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Abstract

The Extent of Eastern Influence:
The Case for the Pre-colonization of Iberia

A thesis presented to the Graduate Program in Ancient Greek and Roman Studies

Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Brandeis University
Waltham, Massachusetts

By Justin Soares

Discussions of Bronze Age trade are typically centered around developments in the Eastern Mediterranean, and as a result the west remains in relative obscurity until Phoenician colonization in the eighth century BCE. Recent archaeological evidence confirms seven centuries of contact between the inhabitants of Iberia and Eastern Mediterranean populations prior to the Peninsula’s colonization. This evidence not only suggests routine Mycenaean and Cypriot interaction on Iberia’s Atlantic coast, but confirms the existence of a flourishing maritime trade network that linked the British Isles and Eastern Mediterranean during the end of the second millennium BCE. As the center of that exchange network Iberia developed a prolonged relationship with Eastern Mediterranean populations that grew stronger the longer it continued. The effects of this relationship led to an increased valuation of eastern goods by the Iberians, who began incorporating these foreign elements into their culture to increase their own individual prestige. Seven centuries of embracing foreign culture in this manner culminated in the pre-colonization of Iberia, in which the region’s inhabitants were so accustomed to and enamored with the Phoenicians that they peacefully accepted colonization.
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Introduction

The Iberian Peninsula is the westernmost point of both Europe and the Mediterranean. Its fringe location often results in its exclusion from discussions of Late Bronze Age Mediterranean exchange systems, and as a result our knowledge of both the Peninsula and its peoples during this time period remains limited. Within the last half century archaeological research on the Peninsula enjoyed a resurgence brought on by the fall of oppressive political regimes in Spain and Portugal, allowing for previously neglected areas of research, such as the Iberian people’s interactions with those from the Eastern Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age, to be explored more extensively.\(^1\) The result is a rapidly expanding body of work, prone to regular updates due to conflicting theories, newly found evidence, and a reconceptualization of information that was once differently interpreted.

Within Iberia’s ever-evolving history, textual and to varying degrees archaeological evidence has always affirmed the existence of a Phoenician period though when this period occurred was unclear. Textual sources such as those provided by Vellius Paterculus, Pliny the Elder, and Pomponius Mela provide a twelfth century BCE date for the start of Phoenician

\(^1\) Throughout this body of work the phrases “Iberians,” “indigenous Iberians,” and “native Iberians” will be used broadly in reference to the inhabitants of Iberian who are not of Eastern Mediterranean origin. The use of these phrases does not take into account the migratory patterns and differences–of which there are many–of the Peninsula’s inhabitants. Similarly, “Europe” and “Mediterranean” will be used in a manner that excludes Iberia despite it being a part of those geographical constructs. This is done seldomly and solely to create a comparison between circumstances on the Peninsula and either the rest of Europe or the Mediterranean.
colonization, but archaeological evidence can only support a tenth century BCE date for the Phoenicians’ arrival, with colonization occurring much later in the eighth century BCE. Advances in archaeological dating methods, primarily carbon fourteen dating, caused a reclassification of superstructures, once thought to have been constructed by the Phoenicians, as being much older and belonging to native groups. Consequently, the Phoenicians are now understood to be a more recent addition to a region which contained its own multi-layered history. The advent of this new information raises questions about the nature of the Peninsula’s inhabitants, their organization, technology, culture, and interactions with the Phoenician colonizers. Although the date of Phoenician colonization has been adjusted from the twelfth to the eighth century BCE, research into native populations indicates interactions with foreign populations in the centuries preceding Phoenician colonization. Further complicating the matter, these encounters began as early as the sixteenth century BCE, and clearly precede the Phoenicians’ involvement in Iberia.

These earlier instances of Eastern Mediterranean interaction were conducted by Mycenaean, Cypriots, Sardinians, as well as the Phoenicians for the purposes of trade. Iberian exchanges with these eastern populations appear to be peaceful, with all parties benefiting. In this thesis I propose that because of these experiences, the local populations of Iberia became accustomed to the presence of foreign peoples through a process of pre-colonization. Discussions of pre-colonization are common amongst Iberian scholars and although frequently cited as a possible phenomenon is seldom explained beyond its most basic form, the period that preceded Phoenician colonization.

---

2 The exact sub-group of Mycenaean and Phoenician populations to interact with Iberia is unknown. In the case of the Mycenaeans the evidence is so limited that further specificity cannot be made. The Phoenicians responsible for the colonization of Iberia undoubtedly Tyrian, but no distinctions can be made for those populations interacting with Iberia prior to colonizing.
The reason for this lack of elaboration is that other aspects of pre-colonization are inherently difficult to discern since they are consistent with a friendly trade-based relationship. In each instance both parties maintain continued contact and amicable interaction, exchanging both material culture and customs. While these similarities initially appear to complicate efforts to distinguish between the existence of pre-colonization or simply a flourishing trade-based alliance, they underlie a link between both phenomena. Due to their similar requisites, trade can manifest itself as a vehicle of pre-colonization despite not always indicating its occurrence.

The increasing frequency of contact brought on by a flourishing trade network lends itself to the gradual notion of pre-colonization supported by Ayelet Gilboa, who classifies the growing interaction experienced in the Mediterranean into four phases.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Type of Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nearly Dormant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cypro-Phoenician Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increasing Trans-Mediterranean Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Height of Trans-Mediterranean Contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gilboa applies this approach broadly to Phoenician activity in the Mediterranean, but it is still useful in an Iberian context since it emphasizes a continuation of heightening interaction centered around trade.

The effectiveness of trade as a means of pre-colonization is derived from its ability to permeate all levels of society through the exchange of commodities used by the general populace, or luxury goods available to only the most elite members of society. Acceptance into both groups

---

3 Gilboa, Ayelet, Ilan Sharon, and Elisabetta Boaretto. “Tel Dor and the Chronology Of Phoenician ’Pre-Colonisation’ Stages” in *Beyond the Homeland: Markers in Phoenician Chronology*. Dudley, MA; Peeters, 2008: Pp. 113-204.
imparts access into social, spiritual, and political spheres, which can in turn be co-opted during a latter period of colonization. Access to the inner circles of these institutions requires a pre-existent level of trust that can only be earned through time, because an immediate attempt at gaining control in such institutions not only creates the possibility for invoking hostilities but also implies an effort toward standard colonization, therefore further emphasizing the gradual nature of pre-colonization.

Examining the archaeological record for indications of pre-colonization is also fraught with difficulties arising from distinguishing between what constitutes a standard trade relationship between two peoples and what can be perceived as pre-colonization. The six centuries of interaction between Iberia and the Mediterranean, prior to Phoenician colonization, left behind a great deal of archaeological evidence which is interpreted by some to refute or confute pre-colonization. Marisa Ruiz-Gálvez, whose work is cited throughout this thesis in support of pre-colonization, does not argue pre-colonization’s existence. She questions its importance. She points out that colonization is usually preceded by a period of interaction between both groups, referencing the exploratory voyages Portugal conducted around the African coast as the start of Africa’s pre-colonization. This approach considers all contact prior to colonization to be pre-colonization. While grammatically correct, what Ruiz-Gálvez describes is a region’s pre-colonial history, not the particular circumstance of pre-colonization described above.

---


In response to the difficulty associated with determining a period of pre-colonization, Jaime Alvar Esquerra provides an alternative approach. He describes two frameworks, “Systemic Hegemonic Mode of Contact” (SHMC) and “Non-Hegemonic Mode of Contact” (NHMC), which precede the establishment of hegemonic colonization. In NHMC the colonizer maintains intermittent contact that has a minimal effect on the potential colony; conversely, in SHMC contact is both frequent and intense. The result is that SHMC creates conditions ripe for colonizers to instill hegemony without resistance.\(^6\)

Pre-colonization and SHMC then are similar, both requiring a period of continued intensifying contact resulting in the control of a foreign land’s resources and trade, but SHMC lacks the charged connotation pre-colonization carries. The differences between SHMC and NHMC, and how they are applicable to pre-colonization, is the frequency and intensity of contact. Put simply, SHMC necessitates a level of frequency and contact capable of fostering the same dominance required by pre-colonization, while NHMC does not and as a result does not promote conditions conducive to colonization, but simply a trade relationship.\(^7\) Although Esquerra’s work does not provide explicit instruction as to secure proof of pre-colonization, it does offer the qualifiers of frequent and intense interaction. These indicators better equip us to examine this transitional period in Iberian history and determine whether the exchanges of the Late Bronze Age are symptomatic of the processes described above.

Chapter one will examine the condition of Iberia prior to interaction with foreign peoples using archaeological evidence to isolate aspects of local culture such as settlement type, burial


\(^7\) Ibid.
practice, metallurgical and pottery techniques. This will provide a better understanding of what technologies and developments should be attributed to local populations, offering a means to compare later phases of interaction for signs of change and possibilities for foreign motivation.

Chapter two will explore the roles of the Mycenaean and Cypriots in pre-colonization. Even though they are not responsible for the colonization of Iberia, establishing and maintaining friendly contact is of crucial importance to later Phoenician interaction. What factors motivated these populations to travel to the limits of their known world, and what technological advancements were needed to allow them to do so? Examining the archaeological evidence associated with the Mycenaean and Cypriot periods will determine what interests they had in Iberia and whether a continuation can be seen in the Phoenician period. For example, if the thriving metallurgical industry alluded to by Herodotus can be supported through the archaeological record, then Iberia’s appeal to these foreign populations becomes less opaque.8

Chapter three focuses on the initial Phoenician interactions with Iberia to determine the nature of their actions in the centuries prior to colonization. When the Phoenicians arrived in Iberia is of chief importance, but is also a source of contention between scholars who support textual evidence and those who rely on archaeological evidence. Both approaches will be scrutinized to provide the earliest possible date for Phoenician interaction on the Peninsula. I will then look closely at extant archaeological evidence between that date and the eighth century BCE—when the Phoenician colonization of Iberia commenced— for evidence of pre-colonization. Particular attention will be given to the adoption of foreign artifacts and practices by both the Phoenicians and Iberians, through which we will then be able to ascertain the nature of the relationship between

8 Herodotus. 1, 163.
the two. The intent of the Phoenicians must also be assessed to determine if colonization was always their goal or if circumstances evolved in such a way that their relationship with Iberia made it an optimal target for colonization.

The occurrences between the arrival of Mediterranean populations and the start of Phoenician colonization, approximately six centuries in total, form the pre-colonial period of Late Bronze Age/Early Iron Age Iberia. To affirm the existence of pre-colonization we must demonstrate both frequent and intensifying interactions between the Phoenicians and the Iberians in the centuries preceding the eighth century BCE, but we must also consider the roles played by the Mycenaeans and Cypriots. Despite not being responsible for Iberia’s colonization, their actions in maintaining continued and intensifying contact with Iberia cannot be undermined. Without these collective circumstances being met pre-colonization would not have been possible.
Chapter One: Iberia Prior to Eastern Mediterranean Involvement

The Eastern Mediterranean presence in Iberia during the Bronze Age is now better understood than ever before. Phoenician influence, previously believed to have been responsible for advanced metallurgy, agriculture, fortifications, and changes in social structure, is now known to be far less instrumental in establishing large-scale settlements than previous scholarship suggested.\(^9\) While archaeological evidence refutes diffusionist claims and clarifies our understanding of the region, it also illuminates the existence of interactions with Mediterranean populations that preceded the arrival of the Phoenicians.\(^10\) Interactions with these outside groups, specifically the Mycenaeans, Cypriots, and Sardinians, are less well understood than those of their Phoenician successors and raise questions. Why did these groups venture to Iberia? Where and when did they make landfall? What were their relationships with the native population, and how did they affect the subsequent colonization of the region by the Phoenicians?

