have possibly maintained in Languedoc as well (Py 1972:61). The presence in L7C of a disk with 'rays' scratched on the surface seems to support of to this idea (Py 1990:804-805). As noted above, many of the disks from La Liquière were characterized by holes for suspension and they were always found in multiple examples. This has led to consider the hypothesis that they might have been part of necklaces in which they were lined in rows and that had been broken and scattered in the various contexts where they were found (Py 1972:36). This interpretation seems to be reinforced by the fact that the disks were always in the upper part of the layers in which they were found (Py 1972:36 and n.2). However, as discussed, not all the disks encountered on the site are provided with holes for suspension. Other conjectures about the use of these objects have been as appliques, sewn on cloth or on leather (to decorate clothes or horse harness, an interpretation Py proposes but is also skeptical about), or hanging by brooches from the suspension holes or fixed to the clothes with a pin through them (Py 1972:61).

Regardless of the way they might have been used before the deposition, their position in the stratigraphy, as well as the fact that they represent a rare type of metal objects that has been found in multiple contexts seems to suggest that scattering the disks over the huts and the area L8 was a deliberate act, performed at the end of the abandonment of these areas. The fact that the objects in question seem to have also often been used in rituals involving the household (albeit, as discussed above, in regard to its foundation) allows perhaps the suggestion that this was a ritual action connected to the end of the occupation of this portion of the site.

Apotropaic objects are believed to have the power to stop or 'trap' evil forces, as well as to ward them off, and to 'undo the negative, undesirable course of events that have already occurred' (Borić 2015:60). The dispersion of apotropaic objects on an area that was being abandoned might have, therefore, responded to the desire to contain in it the negative elements that made the occupation of this part of the site no longer possible or suitable. On the other hand, keeping in mind the history of cyclical abandonment and reoccupation of huts in the site, it might have also been a way to 'undo' the negative and prepare the relinquished huts to become suitable for a new occupation in the future. Walker (2001:94) has described ritual activities as technological processes that involve the use of artifacts and can, therefore, be reconstructed using spatial and relational information about the objects involved in them. In particular, Walker (2001:93-94) suggests that the presence of objects in the higher part of the abandonment stratigraphy of a structure might suggest that there was a ritual component to the dismantlement and abandonment of the same structure.

As remarked above, several of the disks had been pierced with knives or other instruments, something Py (2012:165, 2015:52) thinks could have been done to ritually 'kill' the objects. In his opinion, this proves the ritual nature of the deposit. Magical objects are, in fact, often damaged and 'killed' to remove them from the active world, rendering it impossible for another person to counter the spell tied to them (Wilburn 2015:39-40).

The use of the bronze disks in different types of ritual represents an interesting assimilation of an object of 'foreign' origin (regardless of whether all the disks were imported or some of them represented imitations) in a ritual strictly connected to the history of the occupation of the site. It has been suggested that the apotropaic agency attributed to objects can be accumulated when they have very rich and unusual 'life histories', something that would have probably characterized imported objects with a past marked by exchanges (Borić 2015:61). However, some of this agency can also be derived by the fact that the object is distant in space or time from its context of production, and that the passage of 'things' from one cultural context to the other allows for the acquisition of new significance and social and cultural value (Eckardt and Williams 2003:142). Objects from a different place or time may be assumed to have history behind them, but, because of the distance from their original context, the knowledge of this history is partial and leaves room for speculation and attribution of additional meaning. This is, for example, the case of objects found in abandoned Roman settlements that were regarded as having apotropaic agency in Anglo Saxon communities partly because of their lack of known biography (Eckardt and Williams

2003). In his study of the archaeology of magic in the ancient world, Wilburn (2013:12-13) refers to the idea of ‘coefficient of weirdness’. This concept was formulated by Malinowski (1960:218-25) with reference to the fact that magical language is separated by common language by variations in both terminology and intonation. Wilburn (2015:13) argues that ‘exotic or mysterious items’ were characterized by a similar ‘coefficient of weirdness’, which rendered them appropriate to be used to perform magic.

As the disks from La Liquière are not only objects from a different geographical and cultural context, but also among the most ancient items of this type present in Southern France, they would have probably had equally unknown histories in this context, aside from the ones related to their exchange and their possible use on the site. If they were still perceived as somewhat ‘foreign’ elements, they might have even been viewed as more appropriate items in warding off the intrusion of negative, equally ‘extraneous’ forces in the houses when placed under their foundations or scattered over the structures during the abandonment.

#### 4.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have focused specifically on the three phases of occupation of one of the domestic structures documented in La Liquière and, in particular, in the assemblages of materials they contained, considered in the context of what we know of these structures and of and of the material culture of the site at large. The earlier phase of interaction is marked primarily by an interest in wine as a commodity. The presence of the only finewares attested in the house, two *kantharoi*, might be related to dynamics of exchange involved in the acquisition of the wine amphorae they accompanied rather than to a deliberate choice to acquire these items. This situation is even more likely to have happened in the second phase of occupation of the hut, when a limited quantity of drinking vases, along with more numerous containers, is documented along with a type of hearth than probably allowed for libations to sanction the exchange. Therefore, the imported material and local structure were used as element of a same ritual, a ritual that involved and was seen as valid by people of different backgrounds. The presence of imported vases is still limited (albeit the material of this phase is very damaged and fragmentary), and it is possible to imagine that these vases had been acquired for ‘special’ occasions of interaction with foreign visitors. The assemblage corresponding to the most recent phase of occupation is very different. It is possible to imagine that, through the repeated cross cultural interaction and familiarization with the finewares acquired, local practice of consumption in which the vases were used would have become more complex and structured, as suggested by the co-presence of different types of drinking vases. These vases included imported vessels, colonial pottery in shapes reminding



of the local ones or of the imported cups already known on the site, but also handmade individual cups and a possible handmade imitation of the above mentioned 'Ionian' cups. One of the vessels was an unusual shape for the context, a pitcher, made in what was one of the most popular imported finewares, *bucchero*. To maintain it in use after it had been broken, or, possibly, just to transform it in a shape that would have been more familiar and more useful to their owners, it had been transformed in an open 'cup', one of the type of vases more common in the indigenous handmade repertory. It is possible that the history of exchange and ownership of the imported vases from L7 hut added to the value in the eyes of their owners, but they were also integrated in the existing ceramic repertory: by actual modification, like in the case of the pitcher, or by selecting shapes that would 'fit' in the rest of the assemblage, as it seemed to happen with the most popular shapes in 'colonial' pottery. Most of the structures belonging to the last phase of the site, including L7C, included bronze disk of probable Italic origin, if not inspiration. Because of their position in the stratigraphy, of the fact that they represent a rare metal item of which multiple examples had been left behind on the site, and of the fact that other similar objects are often found in context in which it is presumed they had apotropaic function, it is possible to imagine that their abandonment was deliberate and constituted a ritual act, possibly in correspondence of a negative event that would have caused the abandonment of the area of the site in which they were scattered. If this is true, this particular class of objects had been assimilated in the material culture of the site, functionalizing it to specific indigenous rituals, and it is possible to speculate that their 'foreign' origin and relatively unknown 'history' might have played an element in this choice. In their new context, they became strictly tied to the materiality of the place where they were abandoned as well as acquiring powerful symbolic value in the eyes of the people who scattered them.

By looking at these objects and the assemblages they were part of, therefore, I have distinguished different ways in which imported materials were used, treated and perceived in La Liquière. The focus on three specific huts might appear too narrow but, comparing this discussion with other studies focusing on different specific contexts from Iron Age Mediterranean France, might increase our understanding of the dynamics of exchange happening in the region and of the ways in which imported material was used in domestic contexts.

## 5. The isolated burial of Saint Antoine à Castelnau de Guers

### 5.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses a grave excavated in the site of Saint Antoine à Castelnau de Guers. The burial belongs to a very interesting class of graves that appear during the Early Iron Age in Western Mediterranean Europe, and primarily in Western Languedoc: isolated burials. Like most of the burials of this category, it is also representative of a series of traits typical of the most distinctive Early Iron Age graves of this region: the inclusion in the funerary equipment of Etruscan amphorae and *kantharoi*, of metal banqueting vessels (in particular, bronze ladles or *simpula*) and of weapons. However, this particular burial is also regarded as an anomaly because of the age of the individual buried in it, an adolescent between 12 and 15 years of age.

The grave was first published in Houllès and Janin 1992 and the funerary equipment is also described in Landes 2003. Other than that, it has been included in several discussions involving categories of burials to which it belongs, such as burials with weapons (Beylier 2012a, 2012b), isolated graves (in particular Mauné 1998a, Mazière 2005, 2012 and Graells 2010: 155-169) and burials of young individuals (Janin 1993, Dedet 2008, 2012), but there has not been a specific discussion that examined together the grave, the funerary equipment and what can be inferred of the funerary ritual and of the possible existence of a marker, while also placing the grave in its wider cultural context. Therefore, the burial of Castelnau de Guers has mostly been discussed in terms of how it compares with other burials that share similar elements, and how it can be explained as an anomaly in comparison with these categories.

In this chapter, I examine these aspects, and also discuss some of the most common interpretations of burials with weapons, especially when associated with individuals who do not fit what is generally the expected identity of a person deposited with military equipment. The discussion also focus on the role of Mediterranean imports in Western Languedoc society during the sixth century BC, as both the general patterns of distribution of these objects and the individual items that compose the assemblages included in the burial in question. I also argue that an analysis focused primarily on this burial might reveal it as less unusual than it is normally believed, and that perhaps one of the things that make it stand out is the fact that, when discussing it, scholars tend to ask questions that are not posed in the study of other isolated graves.

The aim is to gain new perspectives in the study of this particular context, but also to reflect on the ways different objects, including Mediterranean imports, were used in the same cultural context to represent people's identity and status. More generally, I believe that discussing the burial of Castelnau de Guers and the reasons why it is regarded as an anomaly can spark useful reflections on the ways burial with weapons in the funerary equipment are discussed in archaeology.

## **5.2 The burial of Castelnau de Guers in its regional context**

Before discussing the burial and its funerary equipment, some background will be provided on the archaeology of the surrounding geographical region, Western Languedoc and, in particular, the lower Hérault valley. I discuss both the dynamics of exchange and trade attested in the area during Early Iron Age and some of the more visible trends in the composition of funerary assemblages from this region.

### **5.2.1 Western Languedoc and the lower Hérault valley**

Castelnau de Guers is placed on a hill that faces one of the first areas to be involved in exchanges with Mediterranean incomers, the lower valley of the Hérault (Mazière 2013a). Around the middle of the sixth century BC the lower valley was the place where the 'port of trade' of Agde/Agathe was established, very near to the coastal Thau Lake. This was a particularly favourable position for a trading point, as the presence of the lake made it easier to reach this area with a navigation of cabotage. Archaeologists have also debated whether the nearby site of La Monédière, founded around the beginning of the sixth century, hosted some Mediterranean people because of the presence of an apsidal house which contained several amphorae and fragments of imported vases (Nickels 1989, Mazière 2013a). From the seventh century BC material of Mediterranean origins is attested in some of the 'richest' burials pertaining to the necropolises of the area (Mazière 2013b and c, Ropiot 2013 and Verger 2013a) and in isolated graves like the one we are discussing.

In Languedoc, and especially in the Hérault valley, from the seventh century BC onwards, metal artefacts and copper ingots are accumulated in hoards called *launaciens* from the site of Launac (Bats 2011:97-98). They are generally placed along roads and rivers and near to the coast (Garcia 2002:41). It is debated whether their purpose was to accumulate material or they had religious meaning (Verger 2013b). Along the coast, 600m off Agde has been excavated the shipwreck of Rochelongue, with a similar cargo composed of copper ingots and metal artefacts (utensils, jewellery, accessories like brooches, hairpins and belt buckles, a razor and a *scalptorium*) (Garcia 2002 and Garcia 2013a). The wreck is dated to the late

seventh century BC, but some of the items that composed the cargo are significantly more ancient (Azzouz and Ugolini 2008:145). Some of the materials are of Italic origins or come from Catalonia, but similar objects are also found both in domestic contexts and graves from Languedoc, as well as in the *launaciens* (Garcia 2013a: 209). Moreover, the presence in the site of Turò de la font de la Canya in Catalonia of a votive deposit including metallic artefacts of types produced in Southern France, seems to suggest that the circle of exchanges involved the North East of Spain as well (Graells 2013b). Metal ornaments and ingots comparable to the ones found in the *launaciens* and in the Rochelongue ship are also found in Sicily, as offerings in the sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros in Selinunte (Verger 2013c) and in the Archaic levels of the Thesmophorion of Bitalemi (Verger 2013c). Isolated elements of personal ornament from Gallia are found also in particularly rich Italian Early Iron Age burials like the grave 660 of Megara Hyblaea (Verger 2013d) and as votives in sanctuaries of Latium (Verger 2013f) and in the sanctuary of Hera at Perachora (Verger 2013e), suggesting the idea that, at least between the seventh century and the first half of the sixth, Sicily was at the core of a network of dynamics of interaction that ranged from Western Mediterranean to the Balkans.

The composition of the cargo of the Rochelongue ship and the way it was assembled are still source of debate: it is considered possible that different elements were not necessarily first accumulated and then stocked, but could have been acquired in different sites, during a navigation of cabotage (Azzouz and Ugolini 2008:145). The identity of the equipment is also a source of discussion. According to some archaeologists (Garcia 2002, Garcia 2013a and Bats 2011), the metal was exported in exchange for Greek and Etruscan wine, pottery and metalwork. In particular, it has been suggested that the collection of the metal stocked in these deposits occurred under the supervision of high ranking individuals, who then acted as intermediaries with the Mediterranean traders (Dedet et al. 2006:156).

The sixth century BC sees an increase of the imported material present both in settlements and in burials. The development of several fortified settlements during this period has been interpreted, as it will be discussed later in this chapter, as a moment of change in which the local society becomes more complex and structured (Garcia 2014: 67-120). Undoubtedly, the foundation of Massalia played an important role in the development of the systems of exchanges (Dedet et al. 2006:156, Bats 2013), both because of the Phocian presence on the coast and because of the growth and diffusion of the Massaliote productions around the middle of the century (Sourisseau 2013).

In this same period, the offerings produced in Southern France are no longer found in the sanctuary of Bitalemi. This might show that the network of exchanges active in the region has changed (Pace 2013: 349), with the two regions being, now, involved in the Etruscan and Carthaginian circuit of exchanges respectively (Bats 2013 and Bouffier 2013). On the other hand, in votive deposits from sanctuaries in Laitum, such as that of Mater Matuta in Satricum, elements of jewellery originating in Southern France, and in particular of the Hérault valley, are attested in contexts up to the third quarter of the sixth century BC (Verger 2013f), signalling the possibility of continuing contact.

### 5.2.2 *The distribution of imports in the Hérault valley during the Early Iron Age*

In this section I discuss the distribution of the type of imported materials and colonial pottery present in the burial in Western Languedoc and in particular in the Hérault valley. The funerary assemblage, in fact, included an Etruscan amphora (type Py3b, or A-ETR 3B in the Dicocer) used as an ossuary, two *bucchero kantharoi* (type B-NERO Ct3e2) and an Etrusco Corinthian cup (ETRU-COR Kyb) (Houlès and Janin 1993, Landes 2003). The cup has been attributed to the Gruppo a Maschera Umana (Sizlâgi 1992: 581, n.78). In the assemblage was also included a Grey Monochrome pottery cup (type GR-MONO 5e) (Houlès and Janin 1993, Landes 2003).

At the site of La Monédière materials datable to the seventh century BC and some fragments of Eastern Greek pottery datable around 600 BC have been found, but the most ancient layers excavated *in situ* are datable to the second quarter of the sixth century BC (Dedet et al. 2006: 145). The same can be said for the most ancient layers excavated at Agde, datable to around 560 BC (Dedet et al. 2006: 145). The settlement of Mont Jouï, between Agde and the Thau lake, seems to also have been occupied starting with the second quarter of the century (Dedet et al. 2006: 147). More towards the interior, the site of Bernat 2, at Aspiran, has been identified as a small rural settlement, datable between 550 and 525 BC (Mauné 1998b:67).

At Agde, Etruscan amphorae are attested since the half of the sixth century BC. They represent the majority of the containers at least until the half of the following century. The fragments of amphorae excavated were, however, too small to identify the types they belonged to (Nickels 1995:10). Among the pottery, *bucchero* is only imported type attested between 560 and 520 BC, and is in very small quantity, 2%. The same can be said for Grey Monochrome pottery. Afterwards, the former type of vases disappears, and the latter

increases to 6%, probably partly because of the presence of a local workshop (Garcia and Marchand 1995:100-102).

|                                 | 560-520 BC | 520-480 BC | 480-460 BC | 460-425 BC |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Etruscan                        | 62,26%     | 25,53%     | 11,32%     | 5,26%      |
| Greek                           | 30,3%      | 17,02%     | 3,77%      |            |
| Massaliote and Ionio-Massaliote | 0,43%      | 57,45%     | 84,91%     | 94,74%     |
| Total number of fragments       | 231        | 47         | 53         | 114        |

**Table 6 Distribution of amphorae at Agde, Rue Parben (Garcia and Marchand 1995:100-102)**

|                                | 560-520 BC | 520-480 BC | 480-460 BC | 460-425 BC |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| <i>Bucchero</i>                | 2%         |            |            |            |
| Grey Monochrome                | 2%         | 6%         | 2%         | 5%         |
| Attic                          | 0          | 2%         | 1%         | 3%         |
| Iberian                        | 32%        | 33%        | 35%        | 37%        |
| Massaliote Colonial Cream Ware | 7%         | 17%        | 17%        | 19%        |
| Handmade                       | 45%        | 18%        | 22%        | 14%        |
| Wheel-thrown not painted       | 12%        | 24%        | 23%        | 22%        |
| Total number of fragments      | 44         | 162        | 161        | 278        |

**Table 7 Percentage of finewares on the total pottery at Agde, Rue Parben (Garcia and Marchand 1995:100-102)**

At La Monédière, in the small portion of the settlement that has been excavated, Etruscan amphorae represent the 10.7% of the total material (Dedet et al 2006:147) and between the 60% and 85.5% of the containers (Nickels 1989:113). This proportion changes as follows over the life of the settlement:

|                   | 575-550 BC | 550-525 BC | 525-500 BC | 500-475 BC | 475-400 BC |
|-------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Etruscan amphorae | 10.7%      | 7.9%       | 14.6%      | 8.5%       | 3.7%       |
| <i>Bucchero</i>   | 1.2%       | 0.8%       | 0          | 0          | 0          |

**Table 8 Percentage of Etruscan amphorae and Bucchero at La Monédière (Dedet et al 2006:147-150)**

The majority of the amphorae belong to the type 3A, 3B and 4 of Py 1985, and the most common clay is dark or orange, generally attributed to productions from Southern Etruria and in particular the area of Caere (Dedet et al. 2006:147-150). From around 540 BC onwards the majority of the containers is represented by Greek and Punic amphorae (Nickels 1989:113-116). In this site, *bucchero* represents the 1.2 % of the fragments between 575 and 550 BC. The most common shapes are *kantharoi*, both the types 2 and 3. Between 550 and 500 BC, the percentage of *bucchero* on the total material decreases to 0.8 %, but, along with the *kantharos*, now exclusively type 3, are also attested fragments of other shapes like *olpai* and *oinochoai* (Dedet et al. 2006:147-150). Grey Monochrome is, in all periods, the most common among the finewares (87% of them), and belongs primarily to the groups A and C (Nickels 1989:113-116)

At Mont Jouï, 4 km towards the hinterland from La Monédière and on the other side of the river, *bucchero* is not present at all and Etruscan amphorae are less well represented. They are, in fact, 26% of the amphorae between 575 and 525 BC and 50% in the last quarter of the century (Dedet et al 2006:150). Greek amphorae represent the majority of the containers in the first period of occupation of the site (Nickels 1987:8-9). In the earliest period, most common among the finewares is Grey Monochrome, accompanied by some Ionian cups and mortars and some fragments of cups in 'Western Greek' pottery (Nickels 1987:8-9).

The material from the sondages carried out at Benat 2 can be divided as represented in the following table:

**Table 9 Percentage of materials from Bernat 2, Aspiran, during the period between 550 and 525 BC (from Mauné 1998b:67)**

All the identifiable amphora fragment belong to amphorae type 3 or 4, but one fragment is in the type of clay more common in the shape 1/2. The *bucchero* vases are all *kantharoi* type Ct 3e3 and Ct3e2. (Mauné 1998b:67). The Grey Monochrome vases are fragmented and not very recognizable, but one of the vases seems to be a cup type 5.

More towards the hinterland than Aspiran, the presence of amphorae is not attested before the second quarter of the sixth century, and never in a significant quantity, with the exception of site of La Ramasse, where this class of material composes 7% of the total fragments (Garcia 1993:175-179, Dedet et al 2006:150-151). As for the *bucchero*, *kantharoi* are attested in the sites of Puech Crochu, Les Rouquets (Garcia 1993:177) and in a cave in the Causse du Larzac, North-East of the river (Dedet et al 2006:151).

Therefore, when we look at the settlements, Etruscan amphorae, prevalently of the types 3 and 4, are comparatively more abundant at the end of the seventh and beginning of the sixth century BC in a small selection of specific coastal sites like Agde and La Monédière. They are not accompanied by great quantities of finewares, while the colonial wheel thrown vases become the most popular finewares rather quickly (Ugolini and Olive 2006:578).

The Hérault was most likely navigable only up to Agde (Ropiot 2007:232), however no structures suggesting the presence of a port have been excavated in the lower valley of the river (Ropiot 2007:248-249). Agde and La Monédière were, regardless, probably two important stops on the roads connecting the coast with the interior and the Gulf of Lion East to West (Ropiot 2007:253-254).

Only after the second quarter of the sixth century, amphorae start making their way towards the hinterland, but only reach sites of the upper valley of the Hérault like La Ramasse and Puech Crochu between the end of the sixth century and the early fifth (Hérubel 2000:92-93, Dedet et al 2006:156). The presence of amphorae in more sites corresponds to a comparatively smaller quantity of materials in single sites. It is also noticeable that, in Western Languedoc, Etruscan amphorae are, in any case, comparatively better distributed than the ones imported from Greece, which tend to remain on the coast (Ugolini and Olive 2006:563-565). Similarly, *bucchero* vases, almost exclusively *kantharoi*, are found in contexts dated until the early fifth century, when the half of the sixth is usually regarded as the period when this pottery is not imported anymore (Ugolini and Olive 2006:567-569). Therefore, it is possible to think that the production of this type of pottery lasted longer than imagined or that their presence in Western Languedoc represents what Ugolini and Olive (2006:569) call 'fonds de boutique'. The period of maximum distribution of the amphorae is represented by the second half of the fifth century BC, when they are secondary to the Massaliote ones (Dedet et al 2006:156). The continuity in imports is especially relevant in comparison to what happens in Eastern Languedoc and Provence, where in the fifth century Etruscan material is not present anymore. It is difficult to determine whether it might depend on an established preference for Etruscan wine or on the fact that Massaliote productions were only sufficient to supply the surrounding region, and the two explanations are not mutually exclusive (Ugolini and Olive 2006:570).

Looking at the material deposited in funerary contexts, the main necropolis in the the Hérault valley for the Early Iron Age is the one of Saint Julie à Pèzenas, which includes over 200 burials dated between the end of the seventh century and the end of the fourth.



Unfortunately, the material included in the funerary assemblages of Saint Julien has only been partially published (first descriptions in Giry1965, Llinas and Robert 1971, the *bucchero* pottery is studied in Robert 1979, trends in the distribution of the material in Nickels 1990, discussion of the Etruscan imports in Hérubel 2000, general trends involving the Etruscan material and a selection of specific graves in Dedet et al 2003, Dedet et al 2006).

In the necropolis of Saint Julien, about twenty burials can be dated between the end of the seventh and the early sixth century. Seven burials include Greek vases, and two also include Etruscan *kantharoi* of the types Ct3e1 and Ct3e2) (Dedet et al 2006:153). From the second quarter of the sixth century BC Etruscan amphorae, predominantly type 3B and occasionally 3A, are used as an ossuary. Because, as discussed above, *bucchero* pottery is already documented in the earliest period of life of necropolis and Etruscan amphorae are attested in the Hérault region since the late seventh century BC, it is evident that this represents a deliberate choice following a change in the burial customs of the area (Dedet et al 2006:154). The containers appear in 19 out of 70 burials, often associated to *bucchero kantharoi*, that are in eight of the 70 graves from this period (Dedet et al 2006:154). The amphorae often present abrasions on the surface around the handles and breaks that are possibly the result of them having been used for some time before being deposited in graves. During the third quarter of the century, their use in the necropolis ceases, while fragments of amphora are still found in several sites of the hinterland (Dedet et al 2006:154). Therefore, their presence in graves is the reflection of a ritual choice rather than a consequence of availability. Overall, the *kantharos*, exclusively of the type B-NERO Ct3e2 or B-NERO Ct3e3, is the only vase in *bucchero* present in the necropolis (Robert 1979, Hérubel 2000:100), and is not used any longer after 525 BC (Dedet et al 2006:154). Vases in Grey Monochrome pottery make their appearance at the beginning of the sixth century BC, becoming the main class of wheel thrown pottery from 570-550 BC circa. This is the period in which imitations of the B2 make their appearance (Nickels 1990:15-19). Only one of the cups is without handles, like the one from Castelnau de Guers (Nickels 1990:9).

Imported material is also attested in isolated graves – or, in some cases, possible isolated findings from larger cemeteries- such as Les Pradels, La Prade, Rec de Bragues, Les Faisses, Corno Lauzo, Arboras and, of course, Castelnau de Guers, all dated between 600 and 500 BC. In particular, the burials of Les Pradels, Les Faisses and Castelnau de Guers employ and Etruscan amphora as the ossuary: type Py 1/ 2 at Les Pradels, Py 3A at Les Faisses and type

3B, the most common in cemeteries, at Castelnau de Guers. Corno Lauzo is the only burial in which a Massaliote one is used the same way.

Fragments of Etruscan amphora and *kantharos* were also among the equipment of two graves discovered at Montméze, between the Hérault and the Thau lake (Hérubel 2000:105), and among the material reported from the necropolis of La Tour du Pigeonnier at Mourèze, North of Les Faisses, dated between the sixth and fourth century BC (Garcia 1993:58-59).

Moving to the West, from the Hérault valley to the Aude, in the necropolis of Gran Bassin II, dating to the second quarter of the sixth and the early fifth century BC, 9 Etruscan amphorae, primarily A-ETR 3B, are included among the funerary equipment, and at least six of them are used as ossuaries (Janin et al 2002:112). *Bucchero kantharoi* are present in four graves, and one has been found out of context. Only one is the same type as the ones from Castelnau de Guers, while the others are not decorated (Janin et al 2002:112). Two graves included bronze basins, and one the handle of a possible *oinochoe* in bronze (Janin et al 2002:116). Grey Monochrome pottery represents here, too, the most common kind of wheel thrown vases, attested in 31 graves with vases of various shapes (Janin et al 2002:112).

Therefore, comparing the distribution of Etruscan material in the settlements and in the funerary contexts it is evident that the latter reflects a series of deliberate choices and trends. *Bucchero kantharoi* appear earlier and in higher percentage and disappear sooner in the funerary contexts than they do in the settlements. They are also the only *bucchero* vessels present in the graves of Western Languedoc (Hérubel 2000:105).

As discussed earlier, Gras (1985:158) suggested that the popularity outside of Etruria of the *kantharos* among the *bucchero* shapes might have been related to the fact that it had handles that allowed its use for performing ritual offerings, which might have been part of the process of encounter and exchange.

It should also be noted that according to the descriptions offered by Greek and Roman sources about banqueting in Gallia, albeit in a much later period, it appears that passing the drinking cup among the people in attendance was not uncommon (Dietler 2010:244). If this custom was already common during the Iron Age, it is possible that the *kantharos* might have become popular and be sought out for one of the characteristics that also made the traders regard it as an appropriate token of exchange.

Ugolini and Olive (2006:567-569), on the other hand, when discussing the distribution of *bucchero* specifically in Western Languedoc and, in particular, in the interior of the region, suggest that these vessels might have been especially appreciated by the inhabitants of sites that did not receive as many different type of imports as those who lived on the coast, but were already familiar with dark coloured pottery because of the clay in which the local handmade vases were made.

Another possible interpretation for the popularity of this vessel could be sought in its very distinctive shape and its simple, dark, shiny surface. When discussing the popularity of conical cups in Crete during the Palatial period, in fact, Knappett (2011:162) points out that the ‘plainness and extreme simplicity’ of these vessel provided it with ‘distinctive iconic qualities’, very easily recognizable. Similarly, the *kantharoi* here discussed have a very distinctive but also simple shape, which is never complicated by very articulate decorations, aside from the presence of lines on the lip and notches on the carination. I think it is possible to credit the popularity of this vessel to the fact that it had achieved equally ‘iconic’ status. Some of the iconicity and subsequent large distribution of these drinking vases could also be credited to the specific tactile and visual properties of *bucchero*, with its smooth, shiny surface. Both these qualities and the essential but unique shape would have made *bucchero kantharoi* easily recognizable even to people who were not used to choosing among different types of pottery. It is also possible that these specific characteristics of the *bucchero* as a material were considered especially appealing. For example, the smooth surface and the decoration with notches could have been considered especially pleasant to the touch, and the polished, shiny surface could have been deemed more attractive than that of painted pottery, or more fitting in assemblages of banqueting vessels. As it will be discussed later, metallic vessels are often an important part of the equipment of ‘rich’ burials in Western Languedoc during the Early Iron Age, and drinking vases with a polished, shiny surface could have been seen as particularly fitting to represent banqueting activities in this same context.

As discussed above, the amphorae that are deposited in burials are almost exclusively of the type Py3, and, in particular, of the subtype 3B. Dedet and Py (2006:135) have noted how the prevalence of this amphora in Western Languedoc in general is specific to the region, as in Eastern Languedoc the shape 3A seems to be the more common, and the two are equally frequent in Provence. Their presence in the region was definitely related to the product they contained rather than to the way they looked. At the same time, the amphora Py3B has a

pointed, narrow shape with oval handles that not only did, most likely, made it easier to transport and to fit in the pit of a burial, but is also extremely distinctive among the other containers used in Southern France during the Early Iron Age. It is possible that a similar 'iconic' quality helped make this the most popular container to be included in funerary assemblages. The inclusion of the amphorae in burials, as it has been discussed above, seems limited to a specific period, even if they are available in the area before and after it (Dedet et al 2006:155). Given the limited popularity of pouring shapes and the absence of vases for mixing, both in funerary and urban contexts, in this time period, it is perhaps possible to think that the amphora was associated with the drinking cups not only because it was a wine container, but because it might have been also actively used in the banqueting practice. From this point of view, the specific shape of the Py3B amphora would have made it easier to handle and use during the funerary banquet.

The coastal sites where the earlier imports were concentrated represented probably the stops of a navigation of cabotage along the shoreline. It is likely that, in the later seventh and early sixth century BC, the exchanges were less frequent and possibly mediated by individuals of high social status in the indigenous communities, who organized the accumulation of metal material in hoards (Dedet et al 2006:156, Bats 2011:99) and were offered goods (such as pottery and metal vessels) that were still regarded as *exotica*, and sometimes included in funerary assemblages. The first half of the sixth century represents the moment in which numerous changes take place in Mediterranean France, from the foundation of Massalia to the creation of fortified settlements that attest the permanent occupation of the territory, the *oppida* (Garcia 2014:57-120). As has been discussed, in the Hérault valley the first quarter of the century is the period when Etruscan amphorae and *bucchero* become more common, and over the following 25 years they start making their way towards the hinterland. It is likely that, regardless of the provenience of the traders that imported goods in Mediterranean France, Massalia played a role in the redistribution of these items. The distribution of the imports over a larger area, however, is also the reflection of more complex networks of exchange inside the region. Dedet et al (2006:156) talk about a 'more democratic' access to these goods, but their increased presence is not only the expression of their availability to a larger number of individuals but of their deliberate selection and assimilation in what has becomes, in this period, the typical *élite* funerary assemblage. Looking at the funerary ritual in Western Languedoc, this is, in fact, again a moment of change. The grave assemblage in the second half of the seventh century was composed by numerous vases (on average, over 50 vessels at Mailhac, over 30 at Pradines and 13 at the necropolis Peyrou, near Agde),

almost all handmade (Mazière 2002:299 and 301). In particular, near Agde, among these sets the most common containers are small urns and vases for storage, some of which probably contained offers of food (Mazière 2002:299). From the beginning of the sixth century, the assemblages become composed of fewer vases, sometimes even only the ossuary (Mazière 2013:189). Over the following 50 years in the Hérault valley, the amphorae, as we have said, start to be used with this function. The vases that accompany it are, now primarily drinking vessels (Mazière 2013:189). In Western Languedoc and Roussillon, the period between the end of the seventh and the half of the fifth century BC is also characterized by more frequent presence of weapons in the funerary equipment in comparison with the pre-existing customs of the area (Beylier 2012a:173-174), a phenomenon that will be discussed more extensively in the following section.

The imports included in the grave of Castelnau de Guers, therefore, all belong to classes that, in the time period to which the grave has been attributed, are becoming an established part of the material culture of Western Languedoc and of the Hérault valley in particular, especially for what concerns the material included in funerary assemblages. As discussed in Chapter 2, Mullen (2013b:33) has compared the assimilation of Mediterranean drinking vessels and wine in non-Greek Iron Age communities to the phenomenon of interference: these people were trying to perform Greek banqueting but drank the wine unmixed, because they lacked knowledge of Greek wine drinking practices. However, I think that, for Western Languedoc, it would be more apt to talk about borrowing of Mediterranean (primarily Etruscan) wine and drinking cups in the language of local banqueting and of the funerary assemblages that referred to it. As described by Mullen herself (2012b:25-26), borrowing is the adoption of linguistic elements from one language to another, after which the new element can also be used by monolingual speakers.

The only exception, among the Etruscan imports from Castelnau de Guers, is represented by the Etrusco Corinthian cup. This class of material is, in fact, only sporadically attested in Western Languedoc (Hérubel 2000:99) and in the Western Mediterranean in general, with the sole exceptions of the sites of Marseille and Saint Blaise (Frère 2006:259-277). Another *kylix* attributed to the Ciclo dei Rosoni and, in particular, to the Gruppo a Maschera Umana is, however, attested at Ensérune (Frère 2006:261, Dubosse 2007:159-60). Vases from the same Group have been found in Catalonia (in Ullastret and in the necropolis of the North Eastern Wall, near Emporion), and in Provence, in the sites of Saint Blaise, Istres and Saint Remy de Provence, as well as in Massalia (Szilágyi 1992:580-582, Marchand 2002:99, Frère

2006:259-277). Six or seven cups attributed to the Ciclo dei Rosoni were found in a shipwreck excavated near the Cap d'Antibes (Sizlâgi 1992:582, Long and Sourisseau 2002:31, Frère 2006:277). The shipwreck, dated around the half of the sixth century BC (Long and Sourisseau 2002:31), carried primarily material of Etruscan production, and possibly produced in the area of Pyrgi/Caere: primarily Etruscan amphorae of the type A-ETR 3B and *bucchero kantharoi* of the type B-NERO Ct3e2. They were accompanied by some amphorae of the type A-ETR 3A, a few *bucchero oinochoai* (type B-NERO Oe7) and 'Corinthian' amphorae probably produced in Sicily. In the ship were also urns, mortars and basins also of Italic production, and an Etruscan imitation of a Punic lamp (Long and Sourisseau 2002:31).

The cup from Castelnau de Guers could have been the only vase of its kind in a more diversified cargo, but the fact that the majority of similar vases have been found in closer proximity of Massalia could be yet a further indication of the role that the colony played, during the sixth century, in the redistribution of all the imports towards the rest of Mediterranean France and Western Languedoc in particular.

### 5.2.3 *The funerary customs of Western Languedoc during the Early Iron Age*

In this section, I discuss general 'trends' observable in the funerary customs of Western Languedoc in the period to which the burial of Castelnau de Guers is dated. They include the presence, typology and quantity of weapons in burials and their association with vases comparable with the ones found at Castelnau de Guers, as well as of metallic banqueting vessels, in particular the *simpulum*. Therefore, discussing them allows us to reason on how representative and how unique this burial is in comparison to its regional context.

In Roussillon and Western Languedoc the period between the end of the seventh and the half of the sixth century BC is characterized by a much higher quantity of weapons in the funerary equipment than before. In the necropoleis of Peyrou at Couffolens, Grand Bassin II at Mailhac and Saint Julien at Pèzenas they are present in respectively, 40, 5%, 33% and 23 % of the burials (Beylier 2012a:173-174). Spears represent the more popular items, either alone or accompanied by one or two other weapons (Beylier 2012a:184). Between the end of the seventh and the first half of the fifth century BC, the presence of more than one weapon in the funerary equipment is, however, relatively infrequent. The weapons are distributed as follows (data from Beylier 2012a:180):

**Table 10 Weapon assemblages in burials from Western Languedoc during the Early Iron Age (from Beylier 2012a:180)**

As for the functionality of an assemblage including more than one throwing weapon, instances of warriors taking more than one in battle are attested both in the iconography of Archaic hoplites and by ethnographic studies (Beylier 2012a:285).

Objects of personal ornament like brooches and belt buckles and instruments for *toilette* like tweezers, both present in the funerary assemblage we are discussing, are also quite common in the equipment of graves with weapons in Western Languedoc between seventh and sixth century BC (Beylier 2012a:223-224).

As for the *simpulum*, it is present in most of the graves containing weapons in the necropolises of Grand Bassin II, Saint-Julien and Las Peyros (Beylier 2012a:225-226), more rarely along with other metal vessels such as basins and *oinochoai* and, in one case (the grave 257 of Saint Julien), a cheese grater.

**Table 11 Distribution of simpula in the burials from Saint Julien (bolded if more than one weapon is present)**

**Table 12 Distribution of simpula in the burials from Grand Bassin II (from Beylier 2012a:226)**

In Catalonia, the association between *simpulum* and weapons is verified in some of the richer burials, prevalently in the area north of the Ebro (Beylier 2012a:227-228). In Eastern Languedoc, Provence and Liguria, most graves including weapons also include metallic vessels related to wine consumption, but in this case it is mostly basins and cups, while the *simpulum* is not present (Beylier 2012a:228-229). Therefore, this particular instrument seems to be a specific feature of prestigious assemblages from the area between Ebro and Hérault.

An association that is particularly interesting is that between *simpulum* and *soliferreum*, also present in the Castelnau de Guers burial. This is a javelin entirely made of iron, from the tip to the end of the handle, designed to be a swift weapon to throw at short distance (Quesada 1997:308-309). It is a type of weapon which is very characteristic of the Iberian Peninsula in pre Roman age, in particular in the South East. Most of the known weapons of this kind have been found on the Mediterranean coast but also in the South of Portugal and in the Meseta. All the *soliferrea* that have been found in France were either in Western Languedoc or in the Southern part of Aquitaine. Only two weapons of this kind have been found north of these regions (Beylier 2012a:57).

Among the 7 graves including this type of weapon excavated in Languedoc, there is only one that definitely does not include also a *simpulum* (Beylier 2012a:231). However, the

association between javelin and the *simpula* in the grave of Corno Lauzo is doubtful (see Graells 2015 and Appendix 3).

**Table 13 Associations between *solifereae* and metal vessels in Western Languedoc (data from Beylier 2012a:231 and Graells 2015)**

The presence of these two objects in the same graves is of great interest also because they both have been interpreted as especially meaningful even among weapons and banquet equipment. Beylier (2012:249) observes that, among the weapons, the *solifereum* and the sword are the ones that are most frequently accompanied by ‘luxury goods’, intended as objects of significant intrinsic value (due to being rare, of exotic provenience, technically elaborate or manufactured in an expensive material) or associated with prestigious activities such as horse riding, banqueting, ceremonial activities as well as care of the body (Beylier 2012a:223-224). Based on these associations, as well as the complexity of their manufacture in comparison with that of a spear, he identifies them as items associated with a higher rank than that expressed merely by the presence of weapons in the grave (Beylier 2012a:249).

The *simpulum*, on the other hand, has been identified by several scholars as one of the elements that, at least from the half of the seventh century BC, starts defining the individuals of highest social status in graves from Western Languedoc (Janin 2000:126), together with weapons and imported vases. Lucas (2003-2004:96) has noted the similarity in the evolution of Catalan funerary customs and in the introduction and increasing presence of this instrument. In Greek and Italic environments, the *simpulum* was used to mix and pour wine in festive ceremonies and religious libations (Lucas 2003-2004:95), but the presence of this vessel in numerous ‘chiefly’ Western Mediterranean graves has been associated with the individual rank of the deceased. Nickels et al (1989:447) argue that it might indicate that its owner was in the prestigious position to use it to distribute wine or other liquids to others during banquets. However, it has also been suggested that, paired with the ostentatious nature of a very large funerary assemblage, the deposition of the *simpulum* in the grave might indicate the privilege of drinking from it, an act also portrayed in one of the plates from the Etruscan palace of Murlo or on the reliefs that decorated metal vessels similarly used in the ritual consumption of wine like the *situlae* from Providence and Kuffarn (Lucas 2003-2004:127-129). The fact that this instrument was involved both in the preparation and consumption of wine, an exotic product adopted in indigenous rituals associated with banqueting, gave it a great symbolic value and made it one of the strongest markers of status among the objects displayed in Western Mediterranean Iron Age burials (Lucas 2003-2004:129).



An interesting detail of the Kuffarn *situla* is that the man who is served with the *simpulum* is sitting in front of a full pantry and accompanied by a young boy dressed similarly. Lucas (2003-2004:127-129) links this image to the fact that in several graves from the necropoleis of Languedoc in which the *simpulum* is present are buried couples, suggesting that the prestige related to this instrument was meant to reflect not just on individuals but on families.

As discussed in the previous section, the use of Etruscan amphorae (almost exclusively type A-ETR 3B) as an ossuary is typical of the funerary customs of the coastal area of Western Languedoc in the central part of the sixth century BC.

These containers are used as cinerary vessels in several burials from the cemeteries of Grand Bassin II and Saint Julien à Pézènas in this period. The data from some of the better published burials from these cemeteries whose chronology overlap with that of the burial from Castelnau de Guers are tabulated in the Appendix 2. The classes of materials included in the equipment are very similar to the ones present in Castelnau de Guers, with exception represented by metal vessels other than the *simpulum* and the possible cauldron or drum stand (grave 273 of Saint Julien). In one case (grave 223 of Saint Julien) the burial, interpreted as feminine, includes a spindle whorl rather than the weapons. In most cases, the burial includes weapons (usually only the spears, but also spear and sword in the grave 7 of Grand Bassin II and spear and greave in the grave 147 of Saint Julien). Where present and identifiable, the other pottery vases accompanying the ossuary are either drinking cups or small containers. The pottery assemblage never seems as big or varied as in Castelnau de Guers, except for the grave 8 of Grand Bassin 2. Iron knives are also very frequent, and their presence suggests the idea of a banquet where meat was consumed along with the wine.

Therefore, the assemblage of materials from this grave appears to be somewhat typical of the funerary customs of Western Languedoc, but only in the realm of a relatively small group of *élite* burials, because of relatively uncommon elements like the presence of the *soliferreum*, its association to the spear and the *simpulum*, the variety of the drinking vessels and the presence of a relatively uncommon shape like the one of the Grey Monochrome cup and of an unusual, for this region, class of materials like the Etrusco Corinthian pottery.

#### **5.2.4 Banquet equipment and weapons: a system of markers of status**

As discussed above, in Western Languedoc and Roussillon graves including weapons in the funerary equipment are extremely rare during the late seventh century BC, but the early sixth

century sees a dramatic increment of burials in which at least one was part of the assemblage, with the 575-525 BC period being characterized by the highest quantity of graves including weapons in proportion to the ones excavated (Beylier 2012a:171-174). This fact has been interpreted as the expression of the emergence of a more complex social stratification accompanied by a 'militarization' of the society (Ruiz Zapatero 2004, Graells 2013a). It has also been suggested that this phenomenon could be a manifestation of defensiveness towards 'foreign', Mediterranean elements (Nickels 1990:90) whose presence in the Gulf of Lion becomes more stable in the sixth century, thanks to foundation of Massalia and the possible installation of Etruscan merchants in Lattara (Beylier 2013:354-355).