In order to answer these questions, this chapter will examine the state of Iberia as it was prior to the arrival of Eastern Mediterranean populations. To commence research on foreign interaction within Iberia anywhere else is dismissive of the Iberians’ roles within the history of their own region and the dispersal of Mediterranean populations along its coast. Understanding the

---

\(^9\) Adolf Schulten and Angel Montenegro relied solely on textual evidence and used it to applied diffusionist theory to attribute the fortified settlements of the Iberian Chalcolithic and Bronze Age to eastern colonization. Colin Renfrew was particularly critical about the reliance of foreign accounts in establishing Iberia’s history and was instrumental in fostering the negative connotation that the field now harbors for such approaches. Advances in archaeology, most notably the widespread use of carbon fourteen dating, have confoundingly affirmed both stances to be correct. Mycenaean interaction in Iberia is now commonly accepted, though the structures misappropriated by Schulten are now known to be of Iberian origin. For more information see Galán, Manuel Bendala. “A Thorny Problem: Was there Contact between the Peoples of the Sea and Tartessos?” in Encounters and Transformations: The Archaeology of Iberia in Transition. Sheffield, England. Sheffield Academic Press, 1991: Pp. 89-94.

cultures extant prior to the arrival of Mediterranean influencers will serve not only as an aid in interpreting the interactions between Iberian and Mediterranean groups, but will also prevent a continuation of misinformation. The following evidence provides a brief glimpse of Iberian history from the Neolithic to the Bronze Age with the intent of demonstrating a diverse region populated by peoples who had already begun their own pursuits of complex settlements, agriculture, and metallurgy before being exposed to Eastern Mediterranean influence.

The Geography of Iberia

Prior to analyzing Iberia’s inhabitants, it is helpful to understand the landscape of the Peninsula and other relevant regions. The emergence of culturally distinct inhabited regions is a product of Iberia’s geography, which can best be categorized in three different classifications: coastal regions, mountain ranges, and the comparatively flat and dry inland Meseta. Located in the center of the Peninsula, the Meseta of central Iberia is an arid plateau framed by mountain ranges, the looming presence of which deprives the Meseta of coastal winds and rains resulting in a climate with hot dry summers and mild winters. In contrast, the coastal regions and mountains experience plentiful rainfall and are subject to hot humid summers and severe snowfall during the winters. See Figure 1 for an annual Rainfall map of Iberia. The only exception to this rule is the region along the
Peninsula’s Southeastern coast, which like the Meseta is deprived of any rainfall by mountain ranges to its north.\textsuperscript{11}

Climate variation between the northern and southern coasts further increases the Peninsula’s aridity. Northward blowing winds, originating in Africa, cause the southern portion of the Peninsula to be substantially warmer and drier than the north, effectively creating a gradient of temperature spanning from the warmer south to the cooler north. An east-west climate divide also exists in the southern portion of the Peninsula, the western portion of which, since it is located on the Atlantic, is exposed to coastal winds, storms, and tidal shifts. Meanwhile, the eastern coast is protected by the comparatively docile nature of the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{12}

Partitioning the Iberian Peninsula is a dense concentration of mountain ranges and rivers. While the mountain ranges, littered with sheer drops and valleys leading to impassable cliff faces, make travelling throughout the Peninsula difficult if not dangerous, they are also home to a plethora of metal and mineral veins, including gold, silver, tin, and copper. See Figure 2 for a topographic map of Iberia. Whereas mountain ranges are both enticing for their resource deposits and a hinderance to travel, the many rivers of the Peninsula offered alluvial gold, and the added benefit

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Topographic_Map_of_Iberia_Fraga_Figure_3_2014}
\caption{Topographic Map of Iberia (Fraga Figure 3, 2014)}
\end{figure}

of providing transportation both inland and seaward. Rivers will be of the utmost importance once Eastern Mediterranean populations make contact with the Iberian Peninsula because their mouths provide a safe place to take shelter from the harsh conditions of the sea and ocean, while simultaneously offering access inland.\textsuperscript{13}

As a result of these climate differences the settlement patterns of Iberian groups are directly impacted. In the Peninsula’s southeast water can be in such limited supply that competition for it is believed to be a contributing factor to the development of defensive structures. Elsewhere, the sloping terrain makes terracing a requisite for any agricultural pursuits. Also visible in settlement patterns throughout the Peninsula is the use of terrain as a defensive feature. Fortified settlements are often further bolstered by their locations atop steep mountaintops or adjacent to cliff faces that provide natural defense.\textsuperscript{14}

The stark regional variances in Iberia’s geography and separation caused by mountains and rivers led to the development of distinct cultures. Categorizing them into regions is imperative in distinguishing them from one another and delimiting their boundaries. Figure 3 Illustrates the division of Iberia into “Focus Groups” depicting the organization used below to refer to the development of culturally distinct groups. The proposed categorization is based upon the climate and topographic data previously mentioned and the emergence of different cultures in each of the named regions (The Mediterranean Coast, The Straits of Gibraltar, and The Atlantic Coast). Note, as well, that Iberia’s Northern Atlantic coast and central plains will be omitted from the scope of this research since, based on our current knowledge, these areas did not experience the same level of contact with Mediterranean populations. The Northern Mediterranean coast will also be omitted as this region is not colonized by the Phoenicians, but the Greeks. In applying this organizational scheme I do not intend to overgeneralize by limiting Iberia to six culturally distinct regions. Iberia was home to a multitude of people who undoubtedly identified as being different from one another, but who will be examined broadly to examine the development of architecture, metallurgy, and agriculture within Iberia.

*The Iberian Neolithic*
Much in the way that understanding the preexistent cultures of the Iberian Peninsula is integral to perceiving the impact of Mediterranean populations, acknowledging the technological advancements of earlier periods is vital framing for Iberia’s Bronze age. While 5,000 years divide the Neolithic and Late Bronze Age, the dates, rates, and means by which the Neolithic peoples spread from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic coast of Iberia are essential, not merely because they showcase the nautical ability of these peoples, but also because the journey later made by the Mediterranean populations will be much the same.

The Iberian Neolithic began on an east to west trajectory with European immigrants migrating along the coast. Using the sea, and eventually the ocean, as a means with which to migrate into the Iberian Peninsula, Neolithic populations advanced at a rate of five kilometers a year, five times faster than on land in the rest of Europe. Arriving in Eastern Iberia between 5,600-5,500 BCE, Neolithic peoples spread to the Atlantic coast by 5,500-5,400 BCE, before permeating the entire Peninsula by 5,200-5,100 BCE. Such a feat was only possible through the use of marine transportation, comingling with settled groups, and cabotage, the act of maintaining a relatively close proximity to the shoreline during maritime ventures, preventing exposure to the more perilous conditions of the open sea/ocean. This approach also allows for surveying of the coast and stopping as needed. To achieve the above rate, Neolithic peoples underwent frequent voyages of 350 kilometers while undoubtedly stopping for supplies and waiting for favorable weather.

Among the supplies needed by the Neolithic settlers were the usual requisites of food and water, but also people. These journeys would not have been possible without new additions to the

\[\text{References:}\]


16 Isern, Neus, João Zilhão, Joanquim Fort, and Albert J. Ammerman. “Modeling the Role of Voyaging…” in
population. Simply put, a group cannot continue voyaging and settling if it does not retain or produce enough people with which to settle. Interaction with settled coastal groups, for which evidence is plentiful, provided the population influx needed to wholly permeate Iberia.\textsuperscript{17}

While technology advanced from the wicker and hide boats of the Neolithic to the more familiar plank and sail ships of the Bronze Age, cabotage, and interaction with established communities along the coast became fundamental in their expeditions.\textsuperscript{18} Furthermore, the 100 – 200-year period required for Neolithic peoples to migrate and settle from one Iberian coast to the other must be kept in mind when considering Mediterranean populations and their identical journey. If Neolithic peoples were able to traverse the Straits of Gibraltar using rudimentary vessels within a century of arriving on the Peninsula, the Phoenicians were likely able to match this accomplishment in a shorter timeframe.

\textit{The Iberian Chalcolithic}

While the Early Neolithic, 5,600 – 4,500 BCE, was a period of dispersal, the Late Neolithic, 4,500 – 3,500 BCE, and Chalcolithic (3,500 – 2,200 BCE) bore witness to cohesive developments along the Peninsula’s entire southern coast.\textsuperscript{19} While this time period is chronologically removed from the Phoenicians’ arrival by an excess of over 1,200 years, it warrants a brief mention is warranted due to the emergence of conventions pertinent to this thesis such as burial culture, walled settlements, agriculture, metallurgy, and overseas trade.

Although there are slight variations, Southern Iberian burials became increasingly uniform as the Bronze Age approached. The standard means was inhumation, with either a naturally


\\textsuperscript{18} Isern, Neus, João Zilhão, Joanquim Fort, and Albert J. Ammerman. “Modeling the Role of Voyaging…”

occurring pit, man-made cist, *covachas* (man-made pits carved from stone), or urn serving as the body’s/bodies’ container.\(^{20}\)

Grave goods demonstrate a difference in the valuation of items between the eastern and western coasts as well as a growing disparity between social classes. In the east metal is abundantly present in the form of weaponry, tools, and jewelry, but diminishes on a westward trajectory to the point of complete absence in the graves of Southern Portugal.\(^{21}\) The lack of copper was not due to availability, since copper was more readily accessible in the west than the east, but instead indicative of difference in the valuation of metals between the peoples of both regions. In the east, the presence of copper in grave goods demonstrates a developing association between metallurgy and power that will become a mainstay of the region in the Bronze Age.\(^{22}\) The Southwestern Peninsula did not develop this same valuation, and because of that the Chalcolithic is often associated with a period of stagnation.\(^{23}\) Further north near the Tagus River metal becomes more prevalent as weapons, but also as tools. Palmela points, copper projectile points, are the earliest metallic points created in


\(^{22}\) Ibid.

Iberia and first appear in this region. Also present are copper tools, indicating that metal was used not solely as a symbol of status, but retained a functional purpose.\textsuperscript{24} These burial traditions and the indications of social stratification remain unchanged until the introduction of foreign influence in burial practices.

Walled settlements such as Vila de Leceia (3,300-2,900 BCE), Vila Nova de São Pedro (2600-1300 BCE), and Zambujal (2,350-2,150 BCE) in Portugal’s Tagus River valley or the more monumental Los Millares (2,600-1,900 BCE) in Andalucía, Spain, contain the first instances of defensive structures appearing in Iberia. Boasting two walled settlements surrounded by a massive defensive wall, a naturally defensible location, and a design plan that featured cisterns, necropoli, and a city stratified by walls, Los Millares was unsurprisingly

\textsuperscript{24} An indication that the development of trade routes, even if only for stone goods, will facilitate the trade of future technologies once they are developed.
misidentified as Phoenician by Adolf Schulten when it was first excavated. Recent excavations indicate that the walls of Los Millares were home to a strictly regimented society in which elite members maintained stringent control of the city’s metallurgical prospects by limiting access to the technology needed to manufacture and work ores. This conceptualization highlight the region’s growing focus on metallurgy, which will continue to grow in the Bronze Age.

Contrastingly, Zambujal was circular and formed around a communal area bordered by individual domiciles whose adjoining walls made up the settlement’s exterior defensive wall. The redesigning of Zambujal’s walls eight times within the site’s two century existence without any evidence of warfare has led scholars to theorize that the function of the walls may not have been defensive, but a means of social organization. See Figure 7 for a sequence of Zambujal’s walls. Given the above information on Los Millares, the role of social organization in the design of

---


settlements ought not be excluded. The frequent reconstructions are notably different from the periodic additions made to Los Millares, perhaps indicating changes of familial ties and the subsequent redesign of the settlement to form spatial connections amongst families who became linked. Regardless of why the walls were so often relocated and rebuilt, walled settlements become commonplace simultaneously in both the south and west of the Peninsula.

Visible signs of conflict did not accompany the rise of defensive architecture in southern Iberia.\(^27\) The only indication of increasing tensions is the building of walls and the growing presence of weaponry in grave goods. Other than developing as a means of social organization,

\(^{27}\) There exists one site, El Azuer, indicating possible conflict. While El Azuer was a settlement of the Montilla building peoples of La Mancha in the Meseta region, and therefore outside the scope of this thesis. The presence of a burned layer has led scholars to posit that populations from Northern Iberia were venturing south and engaging in warfare, or the inhabitants of the Meseta warred with one another. Evidence for either possibility is inconclusive as this is the only instance of possible warfare to be excavated. For more information see Fernández Castro, María Cruz. *Iberia in Prehistory.* Pp. 1-419.
the growing commonality of walls amongst Southern Iberian populations is linked heavily with the rise of agriculture. To make agriculture possible in regions as arid as Southern Iberia hydraulic systems—wells and irrigation—must first be developed. To accomplish such feats, populations needed to organize and work collectively. The presence of both grape vines and olive bushes is a testament to the region’s stability. The olive bush’s natural draught resistance provides a level of insurance in a region with a particularly arid climate, and the time needed for olive bushes and grape vines to bear fruit testifies to a level of continued maintenance and relative peace. The time and energy invested into agriculture and associated secondary industries increased the Southern Iberians’ willingness to defend their farms and settlements, making the development of walls the result of competition for resources.

Iberia’s growing reliance upon agriculture is accompanied by a notable increase in trade. Various forms of pottery existed during the Neolithic, but the emergence of bell beaker style pottery in Western Iberia during the Chalcolithic provides a means of understanding Chalcolithic trade through the spread of these new forms. Cereals, beans, and other agricultural products endemic to specific climate zones within Iberia were contained within these vessels, and because of their exchange we can posit that there was a thriving trade network centered around agricultural goods. Bell beaker pottery

---

29 Ibid.
30 For information on inland trade involving agriculture see Zapata, Lydia, Leonor Peña-Chocarro, Guillem Perez-Jorda, and Hans-Peter Stika. “Early Neolithic Agriculture in the Iberian Peninsula” Pp. 283-325. For information in regards to the spread of bell beaker culture see Garrido-Pena, Rafael, and Ana Mercedes Herrero-Corral. “Children
rapidly spread throughout Iberia, but by the Late Chalcolithic (2,300 BCE) was present as far east as Northern Italy [signifying the end of the Chalcolithic and start of the Bronze Age].\textsuperscript{31} Dispersal across such a distance is suggestive of an important differentiation between the Chalcolithic and Bronze Ages, the emergence of maritime trade. Not only was this an exchange of goods but also an intermingling of populations and the development of trade-based relationships, which I believe are a precursor to those of the Bronze Age.

Collating the above information on the pre-history of Iberia provides a general framework with which to understand Iberia in the centuries leading up to colonization. The Peninsula was home to different groups of people who shared the common traits of inhumation, large-scale defensive settlements, complex forms of agriculture, metallurgy, and pottery making. Although these practices are similar, they evolved and manifested themselves with regional variances, and most importantly for the purposes of this thesis, independently of Eastern Mediterranean contact. The result is a Peninsula populated with a mosaic of cultures, each of which will experience the effects of contact with the Eastern Mediterranean.

\textit{The Mediterranean Coast}

In the Southeastern Peninsula, El Argar (1,700-1,300 BCE) materializes as the successor to Los Millares after its abandonment, bringing with it a change to the settlement patterns of the region. Made up of many fortified settlements scattered around the Almeria region, El Argar was a conglomerate of different peoples sharing the same culture.\textsuperscript{32} Although still heavily fortified, the

---

\textsuperscript{31} Cunliffe, Barry. \textit{Facing the Ocean...} Pp. 1-514

\textsuperscript{32} It must be noted that in addition to the Argaric culture, the Valenciano culture inhabited the Mediterranean coast of the Iberian Peninsula during Bronze Age. Given that the Valencians inhabited Iberia’s Northern Mediterranean Coast that will later be predominately settled by Greeks, and remain disparate through the Phoenician Period until the Second Punic War, the focus on the southeastern region of the Peninsula will be in relation to El Argar. The
walled settlements of the Argaric period are situated upon hilltops and incorporate the region’s natural topography as a defensive feature more comprehensively than Los Millares did. Sheer drops and impassable cliff faces allowed walls to be only partially built while still providing adequate protection. There was also a reduction in the number of walls from the four surrounding Los Millares to the single walls surrounding Argaric settlements such as La Almoloya, La Bastida, Lorga, and Gatas.

From these fortified locations, the Argaric elite controlled populations within the surrounding valleys. Depending on the settlement’s location the populations outside of the fort were involved in a variety of specialized industries, the development of which is also first seen in El Argar. Agriculture is present on a grander scale than in the Chalcolithic Period, when archaeobotanical evidence indicates exclusion of Valenciano culture is of no serious detriment to the study of culture in the Southern Peninsula, not only because of the future division of these two regions, but also because the metallurgical advancements made during this the Bronze Age are the results of Argaric efforts. The few instances of metallurgy which do exist in the Valencian region show strong indication of Argaric immigration, via the presence of Argaric burial custom of inhumation within homes as opposed to the use of a necropolis. For more information, see: Fernández Castro, María Cruz. *Iberia in Prehistory.* Pp. 1-419.
the monocropping of wheat, which would have provided the necessary food stores needed for the development of other industries.\textsuperscript{33}

Metallurgy also became more complex. Tin replaced arsenical bronze to create stronger alloys. Two-phase casting techniques demonstrate a growing mastery of metallurgy. All of these were furthered by the industrialization of the mining process.\textsuperscript{34} The location of kilns at locations distant from mines denotes a reliance upon specialized workers to mine, refine, and work metals, which were transported by river from site to site in a fashion resembling a rudimentary assembly line. The existence of this system prior to the Phoenicians’ arrival is noteworthy as it became the predominant means of operating once they industrialized the process.\textsuperscript{35}

Metallurgy also indicates social stratification via an unequal distribution of grave goods. While a variety of burial practices are employed by the Argarians—all of which are inhumation within a container—it is the goods and practices associated with them that become stratified. The graves of the wealthy contained lavish assortments of ivory, ostrich eggs, jet, callais beads, amethyst, gold, and bronze, and those which evidently belonged to members of the lowest class, were devoid of any offerings.\textsuperscript{36}

Another indication of a social divide is the practice of funeral feasting, during which an animal was sacrificed and ritually consumed during funeral services. Graves which can be classified as wealthy because of their opulent assemblage of grave goods were also more likely to contain the osteological remains of cattle than the graves of less affluent members of society which

\textsuperscript{34} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{35} Campbell, Brian. Rivers and the Power of Ancient Rome... Pp. 160-379.
\textsuperscript{36} The copper, gold, and silver contained abundantly within these graves demonstrate a level of metallurgical mastery that Diodorus Siculus did not credit to the Iberians. Spurred on by a period of unprecedented wealth, the Iberians’ metallurgical craftsmanship advanced with the production of golden vessels, weapons, jewelry, and silver diadems. Lull, Vicente, Rafael Micó, Cristina Rihuete Herrada, and Roberto Risch. “The Bronze Age in Mediterranean Iberia.” In Iberia. Protohistory of the Far West of Europe: From Neolithic to Roman Conquest. Burgos, Universidade De Burgos, 2014: Pp. 127-146.
yield an increased number of ovicaprid bones.\textsuperscript{37} Sheep and goats mature quickly, especially in comparison to cattle who require more time and a substantially larger amount of food. The use of sheep and goats in a funeral setting is thus practical and affordable, whereas cattle would require a greater expenditure of wealth. The presence of cattle remains in wealthier graves indicates societal members possessed the wealth required to make such a sacrifice, while other individuals were forced to be contented with the more meager offering of sheep and goats.

The Argarians occupied Southeastern Iberia, during the fifteenth and fourteenth centuries BCE, when the first evidence of Eastern Mediterranean interaction is visible in the archaeological record. Two fragments of pottery undoubtedly foreign to the Iberian Peninsula since they are colorized in a manner similar to known Mycenaean pottery and wheel-made—Iberian potters still produced hand-made wares—originate during this period. Further archaeological evidence, in the form of pottery dating to the 13\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century and isometrically confirmed as Cypriot in origin, attests to the interaction with Cypriot groups in Southern Iberia shortly after the abandonment of El Argar. While Mediterranean interaction will be discussed at length in the second chapter, their arrival shortly precedes the migration of populations out of the established El Argar region.\textsuperscript{38}

Why the populations of El Argar migrated is unclear. One theory suggests that the existing social order maintained sufficient control throughout the region to such an extent that the costly defensive settlements were no longer needed and as a result were abandoned.\textsuperscript{39} This fails to explain why an entire area of developed industry was deserted. The depletion of resources, a natural

disaster, or climate change certainly held enough potential to disrupt the already fragile agricultural industry of the region, but there is no evidence that such events took place.\textsuperscript{40} Another theory suggests that the arrival of Mediterranean populations in Southern Iberia, particularly the Straits of Gibraltar, prompted a migration toward this region.\textsuperscript{41} Such an idea must be approached with caution since it can quickly devolve into the diffusionist views of Schulten, in which the Mediterranean colonizing powers are given undue credit for the accomplishments of native peoples.\textsuperscript{42} Simply put, I believe that a preexistent establishment and infrastructure needed to be present in order to attract Mediterranean populations. The increased exchange experienced in the Straits region is an entirely plausible incentive for nearby groups to migrate toward the coast.

\textit{The Straits of Gibraltar}

West of El Argar in the Southern Peninsula, the Straits of Gibraltar was home to the semi-mythical Kingdom of Tartessos. No other location or peoples are more associated with Mediterranean interaction than the Straits and the Tartessians. The success experienced within this region is inextricably linked to the relationship that would develop between Eastern Mediterranean populations and Iberians. Writing of later interactions between the Greeks and Tartessians, Herodotus recounts a tale of the Samian Greeks encountering Arganthonius, the Tartessian king whose name is derived from the silver his kingdom is known for.\textsuperscript{43} The existence of this account implies a cultural memory of an affluent kingdom existed in this region.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{43} Herodotus. 1, 163.
\end{flushright}
When this kingdom began is of much debate. Mariano Ortiz and Carolina López-Ruiz believe that Tartessos was also known as Tarsis, a kingdom described in the Bible as having been visited by King Solomon of Israel and Priam of Tyre. Tarsis is said to have been an intermittent trade partner with the Eastern Mediterranean, particularly noted for providing metals to Egypt and Israel. These biblical references are thus posited by Ortiz and López-Ruiz as indicators of Tarsis’ existence on the metal-rich Iberian Peninsula. They even cite a plethora of words used during this period for the color red: *Troshesh* (Coptic), *Trsh* (Phoenician), *Tiros* (Hebrew), as being attributed to the region because of the red tint of its waters, which even today has earned it the name of the *Rio Tinto* (Red River). Bearing in mind that Phoenicia derived its name from *phonix*, also in reference to a color (purple), these suppositions are not entirely baseless.\(^44\)

Maria Eugenia Aubet Semmler considers the multiple usages of the word Tarsis in the Bible as an indicator of untrustworthy etymology.\(^45\) Seemingly in direct response to Semmler’s skepticism, López-Ruiz gathered each biblical reference to Tarsis to better understand how it was used, see the below table. The results of her research indicate multiple meanings associated with Tarsis, all of which are indicators of a place rich in metals engaging in maritime trade.\(^46\) Thus, although used by Semmler as a means to disprove the connection between Tarsis and Tartessos, these references—particularly those to metals—reinforce it. Even with opposing stances, neither


\(^{45}\) Semmler, a leading body on Phoenician interaction in the Mediterranean, is extremely conservative in considering an early date for contact between the Eastern and Western Mediterranean and was vehemently opposed to considering interaction between the two prior to the 10th century. In light of recent archaeological evidence she has modified her stance to be more open to the idea, but is still cautious in altering her conclusions. Semmler, Maria Eugenia Aubet. Trans. Marilyn R. Bierling. Ed. Marilyn R. Bierling and Seymour Giton. “The Phoenician Impact on Tartessos: Spheres of Interaction” in *The Phoenicians in Spain*. Winona Lake, Indiana; Eisenbrauns, 2002: Pp. 225-240.

group of scholars will deny the emergence of a thriving kingdom in the straits associated with metallurgy.