However, this is also a period that, as discussed, sees a series of changes not only in the choice of metallic objects accompanying the deceased, but also on the equipment in terms of vessels. At the end of the seventh and beginning of the sixth century BC, the large sets of accompanying vases are replaced by the simple ossuary or by a small selection of vases, often imported: primarily drinking vessels, in some cases *oinochoai* and, in a couple of burials at Ensérune, unguentaries (Mazière 2012:189).

The changes in the pottery assemblage might indicate also a change in the funerary ritual, with increased emphasis in the banqueting ritual, which does not mean that the local banqueting customs were simply modified to fit the Greek symposium, but that wine and vessels for its consumption were integrated in an already existing system (Mazière 2013:189). During Iron Age, Mediterranean wine in Southern France was 'indigenized' and added to traditional banqueting along to already existing ones like beer and mead (Dietler 2007:234). Besides, it should be noted that the increased emphasis on banqueting practices is already noticeable from the seventh century BC, when *simpula*, knives and skewers become more common in the funerary equipment (Mazière 2012:187). During the sixth century, to this list will be added bronze basins, more *simpula*, a cheese grater from Saint Julien and two *thymiateria* or cauldron supports from Saint Julien and Las Peyros (Mazière 2012:188).

As it has been shown, the new banqueting equipment, including imported pottery and imitations and metal vessels, is frequently associated to the weapons, in particular the *soliferreum* and the sword (Beylier 2012a:249), forming part of a same system of status symbols (Beylier 2013, Graells 2013a). Therefore, the emphasis on the militaristic aspect of the *élite* status seems to go hand in hand with the intensification of commercial contacts with the Mediterranean incomers and acquisition of items to adapt to the local banqueting rituals. This has led researchers to connect the increasingly more common militaristic aspect of the

funerary ritual with the possibility of internal military tensions between local emerging figures of authority rather than 'external' individuals or groups (Nickels 1990:24-25). The first decades of the sixth century BC also see the development of several fortified settlements that will become the characteristic form of occupation of the territory in the Western Mediterranean Iron Age. This change in the settlement models is usually seen as the expression of a radical change in economy and society, partially triggered by the interaction with Mediterranean traders (Garcia 2014:67-77). In particular, individuals who controlled access the main avenues of communication (roads, rivers, the coast) might have enjoyed authority and benefitted of a right to ask for a toll to use these avenues for commerce, than could have been paid in the form of imports (Ropiot 2007:334). Because the question of what was offered in exchange for Mediterranean goods is still widely debated, some have seen the co-presence of weapons and imports in the same graves as an indication that mercenary warfare could have been an activity part of the local population engaged in, especially since Herodotus (*Histories*, VII, 165) mentions the Elysices- the Celts living in Western Languedoc and Roussillon- among the mercenaries fighting for the Carthaginian army in the battle of Himera(Ropiot 2007:334). This is definitely a possibility, though it probably would not explain the entire extent of the diffusion of weapons and banqueting equipment in eminent burials.

Relatively widespread growing affluence and increase in opportunities for social affirmation are among the most common elements that can represent a challenge to existing social orders, and the expression of these challenges often manifests itself in various forms of social behaviour, including, of course, the funerary ritual (Cannon 1989:446). It is very possible that the Mediterranean contacts contributed to create a situation of increased dynamism, and increased social competition.

The development of numerous fortified centres in the territory might also be considered another sign of a society in the midst of internal conflicts, and definitely indicate a change in the socio-political structure of the local communities that parallels the diffusion of the markers of status we just discussed in the funerary equipment (Beylier 2012a:253, 2013:355). However, this does not necessarily mean that the competition actually led to frequent military confrontations. The display of weaponry in the funerary assemblages might have been a way to 'show off' one's status that became even more important in a period of relative 'peace', when the deceased's military prowess could not be actively displayed on the battlefield (Beylier 2012b:431).

One thing that is very noticeable is that, during the passage between the end of the seventh and the early sixth century BC, is the change in what represents the ‘prestige’ goods included in funerary assemblages that goes along with the appearance of the weapons. During the passage between Bronze and Iron Age, in fact, the majority of metallic objects included in burials from Western Languedoc are vessels, objects for personal care, utensils like spindles and accessories for coiffure and jewels, whereas weapons are extremely rare (Janin 1996:17-21, Janin 2000:125-126). Because the cremation of the bodies complicates the identification of the sex of the deceased, archaeologists have had difficulties identifying male burials for to this period since they rarely include weapons, leaving only razors as objects regarded as indicative of the fact that the burial belonged to a male (Janin 1996:27-28). This situation is not exclusive to Western Languedoc, but quite similar to what is observable during the eighth and seventh century BC in Central and Eastern France, even if the style of the different sets of jewellery is very different depending on the region and, possibly, age and ethnicity of the deceased (Milcent 2013a). During the first half of the sixth century BC, paralleling the diffusion of the weapons in the burials, the jewellery sets included in the necropoleis become smaller and less varied (Verger and Pernet 2013:331). In general, during the sixth century BC, the majority of burials assigned a gender are identified as masculine on the basis of the objects in the assemblage (rather than the skeletal remains), while for the previous century the majority of burials assigned a gender on the basis of the assemblage are feminine (Mazière 2012:198). As it will be discussed later, among the isolated graves like the one from Castelnau de Guers at least two of the ones including jewellery predate the others (Mazière 2005:912-913)

The increased visibility of burials characterized by the display of items that are usually associated with the idea of masculinity has led some researchers to wonder if the sixth century also sees a change of the role of *élite* women in indigenous society, especially considering that, in this period, the dynamics of exchange that take place in the region change in general, shifting from rarer interactions limited to specific sites and surrounding areas to more regular interactions, with better distribution around the territory and under the overall control of Massalia (Verger and Pernet 2013:331-370).

On the other hand, it is also possible to suggest that the weapons and banqueting equipment came to share the function of markers of status held by the jewellery sets, still present in the burials, albeit in more subdued fashion, because the type of claims connected to the status that sixth century *élites* wanted to showcase was better represented by this new group of

materials. Rainbird (1999:221) has written about how classes of materials can ‘inherit’ the social role of different ones- in his case study, how monumental burials replaced pottery as a mnemonic device representative of the ancestors in the Pacific Islands. It is possible that something similar happened to imported and imitation banqueting vessels and weapons in the funerary equipment of the graves of Western Languedoc: if they did not completely replace the sets of jewellery, they came to share their function in displaying the power of individuals and groups.

The imported pottery and metallic vessels, however, arguably also acquired a different significance, in this period, than the one they had had at the beginning of the Early Iron Age, when their inclusion in burials was occasional and exceptional. From the second quarter of the sixth century BC, what made them desirable was not only and not specifically their ‘foreign’ origin, but also the fact that they stood as reminder of the exchanges and the connections in which the people who had acquired them participated and their increasingly established role in banqueting rituals that were specific to the region. Because of the ‘iconic’ qualities discussed above, the *kantharos* and amphora in particular probably were strongly connected to the idea of the wine they were used to consume.

### **5.3 The isolated burial of Castelnau de Guers**

Castelnau de Guers is situated on a hill, 8 km North of Agde, overlooking the Hérault valley. Here, in 1989, has been excavated a cremation burial datable to the Early Iron Age. The site is a short distance from the Necropolis of Saint-Julien à Pezenas and from another supposed isolated grave, the one of Rec-de-Bragues (Florensac).

The cover of the burial had been disturbed when the field in which it was located was ploughed, and Houlès and Janin (1992:434), while surveying the area, noticed some of the blocks that composed it. After the burial was excavated, a series of sondages were made in the area to discover other graves with no result, leading to the conclusion that this was an isolated burial.

The grave had been cut by the agricultural work, so it was not possible to reconstruct its shape exactly, but it seems to have been roughly circular. A few blocks of sandstone, probably forming part of the cover, have been identified in the surrounding area on a surface of about 1 x 0,30 cm<sup>2</sup>. The surface soil contained the fragments of ‘au moins cinq vases’ and of a *soliferrum* (Houlès and Janin 1992:434). Still in place, at the bottom of the grave, were the bottom of a cup and a fragment of *soliferrum*. A slab of limestone (50x 44 x 9 cm) covered

a pit 64 cm deep in the rock, where the ossuary, an Etruscan amphora, was placed vertically. Several weapons and ornamental objects were placed against it.

### 5.3.1 The funerary equipment

The Etruscan amphora, of the type 3B of Py1985 (A-ETR 3B in Dicocer), used as an ossuary, was found intact. The other vases included in the grave have all been damaged by ploughing, since they were placed in the upper part of the burial. Among them were two *bucchero kantharoi* of the type 3e of Rasmussen 1979 decorated only by notches on the carination (Dicocer: B-NERO Ct3e2).

The burial also included a low etrusco-corinthian cup, with two handles, recalling the form of the Ionian A2 (ETRU-COR Kyb on Dicocer). The cup is made of cream coloured clay, decorated with stripes painted in the interior, lip and body painted in orange/brown and separated by a purple line, and unpainted foot. The body is decorated with the figure of an aquatic bird painted near to the handles. Incisions on the surface of the vase detail the feathers. It has been attributed by Sizlâgi to the Gruppo A Maschera Umana (Sizlâgi 1992:581, n.78) that follows the tradition of the Pittore dei Rosoni (Sizlâgi 1992:588). This production is mostly concentrated in Southern Etruria, in particular in Veio and Rome, and this is the area where the workshops that produced these vases were probably located. (Sizlâgi 1992:596) The chronology of this type of vessel can be placed between 565 and 555 BC.

Also part of the funerary equipment was a cup with distinctive, diverging lip and no handles in Grey Monochrome pottery (GR-MONO 5e in Dicocer). This form is a variation, with short foot and no handles, of the form V of Arcelin Pradelle 1984 (p.43 n.331), an imitation of the B2 Ionian *kylix*. Cups belonging to this variation of the type V are attested also in the nearby necropolis of Saint Julien (Nickels 1990:9).

On the basis of the clay and treatment it is attributed by Houlès and Janin (1992:435) to the group Agde A of Nickels 1978, localized in the lower Hérault valley and whose distribution centres on the area of Agde. The beginning of this production is to be placed in the second quarter of the sixth century BC; however this pottery is produced until the beginning of the following century (Arcelin Pradelle 1984:138).

The burial also included two handmade cups. Of the vessels in question, the first is a hemispherical bowl with parallel lip and, probably, flat bottom (in the Dicocer, the shape is CNT LOC 5a1, corresponding to the types 2a of Louis et al.1960C and Wa of Nickels 1989

and 432 of Dedet and Py 1974). This vessel was probably used to serve liquids as well as for drinking.

The other handmade vessel that was part of the funerary equipment was a smaller cup, whose profile resembled that of the first one, but with a high carination with concave lip and parallel rim, and flat bottom.

The funerary equipment also included several metal items, most of which were placed against the ossuary. Among them was a *simpulum*, in bronze, burnt and deformed by the action of the fire. The best preserved part of it is a section of the handle, decorated with a motif *à grenetis*, two sets of parallel lines of minute grains impressed by die. This decorative motif is present on other *simpula*: the one placed in the grave 13 of the necropolis of Las Peyros at Couffolens and one of the two present in the isolated grave of Corno Lauzo, in Western Languedoc, and in the grave 8 of the necropolis of Anglès in Catalonia (Lucas 2003-2004:123). This technique of embellishment is attested since late Bronze Age, not only in Southern French and Eastern Spanish contexts but also in metal vessels from Jura and from Veneto (Lucas 2003-2004:123).

The handle was possibly joined to the bowl by rivets, which were still attached to some of the damaged pieces of metal. This item was, therefore, arguably different from most of the *simpula* found in France and in the Iberian Peninsula, since most of them were made from a single piece (Lucas 2003-2004:121). Handles with rivets attached are mentioned in the description of two graves from Saint Julien and possibly identifiable in the assemblage of some graves from the necropolis of the North Eastern Wall at Emporion, but Lucas (2003-2004:121) wonders if this can constitute a particular type of *simpulum* or is to be identified as the trace of a repair or a way to strengthen an handle consumed by use. The repair on the *simpulum* would have probably been performed partly because its previous use contributed to its symbolic meaning. Histories of ownership and exchange, as well as association with a specific ideological context, can contribute to the symbolic meaning of objects, giving them value that transcends the production costs (DeMarrais et al 1996:18).

Among the elements of ornament present in the grave was a belt buckle in bronze, probably from a belt with one hook, which had been damaged by fire, making it difficult to identify any type of decoration. The buckle is of a type (type 2 of Mohen 1980 and B2 of Lorrio 1997) that is characteristic of Languedoc, but also found in areas of the interior South

Western France (Mohen 1980:79) and in several areas of Northern Spain in (Lorrio 1997:607).

Another accessory included in the funerary assemblage was an iron crossbow brooch, with an upturned catchplate and a button shaped knob. The bow is decorated with incised lines and the knob with a spiral motif. Among the material placed against the ossuary was also an iron stem that might have been the brooch's pin. Brooches in bronze and, more often, in iron, with long bilateral hinge, curved bow and foot curved at an angle, ending in a button shaped knob are typical of the material culture of the Languedoc as well as the North Eastern Spain (Gailledrat 1997:252-253), and correspond to the type 7B of Gulf of Lion of Oliver 1984.

The grave also included an iron ring, with a diameter of 3, 6 cm and a button-shaped decoration on the front.

The funerary equipment also included bronze tweezers, an iron knife and fragments of iron stem, possibly the pin of another brooch.

As discussed above, the grave also included weapons. A *soliferreum* was broken in several, twisted fragments. It is attributed by Beylier to the type E1 of his classification (which is based on both the handle and the blade, here absent) because of the notches on the handle (Beylier 2012a:60 and 314). The E1 is one of the types of *soliferrea* that are found in Southern French and Catalan contexts datable to the Early Iron Age, but not in other regions of the Iberian Peninsula, where *soliferrea* belonging to different types are attested at later dates (Beylier 2012a:59). They appear in contexts dated between 575 and 475 BC (Beylier 2012a:60).

The other weapon present in the grave was a spear. Both the iron spearhead and heel have been preserved. Beylier (2012a:314) ascribes the spearhead to his type IIIB1 (Beylier 2012a:81). In Languedoc, most spears attested for Early Iron Age are located West of the Hérault, probably because the majority of burials found in the region for this period are situated here (Beylier 2012a:75). Ogival spearheads are one of the oldest shapes attested, starting from the second half of the seventh century BC (Beylier 2012a:75-76 and 82). The heel was conical in shape, 20,3 cm long and a rivet was preserved near the opening (Beylier 2012a:314). Conical heels are common in Mediterranean regions from the Bronze Age, but items over 15 cm of length, in which the heel is not completely empty but also elongated by



the presence of a point, are not attested in Languedoc until the first half of the sixth century BC (Beylier 2012a:84).

The date proposed by the excavators for this grave is between 570 and 550 BC because of the vases included in it (Houlès and Janin 1992:440), to be adjusted to 560-550 BC taking into account the chronology that Sizlâgi (1992:595) suggests for the Group the Etrusco Corinthian cup belongs to.

### 5.3.2 *The funerary ritual*

The osteological analyses revealed that the individual buried in this grave was between 12 and 15 years old, and had been cremated. Mixed with the bones of the deceased were fragments of animal bones, belonging to two small sheep or goats. Smaller fragments of these bones, mixed with charcoal, have been found also inside the grave that probably had been partially filled with the remains of the funeral pyre. No trace of the latter has been found, and the excavators speculated whether the person buried in this grave had been cremated in a collective pyre or, given the isolated nature of the tomb, an individual one (Houlès and Janin 1992:438-439).

Some of the items that were part of the funerary equipment (the belt buckle and the *simpulum*) had been damaged by fire, having probably burned during the funerary ritual (Houlès and Janin 1992:439).

The *soliferreum* had also been deliberately folded and broken into pieces. Folding is quite common in depositions that include this kind of weapon, but in the case of other graves it is harder to determine whether other *soliferrea* have been broken purposely or are just missing pieces because of the poor preservation of the graves they were in. In this case, however, all the pieces of the weapon were present (Beylier 2012a:197). In the following table are summarized all the main data about this burial:

| Location and chronology   | Ritual, osteology  | Structure   | Pottery vessels   | Weapons  | Personal ornament   | Other   |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| St. Antoine, Castelnau de Guers, Hérault, W Languedoc, 560-550 BC | Cremation. Individual aged between 12 and 15. The <i>soliferreum</i> had been intentionally destroyed. | Possible presence of a marker indicated by the presence of slabs <i>in situ</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Etruscan amphora used as an ossuary (A-ETR 3B)</li> <li>-<i>Bucchero kantharos</i> (B- NERO Ct3e2)</li> <li>-<i>Bucchero kantharos</i> (B- NERO Ct3e2)</li> <li>- Etrusco Corinthian cup (ETRU-COR Kyb)</li> <li>-Grey Monochrome cup (GR-MONO 5e)</li> <li>-Handmade cup (CNT LOC 5a1)</li> <li>-Handmade cup</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-<i>Soliferreum</i> type E1.12 of Beylier 2012a</li> <li>-Spearhead type IIIB1, in iron</li> <li>-Iron heel of the spear</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Bronze belt buckle with one hook</li> <li>-Bronze brooch type 7B of Oliver 1986</li> <li>-Possible element of another brooch</li> <li>-Bronze ring</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Bronze <i>simpulum</i></li> <li>-Iron knife</li> <li>-Tweezers</li> </ul> |

Table 14 The isolated burial of Castelnau de Guers summarized

## 5.4 Isolated graves

In this section, I discuss a specific group of burials the one from Castelnau de Guers belongs to: isolated burial. Some of them have already mentioned as, as it will be discussed, most of them are in Western Languedoc and follow the trends already discussed in the funerary culture of the region.

### 5.4.1 *Isolated graves and their significance*

Isolated graves like the one of Castelnau de Guers are first attested in Western Languedoc during the seventh century BC (Mazière 2005:912). They stand out in the region not only for their position, outside of the contemporary necropolises, but also because some of them are inhumations, while in Western Languedoc cremation was used almost exclusively from c.1000 BC (Mazière 2005:905 and 912 ). The majority of these burials have been excavated in Languedoc, but some examples are also known in Roussillon and Northern Spain.

Isolated graves have been interpreted by some scholars as the expression of a rural *élite* (Maunè 1998b:47-48, Arcelin 1999:445-446, de Chazelles et al 2001:131-132), possibly the owners of some of the land surrounding the proto-urban agglomerations developing during the Early Iron Age, who lived outside these centres.

Excavations and surveys carried out in the micro regions surrounding bigger settlements both in Provence and Languedoc have, in fact, led to the identification of a few occupied sites of limited extension (Maunè 1998a,b, Arcelin 1999, Garcia 2014:78). The investigation of sites of this type has brought to light the same variety of materials found in the bigger proto-urban centres, including fragments of imported amphorae and pottery. This has led some researchers to think that their occupation might not have been temporary and that they represented an alternative style of settlement contemporary to the development of the bigger fortified sites (Maunè 1998a, b, Arcelin 1999). On the other hand, others interpret them as farmhouses subordinate to the main inhabited sites and dedicated to agricultural and pastoral activity, but strategically situated in the territory surrounding the main centres to ensure its more intensive exploitation (Garcia 2014:78).

The choice of burial outside of the contemporary necropoleis has been seen, by the archaeologists who interpret isolated ‘farmhouses’ as the residence of rural aristocracy, as a possible way for *élite* individuals to assert their independence from the bigger settlements (Maunè 1998b:47-48). Others have suggested that the individual graves might have set the limits of the territory that belonged to the family of the buried individual or to the group

they belonged to (de Chazelles et al 2001:131-132, Graells 2013a:57). Another proposed interpretation views the isolated position of these graves as the expression of the fact that the deceased had achieved a status comparable to the heroic one (Taffanel and Taffanel 1960:13, Graells 2010:139). The location of the grave indicated either the border of the territory belonging to the community the dead person belonged to (Taffanel and Taffanel 1960:13) or the place where the hero's feats had happened (Graells 2010:139), reflecting the way in which Homeric heroes are buried away from the rest of the community to be clearly visible and a permanent example (Valenza Mele 1991:159).

Ropiot (2007:142-143) observes that at least three isolated graves are posited to overlook one of the main rivers in Western Languedoc: an isolated burial in La Gravette is near the Aude, and another one, located in Chateau Roussillon, near the Tet. As for Sant Antoine à Castelnau de Guers, the site overlooks the Hérault and is placed between the course of the river and the Thau lake, and possibly also along a road that followed the perimeter of the lake (Ropiot 2007:256). She suggests that the location of these graves might be an expression of the control that families or groups the people who were placed in these burials belonged to held over the territory. Most isolated burials seem to reflect the same association of markers of status typical of the eminent burials of Western Languedoc during the Early Iron Age. For the reasons discussed in the previous section, the possibility for access to connections with the rest of the territory seems to chime particularly well with assemblages that, in almost all the documented cases, included imports and sets connected to banqueting activities as well as weapons.

All the isolated graves from Southern France and Northern Spain mentioned in the literature are described in Appendix 3, with the main bibliography and a list of the items included in the funerary equipment

#### ***5.4.2 The composition of the funerary assemblages.***

Looking at the characteristics of the specific burials, the inhumations all include items of jewellery in the accompanying assemblage, and at least two of them seem to be dated earlier than the isolated graves where the ritual is cremation. It should be noted, however, that the discovery of one cremation burial dated to the seventh century BC has been reported at Coujan, at Murviel-lès-Béziers (Barruol 1971:385), but it has never been verified whether it was actually an isolated burial (Mazière 2012:200).

The Chateau- Roussillon grave is the only one of the three inhumations on which osteological analyses were performed, proving that it belonged to a woman, but the other two have been traditionally interpreted female as well because of the jewellery in them (Mazière 2005:913). The bronze torc decorated with amber fragments included in the Campagnan grave is comparable to items found in the necropolis of Grand Bassin I and on the site of the Motte of Agde, where a rich set of jewellery has been excavated (Garcia 2013b). The bracelets from La Gravette were made of bronze and jet (Mazière 2005:913). Amber and jet were possibly imported from North Europe or the Baltic region, and were regarded as precious and having ‘magic’ properties in the ancient world (Milcent 2013b). The deceased from Chateau- Roussillon wore around the ankle a chain to which were attached pendants common in North Italy between seventh and sixth century BC (Mazière 2005:913). Therefore, all the three individuals buried in these graves wore ornaments that were somewhat ‘foreign’ and, probably, the result of contact and exchange.

The isolated cremation burials from Mediterranean France are all dated to the sixth century BC, and almost all between 575 and 525 BC. The common characteristic among all these graves is that, aside from the incomplete burial of Les Pradels, they include weapons and/or vessels for wine consumption. The grave of Mas Saintes Puelles is, in fact, the only one with a surviving funerary assemblage that does not include imported vases (Soutou and Vezian 1964). Isolated graves seem, overall, to reflect the tendency in the funerary customs of Mediterranean France: most exceptional burials include items that change from jewellery to weapons and imported pottery from the second quarter of the sixth century BC.

As a consequence of the presence of banqueting equipment and weapons in the funerary assemblage, all the cremation burials have traditionally been identified as the graves of adult males. In the case of the Mourèze burial, osteological analyses have confirmed that the person in it was an adult of unspecified gender (Garcia and Orliac 1985:152), but this is the only one on which such analyses have been carried out.

The graves of Castelnau de Guers, Les Faisses and, possibly, Les Pradels also adopt the custom, typical of Western Languedoc, of using an Etruscan amphora as the ossuary. This also happens at Corno Lauzo, but, here, the amphora used is a Massaliote one. However, if we accept the newest interpretation proposed for the grave (in Graells 2015), the amphora would be the ossuary for the most recent of the two overlapping burials.

In Eastern Languedoc, an Etruscan amphora is used as the ossuary in the isolated grave of La Céreirède (Chardenon and Bel 2010, Py et al 2006:599, Py 2009:49-53). This is not only the one isolated cremation of Eastern Languedoc, but also quite unique because of the material in it. The surviving funerary equipment of this grave was in fact composed by an Etruscan bronze cup with beaded rim, which had been burned on the funeral pyre, a dagger and a fragmentary strigil.

Because of the proximity between this grave and Lattes and of the unusual funerary assemblage, Py et al (2006:599, also Py 2009:49-53) have interpreted it as the burial of a person of Mediterranean origins. The chronology of the burial, in fact, makes the strigil contemporary with the most ancient ones attested in Etruria, and these objects are only found in Southern France, outside of Greek colonial contexts, from the Roman Republican period (Py 2009:50). At the same time, assigning a precise ethnic identification on the basis of an atypical assemblage in one grave seems problematic.

Rec de Bragues, Corno Lauzo and Castelnau de Guers are the only burials whose funerary equipment includes more than one pottery drinking vessel. The crater of the hypothetical grave from La Prade would represent the only pottery vase for mixing wine. On the other hand, bronze basins with ornate lips are present in two burials (Rec de Bragues and Les Faisses). These vessels are also present in graves from Saint Julien and Gran Bassin II, as well as from several burials from Provence (Graells 2010:90-91). Two *simpula* are included in the grave of Corno Lauzo, and one is present in Castelnau de Guers.

Weapons are present in 7 of the 9 cremations. The *soliferreum* is included in the graves of Corno Lauzo and the Tumulus 2 of Arboras, other than in the one of Castelnau de Guers. Both these burials, like the one we are discussing, also include other elements of military equipment, another weapon (spear in Castelnau de Guers, spear and sword in the tumulus 2 of Arboras) or another weapon and elements of armour (CornoLauzo includes sword, greaves and a cuirass). Among the seven burials with weapons, only these three (and possibly Rec de Bragues) include more than the spear as a weapon.

Castelnau de Guers and Corno Lauzo are the only two graves to stand out because of the association of *soliferreum* and *simpulum* (possibly two *simpula* in the case of Corno Lauzo). Therefore, the assemblages included in these two graves seem particularly rich in elements that, during the sixth century BC, seem to be used to express high rank in the burials of Western Languedoc. However, in the case of the Corno Lauzo burial, the javelin might

actually belong to the most recent burial that superimposed itself to the pre-existing one (Graells 2015).

Very little is known of the external structure of the isolated burials, and whether or not a marker placed over the pit in the soil in which the deceased was laid and identified them as especially notable. The only exceptions are the Arboras graves (Garcia 1995:285, Beylier 2012a:310) that are described as a burial under *tumulus*. The Chateau Roussillon burial was found under a pile of pebbles topped by a stone cut as a dome (Marichal and Janin 2003), but it is doubtful whether this was an original structure, and the slabs discovered near the Castelnau de Guers grave (Houlès and Janin 1992:434), seem to suggest, if not a structure, at least the presence of a marker, which would fit with the various interpretations that see these burials as symbolically meaningful and notable elements of the landscape, possibly used to define territories.

The presence of a visible and durable markers or funerary monuments in association to these graves would definitely be a telling sign of how the deceased deposited in them were singled out to stand out from the community. Tilley describes monuments as ‘active agents of identity’ (2004:222), since they can constitute a concrete reminder of the identity of the person they represent and continue to affect individuals and social relationships. This is especially true of a funerary monument, that would have a function of constant remainder, if not of the specific person, at least of their role in society, creating new memories inscribed in the landscape and ensuring that people who had not been present at the moment of the funerary ceremony and of the construction of the grave had access to them (Cummings 2003:38).

Compared with the French burials, the two ones from Catalonia present much larger assemblages (comparable only to that of Corno Lauzo, that, even accepting the newer interpretation, would have included an exceptional quantity of material), especially because of the numerous vases from Granja Soley and the several element of military equipment from Calaceite, together with the cauldron support. A similar object has been found in a grave from the necropolis of Las Peyros, in Languedoc, and fragments of a possible similar object have been found in Saint Julien (Gailledrat 2013).

The grave of the Granja Soley, at Santa Perpetua de Mogoda, is dated to second quarter of the sixth century BC (Sanmartí et al 1982). This extremely rich burial included the remains of a young individual (the sex could not be determined ) between 17 and 19 years of age,

placed in an open vase along with the arrowheads, a belt buckle and a ring, who was identified as the 'owner' of the burial by the excavators (Sanmartì et al 1982:101-102). An interpretation that has been suggested for this isolated grave by its excavators (possibly because the deceased was too young to be regarded as a 'chief' as in the case of Corno Lauzo), is that the individual placed in it died while the group he belonged to was moving and he was therefore buried outside of cemeteries (Sanmartì et al 1982:74, also Ruiz Zapatero 2004:325, who, in addition, mentions the possibility that the isolated position of the grave might have 'symbolic' meaning).

In the grave, however, other bones were also present, placed in a Grey Monochrome *oinochoe* with a bracelet and an earring. Because these items of jewellery were very small, the excavators interpreted this material as a different burial, that of a child who had been included in the older individual's grave (Sanmartì et al 1982:78 and 88). More recently, Graells has argued that the isolated position of the grave, deliberately set apart from other burials, would make the thought of including two different individuals in it a 'paradox' (Graells 2010:168-169). He suggests, therefore, that one of the two people buried in the grave was the one who 'owned' it, while the remains of the other person could represent part of the funerary equipment. Following this hypothesis, he observes that the bones identified as belonging to a 17-19 years old are placed in an open vase, that is a type never documented as being used as an ossuary in Catalan burials and atypical in general (cineraries are generally closed shapes). The inclusion of arrowheads in it is equally unusual, and expected to be found near offerings of animals rather than the body of the tomb's 'owner' (however, later on- Graells 2011- he considers the arrowheads as an element of the assemblage, albeit an atypical one). He seems, therefore, inclined to identify the person for whom the grave was set up with the one placed in the *oinochoe*, wondering, as a consequence of his reading of the isolated graves as a sign of heroic status (Graells 2010:139), whether a young child could have been considered worthy of it (Graells 2010:169). While some of the aspects of the status markers that become popular in the Gulf of Lion during the sixth century BC are similar to what can be observed in eminent burials in other areas of the Mediterranean during Archaic Age, there are not enough elements to assume that all the burials that included such elements followed the same mentality, in the exact same ways.

Regardless of whether we believe both the individuals buried in the grave or only one of them to be the 'owner', their young age opens up the interesting possibility that the Castelnau de Guers burial might be less exceptional than it had first been considered.



Similarly, the Tomb of the Warrior from Llinars de Vallès might not exactly qualify as an isolated grave, but still belonged to a very small group of burials where at least two young individuals had been deposited with rich funerary equipment that, in one case, included weapons. The deceased in the Tomb of the Warrior was, in fact, around 19 years old, and the one placed in the tomb E1 was between 7 and 12 years old. In absence of osteological analyses, ‘warrior’ graves are usually interpreted as belonging to adult males, but this assumption might not always be correct.

## **5.5 Castelnau de Guers and the funerary archaeology of sub-adults in Southern France**

### **5.5.1 Ritual, structure and funerary assemblages**

In his study of the funerary archaeology of subadults in Southern France between the late Bronze Age and the end of the Iron Age, B. Dedet examined over 450 burials of individuals below 15 years of age (according to osteological analyses) (Dedet 2008, 2012). The first study was over a sample of 420 graves, later integrated with more material in the second. The young deceased had been buried in necropoleis, urban contexts and individual graves. The grave we are discussing relates to the class of individuals which Dedet (2008:241-300, 2012:149) identifies as *grands enfants* (7-15 years old). In regards to the treatment of the body, the relationship between the numbers of cremations and inhumations reflects the patterns observed in each region for adults. While cremation is the prevalent ritual in Roussillon and Western Languedoc throughout Iron Age, East of the Hérault valley this practice becomes more and more common between 700 and 450 BC, but is still used as an alternative to other rituals (Dedet 2004:195-201 and 203-204). For Western Languedoc, the ritual includes cremation and placement of the remains in an ossuary (Dedet 2008:282). *Grands enfants* also seem to be buried in tombs whose type and external structure are comparable to those of the ones of the adults in the same cemetery or group of graves for what concerns type and structure. (Dedet 2008:286).

Aside from the Castelnau de Guers grave, the only cremation of a *grand enfant* in which wheel thrown vases are used as ossuaries is the grave 4/70 from the cemetery of Saint Julien, in which two Grey Monochrome *oinochoai* are used as containers for the cremated remains of a sub adult between 6 and 15 years of age and of an adult buried in the same tomb, mixed and divided between the two vessels. In one of them were mixed fragments of bone bracelet and of a bronze belt buckle, a knife and a spindle whorl (Dedet 2008:258). The burial, dated to the early sixth century BC, also included another belt buckle, fragments of a *simpulum*, another knife, a brooch and fragments of bracelet. Dedet (2008:258) observes that, given

the presence in the grave of ‘masculine’ (belt buckles, knives, *simpulum*) and ‘feminine’ (spindle whorl, bracelets) objects, the people buried in the tomb were possibly a woman and a boy or a man and a girl. Aside from the Castelnau de Guers grave, there are three other examples of subadult burial including weapons, two of which are dated much earlier than the grave we are examining and the one from Saint Julien we just discussed. Their characteristics are summarized in Appendix 1<sup>5</sup>.

For Northern Spain there have not been specific studies like the one carried out by Dedet, but we know that two young individuals (one around 19 years old, one, probably, a child) were buried in the Granja Soley grave (Sanmartí et al. 1982, Graells 2010:154-169), and in the Tomb of the Warrior at Llinars del Vallès and one of the nearby graves (respectively around 19 years old and between 7 and 12 years old) (Muñoz Rufo 2006). Moreover, a ‘warrior grave’ in the Can Caniys necropolis, grave 1, hosted the remains of an individual between 5 and 10 years of age (mentioned in Pons and Esteba 2000:109). Very recently, Castanyer et al (2015:128-129) have reported the excavation of a group of burials near Emporion. Among the graves was that of a new-born buried using an amphora as an ossuary, wearing an amulet around the neck. Over the amphora was placed a *soliferrum*, and under it a sword.

Going back to Southern France, the objects included in the remaining burials of sub adults in this age bracket are elements of personal ornament (rings, brooches and, especially, pins, present in the 18% of the burials) and small utensils (primarily spindle whorls and knives). Less common are objects for the toilette like *scalptoria* and tweezers (5,5%, the same percentage that is attributed to the burial with weapons with which, in two cases, they overlap) (Dedet 2012:161). The pottery is handmade, consisting mostly of drinking cups and goblets, urns, and, more rarely, dishes. The type and quantity of vases present in the grave generally reflect what happens for the burial of adults in the same areas and cemeteries (Dedet 2008:290).

---

<sup>5</sup> Beylier (2012a: 211) adds to the list of French burials of sub adults including weapons the tomb 167 of Ensérune, whose funerary equipment included a rivet similar to that in the sheath of L’Agnel, and suggests that the absence of the sword itself proves that carrying this weapon was the prerogative of adults.

| Objects                | Percentage |
|------------------------|------------|
| Pins                   | 18%        |
| Rings                  | 12.5%      |
| Brooches               | 12.5%      |
| Belt Buckles           | 5.5%       |
| Bracelets and armbands | 18%        |
| Beads                  | 6.9%       |
| Earrings               | 1.4%       |
| Torcs                  | 4.2%       |
| Buttons                | 1.4%       |
| Braid clasps           | 1.4%       |
| Scalptoria             | 5.5%       |
| Tweezers               | 5.5%       |
| Weapons                | 5.5%       |
| Spindle whorls         | 13.9%      |
| Knives                 | 11.1%      |
| Awls                   | 1.1%       |

**Table 15 Distribution of ornaments and tools in burial of subadults (from Dedet 2012:161)**

### 5.5.2 Status, gender and age

Among the objects more commonly deposited with the deceased, spindle whorls and jewellery are interpreted as pertaining to females, and brooches, knives and awls to males (Dedet 2008:294-296). However, these assumptions should not be taken for granted. Dedet observes that some deceased belonging to the previous age class, *jeune enfants* (1-6 years) are buried with objects identified as ‘female’, but none with ones regarded as ‘male’, whereas for the *grands enfants* the graves including material that is regarded as indicative of the gender are the 40% of the total, and among them 60% are ‘female’ and 40% ‘male’ (Dedet 2012:162-163). He sees this as an indication that between the age of 6 and 7 the education of boys and girls started being different (Dedet 2012:164-165). This seems to be confirmed by the fact that, in various cases, the burials of *grands enfants* including objects that are identified as ‘male’ are placed near to adult graves characterized as such, whereas the younger individuals were only placed near to graves interpreted as feminine (Dedet 2012:163-164). As a consequence, he thinks it possible that the ‘feminine’ objects placed with individuals younger than 6 reflected not their gender, but their attachment to their mother (Dedet 2012:158).

Studying the necropolis of Moulin I at Mailhac (dated to the ninth and eighth century BC), Th. Janin had noted that adolescents were buried with more numerous vases than children, and almost as many as adults, and wondered if in the community buried there the adolescents’ status was closer to that of the adults than to that of children, or, at least, they shared the similar ‘funerary attributes’ (Janin 1993:206). This difference is also observable in

other necropoleis, especially at the end of Bronze and beginning of Iron Age, but becomes less visible overall between seventh and sixth century BC (Dedet 2008:233-235 and 290). Besides, Dedet observes that, in terms of representation in the cemeteries, the class of *grands enfants* tends to skew towards older individuals (10-15 years old), whereas graves of 7-9 years old subject are rarer (Dedet 2012:158). While the previous age category, *jeune enfants* (1-6 years old) amounts to more burials, the *grands enfants*, especially the ones between 10 and 15 years of age, are overall better represented. The mortality among older children would have, in fact, most likely been lower (Dedet 2008:298). Therefore, the inclusion in cemeteries has been seen as the expression of a progressive integration in the society (Dedet 2012:165).

As discussed above, some particular burials stand out among their peers for more notable funerary assemblages, and ritual and external structure of the grave are elements that do not seem to change based on the age of the deceased, but relate to groups of burials that include individuals of various ages (Dedet 2008:286). Therefore, it seems very possible to imagine that the differences existed among subadults on different levels, and were not just due to their age, but also to other elements like the fact that they possibly were part of different social and status groups and families.

## **5.6 Weapons and burials of subadults: warrior graves?**

In this section, I present an overview of the interpretations offered for the burial of Castelnau de Guers and other graves of subadults including weapons. Later, I discuss some of the literature on both burials with weapons and burials of subadults, in an attempt to extract useful perspectives to apply to this particular case.

Janin used the Castelnau de Guers grave as an example of how younger people could have enjoyed an higher social prestige, questioning whether the definition of ‘warrior’ or ‘chief’ graves used for burials containing weapons was actually valid, and if the Castelnau de Guers burial represents an example of ‘substitution’ of an adolescent for an adult (Janin 1993:205).

Dedet offers two possible interpretations for the presence of items considered relevant to adult males in children’s graves like those of Castelnau de Guers and L’Agnel: heirlooms from deceased parents, or proof that, in occasional circumstances, the subadults had already taken part to banquets (Dedet 2012:164) and items related to military combat, at the side of their fathers (Dedet 2008:300), as sources tell us it occasionally happened in Rome with boys aged 14 (Néraudau 1984:24 and 59). Another interesting element is represented by the fact that even those funerary assemblages associated with subadults that stand out because of

the inclusion of larger sets of jewellery are not comparable to the contemporary ones that accompanied adult individuals, especially in the Late Bronze and the beginning of the Early Iron Age (Dedet 2012:165). Dedet identifies three of these graves, whose characteristics are summarized in Appendix 2. However, he believes that the exceptionality of these burials does not quite compare to that of the graves in which subadults are buried with weapons, elements of ornament and vessels for banqueting, leading him to conclude that, if some boys participated in 'adult' activities, the same could not be said for girls (Dedet 2012:164-165).

Lastly, Beylier (2012a:211 and 249, 2012b:431) actually sees the presence of weapons in the funerary equipment that accompanied these sub adult individuals as an expression of the status that might have been extended to the specific individual because of the relationship to an *élite* family. He also suggests that the adolescent from Castelnau de Guers could have already achieved adult status in the society he lived in, but expresses doubts that the same could apply to the younger individuals deposited with weapons, like the one of L'Agnel or Can Caniys.

Some of the above interpretations seem, therefore, to want to dissociate the individual deposited in the grave from the funerary assemblage, connecting it to other, more 'suitable' subjects for which the adolescent would have been 'substituted' or of whom he would have inherited the weapons. The discovery of weapons in a burial is, in fact, usually associated with a series of assumption about the age and gender of the person placed in it. When these assumptions are disregarded, they can inspire alternative interpretations, for example that the weapons could be linked to a different person, closer to the archaeologists' idea of a 'warrior', to whom the deceased might have been connected (for example see Weingarten 2013 on the discussion on a recently excavated grave from Tarquinia in which a woman was deposited with a spear).

On the other hand, the cases in which these assumptions are not met, of which Castelnau de Guers represents an example, might be especially interesting for analysing the way we think of certain objects as markers of status, and of the notion of status in itself.

The generic interpretation of burials including military equipment from a range of different periods and societies as 'warrior graves' has been questioned in various studies. Parker Pearson (1999:85), for example, argues that weapons placed in a grave are not necessarily to be interpreted as the deceased's possession but they could represent gifts offered to the dead, or elements of the 'funerary pomp'.

In H. Harke (1990)'s analysis of burials with weapons in Early Anglo-Saxon England, comparisons of osteological data with funerary assemblages present in the same graves has revealed that, in this context, the 8% of the deceased buried with weapons, were below the age of 14. Moreover, several individuals buried with weapons presented characteristics that seemed incompatible with military activity, such as serious medical conditions and disabilities. On the other hand, the deceased buried with weapons showed the same epigenetic traits, and therefore belonged to the same descent groups (Harke 1990:41-42). This led Harke (1990:42-43) to the conclusion that the symbolic value associated to the weapons was not a reflection of the life led by the individual buried with them, but of a series of social, ethnic and familial values also expressed in the funerary ritual.

Comparing Harke's article with evidence from the late Bronze Age 'warrior graves' of Sellopoulo, which also included juvenile individuals, Whitley (2002:223) argues that the status of which the weapons are expression could be 'ascribed' without having been 'achieved'. He generally opposes what he calls a 'common sense' reading of grave goods, i.e. an interpretation of funerary assemblages as indication of the dead person's actual possessions and activities, rather than as symbols of an identity ascribed to the deceased person (2002:219-220). The association of an individual with specific objects or combinations of objects, as well as the way in which the objects are organised and used together can carry specific meanings and be used to create or modify specific identities (Sorensen 1997:98). Therefore, a funerary assemblage might not be reflective of the biography of the deceased, but the meaning ascribed to it might be tied to the biography of the objects that composed it, and the meanings and values that have been associated to them over the course of their lives (Whitley 2002:219), which still resonated after their inclusion in a grave assemblage (Langdon 2001:601).

All these consideration call for a less literal interpretation of grave goods as indicators of the actual life led by the individual with whom they were deposited, but such interpretations still seem to be primarily applied to the ones that do not 'fit' with the idea of adult masculinity that is usual associated with burials with weapons. At the same time, even when the symbolic nature of status is recognized, there is a tendency to see it as more individualized when discussing an adult man.

In general, when objects that, like the weapons, are interpreted as symbols of power, are deposited with very young individuals, they are seen as a sign of inherited status, if not as a reflection of the status of the adults the subadults were connected to rather than of the

subadults themselves (Pader 1982:61-62) For example, Brown (1981:28-29) considers the mortuary treatment of sub-adults as an indicator of the correlation between social and demographic variables: as the hierarchical aspects of a society increase, children will be accorded relatively more attention.

Shepherd (2007), discussing the burial of sub adults in Archaic Western Greece, has noted how in several instances young individuals (like the 12 years old boy deposited in Pithekoussai in a grave that included the famous 'Nestor's Cup') were buried following rituals and in association with materials that are generally interpreted as being pertinent to subjects who were part of the *élite*. Notably, Shepherd (2007:105) sees the 'ostentatious disposal of wealth' in the burial of sub adults as either an expression of the status of the parents, or as a way to single out young deceased whose loss had a particularly profound effect on their family in that it affected the continuation of the family line. Shepherd thinks in fact possible that children's future role in the household might have been ascribed to them before they actually adopted it, as indicated by their inclusion in 'family plots'.