**Table 2: Biblical Uses of the Word Tarsis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implied Meaning</th>
<th>Number Made</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Location</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tartessian Ships</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Precious Stone, Perhaps Silver</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Personal Name</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The center of Tartessian culture is located between the Guadalquivir and Guadiana Rivers on the Atlantic side of the Straits. Not only is this expanse of land rich in metals and rivers with which to transport ore, its positioning makes it either the last possible area in which to anchor a ship entering the Mediterranean or the first place a ship may find respite after making the difficult journey to the Atlantic. The presence of ivory and ostrich eggs in Southern Iberia also attests to the importance of this region in conducting trade with North Africa.  

This combination of a rich collection of natural resources and a convenient location allowed the Tartessians, at the height of their power to wield influence over populations on both the Eastern and Western coasts of the Peninsula, undoubtedly contributing to the success of Tartessos.

Nomenclature and location aside, Tartessos’ initial involvement in the production of metals is also subject to debate. Archaeological evidence substantiates the existence of settlements in this region, developing during the 2nd millennium BCE, and showing advanced signs of metallurgical activity. With access to abundant supplies of ore, the Straits region’s rapid development of a metallurgical industry, akin to that of the aforementioned Argarians, in which specialized workers

---

mined, refined, and worked metals as they were transported downstream, is no surprise. The quantity of ore in the Rio Tinto region alone allowed mining to occur on such a grand scale that the debris generated during antiquity is still being used in Spanish infrastructure projects, and to a degree that the purity of the remaining materials is so low that modern mining techniques are unable to yield a profit through its reprocessing.\textsuperscript{49}

Our limited understanding of Southern Iberia prior to the rise of Tartessos is due to a focus on the coming Phoenician period. Not only does the region’s current inhabitation prevent excavation, but the excavations that do occur are focused on the period of Phoenician occupation rather than earlier periods of inhabitation. Even this is at times challenging because deeper strata are often unreachable due to the region’s rising water table. This paucity of information leaves us with lacunae in our knowledge regarding the inhabitation of the Straights of Gibraltar during the Early Bronze Age.

\textit{The Atlantic Coast}

Limitations in knowledge do not exist solely in the Southern Peninsula. The Algarve region of Southern Portugal is devoid of any known settlements, and evidence of burials grows sparser as time progresses toward the arrival of Mediterranean groups. Activity on Iberia’s Western Coast was situated around the Tagus River Valley, but the abandonment of settlements and dispersal of populations suggests a period of instability at the end of the Chalcolithic and start of the Bronze Age. Within the Tagus Estuary, Santarem is home to a site that was continuously occupied from the Early Bronze Age through the arrival of the Phoenicians and start of the Iron Age. While

\textsuperscript{49} The quantities of debris nearby the Rio Tinto are the product of centuries of mining in the region both prior to Mediterranean interaction and after. The nature of mining as a destructive industry does not lend itself to trending the growth of a mining industry, but does allow us to definitively state that at the height of its success, mining was a chief industry of the Tartessians. For more information see T. A. Rickard, “The Mining of the Romans in Spain,” \textit{The Journal of Roman Studies}, Vol. 18, (1928) 129-143.
excavations are ongoing, the rare presence of Cogotas type pottery, originating in the Iberia’s central Meseta, provides an indicator of who these people were interacting with and perhaps emigrating toward.\textsuperscript{50}

The stalled development of Western Iberia is seen by some scholars as a period of regression, a view which is not only unfair in that the criticism is derived from a comparison to other cultures progressing along different courses, but also because it undervalues the advancement that did occur. A thriving trade in amphibolite, a stone particularly useful in tool making, spanned the entire length of modern-day Portugal. In addition to demonstrating the existence of an infrastructure large enough to extract stone and disperse it throughout the region, stone-working became an advanced trade with various forms of adzes and blanks that could later be formed into tools of choice being manufactured.\textsuperscript{51} Although stone tools are not the development of a new technology, the importance of maintaining an industry and inter regional connectivity until the Bronze Age must not be undermined, as these concepts will inevitably become vital when interacting with Mediterranean populations.

Regions as significant as the Straits and Atlantic coast left so incompletely understood is unfortunate, and leaves our understanding of Iberia during the Late Bronze Age on the eve of first contact with Eastern Mediterraneans full of uncertainty. The most well understood and established culture, El Argar, dissipates just as Mediterranean populations arrive on the Peninsula. Comparatively, Portugal’s Algarve is devoid of any walled settlements or the intensive development of industry discovered in the other regions analyzed. The largest bastion of activity on the Atlantic Coast is the Tagus River Valley of Central Portugal, which lacks the extensive


collection of settlements, artifacts, or an industry that can compare to the development of metallurgy and agriculture on Iberia’s Mediterranean Coast and is still only partially understood due to the ongoing nature of excavations.

While the transitional period of the Final Bronze Age into the Phoenician Period remains opaque, some conclusions may be based on the information presented here. The geography of Iberia was conducive to the development of different settlement patterns who located themselves around limited resources and the natural defensive features offered by the topography. A byproduct of the division caused by Iberia’s geography was an assemblage of culturally distinct peoples, who developed their own rituals, settlements, and industries prior to interacting with Eastern Mediterranean populations.

The Neolithic and Chalcolithic, though chronologically removed, also offer information pertinent to the understanding of Mediterranean interaction. The two hundred-year period needed for Neolithic groups to settle the coastal regions of Iberia provides a maximum timeframe to gauge future Mediterranean voyages, while the Iberian Chalcolithic contains many of the technological advances that were once thought to be the result of interactions with Eastern Mediterranean populations. Reviewing the above information makes clear that agriculture and metallurgy were growing in importance well before the arrival of Mycenaeans, Cypriots, or Phoenicians. The extreme variation in their pursuit between the Mediterranean and Atlantic Coasts is staggering, but highlights the differentiation amongst Iberian populations. The prospect of a region rich in agricultural goods and metals, with a long-standing interest in maritime trade—as evidenced by the dispersal of Chalcolithic Bell Beakers—would undoubtedly have failed to go unnoticed by other Mediterranean merchants who would soon be looking for a means to endure the palatial breakdown of the Mediterranean Bronze Age.
Chapter Two: The Mycenaean and Cypriot Period

First contact between Iberian and Mediterranean populations is crucial for understanding the transitional period between the end of the Late Bronze Age and the start of the Iron Age. Changes in grave goods, social organization, and technology, occurring in tandem with an increased presence of foreign objects with eastern provenance, indicate that Iberia underwent an extended period of interaction with Mycenaeans and Cypriots prior to the Phoenicians’ arrival. This chapter will rely on archaeological evidence to explore these initial encounters with the intention of better understanding how, when, and why they made their voyages across the Mediterranean. Particular attention will be given to the importance of these interactions in the greater discourse on pre-colonization.

The period between first contact with Iberia and Mediterranean populations and the arrival and eventual colonialism of the Phoenician period was particularly prolonged, spanning from the late fifteenth to the tenth/ninth centuries BCE. This duration is best divided into two periods, the Mycenaean (fifteenth – thirteenth/twelfth centuries BCE) and Cypriot (thirteenth – tenth centuries BCE).52 While referred to by the peoples who were at that time conducting the most interaction with Iberia, these periods ought not be thought of as exclusively belonging to these respective peoples. Iberian trade during the Late Bronze Age must not be interpreted as something that was strictly regimented and controlled. While the Mycenaeans and Cypriots were the predominant

parties engaging in trade, there is evidence indicating that settlements in modern Italy and Sardinia respectively were also active, albeit lesser, participants.
Logistics

Before discussing the evidence for the arrival of Eastern Mediterranean populations on the Iberian Peninsula, their presence begs the question of how and why they undertook such a daring voyage? The journey from the easternmost to the westernmost point of the Mediterranean and the Atlantic Coast was neither easily made nor attempted without technological advances. Ruiz-Gálvez cites three requisites for Eastern Mediterranean populations to safely reach the Iberian Peninsula, the first of which is more formidable ships. Although outfitted with rows of oars, a main sail, and anchors, ships of the Late Bronze Age were still reliant upon cabotage much like their Neolithic predecessors. The availability of larger ships, as evidenced by the wrecks of the Uluburun and Cape Gelidonya, afforded room to hold substantial quantities of provisions and provide sailors room to sleep. Such minor additions to a ship’s architecture may seem trivial, but that advancement saved travelers invaluable time that was previously wasted resupplying or searching for a place to put to shore and sleep.

The importance of time in such a voyage cannot be understated. Traveling across the entire Mediterranean takes approximately eighty to ninety days when utilizing ships of the period. Given that the ideal sailing period of the Mediterranean is only a six-month span from July to October, there is hardly any time for conducting trade once the travelers reach their destination, even without the added burden of unnecessary excursions. The implications of such a time restriction make overnight navigation a requirement. While this is the subject of debate among

---

54 Aubet, Maria Eugenia. The Phoenicians and the West... Pp. 70-193.
55 The travel estimates provided by are based on distances traveled in straight lines. Any additional excursions in search of supplies, shelter, or trade partners would substantially delay a voyage from Tyre to Gadiz. For more information see Aubet, Maria Eugenia. The Phoenicians and the West... Pp. 70-193.
scholars, the remains of what is believed to have been a lighthouse in Ugarit indicates that navigating in the dark is not something that was revolutionary during the Late Bronze Age.\textsuperscript{56} While lighthouses did not guide the way to Iberia, the practice of voyaging after sunset was evidently routine enough for sailors to brave the journey.

The final prerequisite for Eastern Mediterranean peoples to be able to safely navigate to the westernmost point in Europe is the incorporation of local knowledge, which requires working relationships with various native peoples on the route. Such knowledge not only allowed access to local trade networks but also provided critical information on how to navigate the treacherous currents surrounding the Straits of Gibraltar.\textsuperscript{57} Without local knowledge foreign navigators would not have learned that the easiest manner of exiting the straits is from the south. Although counter intuitive, those seeking to exit the Mediterranean needed to pass the straits entirely and follow the curvature of Northern Africa until parallel to Ibiza whence they must sail north until being caught in a westward current.\textsuperscript{58} Attempting to enter the Straits from the Spanish Coast would have resulted in ships having to struggle against both eastward winds and currents, which even in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century CE force seamen to anchor for weeks waiting for favorable conditions.\textsuperscript{59}

\textit{Motivation}

Given the difficulty of the journey, why then would eastern populations incur the risk of traveling to Iberia with hulls filled with valuable merchandise? Firstly, there must have been a high probability of return. While we are unfortunately unable to determine the exact profitability

\textsuperscript{57} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{58} Aubet, Maria Eugenia. \textit{The Phoenicians and the West: Politics, Colonies, and Trade} Pp. 70-193.
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid.
of such a voyage, Tartessos—which will later be heavily associated with the period of Phoenician colonization—is known as having been inhabited prior to the arrival of Eastern Mediterranean populations. The extent to which industry was developed in this region is difficult to measure with existent information, but through the dispersal of bell beaker pottery we know that maritime trade was conducted.

The existence of a trade partner ought not be seen as the only motivator for Eastern Mediterranean peoples voyaging across the Mediterranean. The metals, minerals, and agricultural benefits available in Iberia were enticements for any interested trading partners, but supply without demand insufficiently explains why westward voyages occurred with greater frequency. Increasing evidence for Eastern Mediterranean interaction in Iberia during the thirteenth century BCE suggests that the stimulus responsible for creating that demand was the Mediterranean palatial breakdown and the Late Bronze Age collapse soon after. The proximity in time between these events cannot be seen as a coincidence and has led Ruiz-Gálvez to theorize that the collapse of such institutions not only forced people out in search of new more stable trade partners, but also released a large number of skilled craftsmen into the Mediterranean. The untethering of these artisans is the means by which previously unused techniques such as lost wax casting, rotary techniques, cupellation, and iron working spread throughout the Iberian Peninsula during the second millennium.

While the profit margin of early expeditions to Iberia are unknown, Herodotus references their profitability in his account of Colaeus who according to the tale was blown off course while conducting trade in the Atlantic during the 7th century BCE and landing in the “virgin” port of Tartessos. Despite the haphazard means of arrival, Herodotus records Colaeus as having generated sixty talents of profit. Herodotus. 1, 163. The profit margin generated by voyages during the 2nd millennium was unlikely to be as high because the region was not wholly industrialized until the Phoenicians began colonizing, but this provides insight into the wealth that could be accrued during a single voyage to Iberia. Given the routineness of trade conducted with Iberia during the 7th century BCE, the notion of a port in Tartessos that had remained unreached by western populations is laughable and casts doubt on the unplanned and accidental nature of Colaeus’ voyage.

Archaeological evidence further supports palatial collapse as the motivating force behind the spread of peoples to Iberia. Costa del Negro, Purullena, on Granada’s southern coast, is home to multiple sherds of wheel made pottery, a technique which is not adopted by Iberian populations until the Phoenician period. Among these sherds were those belonging to a pithos found in conjunction with local Cogotas type pottery, in the burned remains of a domicile. Although the building’s carbonized remains would typically allow for an accurate means of dating, the contents of the vessel and the carbon outside yielded two different dates, sparking a debate over the sherds’ age. We are in turn left with the wide range of the late sixteenth century BCE to as late as the mid-twelfth century BCE.62

The Mycenaean Phase (Fifteenth – Thirteenth Centuries BCE)

---

Two sherds of wheel-made pottery unearthed in Llanete de los Morros, Montoro, Cordoba radio carbon dated as being from the fourteenth - twelfth centuries BCE. These sherds and one from Purullena were determined, using Atomic Absorption Spectroscopy (AAS), to have originated in a Mycenae-Berbati workshop in Argolid, Greece. Many have taken these results to be an affirmation of Mycenaean trade on the Iberian Peninsula. Of course, two samples alone are not an affirmation of a Mycenaean presence in Iberia and are more suggestive of indirect trade conducted by the Cypriots who were known to be active in the region. Nevertheless, there is mounting evidence to further support the actual presence of Mycenaeans in Iberia.\footnote{Ibid.}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Mycenaean_Sherds_Llanete_de_Los_Morros.png}
\caption{Mycenaean Sherds of Llanete de Los Morros (Martin Figure C, 2017)}
\end{figure}
Carnelian beads are of particular importance because, while carnelian does not naturally occur in Iberia, it is a luxury item commonly exchanged in the Eastern Mediterranean. Its appearance in Cordoba and Galicia suggests Mediterranean involvement spanning from Cordoba in the southeast to Galicia in the northwest of the Peninsula. Although a strong Mycenaean presence on Iberia’s Atlantic Coast may seem odd, this region has yielded significant archaeological evidence which leaves no doubt regarding whether the artifacts present on the Mediterranean coast arrived by direct or indirect contact. Laxe Auga dos Cervos, located in the Santa Maria de Oya Bay of Galicia, Spain, is home to a depiction of red deer and an eastern style ship carved into a rockface. The ship itself has been referred to as Aegean in style, containing a large hull, many oars, and what is perhaps a sail, with comparisons being made between it and similar pieces in Mount Carmel, Israel, and the Teneida Oasis, Egypt. The presence of such a depiction in these latter examples is no surprise as their location in the Eastern Mediterranean places them in closer proximity to these ships, affording first hand

---

examples of their appearance. The rendering of such a ship in Galicia, near the find of a carnelian bead, suggests that the Mediterranean ships were known by the peoples present there.

The distance between these locations is further littered with thirteenth century evidence for eastern interaction. Iron, originating as far back as the thirteenth century BCE, but appearing sporadically dating to the eleventh century BCE, is intermittently found along the Portuguese coast at sites such as Baiões, Santa Luzia, and Monte do Trigo. In some instances, the iron was formed into fully functional blades, while in others the smelting process has gone awry. One particular piece, a partly finished iron chisel with a bronze handle fused to it, has drawn much scholarly attention, as it and the above-mentioned samples seem to indicate that locals were acquiring foreign artifacts and experimenting with the technology used to make them. In addition to the iron tools, a triangular bronze knife with a gilded handle found at the site of Belemque in modern Portugal was identified as similar in form to the knife found in the Tholos of Vapheio in Mycenae.66

One final piece of artifactual evidence for Mycenaean interaction are the warrior stelae of the Peninsula’s Southwest. In use from the twenty-second – sixth century BCE, the initial stelae were burial markers intended to be laid upon a grave site. Early examples contained no more than carvings of shields, spears, and swords, but as their use continued the assemblage of artifacts depicted on them grew to include people, deities, and various forms of material culture. Over time, they were made with elongated blank areas, suggesting they were meant to be displayed upright, at which point they are thought to have taken on the role of territory markers. Alfredo Mederos

Martin attributed a Mycenaean origin to them. This conclusion, however, relies on a misinterpretation of archaeological evidence. Mederos Martin’s theory is contingent upon the use of stelae by peoples of both regions and the depiction of a chariot crossing a body of water on a stela of Shaft Grave V in Mycenae which he claims is evidence of an expansive trade network. Mederos Martin assigned an extremely early date of Mycenaean interaction with Iberia, one that precedes all other evidence by two centuries, by citing the emergence of the Iberian stelae to the sixteenth century BCE and dismissing evidence pointing to their twenty-second century beginnings.67

Further weakening his argument are the drastic differences between the two types of stelae. The Mycenaean samples in question cover walls and depict entire scenes. Early Iberian stelae are often referred to as slabs since they were never intended to be displayed upright, only depict swords, shields, and spears, and are believed to have been displayed horizontally in a funerary setting. The armament depicted in these reliefs is Iberian in origin; particularly identifiable is a V notched shield which isn’t seen in Mycenae until the 8th century BCE.68 While these stelae will later become unquestionable proof of growing eastern involvement in the Iberian Peninsula, crediting their origin to Mycenae is simply unsupported by archaeological data.

Unfortunately, a Mycenaean presence on the Atlantic is not reflected in the region’s settlements or burials, indicating the contact made between both groups did not advance into

---

68 Although the spread of the V notched shield occurs much later, it is worth mentioning that their spread during the 8th century BCE is followed soon after by their spread to Ireland in the 7th century BCE. While such a pattern may be coincidental, Iberia’s role as a lynchpin between Mediterranean and Atlantic trade may perhaps play a role in the dissemination of this shield type. Celestino-Pérez, Sebastian. “Precolonization and Colonization in the Interior of Tartessos” in Colonial Encounters in Iberia Phoenician, Greek, and Indigenous Relations. Chicago, Illinois. The University of Chicago Press, 2009: Pp.239-251.
exchanges of foreign social organization or cultural practices. Although this may seem damning, the absence of evidence is the result of an overall lack of detailed information in respect to any settlements or burials on the Atlantic coast. As stated in the previous chapter, a regressive period is often attributed to Iberia’s Atlantic Coast, one that quickly recedes with the arrival of eastern populations and the establishment of regular contact with the Mediterranean and Northern Atlantic.\footnote{Lillios, Katina T. “Groundstone Tools, Competition, and Fission...” Pp. 25-32.} Despite the lack of evidence, scholarly assertions posit that the increased appearance of iron and eastern artifacts is a result of easterners settling along the coast. While such claims are linked heavily with the Mediterranean palatial collapse releasing a large number of artisans into the Mediterranean, they do not imply colonization or even emporium. Rather, the suggestions of settlement during this period are limited to individual artisans, such as a potter in Montoro and a smith along the Atlantic coast.\footnote{Ruiz-Galves, Marissa. “Before ‘the Gates of Tartessos’...” Pp. 196-214. And Ruiz-Gálvez, Marissa. “The Atlantic Iberia...” Pp. 161-180.}

The archaeological evidence for a purely Mycenaean period of interaction presented above is scanty. Individually the artifacts presented above may be written off as anomalies, but given the different types—pottery, paintings, beads, the seemingly Mycenaean knife, and rudimentarily worked pieces of iron—there is sufficient evidence to suggest that Iberia was partaking in either direct or indirect contact with Eastern Mediterranean populations. Identifying this as direct contact between Mycenaeans and Iberians poses a challenge with the current available evidence and certainly highlights the need for continued excavations. Mariano Torres Ortiz, Ruiz-Gálvez, and Manuel Galan rely on the information presented above and the lack of artifacts suggesting another responsible to deduce a Mycenaean phase of interaction.
If such a period existed it was brief. Artifacts of Cypriot origin appeared with increasing frequency, suggesting that they became the dominant trade partner with the Iberian Peninsula. The presence of both Cypriot and Mycenaean artifacts between the thirteenth and twelfth centuries BCE indicates overlap in the time during which both groups are thought to be active on the Peninsula. This appears to be the time during which Cyprus overtakes Mycenae’s role in the extant trade network, but Marissa Ruiz-Gálvez presents a third option. Rather than imagining trade as being conducted with specific regions—Mycenae, Cyprus, Phoenicia—she suggests that merchant vessels were likely crewed by peoples hailing from a variety of homelands.71

This directly coincides with her theory surrounding the Mediterranean palatial breakdown as the catalyst for the spread of skilled artisans throughout the Mediterranean. In this framework, craftsmen ventured out into the Mediterranean, banding together in search of a new location where they could use their skillsets. She cites the different origins of artifacts and the presence of specialized tool kits found aboard shipwrecks such as those of the Uluburn and Cape Gelidonya as support for this theory, but also the archaeological evidence for early iron working along Atlantic Iberia.72

Building upon her theory we must re-conceptualize Bronze Age trade not as rigid systems divided by place of origin, but one that was incredibly diverse and interconnected. In respect to the transition from a possible Mycenaean to Cypriot phase of interaction her approach explains the

---


seamless transition by which Cyprus enters into Iberia. Multi-national crews would have facilitated a rapid spread of information, allowing Cyprus to learn of Iberia and its whereabouts so that it too could conduct trade.

*The Cypriot Phase (Thirteenth – Tenth Centuries BCE)*

Evidence for Mycenaean interaction exists solely in the Peninsula’s south and west, while the Cypriot phase includes both of these areas as well as incorporates the southeastern region that was home to the Argaric culture. Even though El Argar was in decline from the sixteenth to the fourteenth centuries BCE there is evidence of a what is traditionally ascribed to as Cypriot interaction. Villena is home to two hoards, a larger and smaller. The larger hoard, intentionally deposited in a dried-out river bed, consisted of sixty-five pieces of gold and silver jewelry and plates. The smaller hoard, contained thirty-five pieces of gold and silver, among which is a partially worked ingot. The adornments and vessels were made with the same techniques as those found in the larger hoard, but the ingot has led scholars to believe that this was a goldsmith’s hoard.  

While the forms and patterns of the plates found in both hoards are Iberian in nature, they were made with technology that was previously not available (or at least thus far unseen) in Iberia. The requisite technique is lost wax casting and is found in Cyprus during this time, but is not the only indicator that foreign parties were likely involved with the manufacturing of these pieces.

---

74 While advanced metallurgical techniques are likely present elsewhere in the Mediterranean, their use in Cyprus is of particular importance since it augments the extant connection between Iberia and Cyprus. For more information see. Ruiz-Gálvez Priego, Marisa. “The West of Iberia…” Pp. 93-120.
Two additional pieces, consisting of a small iron ring and an iron fragment believed to be an adornment made to be attached to a sword hilt, were included in the larger hoard. The treatment of iron as a precious metal is not uncommon in the Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age, but is a stark contrast to the usages of iron on the western coast of Iberia, where iron was being shaped into tools for everyday use. Nonetheless, the most remarkable feature is the iron hilt adornment because of the nail protruding from it. This nail is double ended and served the simple purpose of fastening the object to the metal core of a hilt. The nail’s form is worthy of little attention, but its appearance marks the first use of nails in Iberia, which previously relied upon rivets and pins to fasten objects together. The emergence of this technology in Iberia during the thirteenth century BCE coincides with the common usage of nails in Cyprus during the same time period. The nail and hoard of expertly crafted golden artifacts suggest a foreign presence interacting through the exchange of either the technology needed to create these artifacts, or the artifacts themselves.