However, several archaeologists have questioned the idea that the individuals identified as sub adults should be studied from the perspective of what is assumed to be an exclusively adult society. Living children and adolescents are interpreted as 'variable and culturally construed', but archaeological sub adults are distinguished primarily through their bodies, defined in opposition to those of adults (Sofaer Derevenski 2000:8). These individuals are assimilated in a 'developmental age group' that is defined on the basis of modern, Western ideas of what the earlier stages of life involve (generally dependency from adults, passivity and lack of an impact on the economic system) rather than as individuals with social identities whose categorisation depends from the contexts in which they existed as well as the experiences and material culture that surrounded them (Sofaer Derevenski 2000:8). Therefore, individuals who lived in different circumstances and interacted with different material culture are assimilated in a single category (Sofaer Dervenski 2000:11). This means equating biological categories with cultural ones, excluding the possibility of the existence of different categories in different cultural contexts, and precluding the understanding of the roles and values associated to these categories (Baxter 2005:19).

Besides, the number of stages in life and the values and the activities associated to them are not universal and often culturally, socially and gender specific. Beaumont (2000:39) presents the example of how the Oxford English Dictionary describes 'adolescence' as the period between 14 and 25 years of age in males and 12 and 21 years in females, even if most people

in contemporary Western society would define it as corresponding to the years between 13 and 18 for both genders. She then proceeds to discuss how, in Classical Athens, a woman's adolescence corresponded to the often brief period in which biological maturity (puberty) and social immaturity (not being married) coexisted, while for men this same period involved the various years required by their preparation to social maturity, which happened in different stages between the onset of puberty and the age of 30 (Beaumont 2000:47-48). Similarly, different ideas of what constitutes 'childhood', and what rights should be associated to it prevail in different countries even in contemporary Europe (James and James 2008:1-13). Moreover, modern Western constructs of 'childhood' prove abstract and completely separated by the reality of the lives led by children in different geographical and historical settings, which in turn leads contemporary Western observers to label these experiences of childhood as improper, 'lost' or 'stolen' (Panter Brick 2000:5-9). Anthropological studies have shown that even the concept of the age of an individual and of the pertinence of individuals of the same age to the same group is relative (Fortes 1984:110-111). In particular, societies where social categories are established on the basis of lineage value familial relationships over chronological age: this is true of populations like the Ashanti and Tallensi, but a tendency to privilege 'dating' individuals on the basis of the generation they belong to (in comparison to the other members of their family) rather than of the years passed since their birth can also be noted in the Old Testament and the Homeric poems (Fortes 1984:113).

If defining the social role of sub adults purely in opposition to adults might limit our ability to understand ancient societies, it is possible that looking for specific categories of material culture, separate from 'adult' ones, is a similarly limiting approach since in different societies individuals we would classify as children and adolescents could have shared with adults activities and values in a fashion in which this would not happen in modern Western societies (Barker 2005:22).

As noted above, when very young individuals are deposited with objects regarded as markers of status, it is often deemed possible that the social role associated to the elements of the funerary assemblage is the same that the deceased would have been destined to inherit from their family if not for their untimely death, and, therefore, the grave and funerary assemblage are seen as reflective of their lost potential (Pader 1982:57). However, it is possible to imagine that this attitude would have existed in general towards individuals who had died very young, even if they had already, however briefly, been invested with high rank.



Elia (2012), studying the funerary archaeology of subadults Western Greek context dated between the sixth and fourth century BC, notes that selected individuals had access to ‘adult’ rituals and prestigious grave goods in the funerary equipment. This is even more notable considering the widespread standardization and increased sobriety of funerary rituals in this period and context. In particular, he brings up examples of graves in which young boys were buried with objects that marked not only their relationship to a privileged group, but also the engagement in exclusive activities such as strigils and musical instruments (Elia 2012:106-107). Likewise, young girls were buried with an assemblage that seems to allude to their missed future as brides, including objects like the *lebes gamikos* and perfume vases (Elia 2012:104-105). He, however, also suggests that some young individuals might have enjoyed a status that transcended the division for classes of age, probably because of their role in the family, and that this was reflected in funerary rituals that both celebrated their social role and anticipated their missed future as members of the community (Elia 2012:107).

As discussed above, the *grand enfants*, especially the ones over 10 years old, represent a special class among the subadults of Iron Age Southern France. They are better represented in the cemeteries, and the funerary assemblages, even in burials that are not exceptional as the one we are discussing, are the closest to those of adults (Dedet 2008:297-300). Child mortality was relatively common in the ancient world, but the death of adolescents and young adults was probably not regarded as such. For comparison, in Ancient Greece, boys who had died in this period of their lives were called ‘the untimely ones’, and mourned in an especially bitter way (Morris and Powell 2010:17). It is also possible that particular individuals might have been seen as already included in society and invested of a higher status, or that their achievement of such social role was more eagerly anticipated and that, if it did not come to fruition, it would have been more bitterly mourned. This would not necessarily mean that the objects accompanying them in the grave were part of their everyday life, but, if we accept that funerary assemblages are the expression of a symbolic identity rather than a faithful reproduction of the deceased’s belonging and activities, the same can be said of the material buried with adult individuals.

The Castelnau de Guers burial is rather exceptional for what concerns the treatment of subadults in the funerary archaeology of Mediterranean France during Iron Age, but not a complete anomaly taking into account the tumulus of L’Agnel, the isolated grave of Granja Soley and Janin’s observations on the possibility to identify class differences in the funerary treatment of subadults in at least two of the main Iron Age necropolises of Western

Languedoc (Janin 1993). It should also be taken into account that we do not know if this and Granja Soley are the only cases of very young individuals placed in isolated graves, as osteological analyses are not available for most of them.

Unusual burials occur in several cultural contexts and have been interpreted as an expression of 'social deviance' but also of particularly high rank (Aspöck 2008:26-27, Weiss- Krejci 2008). They are regarded as possibly related not only to the deceased's social identity during their life but also to the particular circumstances of their death (Weiss- Krejci 2008:186-188).

It is possible to imagine that, because of reasons that are difficult to determine from the archaeological record the young deceased of Castelnau de Guers was already invested of a considerably high social status, or posited to achieve such a position in a few years. In this case, the inclusion in the burial of a series of objects that, during the Early Iron Age, have become symbolic of high status and the funerary ritual performed at the moment of his burial would have contributed to either reaffirming the social position that the deceased enjoyed in life or attributing it to him at the moment of his burial.

### **5.7 The funerary ritual and the destruction of the grave goods**

In this section, I discuss what we can infer of the funerary ritual enacted during the burial, and of the ways in which it possibly complements the other information we have about it.

Given the isolated nature of the Castelnau de Guers burial, the excavators have suggested that an individual pyre might have been built and used specifically to cremate the body, the animal offerings and the grave goods destined for the grave (Houlès and Janin 1992:438-439). It is therefore possible to imagine that the celebration of the funerary ritual, including the destruction of some of the grave goods, represented a unique, or at least rare, occasion for the people who were in attendance. The memory of this unique ceremony would have remained tied to the place where it happened because of the remaining funerary monument.

Houlès and Janin (1992: 440), in the original publication of the grave, also wonder if the *soliferrum* had been folded as part of a ritual or because of the length of the weapon. Beylier (2012:203), however, dismisses the purely functional interpretation of the destruction of this kind of weapon since the method utilized (folding it several times) requires considerable effort, and damaged weapons have been found even in very spacious graves. He suggests that the reason *soliferrum* and large spears were the weapons most commonly damaged before being placed in a grave lies with their symbolic value. Other objects that are often damaged before being placed in burials are *simpula*, as in the case of the grave we are analysing, and

bronze basins, and sometimes the same treatment is reserved to knives, torcs and brooches (also damaged in the Castelnau de Guers grave), which leads Beylier (2012:203) to suggest that the choice of which objects were going to be ritually broken before being placed on the grave might have been related to criteria related to the identity of the person they were buried with (age, social status, circumstances of death, etc.). Bending the *soliferreum* would have required considerable heat, and would probably have been done next to the cremation pyre (Mazière 2012:180).

Several different meanings have been associated in the literature to the damaging of objects placed in the funerary equipment. Grinsell (1961 and 1983), using ethnographic examples, suggests interpretations like the need to ‘free’ the spirit of the object to follow the deceased in the afterworld, prevent discussions among the possible heirs, protect the grave goods from being stolen or re-used, prevent evil spirits from taking possession of them.

Graells (2011:584) suggests that the deposition of weapons in graves, especially of women and subadults, might have been related to their poor state of preservation. He imagines that damaged weapons would have been included in burials, while intact ones would be gifted or bequeathed to living people. The destruction of the weapon would have, in any case, reduced its value to the symbolic one, regardless of the object’s state of preservation. This is a possibility, at the very least for some cases. However, it is more difficult to agree that this makes the association of weapons with subadults and women ‘easier to understand’ because only ‘in such contexts’, the weapons ‘would have mainly had a symbolic value and would not have been indicative of the social role or the activities carried out’ (Graells 2011:584). As has been discussed thus far, weapons are far from being the only class of materials that can contribute to creating a social identity, and, if we establish that grave goods were selected for their symbolic value (reflective of a social role), this would have happened regardless of age and gender of the person they were associated with.

In terms of the specific reality of Western Languedoc, it is probably worth noting that weapons are relatively less frequent than other objects in the *launaciens* hoards, though it should be noted that most of the hoards have been looted before discovery. Nevertheless, weapons usually constitute the 1% of the deposits. On the other hand, on the shipwreck of Rochelongue the rapport is different, with 30 weapons over circa 320 metal objects (Beylier 2012a:157). While the weapons in the hoards are often fragmentary, the ones on the shipwreck are intact or only slightly damaged (Beylier 2012a:158). Moreover, Beylier (2012a: 158-159) observes that there are very few comparisons to be drawn between weapons found

in hoards and in burials, since the first group predates the second, having mostly been produced during the seventh century BC, while it is generally estimated that the *launaciens* existed until the end of the following century (Beylier 2012a:159). Therefore, from what we know of their composition, it was not very likely that a damaged weapon would be disposed of in one of these deposits. This makes it possible to imagine that, in this regional context, some damaged weapons might have been deposited in burials because their symbolic value had outlived their functionality. In the case of Castelnau de Guers, however, the *soliferreum* was at the very least whole at the moment of the destruction. In fact, this weapon is one of the best preserved of its type. In burials that had not been disturbed before their discovery *soliferrea* are present in their entirety, albeit intentionally bent and damaged (Beylier 2012a:197). Therefore, the choice to destroy this type of weapon seems to be deliberate and not related to its preservation or condition before deposition.

We also know that, among the objects destroyed in the Castelnau de Guers burial, at least the *simpulum* had possibly been repaired before its inclusion in the funerary assemblage. This seems to indicate that the destruction of this object, too, was a specific choice, since it could have been repaired again had it been damaged.

As discussed above, this instrument, as well as the weapons (in particular the sword and the *soliferreum*) represent some of the most important markers of status in this time period in Western Languedoc. For Early Iron Age metal objects, in particular weapons, jewellery and banqueting utensils like the *simpulum*, represent, in fact, ‘les objets précieux par excellence’ (Bats 2011:99) in this region.

The destruction of ‘wealth objects’ during funerary rituals has been described by Bradley (1982:120) as a ‘very striking way of achieving and maintaining rank in prehistoric society’. Bradley, in fact, follows Gregory (1980:646-647)’s observation that the Papuan system of offering prestige goods as ‘gifts to Gods’ by destroying them is a more radical form of potlatch in that, unlike gifts made to individuals or other groups, the destroyed items could not be returned balancing out the prestige acquired in their alienation (Gregory 1980:647). As a consequence, the destruction of wealth became a particularly powerful and exclusive affirmation of the rank of the person who performed it. He concludes that the destruction of wealth would have been a particularly powerful instrument for the affirmation of prestige in periods of intense social competition (Bradley 1982:119-120). This notion seems to fit with what has been discussed above about the inclusion of weapons and banqueting equipment in the funerary assemblages happening in a period, the sixth century BC, which

seems to be marked by social and economic change and competition among *élites* of the Western Languedoc. If including these objects in the grave represented a form of participation to this competitive mentality, their destruction (in particular the complicated bending of the *soliferreum*) would have been its extreme expression.

However, it is also possible to imagine that other reasons, not mutually exclusive to the one discussed above, might have contributed to this choice of ritual. Giles (2015), analysing burials with weapons from British Iron Age contexts, drew attention to the fact that the destruction of the grave goods would have happened during the funerary ritual, and suggests that the action of ‘killing’ weapons and metal goods before placing them in the grave could have represented a way of dealing with the trauma of death, projecting in response an image of vitality and strength, especially in the case of the burial of young individuals. In Western Languedoc the destruction of weapons in general was not performed exclusively during the funerals of young people. However, in this particular case, it might have been one of the reasons for the choice to damage some of the elements of the assemblage. It is difficult to determine if one of these interpretations really apply to this particular ritual, and they are not mutually exclusive as a series of different elements might have contributed to inform it. However, it is at the very least possible to speculate that the social identity of the deceased played a role in influencing the performance of the funerary ritual, and the complicated and ostentatious destruction of objects that were viewed as symbols of an *élite*, at the end of the funerary rituals, could have represented both a response to the particularly tragic loss of a young individual of high rank and a way to reaffirm and assert his (and their) importance, akin to the selection of the objects included in the grave and to the isolated position of the burial, overlooking the Hérault valley.

## 5.8 Conclusion

The interpretation of isolated graves as a category represents an issue that is still very much discussed and on which, at the moment, only speculation is possible. However, what can be agreed upon is that they were deliberately placed in isolated position, often in a place that overlooked the main rivers of the region or the coast, arguably as assertion of control of the main avenues of communication (Mazière 2012:201). At least two of these graves, including the one that we are discussing, were probably provided with a marker that made them an outstanding element of the landscape.

For the isolated grave from Castelnau de Guers, the position of the burial, the possible presence of a funerary monument, the ceremony involving the destruction of some of the

grave goods and the funerary equipment seem to fit well with each other. We can, in fact, see the destruction of some of the grave goods as both a way to assert the high rank associated to the deceased and, perhaps, elaborate their traumatic and premature loss.

The materials in the funerary equipment formed an assemblage that, in the central decades of the sixth century BC, had become representative of an *élite* status that involved, and was, at least in part, held up by virtue of participation in dynamics of exchange that took place in the valley at whose centre was the river that the burial overlooked.

The inclusion of the imports in the funerary equipment, then, would have been doubly meaningful: they were both the proof of the access to a network of contact and exchange, but some of them had also become part of a set of objects that, among the Western Languedoc *élites*, had been firmly integrated into the local funerary culture as symbols of status. Their origin contributed to their value, but it was a value that was also very specific to the period and context in which they were included in the funerary assemblages.

Some of these objects (the *kantharos* and the amphora, in particular) are, at this point, widely popular among ‘rich’ burials of this period in this region, while other elements of the banquet equipment (the rare Etrusco Corinthian cup, the number of the drinking vase) made it stand out among the others, both in cemeteries and isolated. Similarly, the weapons included were the spear (present in the majority of the burials with military equipment) but also the *soliferreum* (arguably the most ‘prestigious’ weapon together with the sword). In this sense, the biographies of the individual objects included in the funerary equipment would have contributed to shape the social identity attributed to the deceased by the entire assemblage, the imported vases as well as the *simpulum* (bearing traces of repair and that, possibly, had been used in various formal occasions, adding to its value) and the weapons, in particular the *soliferreum*.

It is also especially interesting to observe how the inclusion of different Etruscan pottery vases in the assemblage had different meanings, despite the fact that they all contribute to reflecting a specific image of the deceased. While the amphora and the *kantharos* were objects that had become an essential part of the set of marker of status for Western Languedocan ‘rich’ burials in this time period, the Etrusco Corinthian cup was still something that could have been regarded as unusual, possibly showing wider access to exchange networks in the Mediterranean and inside the region. From this point of view, it is probably the import that chimes better with the position of the burial in the territory.

It is difficult for us to determine whether the status represented by the burial and its equipment had been already attributed to the deceased in life, or if it represented a burial of the deceased's potential role, as well as a reinforcement of the role held by his family. However, similar doubts could just as legitimately be raised about the burial of an adult individual, more in line with our idea of a 'warrior'. The placement of the grave seems to indicate a desire to establish control over the avenues of communication in the region that would have benefitted the living to whom the deceased had been connected, as would have the statement on rank represented by the destruction of part of the assemblage during the funerary ritual.

In this sense, the idea of the isolation of the grave as something that removed the individual from the rest of the community and separated him from associations with a family group seems unlikely. Similarly, the deliberate selection of this particular individual to be buried in a strategically chosen position and with a meaningful funerary assemblage and ritual makes the possibility that the deceased was chosen in 'substitution' for another person, or that the burial was placed in isolated position simply because of practical reasons very doubtful. In comparison with what seems observable from the necropoleis, the young individual buried at Castelnau de Guers enjoys a status that possibly transcends the biological age, but, as discussed above, this is not the only instance in which such a phenomenon is observable in the funerary ritual of Iron Age Mediterranean France. Even among the isolated burials of the Western Mediterranean we can find at least one case in which such a ritual was chosen for at least another young person (Granja Soley and, possibly, Llinars del Vallès), and several others in which the deceased has been only assumed to be an adult. Considering the fact that isolated burials are themselves a category of somewhat exceptional burials in this period and region, we might even wonder if this type of burial seemed especially fitting for very young individuals of particularly high status, whose untimely death would have probably been unexpected and particularly shocking.

## **6. The North Eastern Wall cemetery of Emporion**

### **6.1 Introduction**

This chapter focuses on the cemetery of the North Eastern Wall, near Emporion (Girona), the earliest Phocian settlement in the Iberian Peninsula. This is a necropolis that was in use shortly after the arrival of the Greek colonists, and presents features that are typical of Early Iron Age cemeteries in Catalonia, along with others that are very distinctive. In particular, it stands out among the contemporary cemeteries because of the quantity and variety in types of imported material included in the funerary assemblages. This has often been considered an automatic consequence of the greater closeness to the colonial settlement (see Domínguez 2004), but there has not been any discussion of the specific objects selected to be included in the burials and of the assemblages they were part of. In this chapter, I analyse the composition of the surviving funerary assemblages and the different associations of materials in them. I compare the objects included in the burials from the North Eastern Wall necropolis and the material culture of the contemporary indigenous cemeteries in Catalonia, as well as in the groups of burials from the surroundings of Emporion that are considered ‘Greek’ in the literature and can be dated to at least part of the period during which it was in use. By focusing on the materiality of the assemblages I attempt to highlight the ways new objects and practices from different cultural traditions are associated in the funerary ritual, and how, in a moment of transition and cultural encounter like the sixth century BC in the North East of the Iberian Peninsula, material culture can be used to establish and assert evolving identities.

### **6.2 The cemetery of the North Eastern Wall in its regional context**

#### ***6.2.1 The North East of the Iberian Peninsula in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age***

This chapter requires an overview of a wider area than the previous two, in attempt to discuss whether the specific case study reflects wider regional patterns or if it might be interpreted in a different way. This is because the third case study is characterized by a quantity and assortment of imports that is quite exceptional in its specific surrounding area, and that has usually been analysed in relationship with the general distribution of imports in all the North East of the Iberian Peninsula.



Between ninth and seventh century BC, the North-Eastern coast of the Iberian Peninsula and the area south of the course of the river Ebro were characterized by sparse settlement in caves and small groups of houses (Sanmartì and Santancana 2005: 39). It was only in the second half of the seventh century BC that the first proto-urban settlements appeared (Sanmartì and Santancana 2005:42-43, Lopez Cachero 2007). The villages were usually structured around a central road or place, surrounded by houses that shared the lateral walls with the two adjacent houses and whose back walls formed an enclosure that ran around the perimeter of the village. They are better documented in the area of the lower course of the Ebro than in North-Eastern Catalonia (Sanmartì and Santancana 2005:43). In the lower Ebro valley, however, are also attested different types of structure that lack comparisons in other areas. At Aldovesta, for example, has been excavated a settlement with structures aimed to store products, mostly wine, achieved through exchange with Phoenician traders. More to the south, at Sant Jaume- Mas d'en Serrà a fortified residential complex has been excavated with spaces for storage of goods, among which feature heavily imported Phoenician amphorae (Lopez Cachero 2007:112-113 and Garcia i Rubert and Gracia Alonso 2011: 45). At the end of the seventh century BC and over the first quarter of the following one, several areas, in particular the lower Ebro one, faced a 'crisis social' (Sanmartì and Santancana 2005: 49) involving the destruction and abandonment of several of the above mentioned settlements (Sanmartì 2004: 22, Sanmartì and Santancana 2005: 49).

Connections with Phoenician traders seem to have developed primarily in the area at the south of the Ebro river, as the quantity of imports north of this area is considerably inferior (Garcia i Rubert and Gracia Alonso 2011:45). The type of imports present changed considerably over the course of the sixth century. Before, they consisted primarily of Phoenician amphorae and other large containers and mortar tripods also appeared at various sites and in funerary assemblages (Sanmartì 2004: 17). Tablewares and their imitations were unusual (Sanmartì 2004:17). At the end of the seventh century BC and over the first third of the following one, Phoenician trade in the area collapsed (Sanmartì 2004: 22, Garcia i Rubert and Gracia Alonso 2011: 48-49). In the second quarter of the sixth century BC Mediterranean imports reached the lowest point in Iberian Protohistory (Sanmartì et al 2002: 99-102, Sanmartì 2004: 21, Sanmartì and Santancana 2005:51). What changed was not only their proportional quantity, but also their provenience and nature: they mostly consisted of finewares, produced in different areas of the Mediterranean, but primarily in Greece and the Italian Peninsula (Sanmartì et al 2002, Sanmartì 2004: 21, Sanmartì and Santancana 2005: 129-

132). This is not too surprising because during the second quarter of the following century a small settlement of Phocian colonists had been established on the islet of San Martín of Empúries, in front of the Catalan coast, the first of the two locations of the colony of Emporion. The decline in the Phoenician trade during the first half of the sixth century BC, along with the increase in activity of Massalia and the foundation of Emporion were all, most likely, factors that converged in leading to this change of situation (Mirò and Santos 2013: 15).

On the other hand, the change in the type of imports was probably also influenced by the fact that, from the first half of the sixth century, production of wine is attested in indigenous contexts in Iberia (Sanmartí et al 2002: 103, Sanmartí and Santancana 2005:128-129). This might have reduced the desire to import wine, either because the local production responded better to the needs of Iberian consumers, or because the possibility to produce this beverage reduced the interest in buying it.

The early sixth century BC is a less known period for what concerns settlement structures, as most sites continued their life in the following century, and most of the structures were obliterated by more recent ones (Sanmartí and Santancana 2005:51-52). However, the model of small settlement organized around a central road or square was probably still in use. Along with these relatively small groups of buildings are attested others of larger dimensions (Sanmartí and Santancana 2005:51-52). At least to the last quarter of the sixth century BC is dated the development of larger fortified settlements, the best documented of which is the Puig de Sant Andreu, the most recent of the two phases of occupation of the site of Ullastret, in the Ampodran. This variety in dimensions among the sites datable to the sixth century has led various scholars to suggest that in this period might have developed a hierarchical organization of the territory, possibly reflective of a social stratification more complex than the one in place during the seventh century BC (Sanmartí and Santancana 2005:51-53).

Concerning the funerary ritual, cremation was the ritual generally employed in all of Catalonia since the ninth century BC (Graells 2010:25, Pons 2012). Until the late eighth century BC the cemeteries were relatively large and characterized by simple funerary assemblages, which has led archaeologists to imagine them to be reflective of a society not characterized by marked differences in status (Sanmartí and Santancana 2005:46, Graells 2010:25). Few assemblages included metal objects, especially elements of personal ornament, knives and tweezers (Lopez Cachero 2007: 109, Graells 2010: 25, Pons 2012: 65-67). Some of the most important cemeteries in this period are that of Agullana (900-600

BC), Can Piteu/Can Roqueta (1100-500 BC) in central Catalonia and Coll del Moro (800-500 BC) in the province of Tarragona (Lopez Cachero 2007, Graells 2010: 24 and 25 and Pons 2012). Between late eighth and the first half of the seventh century BC, some cemeteries began to stand out for the quantity of both vases and metal elements present in them (Graells 2010:25, Pons 2012: 67-68). During the second half of the seventh century BC the older cemeteries were abandoned in favour of newer ones (including the cemeteries of Anglès, Pla de la Gibrella, Camallera, Peralada and Vilanera, all in the province of Girona)(Graells 2010: 25-26, Pons 2012:68). Where the older cemeteries were still in use, for example at Can Piteu, new groups of burials were built over the pre-existing ones (Graells 2010:25) The more recent burials were also fewer in number and presented more complex variations of the burial structures (Graells 2010: 25-26, Pons 2012: 67-68). The funerary assemblages became more complex, with the presence of more numerous elements of personal ornament and of utensils like knives and, more rarely, spits (Lopez Cachero 2007:114, Graells 2010: 25-26, Pons 2012:68).

Between late seventh and early sixth century BC, in some burials also made their appearance vases produced in Phoenician or Colonial workshops in the South of Iberian Peninsula, or pottery shapes inspired by Phoenician models. They were primarily big containers, amphorae and mortars (Graells 2010: 26).

During the sixth century BC, small burial groups prevailed, revealing a stricter selection of the part of the population included in cemeteries. Among the cemeteries whose use began in this period are the one that will be the focus of this chapter along with the ones of Mianes, Mas de Mussols, Milmanda and Can Canyisa (Graells 2010:26-27). This period saw the appearance of isolated burials of the type discussed in Chapter 5. The inclusion of weapons in the funerary equipment became a status marker here as occurred also in Southern France, as did the *simpulum*. These changes have been seen as the signs of the emergence of a more rigid structure of the indigenous societies, incorporating 'an ideology intended to legitimate hereditary inequality' (Sanmartí 2004: 21). Mediterranean imports, including banqueting vessels, cosmetic vases and scarabs were included in some of the funerary assemblages (Graells 2010:26-27, Lopez Cachero 2007:114-115, Pons 2012:70-71). The specific distribution and quantity of most of these objects is discussed below, comparing the objects included in the assemblages from the necropolis analysed in this chapter with the ones present in the other Catalan cemeteries. However, between the half of the sixth century BC

and the half of the fifth the presence of imports, both in burial contexts and settlement ones, was very limited (Sanmartí et al 2002: 103, Sanmartí and Santancana 2005:128-129).

The trends described were not universal and especially noticeable in the north and south of the Catalan coast. In the central coastal plains, during the Early Iron Age were still in use cemeteries like the one of Can Piteu that showed very little difference among the material included in the various assemblages. At the same time, in this area appeared exceptional graves like the one of Granja Soley or the burial group of Tomb of the Warrior in Llinars del Vallès (Lopez Cachero 2007: 115 and 117, Graells 2010: 26-27 and 139-169).

### **6.2.2 Emporion**

Emporion represents the second Greek settlement established in the Gulf of Lion, after the foundation of Massalia (Demetriou 2012:28-29). The first place of settlement of Emporion was the so called Palaïapolis, on San Martín of Ampurias, a small islet off the coast of Catalonia, in the second quarter of the sixth century BC. San Martín is now a promontory attached to the coast, but, at the time, the settlement overlooked a small cove and the mouth of the river Fluvià (Mirò and Santos 2013:12).

The area surrounding Emporion, and the very site where the colonists established themselves, were not new to Mediterranean contacts. The excavations in the site of the Palaïapolis have, in fact, led to the discovery of an indigenous centre in which have been identified numerous fragments of Phoenician pottery, especially amphorae, predating the earlier Greek imports. The site was definitely involved in exchanges with Phoenician traders from the second half of the seventh century BC (Aquilué et al 2008:172-178, 2010:67-68, García i Rubert and Gracia Alonso 2011: 45). The same has happened in the nearby indigenous site of Illa d'en Reixac at Ullastret (García i Rubert and Gracia Alonso 2011:45).

The necropolis of Vilanera at L'Escala, 2 kms south-east of the site where Emporion would be founded, was characterized by the presence of graves with different types of imported objects (García i Rubert and Gracia Alonso 2011: 45, Aquilué et al 2008:178-184, 2012:78-86). The differences in the funerary assemblages of the necropolis of Vilanera suggest the emergence of a process of organization of the indigenous society in a hierarchy. This has led scholars to suppose that the emerging indigenous aristocracy probably played a positive role in the development of contact and exchange, first with the Phoenicians and, later, with the Phocéans (Guzman 2013:188).

It is generally believed that Emporion started off as a trading post and, during the fifth century, it evolved into a *polis* (Dominguez 2013:23, Guzman 2013:196-202). However, others argued that Emporion already represented an independent political entity since the century before (Demetriou 2012:35).

The beginning of the Greek presence on the site of the Palaiapolis did not cause an abrupt interruption in the occupation of the site. The new phase of occupation took place directly over the abandoned structures of the previous indigenous village. The change is, however, perceptible in the material culture (Aquiluè et al 2010:68). From the second quarter of the sixth century BC, the material present in the site of the Palaiapolis changed: handmade pottery decreased, Phoenician amphorae disappeared and were replaced by material of Greek and Italic production. This is considered a consequence of the implantation of the new inhabitants of the site, but also of the simultaneous progressive disappearance of the Phoenician presence in the extreme north east of the Iberian Peninsula (Aquiluè et al 2010: 68-69). The earliest structures corresponding to the foundation of Emporion included an artisanal neighbourhood, with kilns for the manufacture of pottery. The structures are in mudbricks on a base of irregular limestone blocks, a technique that differs from what was used for the previous indigenous huts (Aquiluè et al 2010: 70). It is worth noting that the use of this construction technique was attested in indigenous sites of the south of Catalonia before it was at this site. Its use continued in the following construction phases of the life of Emporion (Aquiluè et al 2010:70). In the second half of the sixth century BC, it was also used in some of the indigenous sites surrounding the city (Aquiluè et al 2010:70).

In the Palaiapolis, domestic units dated to the second half of the sixth century present a very simple structure that seems to differ from contemporary Greek models, and has parallels in the indigenous sites surrounding Emporion, as at Ullastret and Mas Castellar de Pontòs (Aquiluè et al 2010: 71-73). This is regarded as a possible sign of the influence of indigenous models on the structure of the colony, if not as proof of the continuity of the indigenous presence in the city (Aquiluè et al 2010: 72). However, not enough buildings from this phase are known to determine that this was the only model in use, and it is possible that this model was chosen just because it suited the natural characteristics of the area the houses were built on (Aquiluè et al 2010:72-73).

Towards the half of the sixth century, the inhabitants of Emporion also started to progressively move to the coast, the area termed the Neapolis (Demetriou 2012:33-37, Santos et al 2013: 107). The earliest phase of Neapolis is not known enough to make

comparisons with the first area of the Greek settlement, but in the north area of the city traces of a possible arrangement of perpendicular roads have been discerned (Aquilué et al 2010:74). A similar arrangement was also present in an area slightly to the south of the earliest layers excavated, dated to the end of the sixth century BC (Castanyer et al 2015: 127). Because of this and of the high quantity of handmade pottery in San Martin, it has been suggested that the Palaiapolis might have had a 'contexte culturel à caractère plus mixte', while the context of the Neapolis would have been 'bien plus grec et coloniale' (Aquilué et al 2010:74), but this statement is still debatable.

While the area occupied by the settlement itself was limited, Emporion, from the beginning, formed a network of contacts in the surrounding territory, to be able to obtain produce through exchange with the population of the indigenous *oppida* in the surrounding region that, from the sixth century onwards, became more and more populated (Aquilué et al 2010: 75-77, Demetriou 2012:37). At least from the fifth century BC, Emporion was connected by several roads to the countryside, which was full of siloses (storage facilities) for crops (Demetriou 2012: 37). The relationships between the Greek settlement and the surrounding area probably also led to the introduction of particular crops and favoured the intensification of the culture of others (Demetriou 2012: 62).

The relationship was even closer and more complex, however, with the Iberians living in the same area where the city was. As discussed, before the foundation of the Palaiapolis, there was already an indigenous village in San Martin, and the presence on this site of imported Greek goods is documented from the beginning of the sixth century BC. Later, handmade local vases in some of the houses seem to point towards a strong indigenous presence in the settlement (Dominguez 2004:434). It is also generally believed that, after the transition to the Neapolis, Greeks and Iberians coexisted (Dominguez 2013:24, Guzman 2013: 188). This is primarily because of information gathered from literary sources, all of which are much later. In Strabo's account, the Phocaeans and the Iberian population (the Indiketans) started off as neighbours, but the Iberians asked to be included in the walls of the city. Emporion became a '*dipolis*', where Greeks and Iberians lived inside the same defensive walls, but separated by an internal one. The two populations maintained separated identities until later, when they came to form one political unit. After the two communities were integrated into one, they supposedly lived by both Greek and 'Barbarian' law. (Demetriou 2012: 45 and 236, Dominguez 2013: 24-25, Guzman 2013). Livy, on the other

hand, described Greeks and Iberians as living in two distinct cities, separated by a wall. (Demetriou 2012:46, Dominguez 2013: 25-26).

Excavations at Emporion have not led to the discovery of houses identified specifically as indigenous datable to the archaic period. The most ancient part of the fortifications thus far documented (Castanyer et al 2015:123) corresponds to the north eastern corner of the settlement, separating it from a beach that led to the harbour, dated between the end of the sixth century and the early fifth. This has led the excavators to imagine it corresponded to an enlargement of a possible initial fortification. It is difficult to determine whether this change in the fortification would have corresponded to the inclusion of the Iberian people in the walls, as their houses would likely not have been on the corner identified by the excavation.

The best evidence for a possible co-existence, or at least existence, of an indigenous settlement in close proximity to Emporion during the sixth century is represented by the North Eastern Wall necropolis, a group of burials characterized by the ritual of cremation in the area that was later occupied by the Roman fortifications of the city. The necropolis was placed to the West of the Neapolis<sup>6</sup>, whereas the other cemeteries datable to the sixth century are South of the city (Santos 2009a, b, Aquilué et al 2012).

In the area immediately East of the fifth century fortification, during the 1986 excavations archaeologists discovered a sanctuary that would have been outside of the urban walls and, in its proximity, a group of domestic structures identified as indigenous (Sanmartí 1992:31-32, Aquilué et al 2010: 73-76). Both the houses and the sanctuary are datable between the second half of the fifth and the fourth century BC, when they were abandoned because the new fortifications of the city were built in the same area, including the space they occupied (Sanmartí 1992:31-32, Aquilué et al 2010: 73-76, Guzman 2013: 196). It is debated whether or not this could represent the moment of integration of indigenous elements in the colony (Sanmartí 1992:31-32, Guzman 2013:201). The position of the sanctuary, that archaeologists suppose was at South of the acropolis of the Neapolis, located between the possible group of indigenous houses and the Greek walls, would have facilitated the integration of the two groups, being a 'neutral' space that facilitated meeting and exchange (Aquilué et al 2010: 75). This period corresponds to both a reorganization of the urban spaces and the moment of

---

<sup>6</sup> The necropolis takes its name from the fact that the North-Eastern walls of the Roman Emporion were built over it. The Roman settlement was to the West of the Neapolis.

maximum use of the Marti necropolis, that includes both burials regarded as Greek and ones regarded as indigenous by the literature (Dominguez 2004, 2013).

It is, then, possible that both Livy and Strabo were projecting a later situation onto the early decades of the city (Dominguez 2013:25-26). It has also been suggested that Livy, in particular, did not want to describe the origins of the city but the situation in which indigenous and Greeks lived from the second century BC, and that the wall he referred to was the one enclosing the city towards West, where the indigenous settlement would have been at the time (Moret 1995). Another hypothesis suggested has been that the wall would have been demolished when Greeks and indigenous formed one political unit (Pena 1985:75). The term '*dipolis*' has also generated discussion on whether it could correspond to two different, nearby settlements or a Greek city in which a specific section, surrounded by walls, contained an indigenous neighbourhood (Pena 1985:74).

Two other important sources for the relationship between Emporion and Iberians are two commercial letters inscribed in lead. One has been found in Emporion and dates between 550 and 530 BC, the second in Pech Maho (in Languedoc Roussillon), and is dated between 480 and 460 BC (Demetriou 2012 :41-44). The letter from Emporion offers instructions to the recipient to ask a person named Bapsed (who, because of his name, has been identified as Iberian) to transport some merchandise on a ship he is going to buy. The letter from Pech Maho presents two inscriptions on the different sides, as it has probably been re-used. The earlier one is in Etruscan language and the later one, datable between 480 and 460 BC, is Greek. The Etruscan inscription is fragmentary, but the name of Massalia can be identified. The Greek document reports a transaction in which a person, who has bought a boat 'from the Emporitai', sold a share (of the boat or of the profits derived from using it) to the author of the document, who paid the price in different instalments, in front of witnesses, who, from the names, were probably Iberians.

These documents permit an understanding of the multi-ethnic nature of cross cultural trade in the Ancient Mediterranean, beyond the rigid distinctions between people of different backgrounds that several scholars impose on the discussion of this phenomenon. It is also certainly possible to imagine (as does Dominguez 2013: 27) that Iberian individuals came to the city and eventually came to live in it because they were part of its network of exchanges.

At Emporion and in the surrounding territory, Greek and Iberian culture mutually influenced one another, resulting in the development of new practices and traditions in the



material culture (Demetriou 2012:51). During the fourth century BC, domestic architecture in the colony included Greek, Iberian, Punic and, later, Roman elements. From the late fifth century onwards, these mixed cultural influences can also be seen in wares such as the Indiketan pottery (which had Iberian shapes decorated with motifs derived both from Greek and indigenous tradition). Another 'colonial' production is the Emporian grey ware, produced both in Emporion and in Ullastret, the indigenous centre that, most likely, has the closest and most intense relationship with the Greek settlement (Demetriou 2012:51, Dominguez 2013:29). Dominguez (2013:32) also argues that the Iberians living in the city would have facilitated the connection and interaction between Emporion and the oppida of the surrounding region.

It is possible that one factor that favoured the integration between the two communities was religion, in particular the presence, at least from the fifth century BC, of a sanctuary of Artemis Ephesia placed out of the walls of the city, perhaps serving as a meeting place for different people (Sanmartí 1992: 31).

### **6.2.3 The cemeteries of Emporion**

For the period that precedes the arrival of the colonists, groups of cremations are attested in the areas where the Palaiaapolis and the Neapolis would later be established (Santos 2009a: 29, Aquilué et al 2012:76-78). The first of these groups of burials, the necropolis Parallí, was excavated in the 1940s. The burials, very disturbed by agricultural work, were poorly preserved. The vases in handmade pottery from these burials allow to date it between ninth and eighth century BC (Lopez Borgoñoz 1998, Aquilué et al 2012:77).

Much more recently discovered is the aforementioned necropolis Vilanera, not fully published yet (Santos 2009a:30-32, Aquilué et al 2008: 179-184, 2012:78-86, Codina and Montalbà 2012). One area of the necropolis is contemporary of the Parallí one, while another can be dated between the second half of the seventh century and the early sixth century (Aquilué et al 2008: 179). In this area of the necropolis, some burials are marked by *tumuli* (Santos 2009a:31). The average funerary equipment includes three to six vases, but some of the burials have much wider assemblages. Along with the vases there are elements of personal ornament such as bracelets, brooches, rings and knives. Weapons appear rarely. In a few of the burials (the 15% circa) are also the earliest imports attested in a cemetery near Emporion, (Aquilué et al 2008:182). They include wheel thrown *pitthoi*, mortar tripods, an oil bottle and two ostrich eggs. The types of imports present in Vilanera are comparable

to the ones attested in the pre-colonial layers of the Palaiapolis. However, considering the distance between the cemetery and Sant Martin, it is possible that there was also another settlement, closer to the necropolis, whose inhabitants were buried in it (Aquiluè et al 2008: 184).

The more recent cemeteries surrounding Emporion are small groups of burials dating from the sixth century BC, in which both cremations and inhumations are present. At least from the fifth century BC, both rituals are attested in the same cemeteries (Lopez Borgoñoz 1998, Dominguez 2004, Santos 2009b). The sixth century necropoleis include the one of the North Eastern wall, which will be the focus of this chapter and discussed in detail in the next section. Dated to the sixth and fifth century BC are the cemeteries placed in the areas of Portixol and Les Coves (Lopez Borgoñoz 1998, Santos 2009b: 34), situated to the South of the Neapolis. In these areas, only very few burials have been excavated. Moreover, they are not very well known as the excavations were carried out at the beginning of the twentieth century and only few of the materials have been documented (Almagro 1953: 17-20, Asensi 1991, Sanmartí 1996, Lopez Borgoñoz 1998).

On the other hand, as mentioned above, the North Eastern Wall cemetery occupies an area to the West of the settlement (Santos 2009 a, b, Aquiluè et al 2012:75). Also to the South of the Neapolis are located the cemeteries named Granada, Mateu and Bonjoan, from the names of the owners of the allotments in which they were excavated. Their early use is dated between the end of the sixth and the fifth century BC. The necropolis Bonjoan was used until the sixth century DC, whereas the necropolis Granada is dated primarily to the fifth century BC and the necropolis Mateu is composed by very few burials whose chronology is difficult to establish (Lopez Borgoñoz 1998).

These cemeteries were excavated in the 1950s, when they were already badly damaged by agricultural works. As a consequence, the information about them is often very fragmentary (Santos 2009b: 34-35). For example, for the pre-Roman period in the Mateu and Granada cemeteries are only known two inhumations, whereas in the Bonjoan necropolis, for the pre-Roman period, 16 inhumations and one cremation are documented (Lopez Borgoñoz 1998). On the other hand, the necropolis Martí, dated between the fifth and third century BC, is located between the North Eastern Wall necropolis and the settlement. It includes 141 inhumations and 32 cremations (Lopez Borgoñoz 1998).

The so-called ‘necropolis of the parking’, a group of burials (22 inhumations and 10 cremations) excavated in the 1980s, is located south of the Neapolis, significantly closer to it than the older burial groups. It is dated between fourth and third century BC (Lopez Borgoñoz 1998, Sanmartí et al. 1983-1984).

In 2010 a new campaign of excavations has uncovered, between the ‘necropolis of the parking’ and the cemeteries Bonjoan, Mateu and Granada, a vast area of burials dated between the fifth century BC and the second century AD. Of these burials, 44 between inhumations and cremations are datable to the pre-Roman period (Castanyer et al 2015: 128). This most recently excavated necropolis has not been published in its entirety, but some assemblages have been described by Castanyer et al (2015: 128-129).

Both cremations and inhumations are present in the Emporian cemeteries. In the literature, the burials have been classified as ‘Greek’ and ‘indigenous’ because of the ritual. Cremation is, in fact, the most common funerary ritual in the indigenous necropolises of Catalonia since the ninth century BC (Santos 2009a, Graells 2010: 24-25). In particular, the prevailing type of burial on the coast seems to be in pits, where the urn and the surrounding equipment were placed (Santos 2009a, b: 33). On the other hand, inhumation has been regarded as the ritual selected by ‘Greek’ individuals (Dominguez 2004, Santos 2009b: 33).

Inhumations were usually placed into a simple pit in the rock, covered and signalled by small mounds of rocks, some of which were also placed in the burials to protect the head (Santos 2009b:36). Newborns and small children were inhumated inside Iberian, Punic or Massaliote amphorae (Gailledrat 1995:36, Santos 2009b:35). This has made the ‘ethnic’ attribution of these burials even more difficult, as inhumation of subadults is documented in indigenous contexts (Dominguez 2013:27).

Most of the burial groups are composed primarily by inhumations, therefore regarded as ‘Greek’ cemeteries that included indigenous individuals (Santos 2009b:38). On the other hand, the cemetery of the North Eastern Wall, composed almost exclusively of cremations, is considered an ‘indigenous’ one because of the prevailing ritual and its position in a different location from the other cemeteries dated to the sixth century (Dominguez 2004, Santos 2009a).