Advances in metallurgy are not unique to Villena. Excavations conducted in 2015 at the Argaric palace of Almoloya uncovered a

---

princess’ tomb filled with gold and silver artifacts made using lost wax casting. Data regarding the dating of these artifacts has yet to be published, but the site as a whole is believed to have been inhabited from the twenty-third century BCE to the sixteenth century BCE. The implications of sixteenth century artifacts indicating the use of advanced metallurgical techniques may force scholars to reconsider how early eastern involvement took place or perhaps even consider the possibility of advanced metallurgical techniques developing in Iberia. Until dates are assigned to these artifacts all discussions pertaining to their impact on our understanding of metallurgy in Iberia are no more than conjecture.

Aside from perhaps indicating an earlier date for the existence of advanced metallurgical techniques, the royal tomb of Almoloya also shows signs of changes in burial culture. Cist graves

---

and urn graves were the common means of burial throughout the southern half of the Iberian Peninsula, and while the royal burial was contained within a vessel, that vessel was not vertically stacked as traditional urn burials were. Rather, the burial was contained within a large horizontally placed pithos sealed with a limestone slab. This becomes the standard means of Argaric burial until its collapse in the fourteenth century BCE. Although not drastically different enough to signify a break in the continuity of burial culture, the adoption of a foreign vessel for the funerary purposes of a society’s most elite members denotes both access to foreign goods and a high valuation placed upon them by the Argaric elite.

The usage of foreign pottery was neither solely reserved for the elite nor burial practices. La Cuesta del Negro, in Purullena, Granada, just south of Argaric territory but before entering the Straits, and Llanete de los Moros in Montoro, Cordoba, adjacent to Granada yet located inland, are home to sites which have thus far yielded the most foreign pottery outside of the Straits. Different from the local pottery, which was handmade, carinated, and either black with a metallic sheen or red and ornamented with indentations, these pieces were wheel made and in some instances contain bichrome contain geometric patterns. Not only were these sherds decorated in

---
the style of the Cypriot Geometric period, they possessed the defining features of narrow bases, wide mouths, and vertical strap handles. The best example of this is the Purullena pithos and a Cypriot pithoid krater from Kommos, both of which contain vertical straps, low and wide mouths, and bodies that decrease in width as they approach the base (See Figure 1).79

The duration of time over which these sherds were deposited further augments the connection to Cyprus. In addition to the sherds described above, there are four additional sets of sherds which have been dated to 1371-1317, 1289-1262, 1256-1134, and 1106-1050 BCE respectively.80 When viewed sequentially with the Mycenaean sherds discussed, a six-century timeframe spanning from the fifteenth/sixteenth – eleventh century BCE becomes evident. The dispersal of these artifacts through time is a clear indication of continued contact demonstrated through pottery alone.

80 Mederos Martin, Alfredo. “The Mycenaean Contacts with the Iberian Peninsula…”
In addition to the ceramic examples thus far described, bronze vessels foreign to Iberia, particularly bowls, provide another insight into an eastern presence in Iberia. The bowls themselves are diminutive in size—less than four centimeters high and less than seventeen centimeters wide—yet offer an indisputable connection to both Cyprus and the Mediterranean’s eastern shore. Three sites, Berzocana in Cáceres, Spain, Nora Velha in Ourique, Portugal, and Baiões in Viseu, Portugal, are home to these bowls, though the first location receives the most attention. Similar to the other examples, the Berzocana bowl is made using the lost wax casting techniques debuted during this period of interaction, but also contains a handle and perhaps the remnants of where a second one was once soldered to the vessel.

Previous scholarship dates the Berzocana bowl as being from anywhere between the sixteenth and seventh centuries BCE. Theories dating the bowl's manufacturing to every century within that range exist, but a recent comparison of bronze bowls found across the Mediterranean posits that it originated between the twelfth and eleventh centuries BCE. This theory is rooted in tracing the migration of the Tjeker peoples from Israel, to Cyprus, and eventually the Mediterranean in correlation with the presence of bowls during periods of Tjeker occupation. The bowls in question are identical in size, shape, and means of manufacturing, and they are well

---

represented with samples being found in the locations provided in Table 2, underlying the existence of a system of exchange that stretched from the Eastern Mediterranean to the Atlantic coast of Iberia. 82

82 Ibid.
Two golden neck torcs located in conjunction with the Berzocana hoard provide further indication of a thriving trade network. Made via casting and hammering, with decoration consisting of fine line work, soldering, and filigree indicative of eastern techniques, these torcs are perhaps the first example of foreign metallurgy being used to create an object of local cultural significance.\textsuperscript{83} Foreign to the Cypriots, these neck torcs are proof of routine exchange between Mediterranean populations and the Iberians, since it would have required sustained interaction to learn the valuation placed on these adornments by local peoples. These torcs are also an indication that a goldsmith skilled enough to manufacture them resided in or visited the area.

The torcs’ importance lies not only in their qualities as adornments or as representations of foreign and local styles being melded together. In the late 1990s Eduardo Galan Domingo made the discovery that each torc’s weight, 750g and 950g respectively, was 6.5 and 8 times the weight of the 11.75g Microasiatic shekel. Despite the absence of shekels in Iberia, understanding their

origin, dissemination, and – most importantly – who used them, provides greater insight into the nature of trade in Iberia. For example, weights corresponding to the 7.9g shekel later employed by the Phoenicians are found in areas formerly controlled by Tartessos, such as Cancho Roano, Quinta da Almaraz, and Cerro del Villar. Such a distribution suggests that the Phoenician interaction with Iberia occurred predominately in the Straits region with the Tartessians. Likewise, weights correlating to the 9.4g Syrian shekel used by the Cypriots are present along the entire Atlantic coast, suggesting the occurrence of not only interaction, but also of trade.

The presence of these weights also serves as a timeline for dating the hoard. By the twelfth century BCE the Syrian shekel fell out of circulation and was replaced briefly by the 5.8g Microasiatic half-shekel. The torcs accompanying the Berzocana bowls are an indicator of this change, correlating to the weight of a whole Microasiatic shekel (11.75g). Within a century, an approximate 9g weight once again circulated, providing a century-long span that coincides with the dating Carlos Zorea derived from the exchange of bronze bowls.

The most notable difference between the Cypriot presence on Iberia’s Atlantic and Mediterranean coasts is the type of evidence found in each one. Much like the pottery in Granada and Cordoba, the iron metallurgy of the Atlantic coast shows a continuation of interaction from the Mycenaean period to the Cypriot at the aforementioned sites of Baiões, Santa Luzia, and Monte do Trigo. During this period of continued contact, two important phenomena occur. Firstly, the level of metallurgical craftsmanship greatly improves, allowing for bronze work of the highest

85 While there are multiple interpretations of the archaeological data, as well as considerations to be made regarding the uniform cessation of a currency’s use throughout the entire Mediterranean, twelfth century date attributed to the Berzocana bowls and torcs was arrived at via two different means by two different scholars, providing the most conclusive dating of the hoard thus far. For information on shekel weights see Ruiz-Gálvez, Marissa. “Before ‘the Gates of Tartessos’:...” Pp. 196-214. And Ruiz-Gálvez, Marissa. “The Atlantic Iberia:...” Pp. 161-180.
quality to be produced. Secondly, whereas material evidence of trade during the Mycenaean period is indicative of exclusively one-way trade from the Mediterranean to Iberia, during the Cypriot period material culture originating in Iberia begins making its way into the Mediterranean.\(^6\) This does not imply that Iberian goods were unavailable in Mediterranean markets. Mediterranean traders undoubtedly targeted Iberian consumables—agricultural and metallurgical, but evidence for the adoption of Iberian material does not exist until the Cypriot phase.

*Iberian Material in the Eastern Mediterranean*

The Cypriot phase contains the first evidence of Iberian artifacts used in the Eastern Mediterranean. This marks the beginning of a unified Mediterranean trade network in which artifacts were traded between the eastern and westernmost points of the Mediterranean. The forms of Iberian material culture present in foreign contexts are rotary spits, Huelva-type swords, and fibulae. Each of these objects is made using the same metallurgical techniques, lost wax casting, filigree, soldering, and the use of bi-valve molds, introduced in Eastern Iberia during this period. Despite both the early instances of iron working in Iberia and being on the cusp of the iron age, the artifacts produced during this period were predominately made of bronze.\(^7\) Their exchange underlies the brief period of time during which a Late Bronze Age Atlantic trade network existed. During this time Iberia acted as a conduit, forming a link between both the Mediterranean and the British Isles, through which the involved parties’ influences were transferred. The dispersion of these artifacts demonstrates a growing interaction between Iberia and the Eastern Mediterranean.

\(^6\) Iberian influence is also visible in the British Isles and France, but as the focus of this thesis is on the Mediterranean discussion of the former will be limited to instances in which they are applicable.

\(^7\) Ortiz, Mariano Torres. “Tarsis, Tartessos, Turdetania” Pp. 251-283.
Originating in Iberia during the 14th century BCE, rotary spits are large skewers used in rotisserie cooking. Although not the most artifactually well represented, rotary spits are the earliest examples of a Bronze Age Atlantic trade network and Iberian influence on its trade partners, with examples found in France (6), England (2), Cyprus (1), and Sardinia (1). Iberian rotary spits are often found in situ with cauldrons, attesting to their functional usage, but in Cyprus and Sardinia they are found in funerary hoards.88 Inclusion within a funerary context suggests that the spits were not used, but rather had prestige value associated with them because of their foreign origin. While the presence of rotary spits in both the Atlantic and Mediterranean affirms that Iberians were interacting in both regions, the presence of an Atlantic flesh hook in Sardinia confirms that goods were being transported between these trade networks.

Similarly, Huelva type swords are present in French, British, and Sardinian contexts.89 Previously thought by scholars to be a subgrouping of carp’s tongue swords, the Huelva type is now reclassified as its own unique form in use between eleventh and ninth centuries BCE.90 Typified by the convex curvature of its hilt, a minute or altogether absent recasso, a leaf shaped blade, and short sword variants, the Huelva type deserves particular attention as it was the precursor to both the Nantes and Sa-Idda sword types that emerged in France and Sardinia.

90 The classification of the Huelva type as its own unique form does to no degree imply that the Huelva type was not influenced by previous forms such as the Hío (Spain) or Blackmoor (British Isles) which are known to predate its appearance in the archaeological record. Furthermore, my omission of the many sub-classifications of Huelva swords is due to the lack of contribution that information offers to the understanding of exchange within the Mediterranean. For information on the Carp’s Tongue Sword Complex that predates the reclassification of forms see Cunliffe, Barry. Facing the Ocean... Pp. 1-514.
respectively. This transference represents the first instance of Iberia influencing the material culture of a foreign people. In addition to acting as the inspiration for new sword types, Iberia was also involved in their distribution, resulting in swords of each type being distributed in France, the British Isles, Iberia, and Sardinia.\(^9\)

Huelva style fibulae, known for their triangular body shape, are found along the same French, Cypriot, and Sardinian dispersal routes. Unlike spits and swords however, fibulae are present in both the Levant and modern-day Italy, with multiple samples being found in Achziv, Megiddo, Samaria, and Sicily. There are slight variations in form as the fibulae make their way eastward, the gradual transition in morphology from a scalene to an isosceles triangle, the sides of the triangle occasionally becoming convex as opposed to concave, and regional stylistic

variation. The latter of these changes is the most important in relation to this thesis. Adoption of the Huelva style pin and its subsequent decoration with local designs is unprecedented with any

---

other form of Iberian artifact, and clearly denotes a period of intensifying interaction between the Eastern and Western Mediterranean.