Aside from the ritual, differences have been identified between the assemblages present in inhumations and cremations (Gailledrat 1995<sup>7</sup>). In the inhumations with pottery (present in the majority of them), wheel thrown vases, especially ones for banqueting and holding perfumes, are always present (Gailledrat 1995:33-34). Along with the pottery perfume vases, there are also several ones in *faience*, glass paste and alabaster (Santos 2009b:37). Among the banqueting vases, the most common shapes are drinking ones and pouring ones, like *oinochoai* and *olpai*, which might suggest the libation was practiced (Gailledrat 1995:36).

The presence of banqueting and perfume vases is almost always mutually exclusive, with only 7 inhumations over 72 (across the various pre Roman groups) where the opposite happens (Gailledrat 1995:37). Nails are often present in the burials, but it is debated whether they were elements of the funerary bed or they were included in the funerary assemblages because they had a votive value (Gailledrat 1995: 34-35). Weapons are hardly ever part of the funerary equipment <sup>8</sup>(Gailledrat 1995:35).

On the other hand, cremation burials include a wider typology of vases, from containers (often used as ossuary) to drinking vessels to, occasionally, perfume vases (Gailledrat 1995:44). Between the sixth and fifth century BC, handmade pottery represents the 50% of the vases in cremations (Gailledrat 1995:46). Handmade vases, in any case, remained in use until the second century BC, albeit in a very small percentage of the graves (Gailledrat 1995:47). Handmade urns used as an ossuary and perfume vases seem to be mutually exclusive, whereas handmade pottery is often associated to vases for drinking, serving or storing beverages. Several burials with handmade ossuary do not have any other equipment (Gailledrat 1995:46). Several cremations have no funerary equipment at all (Gailledrat 1995:45). This variety in assemblage is, however, more evident among the earliest

---

<sup>7</sup> Gailledrat's study does not, of course, include the most recently excavated group of burials. However, those of his conclusions that I include in this paragraph are not contradicted by the information about the inhumations from the most recently excavated cemetery provided in Castanyer et al 2015. Castanyer et al 2015 do not provide information about the cremations in the same burial group.

<sup>8</sup> However, there could have been exceptions. One could have been represented by a burial from the area of El Portixol that, according to the excavator's description, included a panathenaic amphora dated to the second quarter of the fifth century BC along with several elements of weaponry that were subsequently lost (Trias 1967-68:181 and Almagro 1953:18, who present different descriptions of it. Trias lists an helmet, a bronze belt, two swords and a dagger and Almagro an helmet, a cuirass and greaves). The amphora is kept in the Museum of Barcelona (pictures of the vase and full bibliography on it can be found on the ficha 57 on the Iberiagraeca online database). More recently, Castanyer et al. 2015 ( 128-129 ), while describing some of the inhumations from the most recently excavated burial group, also mention the inhumation in amphora of a newborn ( E229), that was deposited over a sword and had a bent *soliferrum* placed over it. However, as mentioned above, the inhumation of subadults was also practiced in indigenous contexts.

cremations, while, from the fourth century onwards, most of the cremations only include one vase, even when this vase is the ossuary (Gailledrat 1995:47). In both cremations and inhumations from the fourth century onwards the assemblages are composed of fewer objects and, in particular, the number of vases decreases. Among these, perfume vases remain one of the most common classes deposited in inhumations and become more and more common in cremations (Gailledrat 1995: 42-43 and 47-48). It should also be noted that necropolis of the North Eastern Wall is the only one in which weapons appear in the assemblages (Gailledrat 1995: 47 and n.42).

As mentioned, in the literature, inhumations and cremations have been identified respectively as ‘Greek’ and ‘indigenous’ burials (Almagro 1953 and 1955, Gailledrat 1995, Dominguez 2004 and 2013, Santos 2009b). Their presence the same cemeteries has been viewed by some as an indication that both colonists and Iberians occupied the same urban space, as described by the sources (Gailledrat 1995). The two groups would have, however, maintained different ethnic identities as attested by the different choices in ritual and some differences in the type of funerary equipment (Dominguez 2013:32).

What is definitely observable in both cremations and inhumations is that the assemblages in them became progressively more similar, while maintaining traits that differentiated them (Gailledrat 1995, Dominguez 2004, 2013, Santos 2009b).

The presence of inhumations and cremations in the same cemetery is not a unique phenomenon in colonial contexts of the Gulf of Lion. Co-presence of ‘Greek’ and ‘indigenous’ individuals and rituals has, in fact, been used as an explanation for the diversity in the burial types present in the fourth century cemetery of Peyrou, near Agathe Tyche (Nickels 1983:423, Garcia 1995:145) and in the fifth and fourth century groups of burials known around Massalia (Bertucchi 1992:134-136).

Gailledrat (1995: 53-54) has observed that the number of cremations included in the inhumation cemeteries surrounding Emporion is small. Therefore, he suggests that sharing the same funerary space with the colonists was a deliberate choice made by a limited group of ‘indigenous’ individuals. He argues that Iberians would probably have very diversified relationships with the colonists, because of connections, interests and affiliations that are difficult to determine from the funerary landscape (Gailledrat 1995:54). I think it is possible to take this observation further: the inclusion in a given burial group, the selection of the elements that formed the funerary equipment (whether from different traditions or not) and

their association in the assemblages and, of course, the ritual are all the result of deliberate choices through which people represented their social selves and the networks of relationships they were involved in. Therefore, the classification of these burials as ‘Greek’ and ‘indigenous’ might not be adequate to describe the complex reality of the community to whom the people buried in them belonged. It focuses on binary divisions rather than on the layered ways in which individuals who are part of a multi-cultural, evolving reality like that of Emporion drew from different traditions in expressing identities, similarities and associations as well as differences and disassociations.

### 6.3 Cemetery of the North Eastern Wall

This is a necropolis situated in the area in which later were built the walls of Roman Emporion (Almagro 1955, Barberà 1990, Santos 2009a). The fortifications were built directly on the rock, after having removed the soil above it, which damaged several burials. The first burials were discovered between 1952 and 1954, during the excavation of the foundation of the walls. These burials had been placed in cracks on the rock, so they survived both the preliminary works for the construction of the walls and the progressive destruction of the walls to reuse their blocks. Because of these circumstances, only a few graves have been excavated of a necropolis that must have been large, and probably continued into the area occupied by the Roman city. The majority of the excavated burials (17) are cremations placed into cracks in the rock. However, because of the conditions of excavation, it is difficult to understand if this was the common practice or if these are the ones that have been identified just because they were the more likely to survive the construction of the walls. Similarly, it is difficult to know if the burials had any kind of marker, as they would have been destroyed. However, there were also four inhumations, two of which were of children. In these graves, the skeleton was placed straight on the rock. Almagro (1955) judged this an ‘indigenous’ necropolis because of the prevalence of cremation as a funerary ritual and because of the presence of handmade pottery in the assemblages. Later discussions have also pointed out the presence of weapons and of ‘prestige goods’ such as weapons and *simpula* in some of the funerary assemblages, that seems to be distinctive of indigenous burials (Gailledrat 1995:44 and 45, Dominguez 2004:442).

The specific funerary assemblages from the necropolis are presented in Appendix 4. Burials 12 and 16 are not considered identifiable as graves by Barberà 1990, as only one object for each assemblage survives. It should, however, be noted that these are a fragment of ‘Ionian’ cup (in grave 12) and part of an Italic brooch *a navicella* (grave 16). In general, Barberà 1990

considers it doubtful that assemblages from which only one or two objects survived could represent coherent and complete burials. However, more recently, other authors (Aquilué et al. 2012:87) have noted that it is possible to consider at least the burials where the only preserved vase is the urn (3, 6, 8 and 14) as complete. These simpler assemblages could be dated towards the end of the sixth century BC, when funerary equipments in other cremation burials were, on average, composed of less numerous elements. In Barberà (1990:204)'s estimation, based on comparison between the excavation reports and the publication (Almagro 1955), the cremations that constitute reliably coherent assemblages are numbers 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 15. In addition, there are doubts about the assemblages in 4, 7 and 15 being complete. Graells 2010 only includes in the catalogue of the graves with imports the burials 1, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 17. Aquilué et al (2012: 86) also regard the coherence of the assemblage in grave 17 as doubtful, because it includes materials from very different chronological periods.

As noted, four inhumations were also part of the cemetery. Numbers 1 and 2, both subadults, were accompanied by several objects, whereas 3 and 4 only seemed to include the bodies. However, both of these burials had been damaged by the removal of the soil that covered them, and the body in the inhumation 4 was missing the legs almost entirely. (Almagro 1955: 398-399). The orientation of these burials differed: North for the graves 1 and 4, East for the inhumation 2 and South-East for the inhumation 3. The necropolis Martí was located not very far south of the North Eastern Wall cemetery. It is dated between 400 and 300 BC and consists of both inhumations and cremations (López Borgoñoz 1998:276, Dominguez 2004: 438). The lack of preserved equipment in the adult inhumations ascribed to the necropolis of the North Eastern Wall has led some scholars to wonder whether these two graves represent evidence of later funerary use of the area (Aquilué et al. 2012:87). This is definitely possible, but the lack of dating material makes it generally difficult to confirm this hypothesis.

The other two inhumations were accompanied by material that places them in the same chronological period as the cremations. Besides, the fact that the individuals buried in them are subadults makes the difference in ritual with the rest of the necropolis less surprising. The inhumation of young children, infants and foetuses is a phenomenon attested in several urban contexts of Iron Age Spain (Gusi and Muriel 2008, Martínez et al 2012:204-207). Burials of children are generally quite rare in Iberian necropoleis, but, when they are present, inhumation is one of the rituals used for them (Martínez et al 2012:206-207). However, in

the later cemeteries surrounding Emporion subadults are often deposited in amphorae (Santos 2009b).

Barberà (1990: 203 and 205) attributes at least the cremations 4 and 10 and inhumation 2 to ‘foreigners’ because they include several imports, some of which are unique for the cemetery and because the equipment includes perfume vases, an anomaly compared to most Iberian funerary assemblages. This opinion has recently been contested by Aquilué et al. 2012. It seems excessively schematic to assign ethnic identity to these burials on the basis of the presence of objects that appear unusual in comparison with the assemblages in the other graves. Besides, the assemblages of the North Eastern Wall cemetery are very heterogeneous and there are important characters (the ritual for the cremations 4 and 10, the use of local handmade pottery in the assemblages for cremation 10 and inhumation 2) that these burials still share with the others in the cemetery and in the other ‘indigenous’ burials around Emporion. On the other hand, the assemblage of the cremation 4 is atypical not only in the cemetery of which it is part, but also in comparison to what is known about the Greek cemeteries surrounding the city and datable to the sixth century BC because of the simultaneous presence of drinking and perfume vases. Therefore, the presence in the grave of perfume vases seems an insufficient basis for an ethnic identification of the person buried in it.

## **6.4 The cemetery of the North Eastern Wall and the contemporary material culture of the North East of the Iberian Peninsula**

### ***6.4.1 Comparisons for the imported materials in the North East of the Iberian Peninsula***

Some of the imported materials and the colonial pottery vases present in North Eastern Wall necropolis are extremely rare in the general landscape of the north east of the Iberian Peninsula during the Early Iron Age. It bears keeping in mind that this cemetery was in use during a period that, as it was discussed above, represented a moment of profound changes in the dynamics of exchange across the North of the Iberian Peninsula. Looking at the specific classes of imports present in the necropolis, graves with eggs in Catalonia appear only in this necropolis and the one of Vilanera (Graells 201:60-61). However, the Vilanera eggs are ostrich ones, also found in the South of the Peninsula, where Phoenician presence is



considerably stronger. The egg in the cremation 1 of the North Eastern Wall is, instead, one of duck or chicken<sup>9</sup>.

Around 30 scarabs have been found in North Eastern Spain, mostly in necropoleis (Padrò 1983b:23-110, Graells 2010:55-60). Unfortunately, most of them were out of contexts or part of assemblages of dubious coherence. The exceptions include, aside from cremation 11, an single scarab in inhumation 15 of the necropolis Martí of Emporion, one from grave 6 of La Solivella, in País Valencià, and one from the excavations of Rhode, the later Greek colony on the Catalan coast (Padrò 1983b:23-110, Graells 2010:55-60). None of the scarabs known in Catalonia are directly associated with objects whose presence in the region is regarded as due to the Phoenician commerce (Graells 2010:55)<sup>10</sup>. 15 scarabs are believed to come from Emporion and the surrounding necropoleis (Padrò 1983b:28-52). Among the out of context scarabs, two were found during early 20th century excavations of the Neapolis (Padrò 1983b:42-43) and one is believed to have been found in the necropolis Portixol (Padrò 1983b: 33-34), in use during the sixth century BC (López Borgoñoz 1998:275). This scarab and one of the ones without context (Padrò 1983b:42-43, Graells 2010:58) are dated to the sixth century, like the one from the North Eastern Wall. Padrò considers all these pieces as Egyptian because of the image engraved on the back, but Graells suggests that they could also be of Cypriot production.

Four scarabs and a scaraboid have been considered part of the assemblage from the 'grave x' of Mas de Mussols (Padrò 1983b:91-98, Graells 2010:56-57, 193-198). The 'grave x' is a rather controversial assemblage, having been published with different descriptions, given by the original excavator to F. Esteve Galvez and J. Maluquer de Motes (Maluquer 1984:65-68, Graells 2010:193-195). Besides, one of the scarabs was found during an exploration of the point where the rest of the material had already been excavated (Maluquer de Motes 1984: 67). The assemblage, as it will be discussed later, included an oil bottle of Phoenician tradition and two globular *aryballoi*. The decoration has not been preserved in any of the perfume vases. Also in the assemblage were a silver ring with an engraved decoration, a silver bracelet, an urn *de orejetas* and a belt buckle with three hooks (Maluquer 1984: 65-68,

---

<sup>9</sup> Graells suggests the presence of an egg these animals might be related to the idea of resurrection and connected with Orphic imagery, especially in Western Greek and Etruscan funerary contexts (Graells 2010:61-62). However, taking into account the presence of ostrich eggs in the earlier necropolis of Vilanera, it is also possible to imagine that this particular egg represented a 'replacement' for the ostrich eggs, that would have become harder to find with the progressive disappearance of material carried by Phoenicians.

<sup>10</sup> A possible exception is the oil bottle from the grave x of Mas de Mussols, further discussed.

Graells 2010: 196-197). If considered a coherent assemblage, the burial should be dated to the second half of the sixth century BC, based on the presence of the Iberian urn and the belt buckle.<sup>11</sup> Looking at other cemeteries, one scarab (without context or description) is reported to have been found in the necropolis of Peralada (Girona). The object is lost, but a picture of it exists (Graells 2010:58). The material known from this context is dated to the sixth century (Padrò 1983b: 28). Nine scarabs, six scaraboids and three fragments are attested in the necropolis of Can Canyís (Tarragona). The objects belonged to an area of the necropolis that was discovered accidentally, before systematic excavations were started, so they lack context. On the other hand, it is reported that all the scarabs and scaraboids were found in the same spot, which has led to suspect that they were all part of the same necklace (Padrò 1983b:77-91). The scarabs are dated to the first half of the sixth century by Padrò (1983b:77-91) and to the first quarter of the century by Bea (1996, reported in Graells 2010:57).

Outside the modern borders of Catalonia, but very close to the Ebro valley, in the necropolis of La Solivella (Alcalà de Xivert, Castellón), were found a scarab and various glass paste beads. Padrò dates the scarab to the first half of the sixth century BC. This means it would have represented an item that had been owned for some time before being included in the burial, datable at the earliest in the last quarter of the century because of the rest of the assemblage (Padrò 1983b: 109-110).

Glass paste beads like those in inhumation 1 are present in various graves in other Iron Age necropoleis in Catalonia including Mas de Mussols, Can Canyís, la Solivella and Perelada (Graells 2008:80-81, 2010:60-61) and, in particular, in T. 14 of Mas de Mussols (Maluquer de Motes 1984:46), that happens to be another subadult burial. They also occur in the inhumations of children from the other cemeteries of Emporion (Gailledrat 1995:41). Beads

---

<sup>11</sup> This chronology is problematic because of the presence of the oil bottle (presumably related to Phoenician trade, and expected to appear in context dating only up to the early sixth century BC). According to Graells (2010:198) the perfume vases could be produced respectively in Sardinia (the oil bottle) and in the Italian Peninsula (the Corinthian *aryballos*), which would allow to consider all the objects in the assemblage a result of Emporitan trade, involving merchants from Etruria or in general from the Italian Peninsula. As the decoration disappeared from the perfume vases, and chemical analyses have not been carried out on them, this is a possibility. However, I would surmise that it would not be impossible that the oil bottle had been owned for a long time before its deposition on the burial, thus explaining its presence along with that of more recent material. In other graves from this necropolis are included various materials dated to the late seventh and early sixth century BC whose presence could be attributed to the Phoenician trade (Graells 2010:107-109).

imported or locally produced were probably used together in necklaces, along with possible ones in perishable materials, for example in wood (Graells 2008:81).

The materials of Etruscan production found in Catalonia are dated later than the early goods probably carried by Phoenicians and concentrate primarily in the area surrounding Emporion (Graells 2010: 68-69). This includes the first, indigenous settlement that occupied the site that would have later become the Palaiapolis (Aquiluè et al. 2008:178). In the first quarter of the sixth century, Etruscan amphorae are the most common imported containers together with Phoenician ones. Both classes of containers are still, however, a minority compared to the local ones (Aquiluè et al. 2008:178-179). In the second quarter of the century, Etruscan containers represent 50% of the amphorae. Despite the presence of various types of Greek amphora, they are present in similar proportions until the last third of the century, when they start to diminish in the Gulf of Lion in general (Aquiluè et al. 2008:181-182). Along with the amphorae, a small quantity of finewares (primarily *bucchero kantharoi*) and coarsewares (fragments of mortar and olla) of Etruscan production have been found in the excavations of the Palaiapolis (Aquiluè et al. 2008:185-187).

Interestingly, in the necropolis of Vilanera, which can be dated to the first quarter of the sixth century and in whose funerary assemblages are included containers and vases of Phoenician origins, no Etruscan amphorae or pottery have been found (Aquiluè et al. 2008:180, Aquiluè et al. 2012: 78-86 ). This is an interesting example of availability of goods not corresponding to their being perceived as desirable or, at the very least, appropriate for the placement in a funerary assemblage.

As it will be discussed later, the most ancient materials of Etruscan production attested in funerary contexts surrounding Emporion are a group of perfume vases probably found in the Portixol necropolis, one of the groups of inhumations close to the city dated to the early sixth century (Asensi 1991). It is perhaps possible to imagine that, even if Etruscan material was already carried by Phoenician traders in the area of the future colony, it was perceived and used differently by the colonists, if not by Etruscan merchants who might have been part of the population of the colony. Therefore, they also acquired new value in the eyes of the potential Iberian owners.

Etrusco-Corinthian pottery is very rare in Catalonia, as in Southern France (the only exceptions being the sites of Marseille and Saint Blaise, see Frère 2008).

The North Eastern Wall necropolis is the only ‘indigenous’ cemetery where an Etrusco Corinthian cup is attested (Graells 2010: 73). Aside from the cup in cremation 9, there is the aforementioned group of four perfume vases that are out of context but presumed to have been excavated in the necropolis Portixol, one of the oldest ‘Greek’ cemeteries surrounding Emporion (Asensi 1991). Outside of funerary contexts, fragments of three cups from the Ciclo dei Rosoni, two from the Gruppo a Maschera Umana, have been discovered in the excavations of the Palaiapolis (Aquiluè et al 2008:186, Graells 2010:69). Another cup from the Gruppo a Maschera Umana has been found in Ullastret (Arribas and Trias 1961, Graells 2010: 68).

*Bucchero kantharoi*, other drinking vessels in the same material and Etruscan amphorae are attested, always in very limited quantity, in a few indigenous settlements: at Illa d’en Reixach and Puig de Sant Andreu, la Fonollera and Mas Castellar de Pontòs (Girona). All these centres are part of the territory surrounding Emporion. In central Catalonia, fragments of these materials are attested at Montjuic and Turò de la Font de la Canya (Barcelona) and La Moleta del Remei and La Gessera (Tarragona), plus an amphora found underwater in the Cap de Creus (Graells 2010:68-69). However, more than two *bucchero* vases have been found only at the Illa d’en Reixach and Puig de Sant Andreu, the two ancient settlements that form the complex of Ullastret, one of the indigenous sites closest to the Greek colony and which had more intense relationships with it, and in the village of La Moleta del Remei (Graells 2010:68-69). Almost all the imports are datable between the last quarter of the seventh and the third quarter of the sixth century BC (Sanmartí et al 2008:197). The Neapolis is the only site where over 15 *bucchero kantharoi* have been excavated (Graells 2010:68-69). On the other hand, *oinochoai* in *bucchero* have only been excavated in Emporion and in the North Eastern Wall necropolis (Graells 2010: 71-72). Overall, *bucchero* is never in funerary assemblages outside of those from the North Eastern Wall necropolis (Graells 2010: 71-73). Unlike what happens in Western Languedoc, Etruscan amphorae are not included in any funerary equipment (Graells 2010:70).

The brooch from cremation 16 was dated to the sixth century by Sanmartí and Martí (1974: 58). For the shape and what is discernible of the decoration it is reminding of the type ‘a navicella larga con zig zag laterali tipo Muletti Prosdocimi’ of von Eles 1986 (108-110), found in the North East of Italy and dated to the first half of the sixth century. However, in none of the examples she presents there is a comparison for the decoration of the foot.

This is the only Italic brooch found in context in Catalonia (Graells 2009: 129). Other known examples are from Museum collections, which makes it difficult to determine whether they were acquired through antiquarian commerce. A possible exception is represented by another brooch *a navicella* from the Museu Episcopal de Vic, accompanied by a note in the inventory of the Museum that described its discovery in Ribes de Freser, in the Pyreneans (Graells 2009:125). Because other brooches of this type are attested in Languedoc Roussillon, and in the French Pyreneans, Graells (2009) has suggested that this brooch might have been acquired through exchange with this region, with or without direct contact with Mediterranean traders.

A type of Italic import that appears in other indigenous funerary contexts, but not in the North Eastern Wall necropolis, is represented by bronze vessels. Elements of a possible *patera* with handles were among the material identified as part of the equipment of the isolated grave of Los Ferreres. A small bronze lion, most likely part of the decoration of a similar vessel, has been found in the area corresponding to the necropolis Bonjoan of Emporion, although the vessel might have actually been in a burial from the necropolis Portixol (Graells 2010:86-89). A different type of *patera*, with a beaded motif decorating the rim, was part of the assemblage in the isolated burial of Granja Soley (Graells 2010: 90). This type of bronze vessel, with decorated lip, bearing beaded or braided motifs, has also been found in several burials in Southern France, including the isolated graves of La Céreirède, Rec de Bragues and Les Faisses (Graells 2010: 90-91). In the necropolis of Can Canyis have also been identified fragments of a *cista*. Another *cista* was part of the funerary equipment of the isolated grave of Corno Lauzo in Languedoc. Parallels for these objects have been found in Central Italy, as well as in the Balkans (Graells 2010: 92-93).

Corinthian pottery is represented in the necropolis of the North Eastern Wall by three *aryballoi* and a *pyxis* (however, Graells 2010:80 argues that the latter could represent an imitation from Southern Italy). Corinthian pottery is, in general, very rare in Catalonia. In funerary contexts, Corinthian perfume vases are attested only in two burials from two of the other cemeteries of Emporion and in three other necropolises: one from Milmanda, two, as discussed above, in the 'grave x' from Mas de Mussols, and a fragment from Mianes (Graells 2010:75-77). A *pyxis* in Corinthian pottery has been found in a grave from the necropolis Martí of Emporion (Graells 2010:80) and another one in the necropolis of Mas de Mussols (Sanmartí et al 2002:76). Outside of funerary contexts fragments of Corinthian vases have only been found in Emporion and in two sites in the immediate surroundings of the colony,

Ullastret and Mas Gusò (Graells 2010:76). However, in the village of Penya del Moro (Barcelona), another possible fragment of Corinthian pottery has been excavated, which would represent the only exception (Sanmartí et al 2002:76-77).

It is worth noting that perfume vases are not rare just among the imports of Etruscan and Greek production. Only two oil bottles of Phoenician tradition are attested in Iron Age funerary contexts from Catalonia: one is in the necropolis of Vilanera, the other is, yet again, part of the 'grave x' assemblage from the necropolis of Mas de Mussols (Graells 2010:49). In the necropolis of Mas de Mussols, the burial 3, dated to the first half of the sixth century BC, also included a Phoenician dipper juglet (Maluquer 1984:68, Graells 2010: 43). However, in this new context, it was placed in a handmodeled urn and it is difficult to determine how it would have been used.

Three 'Ionian' cups, one of which belongs to the type A2 of Vallet and Villard and one to the type B2, have been found in the necropolis of the North Eastern Wall. The production of these vases is always difficult to attribute, but, at least for the two fragments in the cremation 17, possible comparisons exist in Southern Italy. The cup from cremation 12 was too damaged by fire to attempt comparisons. Only another fragment of B2 cup is documented in Catalonia in a necropolis, that of Mas de Mussols (Graells 2010:80). Besides, a fragment of a supposed Eastern Greek crater has been found in Torre Cremada (Tarragona), in the site where a possible isolated grave could have been located. However, the existence of this burial is a hypothesis (Moret et al 2006: 81-86, Graells 2010: 83-85 and 111-112). Outside of funerary contexts, Eastern Greek pottery, and 'Ionian' cups type B2 of Vallet and Villard especially, have been found in villages from the North East of Catalonia: both the Illa d'en Reixach and Puig de Sant Andreu in Ullastret, Boades, Burriac, Castellot de la Roca Roja and Penya del Moro (Sanmartí et al 2002:78, Mirò and Santos 2013: 17). The items found are never more than two with the exception of Penya del Moro (Tarragona), where three cups have been identified (Sanmartí et al 2002:78, Graells 2010:83). Other B2 cups, produced in workshops of the Western Mediterranean, primarily Marseille, are attested at Ullastret, Turó de Ca' n' Oliver, Masies de Sant Miquel and Alorda Park (Sanmartí et al 2002:88-91, Mirò and Santos 2013: 17). However, other, different shapes of Western Greek pottery are only attested in Ullastret, leading to the suggestion that a workshop might have been located on the site (Sanmartí et al 2002:91).

In no other Iberian context are attested painted Massaliote *olpai* like the one in cremation 17. The grey monochrome pottery in the necropolis is represented by *oinochoai* and high-

neck jars. The attribution of this type of vases to colonial (from Marseille or even produced in Emporion) or Phocaeen productions is, in absence of petrographic analyses, always debated. However, it is worth noting that the *oinochoe* shape VII of Arcelin Pradelle 1984, is the best represented type of grey pottery in the excavations from the Palaiapolis (Aquiluè et al. 2000:315 and 320 ). *Oinochoai* in grey pottery are also attested in the isolated grave of Granja Soley and in the grave 4 of the necropolis of Mianes (Graells 2010:73-74).

No other jars in grey pottery like the ones in graves 10 and 13 of the North Eastern wall necropolis have been excavated in Catalonia, but one has been found in the grave 6 of the necropolis of Las Peyros in Languedoc Roussillon (Solier et al. 1976:8 and 52, Graells 2010:86). A similar jar, but with a globular body, rather than an oval one as in Las Peyros and grave 10, is also present in the assemblages included in the grave 15/69 of Saint Julien, also in Languedoc ( Llinas and Robert 1971:11-12). This last vase is regarded as a local imitation of a Phocaeen model because the shape of the body differs from the other known examples (Llinas and Robert 1971: 26-27). On the other hand, the two vases from the North Eastern Wall necropolis are probably of Phocaeen production, based on observation of the clay in which they are made and on the style of the decorative motif (Graells 2010: 73-74 for the pitchers, for the jars I owe the information to P.Castanyer).

Outside of funerary contexts, grey pottery is very common at the Illa d'en Reixach and Puig de Sant Andreu. It is, however, extremely rare in other indigenous contexts: some fragments have been found at Montbarba, Puig Castell, Turò de la Font de la Canya and, possibly, in the village of Els Vilars in Arbeca (Sanmartí et al 2002:91-95, Mirò and Santos 2013: 17). Analyses carried out on the grey pottery from Emporion have revealed that it was made locally. Among the shapes made in the workshop of Ullastret were ones typically inspired by Greek shapes like the *plat a marli* (form IV of Arcelin Pradelle 1984, GR-MONO 4 of Dicocer) along with others that are not typical of the repertory of other Western Greek workshops (Martín et al 2010:94). A particularly interesting item is an *oinochoe* inspired by Etrusco-Corinthian models found at the Illa d'en Reixach (Donati 1991).

The rarity of Etruscan and grey pottery pitchers in Catalonia during the sixth century should, however, be integrated with information regarding the distribution in Iron Age Catalonia of *oinochoai* from the Phoenician world, including Phoenician productions or vases inspired to Phoenician models and made in Western Phoenician workshops. These vases are generally quite rare in Catalonia, in contrast to other regions of the Southern Coast of the Iberian

Peninsula such as País Valencià and Andalusia. In particular, they are never attested on the Catalan coast (Sardà Seuma 2008:103).

Sardà Seuma (2008:103-104) lists two possible Phoenician imports and four possible imitations (either local or imported from Southern Spain), all found in the Ebro valley over the course of the sixth century BC. None of them is from a funerary context. Phoenician *oinochoai* also influenced in a less direct way some local productions of the lower Ebro valley that can be dated from the second half of the sixth century BC (Sardà Seuma 2008:104-106). Through the fifth century imported finewares became more common, but they were mostly drinking shapes and, occasionally, kraters, while pitchers remained one of the less popular shapes of imported pottery in the North East of Spain (Sanmartí and Santacana 2005: 128-129)<sup>12</sup>.

As for the Attic *lekythos* in cremation 4, the only other vase of this type found in Catalonia in a funerary context from the sixth century is from another one of the necropolises of Emporion, in inhumation 55 of the necropolis Bonjoan (Graells 2010:85). During the fifth century, black figure *lekythoi* will then become the most common vases in the Greek cemeteries surrounding Emporion (Dominguez 2004: 440), but will not become as popular in other Iberian funerary contexts (Dominguez 1999: 319-320).

The black figure cup from cremation 9 is also the only one found in a funerary context from Catalonia, but one is attested in Southern France, in the isolated grave of Corno Lauzo (Graells 2010:81). However, an Attic black glaze cup was found in the necropolis of Serra de Darò, which formed part of the archaeological complex of Ullastret (Sanmartí et al 2002:78) and whose use is dated to the fifth century BC. Outside of funerary contexts, fragments of black figure vases, especially cups (band cups, Cassel cups and, especially, eye cups), datable to the second half, and, in particular, the last third of the sixth century, have been found in Ullastret, Peña del Moro, Burriac and Ciutadilla (Sanmartí et al 2002:83-85, Miró and Santos 2013: 17). Black glaze pottery is attested first by a fragment of *lekythos* datable to first half of the sixth century found in Puig Cadener in Manresa. It is, however,

---

<sup>12</sup> It should, however, be noted that in the Tomb of the Warrior at Llinars del Vallés (Sanmartí1993) and in the burial 184 of the necropolis of Agullana (Graells 2010: 127-135 with bibliography), in the Pyreneans, are present variations of handmade carinated urns with one handle on the side. Both contexts are dated between the end of the seventh of the early sixth century BC. Sanmartí (1993: 20) and Graells (2010:131) identified these vessels as possible pouring shapes. In particular the tomb 184 of Agullana also includes a possible mixing vase with pedestal. Graells (2010:135) has interpreted these vases as a first attempt at replicating the shape of Mediterranean ones and suggested this burial, that has also an unusual structure in comparison with the necropolis, and seemed to have been a cenotaph, could have been a monument to a 'foreign' individual who had been integrated in the community.



only in the last 25 years of the sixth century BC that it appears in more indigenous sites, including Illa d'en Reixach, Mas Castellar de Pontòs, Puig Castellar, Penya del Moro, Alorda Park, Castellot de la Roca Roja, Els Castellans. The quantities are still very small: six vases at Illa d'en Reixach, three at Mas Castellar de Pontòs, another site in the immediate proximity of Emporion, only one vase in all the other sites (Sanmartí et al 2002:78, Mirò and Santos 2013: 17).

From the fifth century onwards, Greek pottery, and Attic drinking vases in particular, became more common in Catalonia and are also attested in the interior of the region, but its presence still remained relatively limited if compared, for example, with what happened in Southern France (Sanmartí et al 2002:78-88, Mirò and Santos 2013: 17-19).

#### **6.4.2 Vases produced in the Iberian Peninsula**

In contrast with the situation above described, other elements of the assemblage can easily find comparisons in several other cemeteries, especially in the area surrounding Emporion and in the adjacent regions of Languedoc Roussillon.

The most conservative elements in the assemblages from the cemetery of the North Eastern Wall appear to be the handmade vases. At the same time, we also see the appearance of local painted vases, around the same time period in which this happens in other cemeteries in Catalonia (Graells 2010: 233). Miniature vases in the funerary equipment are already present in the necropolis of Vilanera, where they are usually placed inside the funerary urn (Aquilué et al. 2012:81) and are thought to have held offerings (I owe this information to Marta Santos). The presence of miniature vases, during the Early Iron Age, is also attested in the surrounding region in two graves from the necropolis of Agullana, two from Anglès and one from La Foradada (a mostly unpublished Early Iron Age group of burials briefly described in Pons 1984:38) (Pons 1984:188).

In terms of handmade pottery, the tronco-conic cup (corresponding to the shape 1c of Pons 1984) is very frequent in the indigenous necropolises (particularly Agullana) of the region around Emporion in the period corresponding to and preceding that of the North Eastern Wall cemetery (Pons 1984: 189 and 194). The hemispherical bowl (form 2 of Pons 1984), is also a very typical shape of handmade pottery in the area surrounding Emporion. It is attested in the North East of Catalonia during the Bronze Age, and comes back in use at the beginning of the sixth century, staying in use until Roman times. It is also present in the necropolis of Gran Bassin I, in Languedoc Roussillon. Its variations with handles are present

in the Necropolis of the North Eastern Wall, but also in the ones of Agullana and Anglès (Pons 1984: 191- 194).

Similarly urns with 'S' profile and often, impressed decoration on the neck (shape 13b of Pons 1984) are attested on both the necropolises of Agullana and Anglès. They are present in miniature form both in the North Eastern Wall necropolis and the one of Perelada (Pons 1984: 191). Another type of urn, miniature or at least of small dimensions, that appears in the necropolis is the type 15b. This shape is also attested in the other Iron Age necropoleis of the area surrounding Girona, like Agullana and Anglès (Pons 1984: 194), and among a group of materials preserved in the Archaeological Museum of Barcelona and encountered in a small group of burials excavated at Els Vilars (Pons 1984:37).

The urn with lid from cremation 11 belongs to the type G3 of Pons 1984, and is present also at Anglès and, in France, at Avezac Prat, in Aquitaine (Pons 1984:197).

Carinated urns like the one present in cremation 1 ae also found in Agullana and Anglès, as well as La Foradada , Els Villars and Pla de Gibrella (Pons 1984:196). However, this specific urn (that Pons 1984 calls shape E) does not have an exact comparison, possibly because of the irregular shape (Pons 1984:196).

In the province of Girona, in particular the necropolis of Anglès, are also present variations with more rounded shapes, like the one in the cremation 11. Pons classifies it under the type G32. It is also present at Anglès (Pons 1984:197).

The dishes with high foot are close to the shape 18 of Pons 1984, in particular the sub-type 18a2, with tronco-conic profile. This type of dish is also attested at Peralada and Pla de Gibrella (Pons 1984:197). The urn in inhumation 2, on the other hand, is reminiscent of type 18b. Vases of shape 18 of Pons 1984 are also present at Peralada, Pla de Gibrella, Anglès and Agullana. They are also found in the villages of La Fonollera, Castell de Palamos and Cova des Encantats (Pons 1984: 194 and 197). Shape 18 is found, outside of the area surrounding Emporion, on the other side of the Aude River, in various cemeteries of Western Languedoc Roussillon, including Grand Bassin I and II and Saint Julien. Both in Languedoc Roussillon and in the Emporion area, the shapes 18a and b appear together with Mediterranean imports dated to the early sixth century BC (Pons 1984: 198).

The urn *de orejetas*, like the one from cremation 3 and possibly 8, is a very popular shape in the Iberian pottery repertoire (López Bravo 2002:97). It is a vase closed by a lid with

perforated appendixes. The lid and the mouth of the vase were fitted, making the closure hermetic. This vase was developed in the first half of the sixth century BC in the País Valencià or in the North of Andalusia, possibly inspired to Greek *pyxides* in the closure system and to Phoenician models for the form of the shape and the body (López Bravo 2002:97, Graells 2010:210). They are usually wheel thrown, but a handmodeled production exists as well (López Bravo 2002:97). In Catalan contexts it is attested starting from around the half of the sixth century BC (López Bravo 2002:100), and appears in at least 40 contexts, 12 of which are burials. Among the cemeteries in which it is attested, at Coll del Moro, Mas de Mussols, Mianes and Milmanda are present handmodeled examples like the one present in cremation 3 (López Bravo 2002:100-101, Graells 2010:210).

#### 6.4.3 Other elements of the assemblage

The brooches present in the cemetery all seem to belong to the type *de resort bilateral*, with a hinge that protrudes from both sides. The most complete also all seem to have a bow with circular section and upturned catchplate, terminating in a circular or conical button. They correspond to the type of Gulf of Lion or 7B of Oliver 1986. This type of brooch is dated to the end of the seventh century BC, when it first appears in Southern France (Pons 1984:199) and continues through the whole of the sixth century and the first half of the fifth (Oliver 1986: 151), when they are attested in all the major Iron Age sites in Catalonia (Pons 1984:200).

The brooch from grave 17 is characterized by especially long hinge. This has good comparisons in a brooch found in the necropolis of Mas de Mussols, in the grave 10 (Maluquer 1984:44), in the grave 10 of La Oriola (Esteve Galvez 1999: 207 and 209-210) and in two brooches from the necropolis of Mianes, the burials II and 43 (Esteve Galvez 1999: 87-89, 128, 132 and 176). All these examples have an upturned catchplate terminating in a button that is missing in the one from Emporion.

Burial 1, together with the grave 30 of the necropolis of Mianes and the 'grave x' of the necropolis of Mas de Mussols is one of the two Iron Age Catalan burials that include a signet ring (Graells 2010:196)<sup>13</sup>. The Mas de Mussols one is in silver, while the one from Emporion is in bronze (Graells 2010:196).

---

<sup>13</sup> Graells actually brings the number to three, adding a specimen in bronze from Mianes. However, this object (visible in Esteve Galvez 199: 120) is not a signet ring, but an open ring ending in two touching spirals.

Silver, present at the North Eastern Wall in cremations 1 and 4, is extremely rare in the assemblages found in sixth century burials. The use of this metal only becomes more common in the North East of the Peninsula from the fifth century onwards (Castanyer et al. 2008: 291). In particular, isotopic analyses performed on the ring from burial 1 have revealed that the silver the ring was made of most likely originated in the South of Catalonia (Castanyer et al. 2008: 283). Therefore, its presence in Emporion is more indicative of the existence of an internal Catalan commerce than of silver mining activities in the area in this chronological period (Castanyer et al 2008: 291). Among the few other exceptions for the sixth century are the ring from 'grave x' and a bracelet also in silver from the same assemblage. Other few pieces of jewellery have been found in necropolises in the Ebro valley: a necklace from Mianes, a pendant from Coll del Moro and another pendant, possibly in electron, from the surface survey of the area of the necropolis of Santa Madrona (Graells 2010: 196). Four silver buttons are attested the necropolis of Can Canyís (Graells 2010: 102).

Cremations 2 and 11 include elements of chains, sometimes ending in small, spherical pendants. Because of their frequent association with belt buckles, these objects have been interpreted as decoration for the clothes of men. They probably hung from the belt (Pons 1984: 201). This type of chain and pendant is present in various Iron Age sites from País Valencià to Southern France (Graells 2008: 65). Their chronology spans between the half of the seventh century and the end of the sixth (Rafael 1991: 130).

Cremation 2 includes a bronze and an iron ring much larger than ones that would have been worn on the fingers. The function of these objects is still debated. In some cases, where they are associated with elements of chain as in this grave, it is supposed that they might have been the terminal part of one of these chains. Notably, one of the rings that form the chain in cremation 11 is comparable in size to those of the rings from cremation 2. It is, therefore, possible that the latter corresponded to the terminal part of chains as well. Iron rings like this one have been found in the grave 2 of the necropolis of Anglès (Pons 1984: 223) and in the grave 37 of Agullana (Pons 1984: 222).

Among the elements of ornament present in some of cremations (4, most likely 7 and 10) are bracelets, very common in the Bronze and Iron Age Iberian cemeteries. Bracelets are usually poorly preserved (as it is the case with the ones from Emporion), having been exposed to fire (Graells 2008: 73). These objects appear in a great variety of shapes and decorations. Therefore, there have been several attempts to realize a typology of this class of materials but these studies are specific to particular sites (Graells 2008: 73-74). In Iron

Age contexts, bracelets are usually made in bronze, making the possible one from grave 7 stand out. The bracelet is, in fact, in iron, not used for this type of ornament since the beginning of the sixth century (Pons 1984:225). For this reason, Graells (2010: 103) considers it more likely that the fragments of iron from this grave are actually remains of nails. However, the curved shape of the fragments seems to suggest that they were really part of a bracelet. The ornament would be dated significantly earlier than the *bucchero* vase it is deposited with, and could, possibly, represent an heirloom. The fragments have circular section, typical of the bracelets in iron attested, for example, in the necropolis of Anglès (Pons 1984:225).

The bracelet from cremation 10 had circular section, and was open, with the two extremities terminating in small spheres. This is a common type of bracelet, present at Can Canyís, Coll del Moro, Mas de Mussols and Milmanda (Graells 2008: 74). Bracelets with spherical terminations at the ends are dated from the second quarter of the sixth century BC and all through the century (Graells 2010:104). Only a very small fragment of the bracelet from cremation 4 survives. All we can determine is that it had circular section. In the necropolis of Coll del Moro, bronze bracelets with circular section are dated between 650 and 550 BC (Rafael 1991:125).

The typology of belt buckles with two hooks like the ones in the cremations 1,2 and 11 has been defined by Graells (2005:774). He created a chronology for this type of material based on that of the other items included in the closed contexts in which they have been discovered. The sites in which these belt buckles are present include the necropolis of Grand Bassin II and Las Peyros in Languedoc Roussillon, the North Eastern Wall necropolis, the isolated grave of Granja Soley in Catalonia, and the Temenos of Corfù, where two of these belt buckles had been offered. Most of these contexts are datable to the second half of the sixth century BC. However, in the case of the graves with belt buckles from the North Eastern Wall, the only other element for a chronology is the scarab in burial 11. Graells places these belt buckles among the earliest of their type because of their similarity to the ones from Granja Soley, from the necropoleis of Languedoc Roussillon and from other Iron Age cemeteries like Milmanda and Mas de Mussols, that can be more generally dated after the first quarter of the sixth century BC (Graells 2005:771 and 774-775). Comparing this type of belt buckle with the more simple one hook ones, Graells (2010: 163-164) has suggested that they might be indicative of higher status and, in general, chosen to be deposited in burials over the others.

In general, belt buckles with one, two or three hooks are documented in Languedoc Roussillon and Catalonia from the late seventh century BC to the fifth, where they appear in other regions of the Iberian Peninsula as well. However, they remain most abundant north of the Païls Valenciano (Pons 2005:75-76). The eye of the belt buckle is usually more rarely preserved, but comparisons for the one present in the cremation 2 are in the burials 26 and 33 of the necropolis of Mianes (Esteve Galvez 1999:114 and 116, 118 and 121) and in the grave 14 of La Oriola (Esteve Galvez 1999:212-213).

In inhumation 1 has been found a bronze hemispherical button with crossbar. This type of button appears in various Iron Age European contexts, and, in particular, is quite common in Languedoc Roussillon (Pellicer Catalàn 1984:326). In Catalonia, in particular, it is documented in various late Bronze and Early Iron Age sites like San Cristobal de Mazaleòn, Cabezo de Monleòn and Tossal Redò (Pellicer Catalàn 1984:326).