Figure 21 Various Stylistic Forms of Huelva Fibulae Found Across the Mediterranean (Bruins Figure 1, 2011)
The presence of Atlantic Iberian artifacts in Sardinia, Spain and the Levant corresponds to an equivalent amount of Eastern material culture present in Iberia’s archaeological record. Grave goods from Roça do Casal do Meio, a Neolithic tomb repurposed between the eleventh and tenth century BCE to contain a corbeled roof, contains the remains of a couple believed to be from the Eastern Mediterranean due to the assemblage of grave goods associated with them. Among the offerings are a belt buckle, ivory combs, tweezers, and a Huelva style fibula. With the exception of the fibula all of the other objects are foreign and are found in other sites along the Atlantic coast such as the Cabeço de Maria Candal, Ria Huelva, and Baiões. 93

Of these sites, Baiões is of particular significance because of the large quantity of metal objects present there. Located in Nossa Senhora da Guia, Viseu, Baiões occupied an inland area adjacent to the Dão river during the 11th century BCE. A foundry hoard dated to this period contained a large quantity of iron tools including nine socketed sickles, a mold for making flat faced palstaves, a three pronged flesh hook, a small wheeled stand, small spun bronze bowls (appearing to be of Mediterranean origin if not influence), two fibulae, and a rotary spit (though from outside the hoard). 94 The socketed sickles and flat faced palstaves are artifacts unique to the Iberian Peninsula that are also present in the Mount Sa-Idda hoard of Sardinia, further demonstrating the dispersion of Iberian culture into the Mediterranean. 95

94Ibid.
95Burgess, Colin, and Brendan O’Connor. “Iberia, The Atlantic Bronze Age and the Mediterranean”
While all the above artifacts are involved in the Late Bronze Age Atlantic trade network, the wheeled stand and bronze bowls are the only two types of objects indicating Mediterranean influence. The bronze bowls, similar to the Berzocana type mentioned earlier, are made with spun bronze, a technique not used in Iberia during this time. The wheeled stand is an iron structure of unknown origin. Although stands are common within the Mediterranean, this particular example contains circular handles, a feature more commonly used in the British Isles, around its top. The presence of these unique features has led some scholars to posit that the stand is the result of metallurgical hybridization, in which the increased activity between the Atlantic and the Mediterranean led to the creation of unique forms in Iberia, a theory that requires more evidence to support.96

Ruiz-Gálvez suggests that the stand’s presence, along with the other metal artifacts found at Baiões, were collected as scrap metal for the purpose of being recycled into other objects. Similarly to her theory of highly skilled artisans traveling the post-palatial Mediterranean, she posits that coastal deposits of metal are suggestive of specialized crews who purchased and reworked supplies of scrap metal. While I believe that evidence for this is much for the metal working tools on board the Cape Gelidonya, the multiple smith/foundry hoards near waterways, and the lack of nearby sources of metal at Baiões provide the a faint amount of support to her theory.97 Regardless of their purposes, the iron and bronze artifacts found at Baiões support the trend of intensifying continued interaction between Mediterranean and Iberian peoples.

The material evidence I have provided demarcates an area from Cordoba to north of the Tagus Estuary in which pre-Phoenician contact occurred from the fifteenth – tenth centuries BCE.

97 Ibid.
The pottery record of Purullena demonstrates continued interaction at particular settlements with pottery sherds being present over a timeframe spanning from the fourteenth – eleventh centuries BCE. [See Table 3 for precise dates.] An increasing number of settlements and range of objects, particularly metallic goods at a multitude of sites along the Atlantic coast, testify to both an increasing frequency of eastern visitation and number of locations participating in these interactions. [See Table 4 for settlements, locations, and date ranges.]

Table 4: Purullena Pottery Record Date Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Years Active (BCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purullena</td>
<td>Granada, Spain</td>
<td>1371 – 1317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1289 – 1262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1256 – 1134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1106 – 1050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Atlantic Iberia Metallic Artifact Date Ranges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Centuries Active (BCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castelo de Beijós</td>
<td>Viseu, Portugal</td>
<td>14th – 9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte do Trigo</td>
<td>Alentejo, Portugal</td>
<td>15th – 9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monte do Frade</td>
<td>Penafiel, Portugal</td>
<td>13th – 8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serra da Morerinha</td>
<td>Castelo Branco, Portugal</td>
<td>13th – 9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nossa Senhora da Guia</td>
<td>Baiões, Portugal</td>
<td>12th – 5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roça do Casal do Meio</td>
<td>Sesimbra, Portugal</td>
<td>12th – 9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinta do Marcelo</td>
<td>Almada, Portugal</td>
<td>12th – 5th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The continuation and increased frequency of voyages required by Esquerra to qualify interaction as a SHMC are undeniably met in Iberia between the fifteenth and tenth centuries BCE. The result of this interaction is the adoption of foreign artifacts (rotary spits, swords, and pins) by both Iberia and its trade partners, and the subsequent stylistic hybridization of these artifacts that saw native styles become integrated into foreign objects. The absence of signs indicating conflict suggest that these exchanges occurred through peaceful interactions over a prolonged period of

time during which Iberian artifacts made their way first to Sardinia and Cyprus before reaching the Levant.

By the tenth century BCE, the Phoenicians were undoubtedly aware of trade with Iberia. Presupposing that their involvement in exchanges with Iberia can only be affirmed by the presence of Phoenician settlement on the Peninsula relies on both the rejection of more recent archaeological evidence indicating Phoenician pottery present in the tenth century and a one-dimensional understanding of maritime trade that limits crews of traders to being of specific ethnicities. The abundance of artifacts from different points of origin found onboard known Late Bronze Age shipwrecks and the seamless transition between a period of Mycenaean contact to a Cypriot phase supports Ruiz-Gálvez’s supposition that the crews of these vessels were likely as multi-cultural as the items they transported. Perceiving Bronze Age Mediterranean trade as such allows us to understand how the Phoenicians were gradually introduced to the Iberian Peninsula, and as a result how Iberia would be exposed to the largest influx of eastern culture it had yet to experience.
Chapter Three: The Phoenician Period

The Phoenicians’ entrance into the exchange network pioneered by the Mycenaeans and Cypriots of the Late Bronze Age is difficult to measure. The interactions described in the previous chapter led to a gradual increase of foreign artifacts in both the Eastern and Western Mediterranean, consequently leaving no decisive turning point in the archaeological record from which a date can be attributed to the start of Phoenician interaction in cross-Mediterranean trade. Despite this archaeological data and historic texts provide a starting point from which we can make inferences about when the Phoenicians began interacting with the Iberian Peninsula. Prior to doing so, it is useful to understand who the Phoenicians were, where they originated, what their motivations for traveling across the Mediterranean were, and why unlike the Cypriots they pursued colonization in addition to mercantile interaction. This information will aid in determining not only when the Phoenicians arrived in Iberia, but also in the levels of continuity and frequency necessary to characterize Phoenician interaction with Iberia as pre-colonization.

The Phoenicians were a Semitic people inhabiting a loosely banded conglomerate of city-states located in what is now Lebanon. Mercantilism was such a facet to the Phoenicians’ identity that scholars widely believe trade was not controlled solely by the government, but rather a pursuit open to all members of society. 99 This freedom to trade fueled their expansion with such fervor that at the height of their power they overlooked a vast network of colonies scattered across the

Mediterranean, stretching through the Straits of Gibraltar and onto both Iberia’s and Africa’s Atlantic Coasts.\(^{100}\)

Identifying these colonies can be done in a variety of ways, some without even excavating. Place names ending in -oussa, a common Phoenician naming convention, are a simple indicator of a Phoenician settlement. These endings are prevalent in many locations in the Western Mediterranean; see Table 5 for a selection of them.\(^{101}\) Phoenician colonies also share common traits, making their location easier to predict. Due to their founding by a people reliant upon bodies of water for transport, Phoenician settlements are often located on coastlines, preferably flat areas within coastal promontories that offer protection from storms, nearby deep bays that allow larger ships to come into ports, and near the mouths of rivers to allow travel inland on smaller vessels.\(^{102}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoenician Place Name</th>
<th>Modern Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pithecussa</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ichaioussa</td>
<td>Sardinia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kotinoussa</td>
<td>Gades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitioussa</td>
<td>Ibiza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kromyoussa</td>
<td>Mallorca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophioussa</td>
<td>Formentera, and an unknown settlement perhaps in Galicia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest indicator of a Phoenician presence is of course their material culture. Eastern iconography, containing creatures such as gryphons and sphinxes, and objects such as incense burners and ivory combs, are notably foreign in the Western Mediterranean. Much like in the


previous chapter, their presence signifies either direct or indirect interaction with Phoenicians but the increasing presence and quantity of artifacts leaves no doubt that this contact was direct.\textsuperscript{103}

\textit{Motivation}

When and why the Phoenicians began their interactions with Iberia are inextricably linked questions. The Phoenicians’ westward expansion is often linked with the placement of a silver tithe on Tyre by the Assyrians in the eighth century BCE. This information, paired with the known Phoenician presence in Iberia, led scholars to attribute a cause and effect relationship to Phoenician colonization of Iberia.\textsuperscript{104} Simply put, the Tyrians needed silver to stave off Assyrian advances, so they colonized Iberia to ensure a constant supply. On the surface this suggestion is local, but it implies that the Tyrians already had access to silver by the eight century BCE and knew they could use that as a bargaining chip, or else the Assyrians would not have stipulated such a tithe.

Taking Phoenician mythological traditions into consideration, the tenth/ninth century BCE yields a possible starting point for Phoenician interaction in Iberia. During this period, Tyre was home to a large following of the god Melqart, whose cult was intensely associated with Iberia.\textsuperscript{105} According to Phoenician mythology, Melqart provided a Tyrian oracle with instructions on how to reach Iberia. There are scholars who believe that, because Melqart’s following did not develop until the tenth/ninth century BCE, the Phoenicians did not learn of Iberia until then.\textsuperscript{106} While such an approach deserves credit for taking the Phoenician perspective into consideration, it relies heavily on extrapolating historical information from mythology and fails to take into consideration

\textsuperscript{103} Ortiz, Mariano Torres. “Tarsis, Tartessos, Turdetania” Pp. 251-283.
\textsuperscript{105} Aubet, Maria Eugenia. \textit{The Phoenicians and the West...} Pp. 70-193.
\textsuperscript{106} Ibid.
that any knowledge regarding the location of Iberia attributed to Melqart would first need to be known by Phoenicians who could then associate it with Melqart. In this sense the Phoenician tale of Melqart does not limit the arrival of the Phoenicians to after the ninth century BCE, but rather confirms that they already knew of Iberia, and to such an extent that the region developed a place within the Phoenicians’ own mythology.

The association between Melqart and Iberia presupposes Phoenicians possessing knowledge of the Iberian Peninsula. The appearance of Huelvan fibulae (introduced in the previous chapter) at various locations across the Mediterranean during the tenth century BCE and a contiguous appearance of Phoenician pottery, carbon dated to the ninth and tenth centuries BCE, on both Iberia’s Mediterranean and Atlantic coasts confirms a well-established Phoenician presence in Iberia before the emergence of a Melqart cult. The contiguity of sites suggests on both sides of the Iberian Peninsula suggests that the Phoenicians did not have to slowly advance outward from the Mediterranean toward the Atlantic. Instead we see that Phoenician material culture permeated the existent trade networks rapidly, lending further credence to Ruiz-Gálvez’s theories of skilled multinational crews onboard merchant vessels and highly diversified yet interconnected Mediterranean trade network.