The assemblage in inhumation 1 also included disk-shaped beads, which were published as being in bone but could also be in horn. Disk shaped beads in horn have been found, in Catalonia, in the necropolis of Milmanda (Graells 2008:79-80). 33 disk-shaped beads were in the burial 16 of the necropolis of Mianes (Esteve Galvez 1999: 111-112) and several assemblages from the cemetery of La Atalaya, in Navarra, included groups of this type of bead (Castilla Rodriguez 2005, Graells 2008:80).

Shells like the ones in cremations 1 and 13 appear in graves from several of the Iron Age necropolises of Catalonia (Mas de Mussols, la Pedrera, l'Oriola, Vilanera), but are not especially common. However, the proximity to the sea might be an important factor in the distribution of this particular type of material. (Graells 2008: 79). They are most numerous in another one of the necropoleis of Emporion, the Parallè necropolis (Graells 2008: 79), a group of indigenous cremations that is considered to predate the arrival of the Greek colonists (Dominguez 2004:440, Santos 2009a). However, they also appear in the 'Greek' cemeteries of the city, and Gailledrat (1995:38-39 and 45) attributed a possible ritual, protective value to shells in both contexts.

Another element present in several graves of this necropolis and invested with great significance is the *simpulum*. These instruments, along with the weapons, become some of the most important markers of status in Western Mediterranean burials dated to the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age, along with the diffusion of burials with weapons. In Catalonia, they are primarily attested in the cemeteries of the North Eastern area, where Emporion is

located. However, several of the known items are not complete or are poorly documented (Lucas 2002-2003:95-97 and 109-121, Beylier 2012a: 228).

A typology of these instruments has been attempted by Lucas 2002-2003, with limitations due to the lack of information on several items. Three types are distinguished, and they mostly differ in the shape of the bowl, which is the element most often damaged in these objects while, usually, handles remain identifiable). Lucas placed all the *simpula* from Emporion under her type 2/Granja Soley/Anglès. The type 2 is characterized by a hemispherical cup with lip turned outside and a ribbon shaped handle. This description seems to suit most of the fragments present in the graves from this cemetery. Lucas identified a series of fragments of a ribbon-shaped bronze sheet element present in the assemblage from cremation 1 as a handle but, in comparison with other handles from the same necropolis, these fragments appear to be both too thin in section and too large in shape. Its identification as the handle of a *simpulum* is, therefore, doubtful.

The iron knife with handle held by rivets (which probably held in place a cover in organic material against the inner part, made of iron like the blade) is one of the most common utensils in the necropolis. However, it is also one of the less useful for dating the contexts as this is one of the first objects to be made of iron in the Gulf of Lion and Aquitania starting from the late seventh century and continuing in the sixth (Pons 1984:227-228). Barberà 1990 classifies the burials with knives as ‘warrior’ ones, considering it a weapon, but I think the knife can be regarded as an instrument and connected to banqueting activities.

The throwing weapons present in the burials are all very poorly preserved, which makes only the elements of spear present in grave 9 identifiable with a degree of certainty. The iron fragments in burial 13 have been identified as either part of a spear or of a *soliferreum* by different authors. While both interpretations are possible, it is worth noting that these fragments present no traces of folding (which would have been the mode of destruction for a *soliferreum*). However, it is also true that, if the object was a javelin, the two fragments would only represent a small part of it.

In the late seventh and early sixth century, spears represent the 68% of the weapons deposited in burials in Catalonia , but the percentage might be higher as some burials had been looted before their discovery (Beylier 2012a:178). *Soliferrea* are, on the other hand, much rarer, representing only 8% of the weapons found in burials for this period: the possible *soliferreum* from cremation 13 would be one of three in the same period, along with two from

Perelada and Mianes (Beylier 2012a:178). In the second half of the sixth century, spears remain the most common weapons (present in two thirds of the burials with weapons) (Beylier 2012a3:179).

Burial 17 is problematic because of the doubts about its coherence. It also includes the greatest amount of weapons, represented by the spear and fragments of possible cuirass and greave. Defensive elements are present in less of 10% of the burials with weapons in Catalonia between 650 and 450 BC (Beylier 2012a: 178). They mostly consist of greaves and pectorals but, because their state of preservation is generally not good, it is difficult to estimate their exact quantity (Beylier 2012a: 178). Beylier ( 2012a: 179) notes how in the cemetery of Mianes, where the majority of sixth century burials with weapons from Catalonia are concentrated, no defensive element was present.

The elements considered part of the possible cuirass are 21 fragments in bronze sheet (according to the publication. In the Museum, 25 fragments are attributed to the cuirass), some of which pertain to at least six disks. Also part of the assemblage were thin fragments of bronze sheet with a central ribbed motif. The disks are decorated with a circular motif of embossed circles disposed around a larger central one. The fragments are in a very poor state of preservation, which makes it difficult to analyse their decoration beyond this basic scheme. The disks are included by Graells 2014 in his type 3a of this kind of material, decorated with embossed circles. This decoration is attested, other than on the fragments of cuirass from Emporion, on the one from the graves of Los Ferreres and Granja Soley (also in Catalonia) and Corno Lauzo, as well as in the necropolis of Las Peyros (both in Languedoc Roussillon) (Graells 2014:97-98). In the coastal area of the Gulf of Lion, circular cuirass elements are found in contexts dated to the sixth century BC, while, starting in the following century, and continuing in the fourth, they are found in the Celtic-Iberian area (Graells 2014:111). Several studies have placed the origin of round pectoral protections in the Italian Peninsula, where they are attested since the eighth century BC and in larger quantities (see Quesada 1997: 575 and Beylier 2012a:121 with bibliography). Therefore the circular pectorals found in Languedoc Roussillon and Iberia are considered local productions inspired by Italic models, possibly as a consequence of cultural contact with Etruscans (Beylier 2012a:125).

The disks from Emporion are, however, of much smaller dimensions than most of the other ones that composed cuirasses. For this reason, for the similar decoration and for the presence, in both of the contexts, of material datable to the half of the sixth century BC,



Graells (2014: 175-177) suggests a comparison with the cuirass from Los Ferreres. This cuirass is composed of two parts in bronze sheet that protected the bust and the back respectively, and on which circles were embossed. The cuirass of Los Ferreres had been destroyed, folding it intentionally, and only part of it had been placed in the burial (Graells 2014:173). On the basis of a comparison with this cuirass, he proposes that the disks from Emporion might have been part of a similar pectoral, while the ribbed elements would have been part of the decoration of its extremities. Given the fragmentary nature of the bronze sheet elements, Graells suggests that this cuirass, too, might have been destroyed before being partially deposited in the grave (Graells 2014:174-177). While the reconstruction is possible, it is perhaps worth noting that three out of five disks are not attached to other elements of bronze sheet (one is, and two consist only of a small portion of the disk. In this last case, the fragment is fused to other pieces of bronze sheet. This is something that probably happened after the cuirass was broken). The assemblage includes several other fragments of bronze sheet (published by Almagro as being part of a possible helmet) that could have represented part of the main structure of the cuirass (these fragments are in a very bad state of oxidation, that make it difficult to identify possible decoration on them). At the same time, imagining the disks as being embossed on a larger bronze surface would also mean that the ones included in the assemblage would have been purposely cut out. On the other hand, it is perhaps possible to think that the cuirass, or, at least, part of it, might have been made of perishable material, as Beylier (2012a:127) imagines most Iron Age upper body protection would have been. Individual disks in bronze would have been added to this support, rather than embossed on a sheet of metal that then would have been destroyed when the cuirass was deposited.

Among the pieces of bronze sheet, there is a fragment decorated with two ribbed motifs that Graells (2014: 176-177) identifies as an element of greaves. Among the fragments present in the Museum there are ones decorated with small embossed circles that could have belonged to the pectoral (maybe as part of other disks) or to the greaves. Greaves with a similar decoration are attested, for example, at La Solivella, dated between the late sixth century and the beginning of the fifth (Farnié and Quesada 2009: 189-192), at La Oliva and Cabezo Lucero, dated to the first half of the fifth (Farnié and Quesada 2009: 193-197) and at Arrojo Judío, dated to the early fourth century (Farnié and Quesada 2009:197-199).

Other fragments of bronze sheet present in the Museum are perforated, and might correspond to the part of the greaves through which ran the straps of leather that tied the

protection to the legs. This is an element present in various examples of greaves, from the Early Iron Age ones of Can Canys and the possible greaves of Mas de Mussols to more recent ones like the examples referenced above (Farnié and Quesada 2009: 174-199).

#### **6.4.4 A look at the material in the cemeteries surrounding Emporion used during the sixth century**

None of the known 'Greek' cemeteries is dated to a period that coincides exactly with the one in which the North Eastern Wall necropolis was in use, but some of the graves from the groups excavated around the city contained material that allowed to date them to the sixth century BC. As discussed earlier, compared to the relative starkness of the later burials, the earliest ones are characterized by richer and more varied assemblages, in which several different vases are included, with occasional repetition of the same shape (Dominguez 2004: 438-440).

The cemeteries of El Portixol and Les Coves have been dated approximately to the sixth century, but only few materials have been excavated in the area (Lopez Borgoñoz 1998: 275). However, it is thought likely that it is from these cemeteries that, during illegal excavations, a group of Etrusco-Corinthian perfume vases (four *aryballoi* and one *alabastron*) now kept in the museum of Girona were found. They are dated between the end of seventh and first half of the sixth century BC (Asensi 1991). In a tomb from the necropolis Portixol were found two very unique imported objects. One is the bronze head of a feline, lion or panther, that presumably decorated the linchpin of a chariot, and the other an *askos* shaped like a goat (Sanmartì 1996). The bronze is considered an Etruscan production and dated to the last quarter of the sixth century (Sanmartì 1996: 23-24 and 26), while the *askos* was probably produced in Syracuse and is datable between the late sixth and the late fifth century BC (Sanmartì 1996: 20 and 26). This burial is therefore considered datable to the late sixth century. The necropolis Portixol is also the place of discovery of one of the few scarabs from Emporion that are not out of context (Padrò 1983b: 33-34).

In the necropolis of the Portixol (Trias 1967-68:181 and Almagro 1953:18) was also discovered a grave containing a helmet and several other defensive or offensive weapons. Another grave with weapons is mentioned by Castanyer et al (2015: 129) who describe the discovery of a subadult burial in amphora accompanied by a sword and a *soliferreum*.

Some of the graves from the necropolis Bonjoan are dated between 525 and 475 BC (Dominguez 2004:438). Therefore, this cemetery partly overlaps with the period of use of the North Eastern Wall necropolis. In several assemblages perfume vases are present; they

include Attic *lekythoi*, *aryballoi* and *alabastra* in glass paste (Almagro 1953: 136-143 and Dominguez 2004: 438), an *aryballos* that Almagro identified as local imitation of a Corinthian model (Almagro 1953: 136-137 and 197-198) and an Attic *alabastron* (Almagro 1953: 142 and 188). Along with these different vases are also several *unguentaria* of local production (Almagro 1953:146). Attic pottery is also present in the form of banqueting vessels, including various types of drinking cups, *oinochoai* and amphorae (Almagro 1953:136-143).

Inhumation 43, with a funerary equipment characterized by numerous Attic *lekythoi* datable to the early fifth century BC, is especially interesting because of the presence in the assemblage of a fragment of chain terminating in a spherical pendants, like the ones present in various Iberian contexts and also in the cremations 2 and 11 (Almagro 1953: 178-183).

One of the earliest burials of the cemetery, dated to the last quarter of the sixth century BC, is inhumation 69 (Almagro 1953:202-209). Despite being possibly incomplete, it features a very rich assemblage including a gold signet ring and various vases, among which are Corinthian and Attic drinking and serving vessels and a glass paste *alabastron*.

Inhumation 44, dated to the early fifth century BC, included a silver ring and two silver bracelets, a grey pottery *olpe* and various Attic *lekythoi* (Almagro 1953: 183-186). Other burials dated to early fifth century that featured silver rings are the inhumation 23 (Almagro 1953:164-166), inhumation 48 (Almagro 1953:188-189) and inhumation 55 (Almagro 1953: 193-196). All these burials featured an equipment that comprised *lekythoi* and *aryballoi* (either in Attic pottery or in glass paste). Inhumation 23 also included glass paste beads. In the necropolis Granada, another one of the groups of burials surrounding the city, inhumation 12 is accompanied by an assemblage very similar to the ones above described with a silver ring, Attic *lekythoi* and perfume vases in glass paste (Almagro 1953:242-243).

In the area corresponding to the necropolis Bonjoan has also been found, out of context, a small bronze lion, that is regarded as a possible applique from an Etruscan patera (Graells 2010:86-89). It belongs to a type that Cook (1968: 341-342) dates between 550 and 500. Because of the chronology of the object and the fact that it is of Etruscan production Graells (2010:88) believes it could have come from one of the burials from the necropolis Portixol.

The necropolis Mateu is a small group of burials of uncertain chronology. Inhumation 4 is dated to the second half of the sixth century BC (Lopez Borgoñoz 1998: 275) because the only surviving element of its assemblage is an *aryballos* that has lost its decoration. Because of the colour of the clay, Almagro (1953:228) regarded it as a local imitation of Corinthian

models. In absence of both decoration and chemical analyses it is, however, very difficult to establish its provenience and exact chronology.

### 6.5 Assemblages and associations in the North Eastern Wall necropolis

Given the doubtful completeness and coherence of some assemblages, discussing their composition in comparison to one another focusing in the way they differ might not be useful. On the other hand, observing which objects and associations among objects appear and tend to repeat themselves might be a more helpful approach. It is interesting to notice how, while some objects and classes of materials recur in several burials, there is no such thing as a 'typical' assemblage for this cemetery: objects and associations among them seem to vary between burials. This could be another consequence of the small sample of graves available and the fact that some assemblages are incomplete. However, the reason could also be that we are in the presence of a series of different interpretations of the same cultural trends.

Looking at the elements that recur in various funerary assemblages, the *simpulum* is in several of the cremations with imports (possibly 1 and 13, surely 2, 9, 11, 17). As expected with this instrument, associated with banqueting, drinking vessels are also present in the funerary assemblages that include it, in all the varieties attested in the necropolis (*kantharoi* and imported cups, but also handmade ones), as are handmade dishes. On the other hand, this instrument is not always associated with a container that would have held the wine. Lucas (2002-2003: 128), discussing the *simpula* from Iberia and Languedoc, suggested that the urns to which some of them are associated could have served this function. However, at least in this necropolis, cremations 2 and 13 did not include a larger vase that could have been complementary to the ladle.

In cremations 2 and 13, the *simpulum* is present along with pitchers. This association between these two instruments is also observed at Granja Soley (Sanmartì et al 1982). Both objects could be used to serve wine in the banquet (Lucas 2002-2003) and, at the end of the funerary ceremony, could be used to extinguish the funeral pyre (Graells 2010:73). The same is true of the association between *simpulum* and *olpe* in the cremation 17, bearing in mind the doubtful coherence of the assemblage. Also worth noting is the presence of a possible *simpulum* in the same assemblage as a vase in grey pottery in cremation 1, even if the only remaining fragment of the vase is too small to recognize the shape it pertained to.

In the residential complex of Sant Jaume, in the Ebro valley, two possible *oinochoai*, a *simpulum* and a *clepsidra*, another vessel that would have been used to manipulate liquids have been found (Sardà Seuma 2008:102). This might suggest that the function of the pitcher and the *simpulum* was not mutually exclusive. In particular, the *simpulum* would have had the additional functions of mixing the wine and allowing the person who held it during the banquet to drink from it directly (Lucas 2002-2003:128-129, Sardà Seuma 2008:102-103). The presence of grey pottery and *bucchero* pitchers in some of the graves is especially interesting since, as discussed, outside of Emporion these vases are quite rare. In general, *oinochoai* will remain rare among the banqueting equipment in the majority of Iberian contexts outside of the area surrounding the colony even in the fifth century BC, when the majority of the Greek vases attested in Iberia are drinking and serving ones (Quesada 1994: 113-114, Sanmartì and Santancana 2005:129, Mirò and Santos 2013: 17-19). In this period, the most common vases placed in Iberian graves, often in very high quantity are, in fact, primarily cups and kraters (Dominguez 1999:320-323).

On the other hand, the *simpulum* is an element that, while imported or derived from Mediterranean models, becomes a very identifiable status marker in the funerary equipment of North Eastern Spain and Southern France during the Early Iron Age (Lucas 2002-2003). In this sense, its presence together with a rarer element that possibly served a similar function is especially interesting.

The knife and the *simpulum* are also included in the same assemblages. Barberà (1990:204) identified the cremations in which at least a knife was present as ‘warrior’ graves, regarding it as a weapon. However, it is questionable whether the knife can be characterized as a weapon or, rather, as a tool (Pons 1984:227), and maybe connected to the banqueting activity that is also tied to several other objects in various assemblages.

This association with the *simpulum*, in particular, might be determined by the attribution of an active and distributive role in the banquet to the deceased. In the Italic world, such role is connected to the use of spits and knives (see Riva 2009:74-75, with bibliography). Similar symbolic meanings can be associated with the *simpulum* (Nickels et al 1989: 447, Lucas 2002-2003: 127) and to the *oinochoe*, instruments that allowed the preparation and the distribution of a beverage rich of symbolic meaning like wine (Sardà Seuma 2008:102-103). Sardà Seuma (2008: 102-103) also proposes that the fact that indigenous cups and bowls remain in use, even at the same time as in which a ‘foreign’ serving vase like the *oinochoe* is introduced, would suggest the idea that the procedures of preparation and serving of alcoholic beverages

had been amplified and transformed during the passage from Bronze Age to Iron Age, while the consumption of the same beverages remained substantially similar. This combination of serving and drinking vessels is observable, for example, in the materials excavated at the complex of Sant Jaume. In the North Eastern Wall necropolis we can see the simultaneous presence of a pitcher and indigenous vases that could have been used to drink even in the same assemblage, as in cremations 2, 13 and 15. At the same time, imported drinking shapes are also present in the assemblages, often along with the imported serving vases in cremation 13 and, possibly, 17.

The use of a rare vessel like the *oinochoe*, in combination with this supposed increased sophistication of the preparation of beverages would have contributed to the prestige associated with the active role in the banqueting practices (Sardà Seuma 2008:102-103). With a few exceptions all the *oinochoai* attested in the Catalonia are found in some of the areas that experience the most direct Mediterranean contacts, be it with Phoenician or Greek trade. It would be easy to imagine that this is a simple consequence of greater availability, but perhaps the more intense relationship with Phoenician and Phocaean traders also allowed for a better knowledge of the practices in which these vases were used and a deeper understanding of their functional and also symbolic possibilities.

Cremation 2 is also characterized by the presence of a double belt buckle. This fact has been used as evidence to consider it a double burial (Barberà 1990), but has it has also been suggested that the repetition of an element of prestige like the belt could be a form of status display (Graells 2007). It is possible that a similar interpretation can be given to the presence of two knives and two pitchers, and to the simultaneous presence of the pitchers and the *simpulum*.

No craters or possible vases to mix beverages were found in the necropolis. However, the jars in grey pottery of the burials 10 and 13, which, as said, are unique in the region, are vases to hold liquids. While the vase in cremation 10 was accompanied only by an urn and a bracelet, the one in cremation 13 was part of an assemblage that also included an *oinochoe*, a *simpulum* and two *kantharoi*. In the burial were also a possible knife and dishes, returning the image of a complex banqueting set, possibly one with which wine was mixed before being served. It is, perhaps, possible to wonder whether this would have been intended as the display of a unitary set, or as a series of objects that represented possible alternative versions of social eating and drinking.

The *olpe*, another vase for serving (Bouloumié 1986: 73), is also present in the same assemblage as (possibly) two *simpula* in burial 17, bearing in mind that the coherence of this assemblage is doubtful.

The *simpulum* and weapons are often found in association in the funerary material culture of Western Mediterranean. In the North Eastern Wall necropolis, *simpula* are present in all the assemblages in whom weapons have been identified (cremations 9, 13 and possibly, 17). Cremation 13 includes a complex banqueting equipment in which the *simpulum* is present along with the pitcher and imported drinking vases, but also with another vase to hold liquids, the knife and the dishes. As for cremation 9, it most likely included more than one metallic vessel (at least one being a *simpulum*), an imported cup, a Corinthian *pyxis* and, in the Greek world, usually deposited with women. Its presence in a burial with weapons seems to indicate that it was reinterpreted or used differently in the context of the North Eastern Wall necropolis. This assemblage is interesting due to the association between the *simpula* (probably at least two) and the weapon with two imported vases unique in the necropolis, and pertaining both to the sphere of banqueting and that of cosmetics.

In general, the presence in the graves of imported vases relating to perfumes and cosmetics is one of the things that make the North Eastern Wall necropolis atypical among other Iron Age cemeteries in the area of the Gulf of Lion. Aside from the *pyxis*, there are two Corinthian *aryballoi* and an Attic *lekythos* in cremation 4 (associated with an Attic drinking cup, a silver brooch and a possible vessel in perishable material decorated with a gold rosette), and another Corinthian *aryballos* is in inhumation 2, (the burial of a subadult that also included handmade pottery). As discussed above, these vases are extremely rare outside of Emporion. There is also another element to take into account. While discussing the three perfume vases (two *aryballoi* and an oil bottle) included in the 'grave x' from Mas de Mussols, Graells (2010:195-196) wondered whether 'fuera del hinterland emporitano' perfume vases in indigenous context were valued for themselves or for the liquid they contained. He suggests that, in Mianes and Milmanda, these vases might have represented a 'símbolo' of the perfumes they contained and of the possibility of access to them. On the other hand, people living in Emporion or in its immediate vicinity would have owned perfume vases while being aware of their content, and interested in new cosmetic practices. The fact that the perfume vases became proportionally more common in the inhumations dated to the fifth and fourth century BC seems to suggest that this interest continued.

Cremation 11 is the only burial with *simpulum* and knife in which imported vases are not present. In fact, the rich assortment of handmade pottery and metal elements seems to contrast with the presence of only one import (a scarab) in the assemblage. On the other hand, this burial possibly dates to slightly earlier than most of the cemetery, reflecting a desire to collect primarily objects that would have been read as status markers in local context and a lack of interest, or, perhaps, familiarity with banqueting and cosmetic vases.

As mentioned above, comparing the assemblages in terms of how they differ from one another is problematic because of the possible incompleteness of many of them. However, on the basis of the data currently available, cremation 4 seems to stand out for both the quantity and variety of imported vases, including three perfume vases (two Corinthian *aryballoi* and an Attic *lekythos*) and two drinking vessels, (an Attic cup and a *bucchero kantharos*).

While the association of drinking and perfume vases is quite unusual in the inhumation burials surrounding Emporion (Gailledrat 1995:37), the presence of perfume vases and their repetition is an element that this grave shares with them (but also with an Iberian burial like the 'grave x' of Mas de Mussols, if it represents a coherent assemblage). However, among the Emporitan inhumations with perfume vases, the simultaneous presence of *lekythoi* and other unguentaria is observable in various graves, mostly from the early fifth century BC (Gailledrat 1995:37 and n.23). This burial also includes one of the two objects in gold found in the necropolis, a possible applique to a lost item, and one of the two objects in silver, a brooch. In general, during the sixth century BC objects in silver appear in very few burials in Northern Spain (Graells 2010:101-102) but, as discussed above, some objects in gold and silver are also attested in some of the inhumations of the cemeteries Bonjoan and Granada. This is also the only burial from the cemetery in which are documented knucklebones, also present in several of the inhumations from the other cemeteries surrounding Emporion. Lastly, Corinthian pottery is not vastly more common than in indigenous contexts (Graells 2010:75-77) and the gold rosette (possibly an element of decoration of a container in perishable material, according to Graells 2010) does not meet any comparison in Iberia. Therefore, this assemblage seem to associate traits that make it comparable to the assemblages of the 'Greek' cemeteries with others that are unusual both in comparison with this necropolis and with the other cemeteries surrounding Emporion.

Aquilué et al (2012: 87) have also pointed out how cremation 4, along with cremations 5 and 7 (two other burials whose assemblages did not include handmade pottery) is a presumably intact burial in which the ashes were placed on the rock rather than in a container. Therefore,



it is possible to imagine that, while these burials maintained cremation as a ritual, but the deposition of the ashes different from what happened in the burials with cinerary.

In some of the graves with smaller assemblages, it seems to be discernible a desire to associate in almost equal measure elements from different cultural traditions: for example, the Etruscan pitcher and the iron bracelet (as discussed above, a probable *beirloom*) and, possibly, brooch in cremation 7. Here, as discussed above, the ashes were on the rock as in cremation 4. In cremation 10, the handmade urn and bronze bracelet are associated with the very unusual grey pottery jar. In inhumation 2, the perfume vase was associated with the handmade urn and lid.

Gailledrat (1995:47-49) identified cremations 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15 and 17 as male because of the presence of weapons, belt buckles or banqueting vessels, including both the drinking and serving vases and the *simpulum*, following the idea that the banquet would be exclusively reserved for men. Therefore, he deduces that vases for perfumes and cosmetics were also included in 'male' burials, and that the funerary assemblages deposited in female graves were comparatively simpler and characterized mostly by funerary urns, jewellery and accessories. These categories of materials are difficult to associate with individuals of either gender, consisting mostly of brooches and simple rings and bracelets. It is possible that objects more traditionally identifiable as 'feminine' were present, but they were in materials that would not have allowed their preservation. However, it is worth noting that at least in cremations 4 and 15 (probably incomplete) the imported vases are not associated with other objects regarded as traditionally 'masculine', and neither are the imported vases in cremations 7 and 10 and inhumation 2. As for cremation 12 and 16, the imported cup and brooch are the only surviving elements of the assemblage. In absence of items considered specifically 'feminine', and given the fragmentary nature of the evidence this is not enough to imagine that imported vases were also deposited in 'feminine' burials, but we can at least question the idea that they were exclusively associated with 'masculine' ones. Interestingly, there is also not a 'typical' masculine or feminine set in the inhumations of the cemeteries surrounding Emporion either (Gailledrat 1995:37-38)

|          |                                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 17 | Inh.<br>1 | Inh.2 |
|----------|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----------|-------|
| IMPORTED | Imported drinking vases               |   |   |   | X |   |   |   |   | X |    |    | X  |    |    | X  |           |       |
|          | Imported/colonial oinochoai/olpai     |   | X |   |   |   |   | X |   |   |    |    | X  |    | X  | X  |           |       |
|          | Imported/colonial jars                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | X  |    | X  |    |    |    |           |       |
|          | Imported/colonial non identified vase | X |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |           |       |
|          | Perfume vases                         |   |   |   | X |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |           | X     |
|          | Pyxides (+ lids)                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | X |    |    |    |    |    |    |           |       |
| HANDMADE | Handmade dishes with foot             |   | X |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | X  |    |    |    |           |       |
|          | Handmade cups or bowls                |   | X | X |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | X  | X  |    | X  |    |           |       |
|          | Handmade urns                         |   | X |   | X |   |   |   |   | X | X  |    |    |    | X  |    |           | X     |
|          | Handmade lids                         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | X  |    | X  |    |           | X     |
|          | Handmade miniature vases              |   | X | X | ? |   |   |   |   | X |    | X  |    |    |    |    | X         |       |
| IBERIAN  | Painted Iberian containers            |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | X |   |    |    |    | X  |    | X  |           |       |

Table 16 Pottery distribution in the burials from the necropolis (cremations 12 and 16 excluded)

|                   |                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 17 | Inh. 1 | Inh.2 |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|--------|-------|
| WEAPONS           | Soliferrea/Spears                 |   | ? |   |   |   |   |   |   | X |    |    | X  |    |    | X  |        |       |
|                   | Cuirasses/ greaves                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    | X  |        |       |
| PERSONAL ORNAMENT | Belt Buckles                      | X | X |   |   |   |   |   | X |   |    | X  |    |    |    |    |        |       |
|                   | Brooches de ressort bilateral     | X |   |   | X | X |   | X |   | X |    | X  |    |    |    | X  |        |       |
|                   | Scarabs                           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | X  |    |    |    |    |        |       |
|                   | Beads                             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    | X      |       |
|                   | Finger rings                      | X |   |   |   | X |   |   |   |   |    | X  |    |    |    |    |        |       |
|                   | Chains, dress ornaments, pendants |   | X |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | X  |    |    |    |    |        |       |
|                   | Bracelets                         |   |   |   | X |   |   | X |   |   | X  |    |    |    |    |    |        |       |
|                   | Bronze buttons                    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    | X      |       |
| OTHER             | Tweezers and scalptoria           |   |   |   |   | ? |   |   |   |   |    | X  |    |    |    | X  |        |       |
|                   | Knucklebones                      |   |   |   | X |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |        |       |
|                   | Nails                             | X | ? |   | X |   |   | ? |   | ? |    |    | ?  |    |    |    |        |       |
|                   | Eggs                              | X |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |        |       |
|                   | Shells                            | X |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    | X  |    |    |    |        |       |
|                   | Simpula                           | ? | X |   |   |   |   |   |   | X |    | X  | ?  |    |    | X  |        |       |
|                   | Non identified metal vessels      |   | ? |   |   | X |   |   |   | X |    |    |    |    |    |    |        |       |
|                   | Knives                            | X | X |   |   |   |   |   |   | X |    | X  | ?  |    |    | X  |        |       |
|                   | Gold appliques                    |   |   |   | X |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |        |       |

Table 17 Distribution of the other items in the burials from the necropolis (cremations 12 and 16 excluded)

## 6.6 Material assemblages from the North Eastern Wall necropolis: status, identity, representation

In this section, I discuss some hypotheses presented in recent literature about the role of imports in the funerary assemblages from the North East of the Iberian Peninsula in the sixth century BC. I continue by delineating a possible interpretation of the choices made in the formation of the funerary assemblages.

As highlighted at the beginning of the chapter, from the second quarter of the sixth century BC there was a radical change in the quantity, origin and type of Mediterranean imports in the North East of the Iberian Peninsula. They consisted primarily of finewares, while in the previous period Phoenician amphorae and mortar/tripods had prevailed (Sanmartì et al 2002: 99-102, Sanmartì 2004: 21, 2009:65-68).

The sixth century is also characterized, on the north and south of the Catalan coast, by relatively small cemeteries and by the presence of isolated graves (Graells 2010: 25 and 26). Like in Western Languedoc, objects like weapons and *simpula* appear in several burials and so do Mediterranean imports, but in much more reduced quantity than that attested in Western Languedoc, and seemingly without a particular vase or type of pottery becoming as popular as the *bucchero kantharos* is in that region.

The new types of imports, likely distributed by traders who had started developing new networks of exchange after the foundation of the Palaiapolis, have been seen as markers of especially high status (Sanmartì et al 2002:, Sanmartì 2004: 22, 2009: 65-68). They would have served to ‘emphasize the distinct nature of the upper social class’ (Sanmartì 2004: 22). These imports were acquired in limited quantities so that they could maintain their exclusive quality (Sanmartì 2004: 22, 2009: 65-68). During the phase of contact with Phoenician traders, local emerging chiefs would have been offered the opportunity to establish a social hierarchy by acquiring power through the redistribution of imported wine (Sanmartì 2004:18, 2009: 53), following the model of the patron-role feasting identified by Michael Dietler in the lower Rhône basin (Dietler 2005: 173-181). This is why, in this phase of contact, they would have been interested primarily in containers (Sanmartì 2004:18, 2009: 53). On the other hand, from the second quarter of the sixth century BC, the new developing networks of exchange would have interested Iberian buyers for different reasons. One would have been the fact that the development of local production of wine would have reduced its interest as a product to acquire from foreign merchants (Sanmartì 2004: 22). However, the

new networks of exchange would also have allowed for the acquisition of banqueting equipment that would have been reserved for the new higher classes as a display of status that was precluded to most people, according to the model of the diacritical feast (Sanmartí 2004: 22, 2009: 53 and 65-68). Cabrera (1998: 199) and Walsh (2014: 178-182) have argued that the presence of Mediterranean imports in this period is very limited outside of the territory surrounding Emporion. While it is possible that these items were considered objects of prestige in the rest of Catalonia ‘their weight on the social structure appears to have been minimum’ (Cabrera 1998: 199) outside from the area closer to the colony.

The North Eastern Wall cemetery is the Catalan cremation cemetery closer to Emporion, and displays a larger quantity of imports than the others. The imports present in the assemblages include types of objects that are not included in other Iberian funerary contexts or are comparatively less popular even among the rare imports of this period. This has been regarded as a natural consequence of the proximity with the Greek settlement (for example in Domínguez 2004:442). Alternatively, the inclusion of these imported objects in the funerary assemblages has been seen as a way to reflect social prestige on the family of the deceased through the accumulation and alienation of a series of object that would have been considered valuable because of their foreign origin and relative rarity (Graells 2010:230).

I think these interpretations touch upon elements that are helpful in understanding the material culture of the necropolis, but neither seems to offer a complete explanation of its specific characteristics. The cemetery of the North Eastern Wall reflects a situation of cross cultural contact, intended as close, mutual interaction rather than passive reception of goods on one side. Also it replicates the general ‘trends’ in the culture of the region it is part of, but it does so in ways that I believe are worth examining in more detail.

The closer relationship that the Iberian community living in proximity to Emporion experienced with the colonists would have probably given them more easy access to imports than what was available to other Iberian people. However, this proximity, along with the availability of imported goods cannot, in itself, fully explain the appreciation and adoption of different categories of objects as elements of the funerary equipment. As discussed above, an interesting example of availability of imported goods not necessarily corresponding to the need for them is observable comparing the presence of Etruscan materials in the earliest levels of the Palaiapolis with their absence from the necropolis of Vilanera.

Rather than an accumulation of anything that the new network of contacts had to offer, the presence of imported elements in this necropolis seems to be ascribable to a series of choices that would have resulted from a variety of experiences and dynamics of contact and interaction.

As discussed in Chapter 2, material culture can reflect relationships as well as contribute to articulate them (Hurcombe 2007: 103). Vives Ferrandiz (2010), discussing the cemetery of Los Moreres (Alicante) has argued that frequent interaction can create changes in practice, taste and the way identities are expressed. This is especially relevant in contexts that reflect situations of cross cultural contact and intense interaction among individuals of different backgrounds. In this sense, changes in material culture can reflect ‘the ‘materialisation’ of people’s involvement in different networks and webs of interaction’ (Vives Ferrandiz 2010: 205).

Most of the burials in the cemetery of the North Eastern Wall can be dated to the second half of the sixth century BC or later, therefore circa 25 years after the establishment of the colonists at the Palaia polis and in the moment of the creation of the new colonial settlement at the Neapolis. This means that an ongoing dynamic of interaction between the indigenous population and the colonists and merchants living and working in Emporion was already in existence when this cemetery was in use. It is also possible that the existing dynamics were being redefined due to the establishment of the new settlement of the Neapolis

As noted above, the recorded assemblages in the North Eastern Wall necropolis display a series of different combinations of elements present in Catalan Iron Age indigenous cemeteries as well as elements from different cultural traditions. Sometimes, these objects are associated in ways that are unique to this cemetery (for example, the association of the weapon and the cosmetic vase in burial 9). Other, they create complex and unusual assemblages like the one in cremation 13, possibly representing different versions of social eating and drinking..

There is not a ‘typical’ assemblage for this cemetery. This could be partly because of the incompleteness of some of the burials. However, even with the data available, I think it is possible to credit this fact to a series of different choices aimed to make statements about identity and relationships.

As discussed earlier, identities can be multi layered, flexible and context specific. This is because they are established and evolve in the context of human relationships (Diaz Andreu

and Lucy 2005:1-2, Sofaer Derevenski 2007, Winther-Jacobsen 2013). Material culture can allow people and groups to explore and establish their possible identities in space and time (Knappett 2011: 168-169). One of the ways in which this is done is by expressing association through similarity and disassociation through difference (Petersen 2013:68, Shepherd 2013:79). This is true in terms of making claims about status (through the use of objects that are accessible to certain people and groups to the exclusion of the others), but also in terms of displaying knowledgeability and participation to different cultural traditions through the use of diverse assemblages composed of material from various origins. For these reasons, as discussed in Chapter 2, ‘code switching’ is an interesting concept to apply to the analysis of material culture assemblages composed of elements from different origins. This term is, in fact, used to discuss communication performed using competently two or more languages, regardless of whether the speaker uses prevalently one of them (Mullen 2013a:77, 2013b).

Petersen (2013: 49) has pointed out how this concept is especially helpful in the discussion of culturally complex funerary assemblages. In fact, the selection of ritual and grave goods through which the deceased are represented, much like discourse, is deliberate<sup>14</sup> and the uniqueness of the event of the burial is comparable to that of the utterance of a speech.

One of the few phenomena observable in more than one burial in the necropolis of the North Eastern Wall is the association of pitcher, *simpulum*, and knife. The burials that include them seem to present different versions of instruments that conferred an active and redistributive role to the deceased. It is worth noting that, while cremation is the main funerary ritual in use (with the possible exception of the inhumation of subadults), the pitcher and the *simpulum* could have been used to extinguish the funeral pyre, as well as possibly to offer libations. Therefore, the presence of these elements already suggests the possibility of a ritual that was performed differently from what had previously happened. As noted above, the ritual itself, and the following deposition of the ashes in an urn or on the rock in which the grave was excavated, might have involved specific choices.

In cremation 2, the *simpulum* and the pitchers are associated with other objects that mark the deceased as belonging to *élite* status such as the belt buckle and the chain with pendants. In cremation 13, the same happens with the weapon, but the serving elements are also part of a complex banqueting assemblage that involves the grey pottery jar, the *bucchero* drinking

---

<sup>14</sup> As Petersen (2013:49) herself points out, the main difference here is that speakers have direct agency on the discourse they engage on, whereas the decisions that result in funerary evidence involve several people whose contribution is difficult to detect from the archaeological record.

vases and handmade dishes. The complexity of this assemblage leaves room to wonder whether it was meant to be seen as a functional ensemble or as a series of items that could be used in different banqueting practices.

In other assemblages, for example cremation 9, status markers like the *simpula* (probably more than one, and possibly other poorly preserved metallic vases) and the spear are associated to imported vases connected to both the sphere of banqueting and cosmetics.

On the other hand, the assemblage in cremation 4 suggests an interest in elements that would have been innovative for the Iberian context, with the presence of both perfume vases and drinking ones, along with an object that, to our knowledge, is unique in the funerary landscape of Emporion like the object that the gold applique decorated. This burial maintains its connection to the rest of the necropolis by following the cremation ritual, but the deposition of the ashes on the rock might suggest a slightly different ritual.

As mentioned, when discussing the cemeteries of Emporion Gailledrat (1995: 53-54) observed that Iberians would probably have very diversified relationships with the colonists (Gailledrat 1995:54). I think that different types of connections and relationships between indigenous people and colonists were expressed also in the necropolis discussed in this chapter, regardless of the fact that it was prevalently composed of cremations. Different sets and associations of materials offer individuals different possibilities to explore their social selves through material culture (Knappett 2011:168). On the other hand, intense and continued cross cultural interaction can both offer the opportunity to acquire innovative objects and change group and individuals' practices and ideas about what is 'proper' and desirable (Vives Ferrandiz 2010). In a dynamic situation in which people and groups are redefining their identities and creating new relationships, they might be especially open to the use of different objects and sets of objects to project an image of themselves. As discussed, the period during which the necropolis of the North Eastern Wall was in use was probably one of such moments of dynamism and change, both on a local and a regional level.

It is perhaps worth noting that, while we know very little of the inhumation burials dated to the sixth and early fifth century BC, the ones that are documented often show larger and more varied assemblages than the ones that will appear from the second quarter of the fifth century BC onwards (Gailledrat 1995, Dominguez 2004). This is especially true when considering the material from the necropolis Portixol, including the lost grave in which the



weapons accompanied the panathenaic amphora and the one whose equipment included the chariot linchpin and the *askos*. While the material present in these burials seem to have always been of Greek or Italic production (but there is also the chain with pendants in the inhumation 43 from the necropolis Bonjoan), they might have also represented varied statements about people's place in the newly established reality of the colony. The variety in the assemblages accompanying both cremations and inhumations might offer us an insight in a moment of particular social dynamism, in which ideas of self, representation and appropriateness were being redefined, often expressing complex and diverse relationships and affiliations.

## 6.7 Conclusion

The burials of the North Eastern Wall cemetery offer us the image, albeit incomplete, of a community in a moment of dynamism. On a regional level, the changes in the pattern of settlement and the existence of smaller burial groups seem to suggest an evolution in the societies of North East Spain. However, the cemetery was also primarily in use during the second half of the sixth century, when Emporion had existed for 25 years and was moving to a new area of the coast, possibly renegotiating the dynamics developed in the territory surrounding it.

Therefore, the assemblages of the North Eastern Wall necropolis probably represented the result of a series of choices aimed to assess status and social standing, but also to highlight different relationships, connections and affiliations in which the people buried in the cemetery were involved, both in the Iberian world and in the reality of the colony.

Expressing similarities and differences through material culture, the people who created the assemblages in the cemetery of the North Eastern Wall were probably asserting identities that, in the period in which the necropolis was in use, were in the process of being redefined on multiple levels. The selection and inclusion in the funerary ritual of elements and activities drawing from different cultural traditions is, therefore, both the material expression of their social selves and the instrument through which they were established and reinforced.

## 7. Discussion: travelling objects

In this thesis I have focused on three sets of assemblages from various areas of the Western Mediterranean that include materials from different cultural traditions. These three contexts are all representative, in different ways, of the dynamics of cross cultural contact and exchange in the North Western Mediterranean between seventh and sixth century BC, but they belong to different regions, where different patterns of distribution and consumption of the classes of objects present in these contexts have been distinguished. The case studies also span over different chronologies, from the late seventh century BC to the half of the sixth century for La Liquière, half of the sixth century BC for Castelnau de Guers, last three quarters of the sixth century BC for the North Eastern Wall necropolis of Emporion.

I focused on the materiality of the assemblages taking into account the specific characteristics and affordances of the objects and classes of objects that composed them, including not only the imports, but also the other objects associated to them, as well as the specificities of the different contexts. I also contrasted the assemblages and groups of assemblages with the background of the region they were part of, in order to highlight the ways in which different objects were (or were not) incorporated and ‘indigenised’ in the material culture of different local areas, and how they might have become connected to practices and ideas about identity and status that contributed to making them fit more or less coherently with the other objects to which they were associated and the contexts in which this happened. Ultimately, this was done to better understand the ways in which artefacts were collected together in meaningful assemblages that materialised different aspects of social life.

While some of the types of imports present in the different case studies are similar, the meanings they assume in the different contexts are diverse, and related to the practices in which they are entangled.

In Eastern Languedoc, as observed by Dietler (2005), the main commodity that interested local communities seemed to be wine. The finewares that accompanied the imported amphorae seem to be concentrated in settlements (although not much is known about the burials of the area). In a site like La Liquière, the vases are quite evenly divided among the different structure, which has led Dietler to argue that they did not have a strong diacritical value. However, other values that depended on their characteristics could have been

attributed to them. For example, I argue that the affordance for shared consumption of wine of the *kantharoi* already highlighted by Gras (1985), along with its distinctive shape and simple decoration, that would have given this vase 'iconic' quality, determined its popularity as the main vase that accompanied Etruscan amphorae, and that, as argued by Riva, led the vase to become associate with the idea of exchange and trade, which in turn changed the way these objects were perceived in Etruria and be one of the elements that brought their production to an end (Riva 2010:223). In the specific case of La Liquière, analysing the type of imported vases (*kantharos* and 'Ionian' cup) along with the structure of the house, I attempted also to interpret how the 'foreign' object would have 'fit' with the indigenous structure, in the ritual of libation that would have preceded the exchange. However, I also observed the evolution of the repertoire of handmade pottery and the progressive integration of a wider quantity of finewares in the assemblages of a specific house for each of the documented phases. This allowed me to notice articulations of the general tendencies in the consumption of pottery observable in the site, for example the preference for a type of imported pottery that was already well known in the region, or the presence of more numerous individual handmade cups in a context that also included various imported drinking ones. On the other hand, the analysis of the objects present in the various phases of hut L7 also highlights the ways in which objects other than the most popular classes of imported commodities ( in this particular case, wine and drinking vases) were integrated in the material culture of the hut. For example, the *oinochoe* in *bucchero* was, possibly, modified to 'fit' with the repertoire of shapes present in the hut, probably because the physical characteristics of *bucchero* were still appealing in a shape different from the one that was most popular in this region.

In the case of a different class of materials, the bronze disks with beaded rim, I have argued that their innovative character in the repertoire (they represent the earliest example of this material found in Southern France) could have contributed to characterize them with a 'coefficient of weirdness' that made them appropriate to use in an apotropaic household ritual. Comparing the assimilation of these objects in this specific context with their occasional appearance in more recent contexts, in which they seem to remain related to the ritual sphere, shows that these materials probably were incorporated in the society of Eastern Languedoc becoming associated with an apotropaic value.

In Western Languedoc, wine amphora and *bucchero kantharoi* represented, again, the most popular classes of imports. Like in Eastern Languedoc, the 'iconic' qualities of the *bucchero*

*kantharoi* made them easily identifiable and an appropriate vessel to materialize dynamics related to exchange and cross cultural encounter, probably becoming symbolic of the practice of exchange itself. However, in this region, these same distinctive qualities also contributed to make these vessels recognizable and desirable even in sites that did not receive several imports for a particularly long period of time. Their popularity and their entanglement in activities of both cross cultural exchange and banqueting also led the *kantharos* and another very recognizable pottery vase, the amphora A-ETR3B, to be assimilated in the set of objects used in this regional context to represent high status, along with objects of larger intrinsic value like weapons and metal vessels and of more scarce availability, like rarer imports. The *kantharoi* became so entangled with the material culture of Western Languedoc that they were still bought after their production had ceased, if not produced especially for this region (Ugolini and Olive 2006: 567-569)

In the specific case of Castelnau de Guers, the coherence of the different imported materials with the assemblage, the ritual and the position in the landscape of the monumental burial would have, in fact, been determined by different factors (popularity and easily recognizable meaning for the container and the *kantharos*, rarity for the cup), but they both were related to ideas of access to cross-cultural exchange, control of the territory and inclusion in an *élite* class that, in Western Languedoc during the sixth century BC, was represented by weapons and banqueting vessels, both imported and indigenized like the metal *simpulum*.

On the other hand, in the necropolis of the North Eastern Wall at Emporion, *kantharoi* represent only one of the several types of vases that were incorporated in assemblages in which a variety of imports and of objects that would have been considered markers of status in the indigenous world contributed to delineate and assert complex, multi-layered identities. This also included objects that are atypical both in Catalonia and in the North Western Mediterranean in general. This necropolis materializes the evolving self-representation and self-perception of a community living in a period of great social change, and also in a situation of continued and stable cross cultural interaction. This resulted, certainly, in a wider availability of imported goods to the people who selected and composed the funerary assemblages, but, more crucially, in the existence of more complex relationships and a wider interest and, perhaps, awareness of banqueting practices and technologies of the body. This necropolis, therefore, clearly stands out in contrast with the rest of Catalonia during the last half of the sixth century BC, where Mediterranean imports appear sporadically and seem to

be accumulated primarily in extraordinary graves like the ones of Granja Soley or the 'grave x' of Mas de Mussols. At the same time, the burials of the North Eastern Wall share some of the characteristics of the material culture of the surrounding regions, for example the presence of weapons and *simpula* in the funerary equipment, also present in Western Languedoc, but integrated with the imports in different ways and with larger frequency.

The necropolis also shows a completely different dynamic of integration in the material culture of innovative elements in comparison with contexts such as La Liquière (in which the encounter between people from different cultural background was repeated but occasional, and the merchants remained extraneous to the community), and Castelnau de Guers (situated at the centre of an area of intense exchange and communication in the sixth century BC, but still part of an indigenous reality). In these sites, in fact, the interaction resulted in the selection and assimilation of specific objects that were incorporated because they were regarded as being fitting with the local customs and needs which, as discussed, were complex and different, resulting in probably in a different use and perception of similar classes of materials.

From this point of view, I find that the linguistic models described in Chapter 1 can be very helpful in interpreting the way in which we can assimilate this type of cultural borrowing to the borrowing of words from one language to another, while the necropolis of North Eastern Wall represents, in my opinion, an use of objects from different cultural traditions to compose meaningful assemblages that is more reminding to the way in which multilingual discourse is formulated by people with different levels of proficiency in a language other than their own.

As discussed in Chapter 3, my interpretation of the incorporation of different classes of materials in their new contexts was based on the ways in which they related to both the specific features of their contexts of discovery and the other objects present in them. From this point of view, I think that an analysis of the assimilation of new and innovative objects in material culture that contrasts different levels of analysis, a regional one and one that focuses on specific, selected contexts, can be helpful in articulating the nuances and complexities of the ways in which different objects become entangled in material culture. An interesting approach for a future study would involve a similar type of analysis performed on well documented contexts including imports from different areas of the Mediterranean, and possible cross-regional comparisons among the contexts discussed in this study and similar ones from different areas of the Mediterranean. For example, a comparison between

the North Eastern Wall necropolis and other 'indigenous' cemeteries in the proximity of ancient colonies, or between the assemblages present in the huts from La Liquière and other domestic units from centres in which activities of trade and exchange among people from different backgrounds are attested.

## Appendixes

### Appendix 1: Exceptional burials of subadults (information from Dedet 2008, 2012a).

#### *Subadults buried with weapons:*

| Location, denomination, chronology  | Ritual, osteological analyses                      | Funerary equipment   | Notes   |
|---|--|--|---|
| Grave 55, Grand Bassin I, Maillhac, Aude, Western Languedoc, 650-600 BCE    | Cremation.   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-20 handmade pottery vases, including a crater</li> <li>- Sword of the type <i>à antennes</i></li> <li>-Two iron knives</li> <li>-Iron belt buckle</li> <li>- An iron ring and fragments of two others</li> <li>-Bracelet in bronze</li> <li>-<i>Scalptorium</i> in bronze</li> </ul> |   |
| Grave 331, Negabous, Perpignan, Pyrenée Orientales, Roussillon, 650-600 BCE | Cremation. Individual between 10 and 12 years old. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Crater in handmade pottery</li> <li>-5 cups in handmade pottery</li> <li>-Fragments of a sword</li> <li>-Two disks from a bronze cuirass (pectoral and dorsal)</li> <li>-3 iron knives</li> <li>- Fragments of belt plating</li> <li>-Iron brooch</li> <li>-Iron pin</li> </ul>      | The armband is the only object small enough to fit the body of the deceased |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Iron fragments, possibly from a second brooch or pin</li> <li>-Iron bracelet</li> <li>-Iron armband</li> </ul>  |  |
| Tumulus de l'Agnel 1, Pertuis, Vaucluse, Provence, 600-575 BCE | <p>Cremation. This is the only cremation of a subadult attested in Provence.</p> <p>Individual between 7 and 12 years old.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Bronze <i>oinochoe</i>, used as an ossuary</li> <li>-Fragments of the sheath of a sword, with a rivet in it, inside the ossuary</li> <li>-Possible belt buckle, damaged by fire, and small chain attached to it in the ossuary</li> <li>- Fragment of bronze sheet in the ossuary</li> <li>-Fragments of a bronze cuirass</li> <li>-Fragments of a bronze helmet</li> <li>- Fragment of a bronze bracelet</li> <li>- Fragments of an Etruscan bronze basin with beaded rim</li> <li>- Blade of an iron knife</li> <li>- Iron tongs</li> <li>- Fragments of handmade containers, including one shaped as a crater</li> </ul> | The equipment is probably incomplete as the burial was looted before its discovery |



*Subadults buried with jewels:*

| Location, denomination, chronology  | Ritual, osteological analyses                     | Funerary equipment   | Notes  |
|---|---|--|--|
| Tumulus I, Vayssas, Severac le Chateau, Aveyron, Midi Pyrene, Western Languedoc, late eight century BCE | Inhumation, girl circa 10 years old               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Bronze pin</li> <li>- Two bronze braid clasps</li> <li>- One iron bead</li> <li>-Two amber beads</li> </ul>  | This burial was a stone tumulus hosting 5 individuals. All the other deceased were adults, 2 women and 2 men. The oldest woman, aged over 30, was buried with a very rich jewellery set and a spindle whorl. The younger woman, aged around 20, had no funerary equipment and the two men were buried with two vases and a vase and a ring respectively. |
| Grave 279, Negabous, Perpignan, Pyrenée Orientales, Roussillon, seventh century BCE                     | Cremation, individual between 10 and 14 years old | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Ossuary in handmade pottery</li> <li>-Urn in handmade pottery</li> <li>-Two small cups in handmade pottery</li> <li>-Bowl in handmade pottery</li> <li>-Five bracelets in bronze and iron</li> <li>-Armbands</li> <li>-Bronze pin</li> <li>-Two amber beads</li> </ul> |  |

|   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>Grave 263 Saint Julien, Pézènas,<br/>Hérault, W Languedoc, 550-450 BCE</p> | <p>Cremation. The metal objects were placed in the ossuary.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Ossuary in handmade pottery</li> <li>-Bowl in handmade pottery, served as a lid for the ossuary</li> <li>-Goblet in handmade pottery</li> <li>-Two silver earrings</li> <li>-At least ten brooches in iron</li> <li>- Parts of small chains in bronze</li> <li>-Fragments of at least twenty armbands in bronze, with rectangular section, damaged by fire</li> </ul> |  |
|---|---|---|--|

Appendix 2: Burials with amphora as an ossuary in the cemeteries of Grand Bassin II at Mailhac and Saint Julien at Pezénas.

| Cemetery, grave number, chronology          | Ritual and osteology   | Funerary equipment  | Main bibliography                         |
|---|--|---|---|
| Grand Bassin II, 13, 575-550 BCE, disturbed | Cremation, subject of unidentified age but not an infant. The amphora was placed in a pit excavated in the ground, while the objects were found in the soil that covered it. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Etruscan amphora type AETR3B, used as ossuary</li> <li>- Fragments of handmade pottery</li> <li>-Handle of a Phoenician jar</li> <li>- Damaged spearhead type IIB of Beylier 2012a</li> <li>-Damaged conical talon of a spear</li> <li>-Belt buckle in bronze</li> <li>-Bronze brooch</li> <li>- Quartz bead</li> <li>-Fragment of the possible handle of a <i>simpulum</i></li> <li>- Fragment of an iron knife</li> <li>-Fragmentary unidentified metal objects-</li> <li>Fragments of a stone object, possibly a 'sharpener' for blades</li> </ul> | Janin et al 2002:85-88, Beylier 2012a:336 |
| Grand Bassin II, 55, 575-550 BCE            | Cremation, adult individual  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Etruscan amphora type AETR3B, used as ossuary</li> <li>-Fragmentary iron bracelet</li> <li>-Iron bow brooch</li> <li>- Fragments of an unidentified object in iron</li> <li>- Fragments of an unidentified object in bronze</li> </ul>   | Janin et al 2002:110                      |
| Grand Bassin II,7, 560-525 BCE              | Cremation, adult individual  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Etruscan amphora type AETR3B, used as an ossuary</li> <li>-Iron sword</li> <li>-Iron spearhead type III of Beylier 2012a</li> </ul>   | Janin et al 2002:80, Beylier 2012a:334    |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two iron knives</li> <li>-Bronze tweezers</li> <li>-Bronze rivet</li> </ul> |  |
|--|--|--|--|

|   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| Grand Bassin II, 8, 550-525 BCE           | Cremation. All the metal objects were in the ossuary.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Etruscan amphora type AETR 3 (A or B) used as an ossuary</li> <li>- Fragmentary vase in Grey Monochrome</li> <li>- Jar in Ibero-Languedocan pottery</li> <li>-Urn in handmade pottery</li> <li>-Urn in local wheel thrown pottery, not painted</li> <li>- Fragments of Grey Monochrome</li> <li>- Fragment of Massaliote amphora</li> <li>-Fragment of not identified type of pottery</li> <li>- Iron spearhead type IIC1 of Beylier 2012</li> <li>- Iron conical talon of the spear</li> <li>-Belt buckle in bronze with one hook and incised decoration</li> </ul> | Janin et al 2002:80-81, Beylier 2012a:336                               |
| Saint Julien, 215, 575-550 BCE            | Cremation, adult individual. The metal objects were placed over the bones.                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Etruscan amphora (type A ETR3B) used as an ossuary</li> <li>- Iron spearhead</li> <li>-Conical iron talon of a spear</li> <li>-Bronze belt buckle</li> <li>- Two iron knives</li> <li>-Fragments of bronze</li> </ul>  | Giry 1965:203, Dedet et al. 2003:173-174 and 179-180, Beylier 2012a:346 |
| Saint Julien, 223, 575-525 BCE, disturbed | Cremation, adult individual. The bracelets, brooch and spindle whorl were placed over the bones. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Etruscan amphora (type A ETR3B) used as an ossuary. The handles were missing.</li> <li>-Grey Monochrome cup (type GRMONO6b)</li> <li>-Handmade little vase (type CNT-LOC G5a) with lid, comparable to a <i>pyxis</i>.</li> <li>-Bronze bow brooch</li> <li>-Iron bow brooch</li> <li>-Fragments of 4 bronze bracelets</li> <li>-Clay spindle whorl</li> </ul>   | Giry 1965:206-207, Dedet et al. 2003:173-174 and 180-181                |

|   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| Saint Julien, 273, 575-525 BCE, disturbed | Cremation, adult individual. The human remains were placed in the amphora together with the belt buckle and the brooch. The elements of the spear were 'planted against the amphora'. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Etruscan amphora type AETR3B, used as ossuary</li> <li>-Spearhead, type IIIB of Beylier 2012, in iron</li> <li>-Conical talon of a spear in iron</li> <li>-Bronze belt buckle</li> <li>-Bronze and iron bow brooch decorated by small bronze disks</li> <li>- Object in Grey Monochrome pottery, whose function is debated:possibly it was a stand for a cauldron or a drum</li> </ul> | Giry 1965:232-233, Dedet et al. 2003:173-174 and 182, Beylier 2012a:348 |
| Saint Julien, 147, 575-550 BCE            | Cremation. The weapons were placed at the sides of the ossuary  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Etruscan amphora, used as ossuary</li> <li>-Iron spearhead</li> <li>-Greave in bronze</li> <li>-Bronze belt buckle with incised decoration</li> </ul>  | Giry 1965:168, Dedet et al 2003:173-174, Beylier 2012a:344              |

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| Saint Julien, 149, 600-550 BCE            | Cremation, the funerary equipment was disposed around the amphora  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Etruscan amphora, used as ossuary</li> <li>- Bucchero <i>kantharos</i> (only the foot was found in the excavation)</li> <li>-Goblet in 'dark grey' pottery</li> <li>-Iron spearhead</li> <li>-Conical talon of a spear in iron</li> <li>-Iron bow brooch decorated with copper elements</li> <li>-Large iron knife</li> <li>- Small iron knife</li> </ul> | Giry 1965:169, Dedet et al 2003:173-174, Beylier 2012a:344 |
| Saint Julien, 150, 550-500 BCE            | Cremation. The burial had been partially destroyed. The other vase was placed at the side of the ossuary, and the rest of the equipment was probably inside it as it was in proximity of the vase. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Etruscan amphora, used as ossuary</li> <li>-Small vase in Grey Monochrome pottery</li> <li>-Bronze bracelet</li> <li>-Iron knife</li> <li>- Bronze fragments</li> </ul>   | Giry 1965:170, Dedet et al 2003:173                        |
| Saint Julien, 210, 550-525 BCE            | Cremation, the <i>kantharos</i> was placed near to the ossuary and the rest of the assemblage was inside it  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Etruscan amphora, used as ossuary</li> <li>- Bucchero <i>kantharos</i></li> <li>-Bronze button</li> <li>-Fragments of bronze wire</li> </ul>  | Giry 1965:200, Dedet et al 2003:173                        |
| Saint Julien, 214, 550-525 BCE            | Cremation  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Etruscan amphora, used as ossuary. The opening was closed with the bottom of an handmade vase.</li> <li>-Two iron knives</li> </ul>   | Giry 1965:202, Dedet et al 2003:173-174                    |
| Saint Julien, 234, 550-500 BCE, disturbed | Cremation. The burial pit included two amphorae, one without the handles and one without handles and neck, used as ossuaries. The torc was inside the first amphora.                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Etruscan amphorae, used as ossuaries</li> <li>- Grey Monochrome vase</li> <li>-Conical talon of a spear in iron</li> <li>-Bronze belt buckle with incised decoration</li> <li>-Bronze torc</li> <li>- 3 iron knives</li> <li>- Bronze <i>simpulum</i></li> </ul>  | Giry 1965:214, Dedet et al 2003:173, Beylier 2012a:346     |

|  |  |                           |  |
|--|--|---------------------------|--|
|  |  | - Fragmentary bronze dish |  |
|--|--|---------------------------|--|



### Appendix 3: Isolated Burials from the North Western Mediterranean

Here are quickly described all the isolated graves known in Mediterranean France and in North Eastern Spain. Their isolated nature of some has been questioned because of the discovery of new data after the publication or because the status of the graves was unclear. The dubious examples are marked with an X following the location name, with explanation in the Notes section.

| Site, Department or province, Region, Chron.      | Funerary Ritual, osteological analyses | External structure  | Funerary equipment  | Notes  | Bibliography  |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Chateau Roussillon, Aude, Roussillon, 750-575 BCE | Inhumation. Adult woman                | Under a pile of pebbles topped by a stone cut as a dome. Disrupted, so it is doubtful whether this was the original structure | -Sherds of handmade pottery<br>-Around the left ankle, bronze beads possibly held by a thread. They belong to a type common in the Golasecca culture of North Italy, but some examples have been found in the Grand Bassin I necropolis   |  | Marichal and Janin 2003, Mazière 2005:912-913                         |
| Campagnan, Hérault, W Languedoc, 650-550 BCE, X   | Inhumation                             |   | - Sherds of handmade pottery. The shapes identifiable are a dish and an urn<br>- Bronze torc broken in four pieces. Three bronze rings and eight amber beads<br>-Iron bracelet<br>-Fragments of another bracelet<br>-Bronze conic button<br>-Fragments of other bronze ornament | Excavated in 1963, preserved material studied in 1993. The original article about this finding talked about an ‘inhumation necropolis’ but the only material found pertained to one grave. | Arnal 1963, Feugère 1992:17-22, Garcia 1993:289, Mazière 2005:912-913 |
| La Gravette, Couffolens, W Languedoc,             | Inhumation                             |   | -Two bracelets in bronze and jet  | Accidental discovery of a burial destroyed by agricultural activities. Only some bones,  | Mazière 2005:912-913  |

|   |           |  |  |   |  |
|---|-----------|--|--|---|--|
| 'towards the end of Early Iron Age' (Mazière 2005:913)  |           |  |  | including a left forearm with the bracelets around it were identified   |  |
| Les Pradels, Montpeyroux, Hérault, W Languedoc, 575-525 for the amphora, no accompanying material | Cremation |  | -Upper part of an Etruscan amphora A-ETR1/2  | Accidental discovery of an amphora, now lost, accompanied by burnt human bones. In the same area have been found other fragments of pottery. Mentioned as a 'necropolis' by Garcia 1993 and an isolated burial by Herubel 2000.   | Garcia 1993:55, Herubel 2000:105   |
| La Prade, Puissegur, Hérault, W Languedoc, 575-550 for the crater, X                              |           |  | -Corinthian column crater (CORINT Cr1)<br>In the same area as the fragments of this vase were found<br>-One fragment of Etruscan amphora<br>-Two fragments of Grey Monochrome pottery<br>-One fragment of handmade pottery   | Accidental discovery of 21 fragments of a Corinthian crater that are all that would have been left of the supposed grave  | Ugolini et al 1997, Herubel 2000:105; Mazière 2005:912-913, Graells 2010:84-85                         |
| Rec de Bragues, Florensac, Hérault, W Languedoc, 575-550, X                                       | Cremation |  | - 'Ionian' cup, type produced in the transition period between the types A2 and B2 (GREC-OR KyB2)<br>- Wheel thrown cup with double handle, possibly a local imitation of the same type of 'Ionian' cup<br>- Goblet in Grey Monochrome pottery (GR-MONO 13b on Dicocer)<br>- Bronze basin with incised decoration on the lip similar to that of the basin from Mourèze. Regarded as an | Human remains not preserved. In the same area as the burial have been later found some bronze objects datable to the sixth century BCE (belt buckle, handle of a cauldron, ornamental plaque), which suggests the grave might actually be part of a necropolis (Beylier 2012a:326). | Rouquette and Michel 1976, Herubel 2000:105; Mazière 2005:912-913, Graells 2010:145, Beylier 2012a:326 |

|  |   |  |   |   |  |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|
|  |   |  | <p>Etruscan import.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two iron knives</li> <li>- Iron crossbow brooch</li> <li>- Iron spearhead type IIIB of Beylier 2012a</li> <li>-Iron heel of the spear</li> <li>- Fragments of an iron blade pertaining possibly to a sword, or a third knife</li> </ul>  |   |  |
| Les Faisses, Mourèze, Hérault, W Languedoc, 600-550 BCE, X | Cremation, the amphora was used as an ossuary. Adult individual.                                      |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Bottom of an Etruscan amphora type Py 3A (A-ETR 3A)</li> <li>-Bronze basin with incised decoration on the lip similar to that of the basin from Florensac. Garcia and Orliac interpret it as an Etruscan import from the late seventh century BCE.</li> <li>- Part of a bronze crossbow brooch, type Gulf of Lion of Oliver 1986</li> <li>-Fragments of two bronze bracelets with incised decoration-</li> <li>-Fragment of a curved bronze rod with circular section.</li> </ul> | <p>The grave was an accidental finding during agricultural work rather than the result of an excavation. The grave goods and human remains were offered by the owner of the land where it was found to study.</p> <p>Surface survey in the area where the grave was found has led to the discovery of some fragments of handmade pottery, therefore it is possible to think the burial was not completely isolated.</p> | Garcia and Orliac 1985, Mazière 2005:912-913, Graells 2010:91  |
| La Céreirède, Lattes, E Languedoc, 550-500 BCE             | Cremation, the amphora was used as an ossuary. The metal object had been placed on the funerary pyre. |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bottom half of an Etruscan amphora type 3A (A-ETR 3A)</li> <li>-Bronze <i>patiera</i> with beaded lip</li> <li>- Bronze curved leaf identified by Chardenon and Bel 2003 as the blade of a strigil.</li> <li>- Bronze dagger</li> </ul>  | <p>The upper part of the grave had been destroyed by agricultural work, making it difficult to determine whether the objects found were whole when placed in the burial and if they represented the entire assemblage.</p> <p>The strigil is the only one found in Gallia in a pre-Roman, non-</p>  | Chardenon and Bel 2003, Py 2009:49-50, Mazière 2005:912-913, Graells 2010:142-145, Beylier 2012a:330 |

|  |   |  |   |   |   |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|
|  |   |  |   | Greek context. Because of this Py (2009:49-50) thinks it might represent the burial of an Etruscan individual who died in Lattara (La Céreirède is only 1,5 km N to the ancient settlement). More recently Graells (2010:143) objected that the handle of a strigil would have been preserved better than the blade and the object is to be identified as an element of the decoration of something else. This argument is debatable as the funerary equipment was destroyed and did not deteriorate with time. |   |
| Corno Lauzo, Pouzols-Minervois, Hérault, W Languedoc, 560-540 BCE (traditionally), 575-550 BCE and 530-500 BCE (new proposal), X | Cremation. The amphora was used as an ossuary. The metal objects had been burned on the funeral pyre and the <i>soliferreum</i> had been bent and was placed around the ossuary. Taffanel and Taffanel (1960:7) think the cups might have been broken intentionally |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ionian B2 cup (GREC-OR KyB2)</li> <li>- Bronze <i>simpulum</i></li> <li>- Fragment of another possible <i>simpulum</i></li> <li>- Bronze <i>cista</i>, considered of Italic production by Bouloumié (1976:18) and central European by Graells (2010:92-93).</li> <li>- Foot of a bronze vase, whose shape has not been identified.</li> <li>- Fragments of decorated bronze. Originally published as a cuirass. After being restored, they do seem to have belonged to a cuirass, but to one structured in disks (Graells 2015:253)</li> </ul> | Recently, Graells has suggested that the funerary equipment might be the result of the overlap of two different burials, dated respectively 575-550 BCE and 530-500 BCE (Graells 2015). The discussion is based on two arguments: first, not all the material included in the burial was recovered at the same time by O. and J. Taffanel. Besides, the assemblage includes some items whose chronology places them in the second quarter of the sixth century BCE (including the <i>cista</i>                  | Taffanel and Taffanel 1960, Bouloumié 1976, Mazière 2005:912-913, Graells 2010:92-93 and 140-142, Beylier 2012a:217 and 349, Graells 2015 |

|   |           |  |   |  |  |
|---|-----------|--|---|--|--|
|   |           |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Iron knife</li> <li>- Fragments of metal bracelet</li> <li>- Iron sword</li> <li>- An iron element published as a spearhead by the excavators and classed as type IIIB1 by Beylier 2012a. According to Graells 2015, this was a piece of the above mentioned sword.</li> <li>- Bronze greaves</li> <li>- Bronze crossbow brooch, type Gulf of Lion of Oliver 1986</li> <li>- Fragments of what Taffanel and Taffanel (1960:4) identified as an helmet, but after being restored has been identified as a bronze <i>patera</i> (Graells 2015:251)</li> <li>- <i>Soliferreum</i> type C1 of Beylier 2012a.</li> <li>- Bronze belt buckle, three hooks, silver decoration</li> <li>- Attic black figures cup (AT-FN Ky5).</li> <li>- Massaliote amphora(A-MAS 1)</li> </ul> | <p>and the <i>patera</i>) and others that seem to be datable to the second half of the century, if not the last quarter of it (the amphora, the belt buckle, the javelin, the bracelet, the Attic cup). In his reconstruction, the sword, greaves, pectoral disks, <i>simpula</i>, <i>cista</i>, knife and 'Ionian' cup would belong to the older burial. The amphora, bracelet, belt buckle and Attic cup would be part of the more recent one. Lastly, it is doubtful to which burial the javelin, <i>patera</i> and brooch would belong. Graells discussed the attribution of objects to the two hypothetical burials with O.Taffanel, he does not specify if the attribution of some of the less precisely datable objects to either burial was based on information about their discovery she provided him.</p> |  |
| Mas Saintes Puelles, Aude, W Languedoc, sixth century BCE | Cremation |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fragments of a small handmade urn with decorated shoulder</li> <li>- Fragments of a handmade cup (similar to shape CNT-LOC C1d1 or even more to CNT-LOC C1d2 on Dicocer, however the latter is dated to 400/275 BCE).</li> </ul>   | <p>The burial was discovered in the 1910s during agricultural works, and the material in it was salvaged because of the intervention of Joseph Vezian and published 50 years later. Bernat and Rancoule (1986:111) refer to this grave as a</p>  | <p>Soutou and Vezian 1964, Bernat and Rancoule 1986:111, Mazière 2005:912-913,</p> |

|  |   |         |  |   |  |
|--|---|---------|--|---|--|
|  |   |         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Two iron knives</li> <li>- Iron crossbow brooch</li> <li>- Bronze belt buckle, one hook, decorated with a cross motif</li> <li>- Iron spearhead type IIB1 of Beylier 2012a</li> <li>-Heel of the iron spear</li> </ul>   | ‘necropolis’ and Graells (2010:145-147) writes that the burial ‘seems to be part of a necropolis’, but neither publication explains why the authors believe there was more than one burial in the same area.                                | Graells 2010:145-147, Beylier 2012a:338              |
| Tumulus 1, Arboras, Hérault, W Languedoc, 550-500 BCE, X                                   |   | Tumulus | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Grey monochrome cup</li> <li>- Fragments of handmade pottery</li> <li>- Iron sword</li> <li>-Heel of an iron spear</li> </ul>  | The burial was an accidental discovery of which even the precise location is dubious. Mentioned in Combarous 1978, described in Garcia 1993, the only materials that have been properly studied are the weapons, published in Beylier 2012. | Combarous 1978:33, Garcia 1993:24, Beylier 2012a:310 |
| Tumulus 2, Arboras, Hérault, W Languedoc, between late sixth and early fifth century BCE,X | No body remains preserved. The <i>soliferreum</i> had been bent and broken. | Tumulus | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Bronze disk with beaded lip</li> <li>-Fragment of bronze bracelet</li> <li>- Element of bronze belt</li> <li>- Fragment of iron brooch</li> <li>- Small bronze plaque</li> <li>- Two iron nails</li> <li>- An iron chain</li> <li>-Two iron pegs</li> <li>- A bronze fragment pertaining to an unidentified object</li> <li>-<i>Soliferreum</i> type Ed2 of Beylier 2012a</li> <li>- Heel of an iron spear</li> <li>-Fragment of a blade of an iron sword</li> </ul> | Unpublished burial of uncertain location. The weapons have been discussed in Beylier 2012a.   | Beylier 2012a:310                                    |
| Los Ferreres, Calaceite, Teruel, Aragon, 575-540   | Cremation   |         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Presumably, a funerary urn in pottery</li> <li>- Probably a bronze cauldron, of which survive only part of the handles</li> </ul>   | Burial discovered and described at the beginning of the twentieth century, the exact location is still  | Cabrè 1908, Cabrè 1942, Lucas 1982,                  |

|                                      |  |  |  |  |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|
| BCE, X                               |  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A bronze stand decorated with a horse figure that was probably a <i>thymiaterion</i> or a support used to hold the cauldron in place. This piece is dated between the ninth and eighth century BCE, and has been interpreted as being already an heirloom at the moment of the placement in the burial. However, the fact that similar objects have been found in two graves from Languedoc dated around the same period would allow to think that it could have been produced in the sixth century BCE</li> <li>- A bronze cuirass</li> <li>- Possibly, a bronze helmet in the Museum of Menorca, that is labelled as coming from Calaceite</li> <li>-Two iron swords</li> <li>-Possibly, an iron spearhead present in the Museum in Menorca</li> <li>- Possibly, another spearhead present in the Museum in Menorca</li> <li>- Possibly, a pair of greaves</li> </ul> | dubious. The funerary assemblage was described by Cabré and later sold. Some of the objects, including the stand, were acquired by the Louvre, while others, including the cuirass, were bought by a collector that later left them to the Museum of Menorca. In 1941 some of the objects acquired by the Louvre were given back to the Museo Arqueológico Nacional of Madrid (Moret et al 2006:152-153). The published elements of the funerary equipment have been identified and studied partly on the basis of Cabré's description and partly because the records from the Louvre associated them to the stand. The stand and the cuirass are the only objects that have been studied in depth (Moret et al 2006:151-154). In the same area have been found other bronze objects, which makes it possible to suspect the grave was not isolated (Graells 2010:149) | Quesada 1997:577, Farniè and Quesada 2005:112-114, Moret et al 2007:151-154, Graells 2010:111 and 149-154 |
| Granja Soley, St.Perpetua de Mogoda, | Cremation, with a handmade vase and a Grey |  | -Tronco-conic dish/lid with handle in handmade pottery (CNT-EMP C3b), contained part of the animal offers  | Traditionally, the older individual has been interpreted as the 'owner' of the grave and the   | Sanmartí et al. 1982, Farniè and Quesada  |

|   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Barcelona,<br>Catalonia, 575-550<br>BCE | <p>Monochrome <i>oinochoe</i> used as ossuaries.</p> <p>The grave contained human bones pertaining to two individuals, an adolescent between 17 and 19 years old (in the handmade vase) and an individual who has been identified as an infant because of the small objects placed in the same container, the Grey Monochrome vase. Animal bones, probably part of a ritual offer, were included in the grave in two dishes.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Other tronco-conic dish/lid with handle in handmade pottery (similar to CNT-EMP C3b but on high foot), contained the rest of the animal remains</li> <li>- Small handmade carinated vase with handle that contained remains of the older individual buried in the grave, the belt buckle, a ring, the fragments of cuirass or greaves and the arrowheads. One of the spears was bent around it.</li> <li>-Other handmade carinated vase with handle</li> <li>- Handmade urn</li> <li>- Handmade urn with handle</li> <li>- Two big wheel thrown urns with two handles</li> <li>- Big wheel thrown vase with no handles</li> <li>- Urn <i>de orejetas</i>, wheelthrown, with lid.</li> <li>- Wheel thrown <i>oinochoe</i></li> <li>- <i>Oinochoe</i> in Grey Monochrome, shape VIIIGr2 of Arcelin Pradelle (GR-MONO 8c in Dicocer), including the bronze ring and bracelet and the bones of the second individual</li> <li>- Handles of two <i>simpula</i></li> <li>- Fragments of a possible vessel in bronze</li> <li>- Iron knife</li> </ul> | <p>younger one as having been deposited with him. However, Graells (2010:110 and 154-169) argues that the placement of the younger child in the assemblage, as well as the fact that their remains were deposited in an <i>oinochoe</i>, would make them more likely to be the 'owner' of the grave compared to the older individual, who was placed in a vase of a form never used in Catalonia as a cinerary but to present offers, and accompanied by arrowheads.</p> | <p>2005:170-171, Graells 2010:110 and 154-169, Beylier 2012a:296</p> |
|---|--|--|--|--|



|   |   |  |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
|   |   |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bronze belt buckle with one hook</li> <li>- Bronze belt buckle with three hooks</li> <li>- Fragment of brooch in bronze</li> <li>- Small bronze bracelet</li> <li>- Small bronze ring, possible element of an earring</li> <li>-Iron spearhead type I1 of Beylier 2012a. Bent around the ossuary next to the spears</li> <li>-Iron spearhead type IIIB1 of Beylier 2012a, intentionally damaged</li> <li>- Iron spearhead., bent around the ossuary</li> <li>-Heels of three iron spears</li> <li>- Two arrowheads in bronze, place inside the ossuary</li> <li>- Arrowhead in bronze, place inside the ossuary, intentionally bent</li> <li>-Fragments of bronze from a defensive element interpreted either as a cuirass or greaves, placed inside the ossuary.</li> </ul> |   |  |
| Tomb E4, or Tomb of the Warrior, El Coll, Llinars de Vallès, Barcelona, Catalonia, 600-575 BCE, X | Cremation, the deceased was circa 19 years old. |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Big handmade pottery urn, used as a cinerary</li> <li>- Small handmade urn with an handle, according to Sanmartì (1993:20) possibly a vase to pour liquids</li> <li>-Four tronco-conic handmade dishes</li> <li>-Handmade lid with handle</li> <li>- Two handmade biconic open vases with handle and one tronco-conic one,</li> </ul>   | This burial was excavated in 1953 and believed to be isolated until the discovery of three other nearby graves in 2002 (Muñoz Rufo 2006). Of these other burials, two had been looted (Beylier 2012a:282) but the third (tomb E1) was the grave of an individual between 7 and 12 years | Sanmartì 1993, Muñoz Rufo 2006, Farniè and Quesada 2005:80-84 and 171-174, Beylier 2012a:282 |

|  |  |  |   |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|
|  |  |  | <p>also with handle. According to Sanmarti (1993:20-21), possibly for libations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fragmentary big vase with four handles</li> <li>- Three open vases with 'S' profile</li> <li>- Big vase on high foot</li> <li>- <i>Simpulum</i> in bronze</li> <li>- Bronze plaque (possibly the basis of an applique)</li> <li>- Small iron tube whose function has not been identified</li> <li>- Bronze belt buckle with one hook</li> <li>- Bronze brooch type Gulf of Lion, fragmentary</li> <li>- Bronze semi-circular pin, fragmentary</li> <li>- Several fragments of bronze chain</li> <li>- Bronze button</li> <li>- Remains of a bronze belt</li> <li>- Two bronze pendants</li> <li>- Two small bronze lozenges, ending in bead-shaped pearls at the end. They are perforated, so possibly are pendants or elements of decoration as well</li> <li>- Bronze ring, probable element of dress decoration</li> <li>- Two perforated bronze ferrules</li> <li>- Two iron swords, very badly preserved</li> </ul> | <p>old (Muñoz Rufo 2006:186). This second grave did not include weapons, but had a rich funerary equipment composed of ten handmade vases, a bronze belt buckle with one hook and two bronze rings.</p> |  |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|

|  |  |  |   |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
|  |  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Remains of a possible bronze greave</li> <li>- Iron blade of a spear IIIB2 of Beylier 2012a</li> <li>-Iron blade of a spear, type B of Beylier 2012a</li> <li>-Iron blade of a spear, type III16 of Beylier 2012a</li> <li>-Iron blade of a spear preserved only in a small piece and whose type is not identifiable</li> <li>- Two iron heels of spears, of conical shape</li> </ul> |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

## Appendix 4: The cemetery of the North Eastern Wall at Emporion

### Cremations

Here are tabulated the materials that compose the assemblages accompanying the cremation burials in the necropolis

| Number, chron. | Pottery   | Weapons | Ornaments   | Other   | Notes |
|----------------|---|---------|---|---|-------|
| 1 (550-500 BC) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fragment of Grey Monochrome pottery</li> <li>- Two small handmade cups</li> <li>- Bottom of a big handmade urn.</li> </ul> <p>According to Pons, her type E (Pons 1984:194-195). Drawn in the original publication as more similar to the type G (Pons 1984:195-196). Not preserved in the museum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Miniature handmade urn</li> </ul> |         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fragments of a silver ring. Based on isotopic analyses, it is made of silver from Southern Catalonia.</li> <li>- Bronze signet ring</li> <li>- Numerous fragments of bronze chain</li> <li>- Bronze belt buckle (type 25312 of Graells 2005)</li> <li>- Big bronze ring, probably part of clothes decoration.</li> <li>- Two fragments of an iron bow brooch with upturned catchplate terminating in a button (probably the type 7B or Gulf of Lion of Oliver 1986). Published by Almagro as two fragments of nails but the shape and dimension make it very identifiable as a brooch (opinion confirmed by</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Fragments of a short iron knife</li> <li>-Fragment of iron with a rivet, possibly part of a knife</li> <li>- Fragments of a bronze sheet from an undetermined object. Described as an <i>applique</i> by Almagro. Lucas 2002-2003 thinks it could have been a <i>simpulum</i> because of the flat, ribbon-like shape. However, the sheet appears larger in shape and thinner in section in comparison with the other <i>simpulum</i> handles included in other assemblages. A similar object is present in the equipment of cremation 9.</li> </ul> |       |

|                |   |   |  |  |   |
|----------------|---|---|--|--|---|
|                |   |   | M.Santos and P. Castanyer,<br>pers. comm.)<br>- Small <i>cardium</i> shell   |  |   |
| 2 (550-525 BC) | <p>-Two <i>oinochoai</i> in Grey Monochrome pottery, one belonging to type GR-MONO 8ac of Dicocer and one of a type that is difficult to determine. The more damaged of the two can be considered a local production, while the latter, based on the clay, is considered Massalian (Graells 2010:86)</p> <p>- A handmade bowl, with round profile (CNT-EMP C4c)</p> <p>-A handmade bowl with conical profile (CNT-EMP C1b)</p> <p>- Two handmade dishes with foot (shape close to 18a2 of Pons 1984).</p> <p>- A miniature handmade urn(CNT-EMP U2c1)</p> | <p>- Bronze tubular element with circular section, published as a possible handle by Almagro. A similar object, found in the burial 35 of Mianes, is published as part of a possible weapon in Esteve Galvez1999 (119 and 123-124).</p> | <p>-Two belt buckles (type 25211 of Graells 2005)</p> <p>-Bronze eye of one of the two belt buckles</p> <p>-Fragments of bronze chain.</p> <p>-Two bronze rings terminating in spherical pendants. Probably part of a longer chain.</p> <p>-Bronze ring with flat, incised surface, possible part of clothes decoration.</p> <p>-Iron ring, possible part of clothes decoration</p> <p>-Small bronze object published as a nail by Almagro. Pons (1984:224 and 291) considers it a hook-shaped pendant, which is a more likely interpretation in my opinion.</p> | <p>-Handle of a <i>simpulum</i>.</p> <p>-Small bronze plaque with two little rivets in it. Possibly it served to attach the handle to the bowl of a <i>simpulum</i> (as show in one of the illustrations in Lucas 2002-2003:110)</p> <p>-Possibly a small bronze nail</p> <p>-One iron nail</p> <p>- Two iron knives</p> | <p>This grave was, According to Almagro's notes, undisturbed. Barberà 1990 and Graells 2007 believe it to be a double burial because of the presence of the two belt buckles. However, the presence of double belt buckle (observable also in the isolated grave of Granja Soley- which in itself can possibly represent a double burial- and in the graves AB25 and AB58 from Atalaya) has also been tied to exhibition of wealth and prestige (see Graells 2007 on the subject). What is interesting is that here are doubled also the knife, the pitcher and, possibly, the <i>simpulum</i>.</p> |
| 3 (550-500 BC) | <p>- Fragmentary handmodeled urn <i>de orejetas</i> (IB-PEINTE 2413</p>   |   |  |  |   |

|                      |  |  |   |  |  |
|----------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
|                      | on Dicocer) with painted decoration.   |  |   |  |  |
| 4 (525-500)          | <p>-Two Corinthian <i>aryballoi</i> (ostensibly both type CORINT Ar2B2). One is extremely fragmented. The decoration of the latter represented in Almagro is possibly not a very faithful reconstruction.</p> <p>- Attic black figures <i>lekythos</i> (AT-FN Lt2b), attributed to the Little lion class (Graells 2010:85).</p> <p>- Attic black figures band cup (AT-FN Ky7), from the group of the Little Masters.</p> <p>- <i>Bucchero kantharos</i> (B- NERO Ct3e2).</p> |  | <p>-Silver bow brooch <i>de resorte bilateral</i>. The surviving parts include part of the bow (with tubular section) and fragments of the hinge. Based on isotopic analyses, it is made of silver from Southern Catalonia.</p> <p>-Fragments of a bronze bracelet with circular section.</p> | <p>-Gold <i>applique</i> shaped like a rosette. Graells (2010:54 and 102) observes how the technique in which it is decorated finds comparison with the one used on jewels from the Benaki Museum of Athens, originally from Cyprus (Delivorrias 1999:76). It was, possibly, a decorative element for an object in perishable material (Graells 2010:102 proposes a vessel).</p> <p>-Fragment of bronze sheet</p> <p>-Possible bronze nail</p> <p>- Six knucklebones</p> | <p>Barberà 1990 believes the assemblage to be incomplete. He also argues that the presence of perfume bottles that still contained remains of perfumed oil seems to indicate that this was not an indigenous grave. It also should be noted that, unlike what happened in other cremations, the human remains were placed on the rock and not in an urn (Aquilué et al. 2012:87) With the material from this grave, in the Museum was kept the lip of a miniature handmade urn. There is no mention of it in the publication, however.</p> |
| 5 (sixth century BC) |  |  | <p>-Very fine gold ring with rectangular section.</p> <p>-Small bronze ring, possibly from a chain.</p> <p>-Small bronze brooch <i>de resorte bilateral</i>.</p>  | <p>-Fragment of bronze sheet with a small rivet in it</p> <p>-Fragments of possible <i>scalptorium</i></p> <p>-Fragments of possible bronze nails</p>  | <p>Barberà expresses some doubts on the location of the assemblage because of discrepancies in the documentation. The human remains were</p>   |

|                |  |  |  |                              |  |
|----------------|--|--|--|------------------------------|--|
|                |  |  | <p>-Other bronze bow brooch <i>de resort bilateral</i>, with a small iron ring around the body</p> <p>-Possible fragment of a bronze brooch of the type B or of the Gulf of Lion of Oliver 1986, corresponding to the upturned catchplate terminating in a button.</p>   |                              | placed on the rock and not in an urn (Aquilué et al. 2012:87)                  |
| 6              | -Very fragmented handmade urn            |  |  |                              |  |
| 7 (560-540 BC) | - <i>Bucchero oinochoe</i> (B-NERO Oe7). |  | <p>-Iron fragments with circular section. They were published as nails by Almagro. It is more likely, however, that they were parts of a bracelet. In this case, it would be a type with circular section. Graells (2010:103) is in favour of the interpretation as nails, because iron bracelets are usually not found in contexts dated after the beginning of the sixth century BC, but it is possible that this object</p> | -Unidentified iron fragments | The human remains were placed on the rock and not in an urn (Almagro 1955:385) |

|                |  |  |  |                        |  |
|----------------|--|--|--|------------------------|--|
|                |  |  | <p>was more ancient than the rest of the assemblage and represented an <i>heirloom</i>.</p> <p>-According to Pons 1984 (226 and 292), three of the iron fragments can also be identified as parts of a bow brooch, probably of the type 7B/Gulf of Lion of Oliver 1986:two fragments of the bow and one of the upturned catchplate. However, this last fragment does not seem to correspond to the ones preserved in the Museum (or at least I was not able to find the one corresponding to her drawing).</p> |                        |  |
| 8 (550-500 BC) | <p>-Vase of painted Iberian pottery, with very faded decoration, of which only the foot survives. Because of the globular body, it was possibly an urn <i>de orejetas</i> type IB-PEINTE 2411.</p> |  | <p>-Bronze belt buckle with two hooks. It is too ruined to identify the decoration, but the shape is the same as the one of the belt buckles in the cremations 2 and 11, type 25211 of Graells 2005.</p>   |                        |  |
| 9 (550-        | -Corinthian <i>pyxis</i>   |  | - Fragmentary bronze   | -Fragmentary handle of |  |



|      |  |  |   |   |  |
|------|--|--|---|---|--|
| 525) | <p>(CORINT Py8c) with lid (CORINT Cv6). Possibly produced in Southern Italy rather than in Greece (Graells 2010:80).</p> <p>- Etrusco Corinthian cup (ETRU-COR Ky1a), from the group 'a maschera umana' (Szilágyi 1992:581, n.79).</p> <p>- Miniature handmade vase.</p> <p>- Fragments of a handmade urn (possibly type CNT-EMP U2c).</p> | <p>- Iron spearhead, type III of Beylier 2012a</p> | <p>brooch of the type B or of Gulf of Lion of Oliver 1986. The bow, hinge and catchplate with upturned foot ending on a button are preserved</p> <p>- Fragmentary bronze brooch <i>de resort bilateral</i>. The foot and the hinge are present.</p> | <p><i>asimpulum</i>. Ribbon shaped, terminates on one extremity in an applique connecting it to the bowl of the vessel and on the other on a hook end, as in <i>simpula</i> type 2 of Lucas 2002-2003.</p> <p>- Bronze fragments. In the catalogue of the Museum they are marked as parts of a <i>simpulum</i>. They are a thick, flat, ribbon-shaped handle, progressively enlarged towards one of the extremities (an instrument with a similarly shaped handle is in the grave 9 of Anglès, depicted in Lucas 2002-2003:113) and a fragment of what could have represented the juncture between the handle and the bowl of the ladle. The bowl appears to have been semi spherical like in the above mentioned <i>simpulum</i>.</p> <p>- Fragments of the lips of at least two different metal vessels (also identified and drawn in Pons 1984:200 and 291).</p> |  |
|------|--|--|---|---|--|

|                 |  |  |  |  |   |
|-----------------|--|--|--|--|---|
|                 |  |  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Fragments of a thin bronze thread with tubular section, one attached to a fragment of bronze sheet that could pertain to a vessel.</li> <li>- Ribbon-shaped fragments of bronze sheet, too thin in section to represent the handle of a <i>simpulum</i>. On one extremity, a small rivet. The other ends in a possible <i>applique</i> that would have joined the ribbon to a vessel. Similar to the thin, ribbon shaped bronze element in cremation 1.</li> <li>-Flat fragment of bronze joined to a possible rivet.</li> <li>-Fragments of a hollow bronze tubular object with circular section (possible handle of a vessel?).</li> <li>-Fragments of two iron knives.</li> </ul> |   |
| 10 (560-540 BC) | -Jar in grey pottery. It is regarded as a Phocian production rather than a colonial imitation because of the appearance of the clay and the motif that |  | -Fragment of a bronze bracelet with semi-circular section, open and with the extremities terminating in small spheres. |  | Barberà 1990 considers this assemblage not indigenous because of the presence of the unusual jar. |

|              |  |  |  |   |  |
|--------------|--|--|--|---|--|
|              | <p>decorates it (Graells 2010:86, pers comm from P. Castanyer).</p> <p>-Handmade urn with concave foot and biconical body (CNT-EMP U2b).</p>   |  |  |   |  |
| 11 (575-500) | <p>-Handmade urn with lid (CNT-EMP V3c for the lid, urn type G32 of Pons1984)</p> <p>- Two miniature handmade jars.</p> <p>- Handmade bowl with handle.</p> <p>-Handmade bowl (CNT-EMP C4c).</p> |  | <p>-A scarab type VI of Padrò 1983a, in white glazed glass paste, with the incision of a winged creature on the reverse. Padrò identifies the creature as a sphinx with falcon head and deems this an Egyptian specimen from Naucratis, dating this type of object to the sixth century BC (Padrò 1983a:55-56, b:47-50). Graells thinks the creature is a gryphon, which could sometimes be represented with falcon head. He believes that the production of the object could also be Phoenician or Chipriot (Graells 2010:58).</p> <p>-A small bronze bow brooch of the type 7B or of the Gulf of Lion of</p> | <p>- An iron knife</p> <p>- Fragments of a <i>simpulum</i>, initially interpreted as elements of a helmet or small cauldron and of a strigil. The handle is extremely similar to the first one described in cremation 9.</p> <p>-Bronze tweezers</p> <p>-Bronze fragments of an unidentified object (possibly other tweezers)</p> |  |

|                 |   |   |  |   |   |
|-----------------|---|---|--|---|---|
|                 |   |   | <p>Oliver 1986.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Several elements of bronze chain, including a large bronze ring joined to two smaller ones and another bronze ring terminating in a spherical pendant like the ones in burial 2 and 5.</li> <li>-Fragments of a possible bronze signet ring</li> <li>- A belt buckle with two hooks, same type as the ones in graves 2 and, ostensibly, 8 (type 25211 of Graells 2005).</li> </ul> |   |   |
| 12              | <p>-Fragments of an 'Ionian' cup, very altered by the action of fire. It was published as 'Attic' by Almagro.</p>   |   |  |   |   |
| 13 (550-525 BC) | <p>-Two <i>bucchero kantharoi</i> (one type B-NERO Ct3e3 and one B-NERO Ct3h).</p> <p>-Fragments of <i>oinochoe</i> in Grey Monochrome pottery (Dicocer GR-MONO 8ac, the vase is too fragmentary to</p> | <p>Two iron elements with circular section, one of which has pointed end. They were published by Almagro as nails, despite the dimensions, far superior to those of any other object identified as such. Pons</p> | <p>-<i>Cardium</i> shell</p>   | <p>- Fragments of a possible <i>simpulum</i>, originally part of it was regarded as a possible helmet</p> <p>-Small fragment of iron, possibly from a knife</p> | <p>The assemblage is possibly incomplete, according to Almagro's excavation notes (Barberà 1990:204).</p> |

|  |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>reconstruct the exact shape). Possibly a Phocian production because of the colour of the clay and the decoration on the neck (Graells 2010:86).</p> <p>-Lip and neck of a Grey Monochrome jar of the same shape of the one in cremation 10 (GR-MONO 9a). It is decorated with a similar motif on the neck as the <i>oinochoe</i>. Possibly Phocian because of the appearance of the clay and of the decoration (based on comparison with the other vases considered Phocian in the literature.</p> <p>P.Castanyer, in pers. comm., agrees with this interpretation).</p> <p>-Handmade dish with tronco-conical section (shape not present in the Dicocer, close to 18a2 of Pons 1984).</p> <p>-Two handmade dishes</p> | <p>(1984:234) interprets them as parts of a spear of the same type as the one in burial 9. Beylier (2012a:272) considers them part of a possible <i>soliferreum</i>, that would have been deposited in the burial only partially. It should be noted that they do not present traces of bending-typical mean of destruction of javelins.</p> |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|

|                 |  |                 |                              |                             |   |
|-----------------|--|-----------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
|                 | with high foot (shape not present in the Dicocer, close to 18a2 of Pons 1984).   |                 |                              |                             |   |
| 14              | -Lower half of the ossuary, a painted Iberian vase. The surviving part of the vase is a flat foot and the profile of an oval body  |                 |                              |                             | Almagro believed this burial to have been disrupted by the construction of the wall.  |
| 15 (550-500 BC) | <p>-<i>Bucchero oinochoe</i> (B-NERO Oe7).</p> <p>-Fragments of two handmade urns, one so broken that the shape cannot be reconstructed. The other is extremely fragmented.</p> <p>-Fragments of two handmade lids.</p> <p>-Fragment of handmade cup with tronco-conical profile, like the ones in burials 2 and 13.</p> |                 |                              |                             | The material was found in a crack in the rock. Almagro 1955 thinks the grave had been damaged already when the Roman wall was built, at least in terms of the soil that covered the grave being removed. Barberà 1990 considers this funerary equipment partial and incomplete, and also doubts the reconstructed shapes of the handmade vessels. Not included in Graells 2010's catalogue of the burials with imports in Iberia. |
| 16 (600-500 BC) |  |                 | -Italic brooch 'a navicella' |                             |   |
| 17 (560-        | -Small <i>olpe</i> in Massalian  | -Fragments of a | -Bronze and iron brooch      | - Fragments of two possible | The coherence of the  |

|         |   |   |   |   |  |
|---------|---|---|---|---|--|
| 540 BC) | <p>cream ware (Graells 2010:86).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fragmentary 'Ionian' cup type B2 of Vallet and Villard 1955 (Dicocer GREC-OR KyB2), decorated in black glaze. It was probably produced in South Italy because of the appearance of the clay (Marta Santos, pers. comm.). It should be noted that chemical analyses from B2 cups excavated in the Palaiapolis, as well as in Marseille and in the shipwrecks of Pointe Lequin 1A and Cala Sant Vincenc, nearl Ibiza, all point to production in the same workshop, most likely a Western one (Krotscheck 2008:151).</li> <li>- Fragmentary 'Ionian' cup, type A2 of Vallet and Villard 1955 (GREC-OR KyA2 in Dicocer), decorated in red glaze. According to Graells (2010:80-81), it can be</li> </ul> | <p>possible iron spearhead.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Fragments of a possible iron spear heel.</li> <li>- At least 25 (21 in the publication) bronze fragments decorated with circular motifs, considered a possible cuirass. At least 8 of them are circular fragments decorated with a motif of rivets (thickness: 0, 4 cm). Graells 2014 considers the disks as belonging to the type 3a of his typology of curiasses. The possible shape of the cuirass will be discussed further in the chapter. Possibly part of the cuirass (or of greaves) are various fragments of bronze sheet with a central linear motif (thickness: 0, 6 cm).</li> <li>-Fragment of a possible bronze greave.</li> </ul> | <p>type 7B or of the Gulf of Lion of Oliver 1986. It has a particularly long hinge on both sides.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Big iron brooch of the Gulf of Lion type, or type 7B, of Oliver 1986 The brooch is missing the foot and catch plate, but the bow and hinge suggest a possible pertinence to the same type as the bronze one.</li> </ul> | <p><i>simpula</i>. In the museum, 5 fragments of bronze, including a possible handle, are labelled as part of one of these vessels. However, other fragments could correspond to the lip and body of the bowl one of these vessels (the profile of the cup is particularly similar to that of one of the <i>simpula</i> from Granja Soley, see Sanmartí et al 1982:91) and another possible ribbon shaped handle.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bronze tweezers.</li> <li>- Iron knife.</li> </ul> | <p>assemblage is doubtful as observed by Barberà 1990, who reports contradictions in the description of the excavation. Aquilué et al. 2012 also point out that the material could belong to different, mixed assemblages.</p> |
|---------|---|---|---|---|--|

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | <p>ascribed to a workshop from Great Greece, most likely Calabria, where similar productions are documented in Reggio, Locri and Sibaris.</p> <p>-Handmade urn of big dimensions.</p> <p>-Handmade vase with decorated neck.</p> <p>-Painted local vase of big dimensions, extremely fragmentary. Almagro presents a drawing of the supposed shape of the entire vase, but it is doubtful how the shape was identified from the very small fragments kept in the Museum.</p> |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

### Inhumations

| Number, chronology | Pottery                                | Personal ornaments   | Notes                             |
|--------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| 1 (600-500 BC)     | -A miniature cup in handmade pottery   | <p>-Bronze button</p> <p>-Three glass paste beads, one ring shaped, one spherical and one oval.</p> <p>-Three ring shaped bone (or possibly horn) beads.</p> |                                   |
| 2 (550-500 BC)     | - Corinthian <i>aryballos</i> (CORINT' |  | Barberà (1990:205) considers this |



|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
|  | Ar2B2)<br>- A handmade urn on foot (CNT-EMP U1c of Dicocer and 18b of Pons 1984)<br>-Fragment of a handmade lid, probably for the urn. |  | burial non indigenous, because of the presence of the perfume vase and the orientation. |
|--|--|--|---|

## Bibliography

- Algazi, G., 2005, Diversity Rules: Peregrine Horden and Nicholas Purcell's *The Corrupting Sea*, *Mediterranean Historical Review* 20-2, 227-245.
- Almagro, M., 1953, *Las necrópolis de Ampurias. Vol I: necrópolis griegas*. Barcelona: Diputació Provincial
- Almagro, M., 1955, *Las necrópolis de Ampurias. Vol II: necrópolis romanas y necropolis indígenas*. Barcelona: Diputació Provincial.
- Almagro, M. and Ruiz, G., 1992, Paleoetnologia de la Península Ibérica, *Complutum* 2-3, 469-499.
- Anwar, N. and Curé, A.-M., 2011, Lattes. In: Roure, R., and Pernet, M. (eds), *Des rites et des hommes*. Paris: Errance, 194-197.
- Appadurai, A., 1986, Introduction: commodities and the politics of value. In: Appadurai, A. (ed), *The social life of things*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-63.
- Aquilué, X., Castanyer, P., Santos, M., Tremoleda, J., 2008, Noves evidències del comerç fenici amb les comunitats indígenes de l'entorn d'Empúries. In: Garcia i Rubert, D., Moreno Martínez, I., and Gracia Alonso, F. (eds), *Contactes. Indígenes i fenicis a la Mediterrània occidental entre els segles VII i VI ANE*, Barcelona: Cevagraf, 171-190.
- Aquilué, X., Castanyer, P., Santos, M., Tremoleda, J., 2010, Grecs et indigènes aux origines de l'enclave phocéenne d'Emporion, In: Treziny, H. (ed), *Grecs et indigènes de la Catalogne à la Mer Noire*, Errance, Paris, 65-78.
- Aquilué, X., Castanyer, P., Santos, M., Tremoleda, J., 2012, El paisatge funerari en el territori d'Empúries, entre el bronze final i la primera edat del ferro. In: Rovira i Hortalà, C., Lopez i Cachero, J., Mazière, F. (eds.), *Les necròpolis d'Incineració entre l'Ebre i el Tíber (segles IX-VI aC). metodologia, pràctiques funeràries i societat. Taula rodona Internacional. Barcelona, 21 i 22 de novembre de 2008*. Barcelona: MAC, 75-90.

- Arafat, K. and Morgan, C., 1994, Athens, Etruria and the Heuneburg: mutual misconceptions in the study of Greek-barbarian relations. In Morris, I.(ed), *Classical Greece: ancient histories and modern archaeologies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 108-134.
- Arcelin, P., 1979, La nécropole de l'Arcoule, commune du Paradou (Bouches- du- Rhône), *Documents d'Archéologie meridionale* 2, 133-135.
- Arcelin, P.1999, L'habitat dans l'image sociale du Gaulois du Midi: La question des résidences aristocratiques, In: Braemer,F., Cleuziou,S. and Coudart, A., *Habitat et société : actes des rencontres 22-23-24 octobre 1998*, Antibes: APDCA, 439-480.
- Arcelin, P. and Arcelin-Pradelle, C., 1973, La nécropole protohistorique de La Catalane aux Baux-de-Provence. *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise* 6, 91-189.
- Arcelin-Pradelle, C.1984, *La céramique grise monochrome en Provence*. *Revue Archéologique Narbonnaise*.
- Arcelin-Pradelle, C., Dedet, B., Py, M., 1982, La céramique grise monochrome en Languedoc oriental., *Revue Archéologique Narbonnaise* 15, 19-65
- Arnal, J., 1963, Un torques hallstattico inedito (Belarga, Hèrault, France), *Ampurias* 15, 203-205
- Asensi, R.M., 1991, Los materiales etruscos del orientalizante reciente y período arcaico de la Península Ibérica: Las cerámicas etrusco-corintias de Ampurias, In: Remesal, J. and Musso, O (eds), *La presencia de material etrusco en la Peninsula Iberica*, Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona, 225-239.
- Askegaard, S., 2014, Consumer Culture Theory: Neo-liberalism's 'useful idiots'?, *Marketing Theory* 14-4, 1-5.
- Aspöck, E., 2008, What Actually Is a 'Deviant Burial'? Comparing German-Language and Anglophone Research on Deviant Burials. In: Murphy, E.M. (ed.), *Deviant Burial in the Archaeological Record* Oxford: Oxbow Books.17-34.
- Austin, M.M. and Vidal-Naquet, P. 1977, *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece: An Introduction*. London: B.T.Batsford.
- Azzouz, O.B. and Ugolini, D., 2008, *Musée de l'Ephébe*, Montpellier: J.F. Impression.
- Bagnasco Gianni, G., 2006, Caratterizzazione e diffusione delle ceramiche depurate tra Etruria e Francia Meridionale, In: Gori,S. and Bettini M.C. (eds), *Gli Etruschi da Genova ad*

*Ampurias. Atti del XXIV Convegno di Studi Etruschi ed Italici, Marseille-Lattes, 26 settembre - 1 ottobre 2002.* Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 221-232.

Barberà i Farras, J. 1990, La necrópolis de la muralla NE de Ampurias en el proceso de la iberización, *Verdolay* 2, 201-206.

Bats. M., 2006, Systemes chronologiques et mobiliers etrusques du Midi de la Gaule au premier age du Fer (v. 600-480 av. J-C): les rythmes de l'archeologie et de l'histoire. In: Gori, S. and Bettini M.C. (eds), *Gli Etruschi da Genova ad Ampurias. Atti del XXIV Convegno di Studi Etruschi ed Italici, Marseille-Lattes, 26 settembre - 1 ottobre 2002.* Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 81-92.

Bats, M., 2013, La transformation des reseaux maritimes en Méditerranée occidentale vers 540/530 et le debut du control Massaliète des circulations maritimes dans le Midi. In Verger, S., and Pernet, L. (eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule.* Paris: Errance, 332-337.

Baxter, J.E., 2005, *The archaeology of Childhood: Children, Gender and Material Culture.* Walnut Creek: AltaMira.

Belarte, M.C. and de Chazelles, C.-A. 2011, Les manifestations de pratiques rituelles en context domestique en Ibérie et en Gaule méditerranéenne. In Roure, R. and Pernet, M. (eds), *Des rites et des hommes.* Paris: Errance, 165-179.

Beylier, A., 2012a, *L'armement et le guerrier en Méditerranée nord-occidentale au Premier âge du Fer.* Lattes: UMR5140 CNR.

Beylier, A., 2012b, Le depot d'armes dans les tombes du Languedoc occidental au premier Age du Fer: essai de caractérisation. In: Rovira i Hortalà, C., Lopez i Cachero, J., Mazière, F. (eds.), *Les necròpolis d'Incineració entre l'Ebre i el Tíber (segles IX-VI aC). metodologia, pràctiques funeràries i societat. Taula rodona Internacional. Barcelona, 21 i 22 de novembre de 2008.* Barcelona:MAC, 425-431.

Beylier, A., 2013, Les armes dans les tombes et les conflits armées. In Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule.* Paris: Errance, 350-355.

Berry, C. J., 1994, *The idea of luxury: A Conceptual and Historical Investigation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Bertucchi, G., 1992, Necropoles et terrasses funéraires à l'époque grecque. Bilan sommaire des recherches. In: Bats, M., Bertucchi, G., Gonges, G. and Treziny, H., *Marseille grecque et la Gaule*, Lattes: ADM, 123-137.
- Bhabha, H.K., 1990, *Nation and narration*. New York: Routledge.
- Boardman, J. 1999, *The Greeks Overseas*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Boisson, H., 2002, Deux structures liées à la production de céramique non tournée du premier âge du Fer à Mailhac (Aude), *Documents d'Archéologie meridionale* 25, 7-31.
- Boric, D. 2002, "Deep Time" Metaphor. Memory and Apotropaic Practices at Lepenski Vir, *Journal of Social Archaeology* 3(1), 46-74.
- Botto, M., and Vives Ferrandiz, J., 2006, Importazioni etrusche tra la Baleari e la Penisola Iberica (VIII-prima metà del V sec. A.C.), In: Della Fina, M. (ed), *Gli Etruschi e il Mediterraneo. Commerci e politica. Atti del XIII Convegno Internazionale di Studi sulla Storia e l'Archeologia dell'Etruria (2005)*, *Annali della Fondazione per il Museo C.Faina*, Rome: Qasar, 117-196.
- Bouffier, S., 201 3, Le control carthaginoise des trafics en Sicilie occidentale à la fine de l'époque archaïque. In Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*, Paris: Errance, 345-346.
- Bouloumié, B., Vases de bronze étrusques du service du vin. In: Swaddling, J. (ed), *Papers of the Sixth British Museum Classical Colloquium: Italian Iron Age Artefacts in the British Museum*, 63-79.
- Bouloumié, B. 1991, *Saint-Blaise: l'habitat protohistorique. Les céramiques grecques*. Aix-en-Provence: Travaux du Centre Camille Julien.
- Brown, J.A., 1981, The search for rank in prehistoric burials. In: Chapman, R., Kinnes, I. and Randsborg, K. (eds), *The Archaeology of Death*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 25-37.
- Buret, G., 2003, Les disques perlés en bronze de Gaule meridionale (VI-II s. av. J.C.) In: Landes, C. (ed.), *Les Etrusques en France. Archéologie et collections. Catalogue d'exposition*. Lattes: Musée archéologique Henri Prades, 55-57.
- Cabrè, J. 1908, Hallazgos arqueológicos, *Boletín de Historia y Geografía del Bajo Aragón* II.5, 214-244.

- Cabrè, J. 1942, El thymiatierion celtico de Calaceite, *Archivo Espanol de Arqueologia* 15, 181-216.
- Carbrera, P., 1988, Greek trade in Iberia: the extent of interaction, *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 17(2), 191- 206.
- Cannon, A.1989, The Historical Dimension in Mortuary Expressions of Status and Sentiment, *Current anthropology* 30,4, 437-458.
- Cartledge, P.1983, 'Trade and Politics' revisited: Archaic Greece. In Garnsey, P., Hopkins, K. and Whittaker, C.R. (eds), *Trade in the Ancient Economy*, 1-15. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Castro Curel, Z., 1989, Fusayolas ibericas, antecedentes y empleos, *Cypsela: revista de prehistòria i protohistòria* 3, 127-147.
- Castanyer, P., Santos,M., Aquilué, X., Tremolada, J., Pons,E., Martín, A., Rovira, M., Mata, J., 2008, Elaboración y comercio de la plata y plomo en la Emporion griega y en los hàbitats ibèricos de su entorno, *Revista d'arqueologia de Ponent* 18, 270-291.
- Castanyer, P., Santos, M., Tremoleda, J., 2015, Nuevos datos arqueològicos sobre la evolución urbana de Emporion, In: Roure, R. (ed), *Contactes et acculturations en Méditerranée Occidentale*, Paris: Errance,121-129.
- Castilla Rodriguez, A., 2005, Sobre los ajuares de la necropolis de La Atalaya, Cortes de Navarra, *Quadernos de Arqueologia de la Universidad de Navarra* 13, 115-210.
- Chardenon, N. and Bel,V., 2003 Une tombe du VI siècle avant notre ère à la Céreirède. In Pernet, L. and Py, M. (eds.), *Les objets racontent Lattara*. Paris: Errance, 18.
- Chausserie-Laprée, J. 2011, Martigues et sa region. In Roure, R. and Pernet, M. (eds), *Des rites et des homes*. Paris: Errance , 189-193.
- Codina, D., and Montalbàn, C., Tipologia dels enterraments localizats al sector 3 del la necropolis de Vilanera (L'Escala, Alt Empordà), Rovira i Hortala, C., Lopez i Cachero, J., Mazière, F. (eds.), *Les necròpolis d'Incineració entre l'Ebre i el Tíber (segles IX-VI aC). metodologia, pràctiques funeràries i societat. Taula rodona Internacional. Barcelona, 21 i 22 de novembre de 2008*, Barcelona: MAC,153-160.
- Columeau, P., 1984, Etude de la faune. In: Py et al 1984b, *La Liquière (Calvisson, Gard): Village du premier age du fer en Languedoc oriental (Revue archeologique de Narbonnaise)*, 335-348.

- Cook, B.F., 1968, A class of Etruscan Bronze Omphalos-Bowls. *American Journal of Archaeology*, 72-4, 337-344.
- Cummings, V. 2003, Building from memory. In Williams, H. (ed.), *Archaeologies of remembrance: death and memory in past societies*. Heidelberg: Springer, 25-43.
- Cunliffe, B. 1988, *Greeks, Romans and barbarians: Spheres of interaction*. London: Guild.
- Curti, E., Dench, E. and Patterson, J. 1996, The archaeology of central and southern Roman Italy: recent trends and approaches, *Journal of Roman Studies* 96, 170-189.
- Cusick, J.G. 1998, Historiography of Acculturation: An Evaluation of Concepts and Their Application in Archaeology. In Cusick, J.G. (ed), *Studies in Culture Contact: Interaction, Culture Change and Archaeology* (Center for Archaeological Investigations. Southern Illinois University, Occasional Paper n.25), 126-145. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.
- Daveau, I. and Py, M., 2015, Grecs et Etrusques à Lattes: nouvelles données à partir de le fouilles de la Cougourlude. In: Roure, R. (ed), *Contactes et acculturations en Méditerranée Occidentale*, Paris: Errance, 31-42.
- Diaz-Andreu, M. And Lucy, S., 2005, Introduction. In: Diaz-Andreu et al., *The Archeology of Identity*. London And New York: Routledge, 1-12.
- de Chazelles ,C. A., Mauné,S., Sanchez, C. and Ropiot, V., 2001, Autour des oppida de Montlaurès (Aude) et de Saint-Siméon (Pézenas, Hérault) : méthodes et résultats d'une recherche sur le territoire vivrier de deux agglomérations protohistoriques (VIe-Ve s. av. J.-C.). In: Martin, A. and Plana-Mallart, R.(eds), *Actes de la table-ronde d'Ullastret, Territori politic i territori rural durant l'edat del Ferro a la Mediterrania occidenta, 25-27 mai 2000*, Girona: MAC, 115-143.
- DeMarrais, E., Castillo, L.J. and Earle,T., 1996, Ideology, materialization, and power strategies, *Current Anthropology* 37.1, 15-31.
- Dedet, B., 1995, Grecs, Etrusques et indigènes dans les Garrigues du Languedoc oriental au premier Age du Fer. In: Arcelin, P., Bats, M., Garcia, D., Marchand, G.and Schwaller, M. (eds), *Sur les pas des Grecs en Occident, Hommages à André Nickels*, Paris: Errance, 277-307.
- Dedet, B. 2008, *Les enfants dans la société protohistorique. L'exemple du sud de la France*, Rome: Collections de l'Ecole Francaise.

- Dedet, B., 2012, Mobilier funéraire et statut des enfants dans le monde indigène protohistorique du sud de la France In: Hermay, A. and Dubosse, C., *L'Enfant et la mort dans l'Antiquité Actes du colloque international organisé à la Maison Méditerranéenne des Sciences de l'Homme (MMSH) d'Aix-en-Provence, 20-22 janvier 2011. III. Le matériel associé aux tombes d'enfants*, Aix-en-Provence: Centre Camille Jullian, 149-171.
- Dedet, B., 2012b, Tombes sur bucher et depots secondaires d'incinération en Languedoc oriental et Provence au premier age du Fer. In: Rovira i Hortalà, C., Lopez i Cachero, J., Mazière, F. (eds.), *Les necròpolis d'Incineració entre l'Ebre i el Tíber (segles IX-VI aC). metodologia, pràctiques funeràries i societat. Taula rodona Internacional. Barcelona, 21 i 22 de novembre de 2008*. Barcelona:MAC, 209-230.
- Dedet, B., Janin, T., Marchand, G., Schwaller, M., 2003 Canthares, bassins et amphores pour l'au-delà: la nécropole de Saint Julien en Languedoc (Pézenas, Hérault). In Landes, C. (ed.), *Les Etrusques en France. Archéologie et collections. Catalogue d'exposition*. Lattes: Musée archéologique Henri Prades, 169-182.
- Dedet, B., Janin, T., Marchand, G., Schwaller, M., 2006 'Les Étrusques en Languedoc central: des premiers contacts au commerce, In: Gori, S. and Bettini M.C. (eds), *Gli Etruschi da Genova ad Ampurias. Atti del XXIV Convegno di Studi Etruschi ed Italici, Marseille-Lattes, 26 settembre - 1 ottobre 2002*. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 145-158.
- Dedet, B., and Py, M., 1975 *Classification de la céramique non tournée protohistorique du Languedoc méditerranéen*, *Revue Archéologique Narbonnaise, supplement 4*.
- Dedet, B. and Py, M., 1985, *L'occupation des rivages de l'Etang de Maguio au Bronze Final et au Première Age du Fer, Tome III*. Montpellier: Association pour la Recherche Archéologique en Languedoc Oriental.
- Dedet, B. and Py, M., 2006, Chronologie et diffusion des importations étrusques in Languedoc oriental, In: Gori, S. and Bettini M.C. (eds), *Gli Etruschi da Genova ad Ampurias. Atti del XXIV Convegno di Studi Etruschi ed Italici, Marseille-Lattes, 26 settembre - 1 ottobre 2002*. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 121-145.
- Dedet, B. and Py, M., 2008, *Les oppida du Gard*, Nîmes: Conseil General du Gard.
- Demetriou, D. 2012, *Negotiating Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



- Descat, R. 1995 *L'économie antique et la cité grecque. Un modèle en question. Annales. Économies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 50, 961-989.
- Dicocer, Py., M et al, *Dictionnaire des céramiques anciennes*, <http://syslat.on-rev.com/DICOCER/d.index.html>, last consulted, 25/06/2016
- Dietler, M. 1989, Greeks, Etruscans and thirsty barbarians: Early Iron Age interaction in the Rhône Basin of France. In Champion, T.C., (ed), *Centre and Periphery: Comparative Studies in Archaeology*, 127-137. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Dietler, M., 1990, Driven by Drink: the role of drinking in the political economy and the case of Early Iron Age France. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, 9-4, 352-406.
- Dietler, M., 1995, The cup of Gyptis: rethinking the colonial encounter in Early Iron Age Western Europe and the relevance of world-system models. *Journal of European Archaeology*, 3(2), 89-111.
- Dietler, M. 1999, Consumption, cultural frontiers and identity: anthropological approaches to Greek colonial encounters. In Stazio, A. and Ceccoli, S. (eds), *Confini e frontiera nella Grecità d'Occidente: Atti del Trentasettesimo Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia (Taranto, 3-6 ottobre 1997)*, 475-501. Naples: Arte Tipografica.
- Dietler, M. 2005, *Consumption and Colonial Encounters in the Rhône Basin of France: a Study of Early Iron Age Political Economy* (Monographies d'Archéologie Méditerranéenne). Lattes: CNRS.
- Dietler, M. 2009, Colonial Encounters in Iberia and the Western Mediterranean: An Exploratory Framework. In Dietler, M. and López Ruiz, C., (eds), *Colonial Encounters in Ancient Iberia: Phoenician, Greek and Indigenous Relations*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 3-48.
- Dietler, M., 2010, *Archaeologies of Colonialism*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: The University Of California Press.
- Dobres, M. A., and Robb, J. E., 2005, "Doing" Agency: Introductory Remarks on Methodology, *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 12-3, 159-166.
- Dominguez, A.J., 1999, 'Hellenisation' in Iberia? The Reception of Greek Products and Influences by the Iberians, In: Tsetskhladze, G. (ed.), *Ancient Greeks. West and East*, Leiden: Mnemosyne, 301-329.

- Dominguez, A.J., 2002, Greeks in Iberia: colonialism without colonisation. In: Lyons, C. and Papadopoulos, J. (eds), 2002, *The Archaeology of Colonialism*, Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 65-95.
- Dominguez, A. J. 2004, Greek identity in the Phocaean colonies. In: *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean: Papers in Honour of Brian Shefton*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 429-456.
- Dominguez, A.J., 2013, Greeks and non-Greeks in the City of Emporion and the Construction of Their Different Identities, *Electrum* 20, 23-36.
- Donati, L., 1991, Considerazioni su un oenochoe da Ullastret, , In: Remesal, J. and Musso, O (eds), *La presencia de material etrusco en la Peninsula Iberica*, Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona, 577-587.
- Douglas, M., and Isherwood, B., 1979, *The world of goods. Towards an anthropology of consumption*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Dubosse, C., 2007 *Ensérune, Nissan-lez-Ensérune, Hérault: les céramiques grecques et de type grec dans leurs contextes, VIe-IVe s. av. n. è.* Lattes :UMR 5140 du CNRS, Archéologie des Sociétés Méditerranéennes.
- Dunbabin, T. J. 1948, *The Western Greeks*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dunbabin, T. J. 1957, *The Greeks and their Eastern Neighbours*. London: Society for the promotion of Hellenic Studies.
- Dunn, R.G. 2008, *Identifying consumption: subjects and objects in consumer society*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Eckardt, H. and Williams, H. 2003, Objects without a past? In Williams, H. (ed.), *Archaeologies of remembrance: death and memory in past societies*. Heidelberg: Springer, 25-43.
- Elia, D., 2012, Sepulture di pre-adulti nelle necropoli greche dell'Italia meridionale : osservazioni sulle strategie di rappresentazione tra periodo tardo-arcaico e età classica, In Hermay, A. and Dubosse, C., *L'Enfant et la mort dans l'Antiquité Actes du colloque international organisé à la Maison Méditerranéenne des Sciences de l'Homme (MMSH) d'Aix-en-Provence, 20-22 janvier 2011. III. Le matériel associé aux tombes d'enfants*. Aix-en-Provence: Centre Camille Jullian, 97-111.

- Erroux, J., 1984, Etude de quelques graines de La Liquière. In: In: Py et al 1984b, La Liquière (Calvisson, Gard): Village du premier age du fer en Languedoc oriental (Revue archeologique de Narbonnaise), 349-350.
- Esteve Gàlvez, F.1999, *Recerques Arqueologiques A La Ribera Baixa De L'Ebre*. Amposta: Museu del Montsià , Ajuntament d'Amposta.
- Farnié Lobensteiner, C. and Quesada Sanz, F. 2005, *Espadas de hierro, grebas de bronce. Símbolos de poder e instrumentos de guerra a comienzos de la Edad del Hierro en la Península Ibérica*. Murcia: Monografías del Museo de Arte Ibérico de El Cigarralejo 2.
- Felder, K., 2015, Networks of Meaning and the Social Dynamics of Identity. An Example from Early Anglo-Saxon England, In: *Papers from the Institute of Archaeology*, 25(1), 1-20.
- Feugère, M., 1992, Essai d'inventaire archéologique de la commune de Campagnan (Hérault), *Archeologie en Languedoc*, 15-24.
- Feugère, M., 2007, Cultes domestiques in Languedoc preromain: magie ou religion? In: *Ephesia Grammata* 1-2007, 1-10.
- Feugère, M. and Newman, C. 2010, Mobilier Votif Du Mas De Causse. In Pernet, L. and Py, M. (eds.), *Les objets racontent Lattara*, Errance, Paris: Errance, 30-31.
- Fortes, M.1984, Age, generation, and social structure. In Kertzer, D.I. and Keith, J., *Age and anthropological theory*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 99-122.
- Foxhall, L.1998, Cargoes of the heart's desire: the character of trade in the archaic Mediterranean world. In Fisher, N. and van Wees, H. (eds), *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, 295-308. London and Swansea: Duckworth and The Classical Press of Wales
- Foxhall, L., 2000, The Running Sands of Time: Archaeology and the Short-Term. *World Archaeology*, 31- 3, 484-498.
- Foxhall, L. 2005, Village to City: Staples and Luxuries? Exchange Networks and Urbanization. In Osborne, R. and Cunliffe, B., *Mediterranean Urbanization 800-600 BC*, 233-248. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frankenstein, S. and Rowlands, M.J. 1978, The internal structure and regional context of Early Iron Age Society in southwestern Germany. *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology* 15, 73-112.

- Frère, D. 2006, La céramique étrusco-corinthienne in Gaule, In: Gori, S. and Bettini M.C. (eds), *Gli Etruschi da Genova ad Ampurias. Atti del XXIV Convegno di Studi Etruschi ed Italici, Marseille-Lattes, 26 settembre - 1 ottobre 2002*. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 249-280.
- Fulminante, F., 2012, Social Network Analysis and the Emergence of Central Places. A Case Study from Bronze and Early Iron Age Central Italy. *BaBesch* 87, 1-27.
- Gailledrat, É. 1995, Grecs et Ibères dans la nécropole d'Ampurias (VI-II siècles av. J.-C.), *Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez* 31, 32-54.
- Gailledrat, É. 1997, *Les ibères de l'Èbre à l'Hérault (VIe-IVe s. avant J.-C.)* Lattes: UMR 5140 CNRS.
- Gailledrat, É., 2015, New Perspectives on Emporia in the Western Mediterranean: Greeks, Etruscans and Native Populations at the Mouth of the Lez (Hérault, France) during the Sixth–Fifth Centuries BC, *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology*, 28-1, 23-50.
- Garcia, D., 1987, Observations sur la production et le commerce des céréales en Languedoc. *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise*, 20, 43-98.
- Garcia, D. 1993, *Entre Ibères et Ligures: Lodévois et moyenne vallée de l'Hérault protohistoriques*. Paris: CNRS Éditions.
- Garcia, D., 1995, Le territoire d'Agde grecque et l'occupation du sol en Languedoc central durant l'Age du fer. In: Arcelin, P., Bats, M., Garcia, D., Marchand, G., Schwaller, M. (eds) *Sur les pas des Grecs en Occident*, 137-167.
- Garcia, D., 2002, Epave de Rochelongue, Cap d'Agde In: Long, L., Pomey, P. and Sourisseau, J.C., (eds.) *Les Étrusques en mer: épaves d'Antibes à Marseille*. Marseille: Édisud, 38-41.
- Garcia, D., 2009, L'organisation sociale des communautés du premier âge du Fer en Celtique méditerranéenne: ce que pourraient nous révéler les données de l'habitat... In : Belarte, M.-C., (ed). *L'espai domèstic i l'organització de la societat a la protohistòria de la Mediterrània occidental* (Ier mil·lenni aC). Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona, 57-66.
- Garcia, D., 2013a L'épave de Rochelongue (Agde, Hérault) In Verger, S., and Pernet, L. (eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*, Paris: Errance, 208-210.

- Garcia, D., 2013b , Campagnan, parure à perles d'ambre. In Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), Une odysée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule, Paris: Errance, 184.
- Garcia, D., 2015 *La Celtique méditerranéenne: Habitats et sociétés en Languedoc et en Provence du VIII<sup>e</sup> au II<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.C.*, Paris, Errance (second edition).
- Garcia, D. and Orliac, D., 1985 Mobilier d'une tombe du premier âge du fer au lieu-dit Les Faïsses à Mourèze (Hérault), *Documents d'Archéologie Méridionale*, 8,151-154.
- Garcia, D. and Marchand, G. 1995 A propos du faciès céramique d'Agde (Hérault), In Arcelin, P., Bats, M., Garcia, D., Marchand, G., Schwaller, M, (eds) *Sur les pas des Grecs en Occident*. Paris: Errance, 99-104.
- Garcia i Rubert, D. and Gracia Alonso, F., 2011, Phoenician trade in the North-East fo the Iberian Peninsula: a historiographical problem. *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 30 (1), 33-56.
- Gibson, J., 1979, The ecological approach to the visual perception of pictures. *Leonardo* II, 227-235.
- Giles, M., 2015, Performing pain, performing beauty. Dealing with difficult deaths in the Iron Age. *Cambrdige Archaeological Journal*, 25:3, 539-550.
- Giry, J.1965, La nécropole préromaine de St-Julien (Cne de Pézenas, Hérault). *Rivista di studi liguri* 31,117-235.
- Glennie, P.1995, Consumption within Historical Studies. In Miller, D. (ed), *Acknowledging Consumption*, 164-203. London and New York: Routledge.
- Gosden, C. 1985, Gifts and kin in Early Iron Age Europe. *Man* 20, 475-493.
- Gosden, C. 2004, *Archaeology and Colonialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gosden, C., and Marshall, Y., 1999, The cultural biography of objects. *World Archaeology* 31-2, 169-178.
- Graeber, D., Consumption. *Current Anthropology* 52, 489-511.
- Graells, R., 2005, Origen i dispersió dels fermalls de dos garfis i placa única. In: *XIII Colloqui Internacional d'Arqueologia de Puigcerdà: Món ibèric als Països Catalans. Homenatge a Josep Barberà i Farràs ,Puigcerdà 2003*. Puigcerdà: Institut d'Estudis Ceretans, 769-782.

- Graells, R., 2007, Cinturones imposibles VS ornamentació funeraria, o como entender las tumbas con dos cinturones de garfios en el Noreste peninsular (s.VI A.C.). *SALDVIE* 7, 39-46.
- Graells, R. , 2008, *La Necròpolis protohistòrica de Milmanda*. Barcelona: Institut Català d'Arqueologia Clàssica.
- Graells, R., 2009, Sobre una fíbula a navicella trobada a Ribes de Freser avui al Museu Episcopal de Vic, *Quaderns del Museu Episcopal de Vic* IV, 123-132.
- Graells, R. 2010, *Las tumbas con importaciones y la recepción del Mediterráneo en el nordeste de la Península Ibérica (ss. VII-VI aC)*. *Revista d'Arqueologia de Ponent Serie Extra* 1.
- Graells, R., 2011, Warriors and heroes from the North-East of Iberia: a View from the Funerary Contexts. In Moore, T., and Armada, X.L., (eds). *Atlantic Europe in the First Millennium BC: Crossing the Divide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 575-589.
- Graells, R. 2013a, Aristocracies languedociennes entre monde Hallstattien et Méditerranée (650-580 avant J.C.) In Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*, Paris: Errance, 54-59.
- Graells, R., 2013b Le depot de bronzes del Turò de la Font de la Canya (Avinyonet del Penedès, Tarragone) In Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*, Paris:Errance, 215.
- Graells, R., 2014, Discos coraza de la Peninsula Iberica (s. VI-IV AC). *Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums* 59, 85-244.
- Graells, R., 2015, El guerrero de Corno Lauzo: revisión dels materials, In: Roure, R. (ed), *Contactes et acculturations en Méditerranée Occidentale*, Errance, Paris, 121-129.
- Gras, M., 1985, Aspects de l'économie maritime étrusque. *Ktema*, 149-159.
- Gras, M., 1986, La coupe et l'échange dans la Méditerranée archaïque. In: *Hommages à François Daumas*. Montpellier: Université Paul Valéry, 351-360.
- Gras, M. 1997, *Il Mediterraneo nell'età arcaica*. Paestum: Fondazione Paestum.
- Gras. M., 2004, Les Etrusques vue de la Gaule. *Documents d'Archeologie Meridionale* 27, 213-135.

- Gregory, C., 1980, Gifts to men and gifts to God: Gift exchange and capital accumulation in contemporary Papua. *Man* 15.4, 626-652.
- Gruzinski, S. and Rouveret, A., 1976, "Ellos son como niños". Histoire et acculturation dans le Mexique colonial et l'Italie méridionale avant la Romanisation. *Mélanges de l'Ecole Française de Rome. Antiquité* 88, 159-219.
- Gusi, F. and Muriel, S., Panorama actual de la investigación de las inhumaciones infantiles en la Protohistoria del sudoeste mediterráneo europeo. In: Gusi, F., Muriel, S, Pujoles, R.. (eds), *Nasciturus, infans, puerulus, vobis mater terra. La muerte en la infancia*. Diputació de Castelló, Servei d'Investigacions Arqueològiques i Prehistòriques, 257-329.
- Guzman, M., 2013, Griegos e indígenas en Empóron (siglos VI-IV a.C.): un estado de la cuestión. *Faventia, Supplementum* 2, 187-202.
- Hall, J. M. 2002, *Hellenicity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Härke, H., 1990, Warrior Graves? The Background of the Anglo-Saxon Weapon Burial Rite. *Past and Present*, 22-43.
- Hayden, B., 1998, Practical and Prestige Technologies: The Evolution of Material Systems. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 5-1, 1-55.
- Helms, M.W., 1993, *Craft and the Kingly Ideal*. Austin: University of Texas.
- Herskovits, M.J., 1952, *Les bases de l'anthropologie culturelle*. Paris: Payot.
- Hérubel, F., 2000, Mobilier étrusque en Languedoc occidental (VIe-Ve s. av. J.-C.). *Documents d'archéologie méridionale* 23, 87-112.
- Hodder, I., 2010, Human-thing entanglement: towards an integrated archaeological perspective. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 17, 154-177.
- Hodder, I., 2012, *Entangled*. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hodos, T. 2006, *Local Responses to Colonization in the Iron Age Mediterranean*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Holtorf, C., 1998, The life-histories of megaliths in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (Germany), *World Archaeology* 30-1, 23-38.

- Horden, P. and Purcell, N., 2000, *The Corrupting Sea. A study of Mediterranean History*, Oxford: Blackwell
- Houlès, N. and Janin, T., 1992 Une tombe du premier Age du Fer au lieu-dit Saint-Antoine à Castelnau-de-Guers (Hérault). *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise* 25.1, 433-441.
- Hurcombe, L., 2007, *Archaeological Artefacts as Material Culture*, London: Routledge.
- Hurst, H.R., and Owen, S., *Ancient colonizations: analogy, similarity and difference*, London: Duckworth.
- James, A. and James, A.L, 2007, European Childhoods: An Overview, In James, A. and James, A.L. (eds.), *European childhoods: cultures, politics and childhoods in the European Union*. Palgrave Macmillan, 1-13.
- Janin, T., 1993 Âge au décès et "statut social" dans les sépultures à incinération du Premier âge du fer languedocien: première approche. *Bulletins et Mémoires de la Société d'anthropologie de Paris*, 5(1), 203-208.
- Janin, T.1996, Pratiques funéraires et sociétés protohistoriques en France méridionale: les nécropoles du Bronze final IIIB mailhacien, approche préliminaire et premiers résultats. *Revista d'arqueologia de Ponent* 6, 7-34.
- Janin, T.2000, Nécropoles et sociétés élysiques: les communautés du Premier âge du Fer en Languedoc occidental In Janin, T. (ed.), *Mailhac et le premier âge du Fer en Europe occidentale. Hommage à Odette et Jean Taffanel*. Lattes: UMR 5140 du CNRS, Archéologie des Sociétés Méditerranéennes, 117-131.
- Janin, T., Taffanel, O., Taffanel,J., Boisson, H., Chardenon, N., Gardeisen,A., Hérubel,F., Marchand,G., Montécinós, A. and Rouquet, J. 2002 La nécropole protohistorique du Grand Bassin II à Mailhac, Aude (VIe-Ve s. av. n. è.). *Documents d'archéologie méridionale*. 25, 65-122.
- Janin,T., and Py, M.. (eds) 2008, *La ville portuaire de Lattara (Lattes, Hérault) et son territoire: nouveaux acquis, nouvelles questions*. Gallia 65.
- Johnston, A.W. and Jones, R.E. 1978, The 'SOS' Amphora. *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 73, 103-141.



- Joy, J., 2009, Reinvigorating object biography: reproducing the drama of object lives, *World Archaeology* 41, 540-556.
- Joy, J., 2010, *Reflections on the Iron Age: biographies of mirrors*. Oxford: BAR British Series 518.
- Knappett, C., 2005, The affordances of things: a post-Gibsonian perspective on the relationality of mind and matter. In: DeMarrais, E., Gosden, C. and Renfrew, C.,(eds), *Rethinking Materiality: The Engagement of Mind with the Material World*, Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 43–51.
- Knappett, C., 2011, *An Archaeology of Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kopytoff, I., 1986 The cultural biography of things. In: Appadurai, A. (ed), *The social life of things*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 64-91
- Kristiansen, K. 1994, The emergence of the European world system in the Bronze Age: Divergence, convergence, and social evolution during the first and second millennia BC in Europe. In Kristiansen, K. and Jensen, J.(eds), *Europe in the first millennium BC*, 7-30. Sheffield: J.R. Collis.
- Krotscheck, U., 2008, *Scale, structure, and organization of archaic maritime trade in the western Mediterranean: The "Pointe Lequin 1A"*, PhD dissertation at Stanford University.
- Küchler, S. and Miller, D. (eds) 2005, *Clothing as Material Culture*. New York: Berg.
- Lagrand, C. and Thalmann, P., 1973, *Les habitats protohistoriques du Pegue (Drôme)*, Grenoble: Centre de documentation de la Préhistoire Alpine.
- Landes, C., 2003, Mobilier funéraire d'une tombe isolée à Castelnau de Guers, In: Landes, C.(ed.), *Les Etrusques en France. Archéologie et collections. Catalogue d'exposition*. Lattes: Musée archéologique Henri Prades, 183.
- Langdon, S., 2001, Beyond the grave: biographies from early Greece. *American journal of archaeology*, 579-606.
- Larderet, P., 1957, L'oppidum de la Roque, commune de Fabrègues, Hérault, *Gallia* 15, 1-39.
- Latour, B., 11 January 1998, *On Actor Network Theory: A few clarifications 1/2*, <http://amsterdam.nettime.org/Lists-Archives/nettime-l-9801/msg00019.html> (last accessed, 9 June 2010)

- Llinas, C. and Robert, A. 1971 La nécropole de Saint-Julien à Pézenas. Fouilles 1969-1970. *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise* 4.1, 1-29.
- Long, L. and Sourisseau, J.C., 2002 Epave de La Love, Cap d'Antibes In Long, L., Pomey, P. and Sourisseau, J.C., (eds.) *Les Étrusques en mer: épaves d'Antibes à Marseille*. Édisud, Marseille, 25-31.
- Long, L., Gantés, L.F. and Rival, M., 2006, L'épave Grand Ribaud F. Un chargement de produits étrusques du début du V s. av. J.C. In: Gori, S. and Bettini M.C. (eds), *Gli Etruschi da Genova ad Ampurias. Atti del XXIV Convegno di Studi Etruschi ed Italici, Marseille-Lattes, 26 settembre - 1 ottobre 2002*. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 455-496.
- López Borgoñoz, A., 1998, Distribució espacial y cronològica de las necrópolis ampuritanas. In: Mayer, M., Nolla, J.M. and Pardo, J. (eds), *De les estructures indígenes a l'organització provincial romana de la Hispania Citerior*. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Catalans, 275-298.
- López Bravo, G., 2002, La urna ibérica de orejetas perforadas. *Complutum*, 13, 97-116.
- López Cachero, F.J., 2007, Sociedad y economía durante el Bronce final y la Primera Edad del Hierro en el noreste peninsular: una aproximació a partir de la evidencias arqueològicas. *Trabajos de Prehistoria*, 64, 99-120.
- Louis, M., Taffanel, O. and Taffanel, J., 1955, *La premier Age du Fer Languadocienne, Iere parties: les habitats*. Bordighera: Istituto di Studi Liguri.
- Lomas, K., 2013, Language and Iconography: The Identity of Sub-Groups in Italian Funerary Monuments, *Herom* 2-1, 97-121.
- Lorrio, A. J., 1997, *Los celtíberos*, *Complutum Extra* 7.
- Lucas Pellicer, M<sup>a</sup>. R., 1982, El thymiaterion de Calaceite (Teruel), *Boletín de la Asociación Española de Amigos de la Arqueología* 16, 20-28.
- Lucas Pellicer, M<sup>a</sup>. R., 2002-03, Simpulum y bebida, marcadores de prestigio y jefatura durante el Hierro I (siglos VII/VI aC): entre el Herault y el Ebro., *Kalathos* 22-23, 95-134.
- Lyons, C. 1996, Sikel burials at Morgantina: defining social and ethnic identities. In Leighton, R. (ed), *Early Societies in Sicily: new developments in archaeological research* (Accordia Specialist Studies on Italy, Volume 5), 177-188. London: Accordia Research Center, University of London.

- Lyons, C. and Papadopoulos, J. (eds), 2002a, *The Archaeology of Colonialism*, Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute.
- Lyons, C. and Papadopoulos, J., 2002b, Archaeology and Colonialism, In: Lyons, C. and Papadopoulos, J., (eds), 2002, *The Archaeology of Colonialism*, Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 1-45.
- MacLean, R., and Insoll, T., 2003, Archaeology, luxury and the exotic: the example of the Islamic Gao (Mali) and Bahrain, *World Archaeology* 34-3, 558-570.
- Malinowski, B., 1960, *Coral Gardens and their Magic, Vol II*. London: Allen & Unwin (second edition).
- Malkin, I., 2004, Post-colonial concepts and Ancient Greek Colonization, *Modern Language Quarterly* 65.3, 341-364.
- Malkin, I., 2011, *A small Greek world: networks in the Ancient Mediterranean*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Malkin, I., Constantakopoulou, C. and Panagopoulou, K. 2007, Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean. *Mediterranean Historical Review* 22, 1-9.
- Maluquer de Motes, J., 1984, *La necrópolis paleoibérica de "Mas de Mussols", Tortosa (Tarragona)*, Barcelona: Departamento de Prehistoria y Arqueología.
- Marchand, F., 2002, La ceramique etrusco-corinthienne In Long, L., Pomey, P., and Sourisseau, J.C., (eds.) *Les Étrusques en mer: épaves d'Antibes à Marseille*. Marseille: Édisud, 99-102.
- Marichal, R. and Janin, T., 2003, Une inhumation protohistorique. In Marichal, R. and Rébé, I., (eds.) *Les origines de Ruscino*, UMR 5140 du CNRS, Lattes: Archéologie des Sociétés Méditerranéennes, 53-56.
- Martí, A., 2000, L'oppidum del Puig de Sant' Andreu d'Ullastret. Aportació de les intervencions arqueològiques recents al coneixement dels sistemes defensius i del urbanisme. In Buxó, R. and Pons, E. (eds), *L'habitat protohistòric a Catalunya, Rosselló I Llenguadoc occidental*, 107-121 (Serie Monografica del MAC-Girona 19). Girona.

- Martín, A., 2005, Territori i habitat al nord-est català en època ibèrica. In *Món Ibèric als Països Catalans: XIII Col·loqui Internacional d'Arqueologia de Puigcerdà*, 323-345. Puigcerdà: Institut d'Estudis Ceretans.
- Martín, A., Buxó, R., Lòpez, J.B. and Mataró, M. (eds) 1999, *Excavacions arqueològiques a l'Illa d'en Reixac (1987-1992)* Girona: Monografies d'Ullastret 1.
- Martínez, J., Domínguez Solera, S., and Carincero Cáceres, S., 2012, Inhumaciones de preinatales en área de la muralla sur del *oppidum* de Monte Bernorio (Villaren, Palencia), *Munibe* 63, 199-211.
- Mascort, M., Sanmartí, J. and Santacana, J. 1991a, Aldovesta: les bases d'un modèle commercial dans le cadre de l'expansion phénicienne au nord-est de la Péninsule Ibérique. In *II Congresso internazionale di Studi Fenici e Punici*, 3, 1073-1079. Rome.
- Mascort, M., Sanmartí, J. and Santacana, J. 1991b, *El jaciment protohistòric d'Aldovesta (Benifallet) i el comerç fenici arcaic a la Catalunya meridional*. Tarragona.
- Mauné, S. (ed), 1998a, *Recherches récentes sur les établissements ruraux protohistoriques en Gaule méridionale (IXe-IIIe s. av. J.-C.)* Montagnac: Mergoïl.
- Mauné, S. 1998b, Les établissements ruraux des VI et V s. av. J.C. in Languedoc central. Etudes de cas et perspectives In: Mauné, S. (ed) *Recherches récentes sur les établissements ruraux protohistoriques en Gaule méridionale (IXe-IIIe s. av. J.-C.)* Montagnac: Mergoïl, 45-72.
- Mazière, F., 2002, Sens et fonctions des vases dans les nécropoles du Premier Âge du Fer en Languedoc occidental. *Bulletin de la Société archéologique champenoise, suppl.1*, 295-302.
- Mazière, F. 2005, Pratiques funéraires en Languedoc occidental et en Roussillon du Bronze final III à la fin du Premier Âge du fer : essai de synthèse, In : *XIII Colloqui Internacional d'Arqueologia de Puigcerdà: Món ibèric als Països Catalans. Homenatge a Josep Barberà i Farràs, Puigcerdà 2003*. Puigcerdà: Institut d'Estudis Ceretans, 905-953.
- Mazière, F. 2012, Sepultures et nécropoles en Languedoc occidental et en Roussillon au premier âge du Fer (IX-VIe s. av. J.-C.): du geste observé au rite supposé. In Rovira i Hortalà, C., López i Cachero, J., Mazière, F. (eds.), *Les necròpolis d'Incineració entre l'Ebre i el Tíber (segles IX-VI aC). Metodologia, pràctiques funeràries i societat. Taula rodona Internacional. Barcelona, 21 i 22 de novembre de 2008*. Barcelona: MAC, 173-208.

- Mazière, F. 2013a, Agde et la basse vallée de l' Hérault de la fin de l'âge du Bronze à l'arrivée des Grecs. In: Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*, Paris:Errance, 36-42.
- Mazière, F. 2013b, Agde, la necropole du Peyrou (Hérault). In Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*, Paris: Errance, 46-47
- Mazière, F.2013c, Agde, la necropole du Bousquet (Hérault). In Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*, Paris: Errance,50-51.
- Mele, A.1979 *Il Commercio Greco Arcaico: Prexis ed Emporie* (Chahiers du Centre Jean Bérard IV). Naples: Institut Français de Naples.
- Milcent, P.Y., 2013a La nouvelle place des femmes dans l'espace funéraire en Gaule: des tombes à épée hallstattienne aux tombes à riche parure féminine). In: Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*, Paris: Errance, 136-141.
- Milcent, P.Y., 2013b, Ambre et lignite. In: Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*, Paris: Errance, 181.
- Miller, D. 1987 *Material Culture and Mass Consumption*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell
- Miller, D. (ed), 2005, *Materiality*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mirò, M. and Santos, M., 2013, The Greek presence on the east coast of the Iberian Peninsula: Colonial establishments and rhythms of trade with Iberian societies. *Catalan Historical Review* 7, 9-28.
- Mohen, J. P.1980, *L'Age du Fer en Aquitaine. Mémoires de la Société Préhistorique Française* 14.
- Morel, J.P. 1975 L'expansion phocéenne en Occident: dix ans de recherches (1966-1975). *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 99, 853-896.
- Morel, J.P. 1981 Le commerce étrusque en France, en Espagne et en Afrique. In: Neppi Modona, A. (ed), *L'Etruria Mineraria: Atti del XII Convegno di Studi Etruschi e Italici, Firenze 1979*, 463-508. Florence: Olschki.

- Morel, J.P., 1983a, Les relations économiques dans l'Occident grec. In: *Modes de contact et processus de transformation dans les sociétés anciennes. Actes du colloque de Cortone (24-30 mai 1981)* (Collection de l'Ecole Française de Rome, 67), 549-576. Rome.
- Morel, J.P., 1983b, La céramique comme indice du commerce antique (réalités et interprétations). In Garnsey, P., and Whittaker, C. R., (eds), *Trade and Famine In Classical Antiquity*, 66-74. Cambridge: The Cambridge Philological Society.
- Morel, J.P., 1991, Les phocéens en Gaule dans le contexte méditerranéen et indigène. In *Voyage en Massalie: 100 ans d'archéologie en Gaule du Sud*, 14-17. Marseille: Musées de Marseille, Edisud.
- Moret, P., 1995, Tite-Live et la topographie d'Emporion. *Mélanges de la Casa de Velasquez* 31-1, 55-75.
- Moret, P., Benavente, J.A. and Gorgues, A., 2006, *Iberos del Matarraña. Investigaciones arqueológicas en Valldeltormo, Calaceite, Cretas y La Fresneda (Teruel)*, Alcañiz :Taller de Arqueología and Casa de Velazquez.
- Morris, I. 1994, Archaeologies of Greece. In Morris, I. (ed), *Classical Greece: ancient histories and modern archaeologies*, 8-47. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Morris, I. 2000, *Archaeology as Cultural History*. London and New York: Blackwell.
- Morris, I. and Powell, B., 2010, *The Greeks, History, Culture, and Society*, Pearson Prentice Hall, 2nd Edition.
- Morris, S., 2006, The View from East Greece: Miletus, Samos and Ephesos, In: Riva, C. and Vella, N.C. (eds), *Debating Orientalization: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Change in the Ancient Mediterranean*, London and Oakville: Equinox, 1-10.
- Mullen, A., 2013a, *Southern Gaul and the Mediterranean. Multilingualism and Multiple Identities in the Iron Age and Roman Periods*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mullen, A., 2013b, The bilingualism of material culture?, *Herom* 2.1, 21-43.
- Mullins, R., 2011, The Archaeology of Consumption. In: *Annual Review of Anthropology* 40, 133-144.

- Muñoz Rufo, V., 2006, El Coll (Llinars del Vallès): una segona tomba del ferro I. *Cypsela: revista de prehistòria i protobistòria* 16, 183-194.
- Nenci, G., 1983, Tryphé e colonizzazione. In: *Actes du colloque de Cortone (24-30 mai 1981)*, 1019-1031.
- Néraudau, J. P. 1984, *Être enfant à Rome*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Nickels, A. 1978, Contribution à l'étude de la céramique grise archaïque en Languedoc-Roussillon, *Les céramiques de la Grèce de l'Est et leur diffusion en Occident (Naples, 1976)*. Naples: Centre Jean Berard, 248-267.
- Nickels, A. 1987, Le site protohistorique du Mont Jouï à Florensac (Hérault). In: *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise* 20.1, 3-41.
- Nickels, A. 1989, La Monédière à Bessan (Hérault). Le bilan des recherches. In: *Documents d'archéologie méridionale* 12, 51-119.
- Nickels, A. 1990, Essai sur le développement topographique de la nécropole protohistorique de Pézenas (Hérault), *Gallia*, 47.1, 1-27.
- Nickels, A. 1995, Les sondages de la rue Perben à Agde (Hérault). In: Arcelin, P., Bats, M., Garcia, D., Marchand, G., Schwaller, M., (eds) *Sur les pas des Grecs en Occident*, Paris: Errance, 59-98.
- Nickels, A., Marchand, G., Schwaller, M., 1989, *Agde: la nécropole du premier âge du fer*, *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise, Supplément* 19.
- Nijboer, A., 2004, La cronologia assoluta dell'età del Ferro nel Mediterraneo, dibattito sui metodi e sui risultati, *Mediterranea* 1-2004, 527-556.
- Nijboer, A., 2006, The Iron Age in the Mediterranean: recent radiocarbon research at the University of Groningen. In: *XV Congresso UISPP, A New Dawn for the Dark Age? Shifting Paradigms in Mediterranean Iron Age Chronology*, 103-118.
- Nijboer, A., 2010, Leggere la colonizzazione greca antica nel XX e XXI secolo d.C., In: *IX Giornata Archeologica Francavillense*, Castrovillari: Tipografia d'Arte Patitucci, 32 - 60.
- Oliver, A.J., 1986, Hacia una clasificación tipológica y cronológica de las fíbulas de la Edad del Hierro en la meseta norte. *Zephyrus* 39-40, 139-157.

- Osanna, M., 2014, The Iron Age in South Italy: Settlement, Mobility and Culture Contact, In: Knapp, A.B., and van Dommelen, P. (eds), *The Cambridge Prehistory of the Bronze and Iron Age Mediterranean*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 230-248.
- Osborne, R. 1995, Pots, trade and the Archaic Greek economy. *Antiquity* 70, 31-44.
- Osborne, R., 2001, Why did Athenian pots appeal to the Etruscans? *World Archaeology* 33, 277-295.
- Osborne, R., 2006, W(h)ither Orientalization, In: Riva, C. and Vella, N.C. (eds), *Debating Orientalization: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Change in the Ancient Mediterranean*, London and Oakville: Equinox, 153-158.
- Osborne, R. 2007, What travelled with Greek Pottery? *Mediterranean Historical Review* 22, 85-95.
- Owen, S., 2005, Analogy, archaeology and archaic Greek colonization, In: Hurts, H.R. and Owen, S., *Ancient colonizations: analogy, similarity and difference*, London: Duckworth, 5-22.
- Pace, R., 2013, Le sanctuaire de Bitalemi et les transformations des pratiques dévotionnelles vers 540/530 avant de J.C. In: Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*, Paris: Errance 347-349.
- Pader, E. J., 1982, *Symbolism, social relations and the interpretation of mortuary remains*. Oxford: BAR.
- Padrò, J., 1983a, *Egyptian-type documents from the Mediterranean littoral of the Iberian Peninsula before the Roman Conquest I*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Padrò, J., 1983b, *Egyptian-type documents from the Mediterranean littoral of the Iberian Peninsula before the Roman Conquest II*, Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Panich, L. M., 2014, Native American Consumption of Shell and Glass Beads at Mission Santa Clara de Asis, *American Antiquity* 79(4), 730-748.
- Panter-Brick, C., 2005, Nobody's Children? In: Jenks, C. (ed.), *Childhood: Critical concepts in sociology. Vol. 1*, London: Taylor & Francis, 81-95.
- Parker Pearson, M., 1999, *The archaeology of death and burial*. Phoenix Mill: Sutton.
- Peers, L., 1999, 'Many tender ties': the shifting contexts and meanings of the S BLACK bag. *World Archaeology* 31-2, 288-302.



- Pellicer Catalàn, M., 1984, Elementos ultrapirenaicos y Hallstattizantes en el horizonte del Bronce Final-Hierro del Noreste hispano. *Habis* 15, 309-344.
- Peña, M.J., 1985, Le problème de la supposée ville indigée à cote d'Emporion. Nouvelle hypothèses. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 11, 69-83.
- Petersen, J.H., 2013, Communicating Identities from Beyond? Assessing expressions of identity in funerary material from the Black Sea Region, *Herom* 2.1, 45-73.
- Pons, E., 1984, *L'Empordà de l'edat del bronze a l'edat del ferro*. Girona: Centre d'Investigacions Arqueològiques.
- Pons, E., 2012, Les necròpolis d'incineració en el nord-est català (1100-550 ane): una nova síntesi. In: Rovira i Hortalà, C., Lopez i Cachero, J., Mazière, F. (eds.), *Les necròpolis d'Incineració entre l'Ebre i el Tíber (segles IX-VI aC). metodologia, pràctiques funeràries i societat. Taula rodona Internacional. Barcelona, 21 i 22 de novembre de 2008*. Barcelona:MAC, 37-56.
- Purcell, N., 2005, Colonization and Mediterranean history, In: Hurts, H.R. and Owen, S., *Ancient colonizations: analogy, similarity and difference*, London: Duckworth, 115-139.
- Purcell, N., 2006, Orientalizing: five historical questions, In Riva, C. and Vella, N.C., (eds), *Debating Orientalization: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Change in the Ancient Mediterranean*, London and Oakville: Equinox, 21-30
- Py, M., 1972, Les disques perlés en bronze du Languedoc oriental. *Rivista di Studi Liguri*, 38, 27-61.
- Py, M., 1979, Un four de potier du VI s. av. J.C. à Bezouze, Gard. *Documents d'Archéologie meridionale*, 2, 1979, 53-60.
- Py, M., 1984a, Le site et le fuilès, In Py et al 1984a, *La Liquière (Calvisson, Gard): Village du premier age du fer en Languedoc oriental (Revue archeologique de Narbonnaise)*, 9-21.
- Py, M., 1984b, Inventaire des mobiliers hors de context, In Py et al 1984b, *La Liquière (Calvisson, Gard): Village du premier age du fer en Languedoc oriental (Revue archeologique de Narbonnaise)*, 187-198.
- Py, M., 1984c, Phases et chronologie, In Py et al 1984b, *La Liquière (Calvisson, Gard): Village du premier age du fer en Languedoc oriental (Revue archeologique de Narbonnaise)*, 199-215.

- Py, M., 1984d, La ceramique non tournée, In Py et al 1984b, *La Liquière (Calvisson, Gard): Village du premier age du fer en Languedoc oriental (Revue archeologique de Narbonnaise)*, 215-259.
- Py, M., 1984e, Les ceramiques tournées de La Liquière et les premiers commerces mediterraneennes , In Py et al 1984b, *La Liquière (Calvisson, Gard): Village du premier age du fer en Languedoc oriental (Revue archeologique de Narbonnaise)*, 260-278.
- Py, M., 1984e, Habitat et modes de vie domestique, In Py et al 1984b, *La Liquière (Calvisson, Gard): Village du premier age du fer en Languedoc oriental (Revue archeologique de Narbonnaise)*, 295-316.
- Py, M., 1984e, Economie et societe, In Py et al 1984b, *La Liquière (Calvisson, Gard): Village du premier age du fer en Languedoc oriental (Revue archeologique de Narbonnaise)*, 317-333.
- Py, M., 1990, *Culture, économie et société protohistoriques dans la région nîmoise*. Rome: Publications de l'École française de Rome.
- Py, M., 2003, La Liquière (Calvisson, Gard). In: Landes, C. (ed.), *Les Etrusques en France. Archéologie et collections. Catalogue d'exposition*. Lattes: Musée archéologique Henri Prades, 107-117.
- Py, M., 2009, *Lattara: Lattes, Hérault. Comptoir gaulois méditerranéen entre Etrusques, Grecs et Romains*. Paris: Errance.
- Py, M., 2012, *Les Gaulois du Midi, De la fin de l'Age du Bronze à la conquête romaine*, Paris: Errance, Second edition.
- Py, M., 2015, *Les oppida de la Vaunage et la cité gauloise des castels à Nages (Gard)*, Montpellier: PULM.
- Py, M., Py, F., Sauzet, P. 1984b, Description des stratigraphies, structures et mobiliers In: Py et al 1984b, *La Liquière (Calvisson, Gard): Village du premier age du fer en Languedoc oriental (Revue archeologique de Narbonnaise)*, 23-186.
- Py, M., Py, F., Sauzet, P., Tendille, C., Columbeau, P., Erroux, J. and Duday, H. 1984a, *La Liquière (Calvisson, Gard): Village du premier age du fer en Languedoc oriental (Revue archeologique de Narbonnaise)*.
- Py, M., Lebeaupin, D., Bessac, J.C., Stratigraphie du Marduel (Saint-Bonnet-du-Gard). VI- Les niveaux du Bronze final au milieu du Ve s. av. n. è. sur le Chantier Central. *Documents d'Archéologie Méridionale* 17-1, 201-265.

- Py, M., Lebeaupin, D., Séjalon, P., Roure, R., 2006 Les Étrusques et Lattara: nouvelles données In Gori, S. and Bettini M.C. (eds), *Gli Etruschi da Genova ad Ampurias. Atti del XXIV Convegno di Studi Etruschi ed Italici, Marseille-Lattes, 26 settembre - 1 ottobre 2002*. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 583-608.
- Py, M. and Tendille, C., 1975, Fouille d'une habitation de la deuxième moitié du VI siècle sur l'oppidum de la Font de Coucou, commune de Calvisson, Gard. In: *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise*, 7, 33-65.
- Quesada Sanz, F., 1994, Vino, aristócratas, tumbas y guerreros en la cultura Ibérica. *Verdoly* 6, 99-124.
- Quesada Sanz, F. 1997, *El armamento ibérico. Estudio tipológico, geográfico, funcional, social y simbólico de las armas en la Cultura Ibérica (siglos VI-I a. C.)*. Montagnac: Monographies Instrumentum 3.
- Rafael i Fontanals, N. 1991, *La Necropolis Del Coll Del Moro De Gandesa. Els Materials*. Tarragona: Publicacions De La Diputació De Tarragona.
- Rainbird, P., 1999, Entangled biographies: western Pacific ceramics and the tombs of Pohnpei. *World Archaeology* 31-2, 214-224.
- Raynaud, C. and Roux, J.C., 1983, L'oppidum des Gardies à Pignan. *Documents d'Archéologie Méridionale*, 6, 23-65.
- Revell, L., 2013, Code-switching and identity in the western provinces, *Herom* 2.1, 123-141.
- Riva, C., 2006, The Orientalizing Period in Etruria: sophisticated communities, In Riva, C. and Vella, N.C. (eds), *Debating Orientalization: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Change in the Ancient Mediterranean*, London and Oakville: Equinox, 110-134.
- Riva, C., 2009, Nuove tecnologie del se': il banchetto rituale collettivo in Etruria. In: Mata, C., Pérez Jorda, G. and Vives Ferrándiz, J., (eds.) *IV reunió d'Economia en el I mil·lenni a.C. (Caude de las Fuentes, Octubre 2009)*. Saguntum, 69 -80.
- Riva, C., 2010, Trading settlements and the materiality of wine consumption in the north Tyrrhenian Sea region. In van Dommelen, P. and Knapp, A.B. (eds) 2010, *Material connections in the ancient Mediterranean: mobility, materiality and identity*. London: Routledge, 210-232.

- Robert, A., 1979, La place du bucchero nero dans la nécropole de Saint Julien de Pézenas (Hérault) In Lambrechts, R.(ed.) *Le bucchero nero étrusque et sa diffusion en Gaule Méridionale. Actes de la Table-Ronde d'Aix-en-Provence (21-23 mai 1975). L'antiquité classique* 49.1,596-597.
- Ropiot, V., 2007, *Peuplement et circulation dans les bassins fluviaux du Languedoc occidental, du Roussillon et de l'Ampourdan du IXe s. au début du IIe s. avant notre ère*, PhD Thesis, Université de Franche-Comté. <http://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00424395> (last accessed 13/09/2014)
- Ropiot, V., 2013 Béziers, la necropole de la Couroundelle (Hérault). In Verger, S. and Pernet, L. (eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*. Paris: Errance, 51-53.
- Rouillard, P., Plana, R., Moret, P., 2015, Les Ibères a le rencontre des Grecs, In: Roure, R. (ed), *Contactes et acculturations en Méditerranée Occidentale*, Errance, Paris, 199-218.
- Rouquette, D. and Michel, M., 1976, Une tombe protohistorique au Rec-de-Bragues à Florensac (Hérault). *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise* 9, 203-209.
- Rowlands, M. 2010, Concluding thoughts. In: van Dommelen, P. and Knapp, A.B. (eds) 2010, *Material connections in the ancient Mediterranean: mobility, materiality and identity*. London: Routledge, 233-240
- Ruffini, G., 2012, Irad Malkin, A small Greek world: networks in the Ancient Mediterranean. *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 1643-1644.
- Ruiz Zapatero, G. 2004, Casas y tumbas. Explorando la desigualdad social en el Bronce Final y primera Edad del Hierro del NE. de la Península Ibérica. *Mainake* 26, 293-333.
- Said, E., 1978, *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.
- Sanmartí, E. , 1992, Massalia et Emporion, une origine comune, deux destins differents.In Bats, M., Bertucchi, G., Conges, G. and Treziny, H., *Marseille grec et la Gaule*. Lattes: Traveux du centre Camille Julien, 27-41.
- Sanmartí, E.1993, *Una tomba de guerrier de la primera edat del ferro trobada a Llinars del Vallès (Vallès Oriental, Barcelona)*, Granollers: MDG.
- Sanmartí, E., 1996, La ‘tumba Cazorro’ de la necrópolis emporitana de ‘El Portixol’ y algunos apuntes acerca de la economía de Emporion en el siglo V.a.C.. *Archivo Español de Arqueología* 69, 17-36.

- Sanmartí, E., 2004, From local communities to early states. *Pyreneae* 35, 7-41.
- Sanmartí, E., 2009, Colonial Relations and Social Change in Iberia (Seventh to Third Centuries BC) In Dietler, M. and López Ruiz, C. (eds), *Colonial Encounters in Ancient Iberia: Phoenician, Greek and Indigenous Relations*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 49-90.
- Sanmartí, E., Barberà, J., Costa, F. and Garcia, P., 1982, Les troballes funeràries d'època ibèrica arcaica de la Granja Soley (Santa Perpètua de Mogoda, Vallès Occidental, Barcelona). *Ampurias* 44, 71-103.
- Sanmartí, E., Nolla, J.M. and Aquilué, X., 1984, Las excavacions de l'àrea del Parking al sud de la Neàpolis d'Empuries (informe preliminar). *Empuries* 45-46, 110-153.
- Sanmartí, E., Asensio, D. and Martín, M., 2002, Les relacions comercials amb el món mediterrani dels pobles indígenes de la Catalunya sudpirineica durant el període tardoarcaic (575-450 a.C.). *Cypsela: revista de prehistòria i protohistòria* 14, 69-106.
- Sanmartí, E., and Santacana, J., 2005, *Els Ibers del Nord*, Barcelona: Rafael Dalmau.
- Santos, M., 2009a, Les primeres manifestacions funeràries a Empuries. In: *El món funerari a l'antiga Empuries*, Girona: MAC, 29-32.
- Santos, M., 2009b, El paisatge funerari de l'Emporion grega entre els segles VI y III a.C.. In: *El món funerari a l'antiga Empuries*, Girona: MAC, 33-39.
- Santos, M. and Sourisseau, J.-C., 2011, Cultes et pratiques rituelles dans les communautés grecques de Gaule méditerranéenne et de Catalogne. In Roure, R., and Pernet, M., (eds), *Des rites et des hommes* Paris: Errance, 223-255.
- Santos, M., Castanyer, P., Tremoleda, J., 2013, Emporion arcaica: los ritmos y las fisonomías de los dos establecimientos originarios, a partir de los últimos datos arqueológicos. In: Bouffier, S. and Hermay, A., *L'Occident grec de Marseille à Megara Hyblaea*, 103-113.
- Scheidel, W., and von Reden, S., 2002, *The Ancient Economy*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Sardà Seuma, S., 2008, Servir el vino. Algunas observaciones sobre la adopción del oinochoe en el curso inferior del Ebro (s. VII-VI aC), *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 65, 95-115.

- Saunders, N. J., 1999, Biographies of brilliance: pearls, transformations of matter and being c. AD1492. *World Archaeology* 31-2, 243-257.
- Seip, L.P., 1999, Transformations of meaning: the life history of a Naualk mask. *World Archaeology* 31-2, 272-287.
- Sherratt, A. and Sherratt, S., 1990, The growth of the Mediterranean economy in the early first millennium BC, In: *World Archaeology*, 361-368.
- Sherratt, A. and Sherratt, S., 1993, From luxuries to commodities: the nature of Mediterranean Bronze Age trading systems, In: Gale, N.H. (ed.), *Bronze Age Trade in the Mediterranean*. Jonsered: Åström, 351-386.
- Shepherd, G., 2007, Poor little rich kids? Status and selection in Archaic Western Greece. In Crawford, S. and Shepherd, G. (eds.) *Children, childhood and society*. Oxford: BAR, 93-106.
- Shepherd, G., 2013, Difference, Similarity, and Code-Switching in Ancient Sicily and South Italy. *Herom* 2.1, 75-95.
- Simmel, G., 1978, *The philosophy of money*. London: Routledge.
- Skinner, J.N., 2012, *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: From Homer to Herodotus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Snodgrass, A. M., 2005, 'Lesser breeds': the history of a false analogy, In: Hurst, H.R. and Owen, S., *Ancient colonizations: analogy, similarity and difference*, London: Duckworth, 45-58.
- Sofaer Derevenski, J., 2000, Material culture shock: confronting expectations in the material culture of children. In Sofaer Derevenski, J. (ed.), *Children and Material Culture*. London: Routledge, 3-16.
- Sofaer Derevenski, J., 2007, Introduction: Materiality and Identity, In: Sofaer Derevenski, J.(ed), *Material Identities*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1-10.
- Sommer, M. 2007, Networks of Commerce and Knowledge in the Iron Age: The Case of the Phoenicians. *Mediterranean Historical Review* 22, 97-111.
- Sørensen, M.L., 1997 Reading dress: the construction of social categories and identities in Bronze Age Europe. *Journal of European Archaeology* 5.1, 93-114.

- Solier, Y., Passelac, M. and Rancoule, G., 1976, *La necropole de 'Las Peyros' à Couffoulens (Aude)*. Paris: Boccard.
- Sourisseau, J.C., 2011, La diffusion des vins grecs d'Occident du VIIIe au IVe s. av. J.-C., sources écrites et documents archéologiques, In: Lombardo, M., Siciliano, A., Alessio, A. (eds), *La vigna di Dioniso. Vite, vino e culti in Magna Grecia. Atti del 49° Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia (Taranto, 24-28/09/2009)*, Rome: Electa.
- Sourisseau, J.C., 2013, Amphores et céramiques massaliètes du VI siècle avant de J.C. In Verger, S., and Pernet, L., (eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*, Paris: Errance, 337-339.
- Soutou, A. and Vezian, J. 1964, Mobilier d'une tombe à incinération de Mas-Saintes-Puelles (Aude). *Cahiers Ligures de Préhistoire et d'Archéologie* 13, 164-172.
- Szilàgyi J., 1992, *Ceramica etrusco-corinzia figurata*. Florence: LS Olschki.
- Taffanel, O., and Taffanel, J., 1960, Deux tombes de Chefs à Mailhac (Aude), *Gallia* 18, 1-37.
- Tendille, C., 1978, Fibules protohistoriques de la region nimoise. *Documents d' Archéologie meridionale*, 1, 1979, 77-112..
- Tendille, C., 1979, Mobiliers métalliques protohistoriques de la region nimoise: les bractelets. *Documents d' Archéologie meridionale*, 2, 1979, 61-79.
- Tendille, C., 1980 Mobiliers métalliques protohistoriques de la region nimoise: autres objets de parure et d'habillement. *Documents d' Archéologie meridionale*, 3, 1980, 95-124.
- Tendille, C., 1984, Le mobilier métallique. In: In Py et al 1984b, *La Liquière (Calvisson, Gard): Village du premier age du fer en Languedoc oriental (Revue archeologique de Narbonnaise)*, 279-294.
- Tilley, C. 2004, *The Materiality of Stone: Explorations in Landscape Phenomenology*, Oxford: Berg.
- Trias de Arribas, G., 1967, *Ceramicas griegas de la Peninsula Iberica*, Valencia
- Trubitt, M.B.D., 2003, The Production and Exchange of Marine Shell Prestige Goods. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 11-3, 243-277.
- Ugolini, D., Fédière, G., Fédière, P., Olive, C., 1997, Le cratère corinthienne de la Prade, à Puisserguier (Hérault), In Ugolini, D. (ed.), *Languedoc occidentale protohistorique. Fouilles et recherches récentes (VI-IV s. av. J.C.)*, Publications de l'Université de Provence: 67-76.

- Ugolini, D and Olive, C. 2006, 'De l'arrivée à la consommation: l'impact des trafics et des produits étrusques en Languedoc occidental'. In: Gori, S. and Bettini M.C. (eds), *Gli Etruschi da Genova ad Ampurias. Atti del XXIV Convegno di Studi Etruschi ed Italici, Marseille-Lattes, 26 settembre - 1 ottobre 2002*. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 555-581.
- Valenza Mele, N., 1991, Vita dell'aldilà e corredi funerari. Evoluzioni comparate, *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 17, 149-174.
- van der Veen, M., 2003, When is food a luxury?, *World Archaeology* 34-3, 405-427.
- van Dommelen, P. 2006, The Orientalizing Phenomenon: Hybridity and Material Culture in the Western Mediterranean. In Riva, C. and Vella, N.C. (eds), *Debating Orientalization: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Change in the Ancient Mediterranean*, London and Oakville: Equinox, 135-152.
- van Dommelen, P. 2012, Colonialism and Migration in the Ancient Mediterranean, *Annual Review of Anthropology* 41, 393-409.
- van Dommelen, P. and Knapp, A.B. (eds) 2010, *Material connections in the ancient Mediterranean: mobility, materiality and identity*. London: Routledge.
- Vella, N.C., and Riva, C., 2006, Introduction, In Riva, C. and Vella, N.C. (eds), *Debating Orientalization: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Change in the Ancient Mediterranean*, London and Oakville: Equinox, 1-10.
- Verger, S., 2013a, Agde, le Peyoru, tombes avec vases et utensiles grecs (Hérault). In Verger, S., and Pernet, L. (eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*. Paris: Errance, 47-49.
- Verger, S. 2013b, Les depots launaciens. In Verger, S., and Pernet, L. (eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*. Paris: Errance, 100-107
- Verger, S. 2013c, La couche archaïque de Bitalemi à travers quelque-uns de ses depots de bronze. In Verger, S., and Pernet, L. (eds), *Une odyssée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*. Paris: Errance, 265-270



- Verger, S., 2013d, Una collection exceptionnelle d'amulettes:le collier cosmologique de la tombe 660 de Megara Hyblaea .In Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), *Une odysée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*. Paris: Errance, 265-270
- Verger, S., 2013e, Parures de la Gaule et des Balkans dans le sanctuaire d' Hera à Perachora In Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), *Une odysée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*. Paris: Errance, 312-314.
- Verger, S., 2013f, Des objets gauloises dans les sanctuaires féminins du Latium, In Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), *Une odysée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*. Paris: Errance,315.
- Verger, S., and Pernet, L.(eds), *Une odysée gauloise. Parures de femmes à l'origine des premiers échanges entre la Grèce et la Gaule*. Paris: Errance,
- Vives Ferràndiz, J., 2008, Negotiating Colonial Encounters: Hybrid Practices and Consumption in Eastern Iberia (8th–6th centuries BC), *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology*, 21-2, 241-272.
- Vives Ferràndiz,J., 2010, Mobility, materiality and identities in Iron Age East Iberia: on the appropriation of material culture and the question of judgement. In: van Dommelen, P. and Knapp, A.B. (eds) 2010, *Material connections in the ancient Mediterranean: mobility, materiality and identity*. London: Routledge, 190-210.
- Von Eles Masi, P., 1986, *Le fibule dell'Italia settentrionale*, Beck: Munich.
- Walker, W.H., 2001, Ritual Technology in an Extranatural World. In: Schiffer, M.B. (ed), *Anthropological Perspectives on Technology*, Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 87-107.
- Wallace- Hadrill, A., 2009, *Rome's cultural revolution*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Walsh, J. St.P., 2014, *Consumerism in the Acient World*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Weingarten, J., 2013, How a Prince Became a Princess,  
<http://judithweingarten.blogspot.co.uk/2013/10/how-prince-became-princess.html> (last accessed: 14/09/2014)

- Weiss-Krejci, E., 2008 Unusual Life, Unusual Death and the Fate of the Corpse: A Case Study from Dynastic Europe. In Murphy, E.M. (ed.), *Deviant Burial in the Archaeological Record*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 169-190.
- Wengrow, D., 2006, Approaching Ancient Orientalization via Modern Europe, In Riva, C. and Vella, N.C. (eds), *Debating Orientalization: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Change in the Ancient Mediterranean*, London and Oakville: Equinox, 31-47.
- White, R., 1991, *The Middle Ground: Indians, Empires, and Republics in the Great Lakes Region, 1650-1815*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whitehouse, R. D. and Wilkins, J.B. 1989, Greeks and natives in south-east Italy: approaches to the archaeological evidence. In T.C. Champion (ed), *Centre and Periphery: Comparative Studies in Archaeology*, London: Unwin Hyman, 102-126.
- Whitley, J., 2002 , Objects with attitude: biographical facts and fallacies in the study of Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age warrior graves, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 12.02 , 217-232.
- Wilburn, A.T., 2015, *Materia Magica. The Archaeology of Magic in Roman Egypt, Cyprus, and Spain*, University of Michigan Press.
- Willaume, M.,1993, Les objets de la vie quotidienne, In: *Archéologie d'Entremont*, Entremont: Musée Granet, 107-141.
- Winther-Jacobsen, K., 2013, Artefact Variability, Assemblage Differentiation and Identity Negotiation. Debating Code-Switching in Material Culture: Introduction, *Herom* 2.1, 7-18.