Lastly, the Phoenicians’ founding of Cadiz is well attested in multiple first century BCE textual sources, with Vellius Paterculus, Pliny the Elder, and Pomponius Mela agreeing on a late
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twelfth century BCE date for the colony’s initial settlement.\footnote{The specificity of the date, 1104 BCE, attested to by these writers is due to the shared notion of Cadiz being founded eighty years after the end of The Trojan War. Reliance upon the same methodology to reach such a date indicates that these writers likely shared a common and unfortunately unknown source. Paterculus, Vellius. Historiae. Trans. J.S. Watson. London, England, Harper & Brothers, 1883: P 1,2. Pliny the Elder. Naturalis Historia. Ed. Karl Friedrich Theodor Mayhoff. Lipsiae, Germany; Teubner, 1906: P 16,216. Mela, Pomponius. De chorographia. Ed. Karl Frick. Lipsiae, Germany; aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1880: P 3,46.} Strabo, whose writings are contemporaneous to these scholars, does not give a date for the commencing of colonization, but does elaborate on the difficulties the Phoenicians had in trying to establish a colony in Southern Iberia. His account begins with three trans-Mediterranean voyages from Tyre to Cadiz, undertaken for the purposes of establishing a settlement. The first and second ventures were deemed unsuccessful due to the inauspicious auguries of sacrifices; while the third venture makes no reference to sacrifices, the result is the successful establishment of “Gadeira” (Cadiz).\footnote{Strabo. The Geography of Strabo. Pp. 180-181.}

At no point in the narrative does Strabo indicate the duration of each journey, the time elapsed between journeys, or any other details to provide a chronology of events. Relying upon the work of his contemporaries to create a temporal framework in which to place these events, we can hypothesize that the first voyage from Phoenicia to Iberia took place in the late twelfth century BCE. Allotting time for travel and attempted colonization, we would still expect the founding of Gades to occur sometime in the early eleventh century BCE at the latest. Although the evidence I gathered in the previous chapter indicates increasing interaction between the Eastern and Western Mediterranean with the approach of the tenth century, this is still far too early to be supported by current archaeological evidence for Phoenician colonization. Additional evidence is needed to either refute the claims of these scholars or confirm the inaccuracies of their dating methods.

What we are then left with is a two-century gap between the twelfth and tenth/ninth centuries BCE in which textual and archaeological sources do not agree in support of early
Phoenician colonization.\textsuperscript{111} Given the undeniable evidence for interaction between Iberia and Cyprus, this lack of artifacts suggesting a Phoenician presence initially seems to be damning, but also calls attention to the limitations of archaeology within the Straits region. The continued inhabitation of Cadiz and Huelva, home to ancient Gades and Onoba, severely limits areas in which excavations can take place. Erosion and silt deposits also made significant changes to the geography of Cadiz, most notably the complete disappearance of a third island which existed in antiquity.

One final example is a Huelvan excavation in which the pottery dated to the 10\textsuperscript{th} century BCE was excavated. Thousands of sherds were uncovered, and though archaeologists never reached a layer that failed to yield artifacts, operations were halted when groundwater made proceeding impossible.\textsuperscript{112} In light of this archaeological evidence offers us the most substantial proof of early Phoenician interaction in Iberia. Simultaneously we must be aware that future excavations may force a reconceptualization of Phoenician settlement in Iberia. The last fifty years saw material finds narrow the gap between textual and archaeological evidence from over three centuries to two, making such a possibility well known to Iberian historians.

The tenth/ninth century BCE date corroborated by archaeological evidence predates the development of the metal industry, previously thought to have drawn Phoenician interests. Although copper and tin were undoubtedly mined, the supplies of silver that Iberia would become known for were not extracted and harnessed until cupellation became widespread, by which time

\textsuperscript{111} The reason for the 10\textsuperscript{th}/9\textsuperscript{th} distinction is that these dates are much contested by scholars active in the field. Hermanfrid Schubart, excavating in the 1970s, initially dated the site to the 8\textsuperscript{th} century BCE. Continued excavation has led to new finds which are carbon dated to a range between the 10\textsuperscript{th}/9\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE. Mariano Torres Ortiz, who works extensively with carbon dating to provide a chronology of sites across Iberia, cites the late 10\textsuperscript{th}. Maria Eugenia Aubet Semmler, renowned for her work on the Phoenicians, is conservative in both relying on carbon dating and attributing an early date for Phoenician interaction in Iberia, and sites the 9\textsuperscript{th}.

\textsuperscript{112} Bell, Carol. “Phoenician Trade: The First 300 Years” Pp. 91-105.
Phoenician colonization was well underway.\textsuperscript{113} This forces an abandonment of preconceptions regarding why Iberia was initially visited by the Phoenicians. Silver was not a factor. The Phoenicians did not require it to stave off Assyrians and, based on our current knowledge, was not available in large quantities. Other metals were available, but Iberians had yet to industrialize their output. The result of this is a balanced approach in which multiple resources become factors. Agricultural products such as wheat and cattle were widely available in Tartessos. Iberia’s mountainous regions were an excellent source of lumber, which would have been highly sought after in the east. Metals and minerals such as bronze, tin, iron, and salt were all in abundance. These all served as external motivators, assets which Iberia possessed that drew Mediterranean populations to its shores.\textsuperscript{114} The demand for these products, particularly silver, then sparked the industrialization of their harnessing, leading to their availability in the eighth century BCE when the Assyrians imposed their tithe.

What then motivated Phoenician venturing to Iberia? Although it seems trivializing to reduce an occurrence of such historical importance to something as simple as consumer driven trade, the Phoenicians’ early involvement in Iberia was a continuation of exchange commenced by the Cypriots.\textsuperscript{115} The sudden appearance of Phoenician pottery in regions known to have traded with the Cypriots on both sides of the Iberian Peninsula, and the presence of Huelvan pins in the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{114} Omitted from this listing of resources is the possibility of Iberia as a source of slaves. Though there is scholarship on the matter, there is a dearth of evidence to suggest the export of slaves. The generally amicable relationship that Iberia possessed with Mediterranean populations suggests peaceful interactions. Slave raids would simply not be conducive to fostering the long-lasting trade relationship seen in Iberia. The extent to which slavery was utilized by native populations is still undetermined, but the mining industry that developed in Iberia was likely impossible without forced labor. For more information see Dietler, Michael. “Colonial Encounters in Ancient Iberia and the Western Mediterranean” in Colonial Encounters in Iberia Phoenician, Greek, and Indigenous Relations. Chicago, Illinois. The University of Chicago Press, 2009. Pp.18-48.
\item \textsuperscript{115} Dietler, Michael. “Colonial Encounters in Ancient Iberia and the Western Mediterranean” Pp.18-48.
\end{itemize}
Levant, suggests the trade network existing between Iberia and Cyprus was expanded into a trans-Mediterranean network via the incorporation of Phoenicia during the tenth/ninth century BCE. This signifies the beginning of five centuries of interaction, spanning from the tenth/ninth to the sixth centuries BCE, during which time the Phoenicians’ motivations and intentions understandably evolve. One of the most noteworthy factors contributing to the Phoenicians’ changing relationship with Iberia was war with Assyria, the results of which led to the above-mentioned silver tithe and a sizeable decrease to Phoenician territory, which consequently provided the two internal motivators most cited by scholars, a need for silver and a place to settle populations displaced by war.  

The Phoenicians who settled Iberia during the eighth century are thus comparable to refugees fleeing an area torn apart by war in search of one where they could safely settle without fear of reprisal. The strong relationship maintained with Iberia made it an obvious destination. This may appear to be no more than supposition, but there is archaeological evidence which provides support to this theory. The settlements established circa the eighth century were not simple domiciles but the upscale homes of elite members of society. These homes have led to two distinct interpretations of the archaeological record. Tyre, as the last vestige of Phoenicia in the east, subsidized trips in an effort to alleviate a population swollen by other groups of Phoenicians displaced by war. While this certainly accounts for the colonization of Iberia, it fails to explain why a government would provide money for the construction of lavish homes. Instead we can

---

interpret these lavish homes as being the product of elite members of Phoenician society who abandoned their homeland in the events preceding to, during, or after war.\textsuperscript{118}

The shift in motivation provides a lens through which to view the pre-colonization conducted by the Phoenicians. Knowing that the Phoenicians first appeared in Iberia during the tenth/ninth century BCE and were actively colonizing by the eighth century BCE, pre-colonization, as carried out by the Phoenicians, would need to have taken place within those two centuries. Archaeological evidence can help us examine Phoenician activity in Iberia during this period to determine whether these interactions are indicative of pre-colonizing efforts.

\textit{The Mediterranean Coast}

Nowhere is evidence of early interaction more present than Malaga, Spain. Home to the Morro de Mezquitilla, the location responsible for providing the earliest dates of a Phoenician presence, Malaga is home to many early Phoenician settlements. The current chronology indicates that Mezquitilla and Toscanos were established simultaneously during the early ninth century BCE. Their location and that of neighboring settlements in such close proximity has led scholars to posit that a fleet of Phoenician ships visited the region and intentionally established settlements close enough to one another to provide support without being a drain on each other’s resources. The settlements, from east to west are Almuñecar (Sexi), Chorreras, Morro de Mezquitilla, Toscanos, Malaga, and Cerro del Villar, and of these Morro de Mezquitilla is the oldest, longest inhabited, and most thoroughly excavated.

\textsuperscript{118} Ibid.
Morro de Mezquitilla is a terraced settlement, whose lower tiers begin near the Algarrobo River and continue rising for approximately 300 meters. After the accidental discovery of a Phoenician necropolis by farmers, archaeological excavations began during the 1960s. The terracing, necessary for the settlement’s structural integrity due to the area’s slope, has over time led to a series of walls and settlements stacked vertically upon one another.119 Although the challenges of excavating the area made initial attempts at dating the region difficult, carbon fourteen dating has shown the Phoenician occupation level spanning from the ninth – seventh century BCE.120 In addition to being the earliest date of a Phoenician settlement in Iberia, the settlements at Mezquitilla provide an immense amount of information on the Phoenician presence in Iberia during the ninth century BCE.

Morro de Mezquitilla was founded atop a preexistent Bronze Age settlement, suggesting that the Phoenicians and Iberians perhaps co-occupied the area.121 The earliest evidence of a Phoenician presence corresponds to the ninth century BCE. Usage of the nearby necropolis continues well into the seventh century BCE, confirming the continued Phoenician occupation and contact of Mezquitilla.122 There are three possibilities for this continuation. The retaining walls and terracing suggest that agriculture was practiced early on and continued with the settlement’s growth. The presence of a smith is attested by a workshop containing a forge, iron slag, and the remains of iron nozzles used in bellows. Handmade pottery indicates interaction between

120 Ortiz, Mariano Torres. “La Cronología Absoluta Europea…” Pp. 49-60.
Phoenicians and locals, suggesting that trade also took place here. The appearance of three industries suggests a multi-faceted approach to the initial Phoenician settling of Iberia.

*The Straits of Gibraltar and Atlantic Coast*

Moving along a westward trajectory toward the Atlantic, Huelva, located just outside the Straits of Gibraltar, provides thousands of Phoenician pottery sherds deposited alongside cattle bones which were dated to the late tenth/ninth century BCE. The area’s shifting water table has halted further excavation, affording us only a narrow view at the region’s early occupation.\(^{123}\) In spite of these limitations, the Huelvan site, being a coastal promontory, conforms to our understanding of where Phoenicians settled. Their presence also marks the commencement of Phoenician activity outside the Straits and, given the difficulty in exiting the Mediterranean aboard a ship, lends further credence to Ruiz-Gálvez’s theory of multi-cultural crews and friendly interactions with natives. Lastly, Huelva provides the first indication of Phoenicians arriving within an area encompassed by Tartessos. Continued interaction strengthened the relationship between the two, making the Straits of Gibraltar the epicenter of easternization in Iberia.

On Iberia’s Atlantic Coast, Santarem contains an unbroken stratigraphy from the late tenth – eight century BCE and pottery dated within this range. The lack of accuracy in this dating does not allow us to say with complete certainty that this site predates those in Malaga or Huelva, but the presence of burials dating to the ninth century BCE confirms that there was continuity among the regions, with the earliest estimates of Phoenician arrival on the Atlantic Coast being twenty-five years after their arrival on the Mediterranean Coast.\(^{124}\) Despite the temporal propinquity of

---

\(^{123}\) Bell, Carol. “Phoenician Trade: The First 300 Years” Pp. 91-105.

\(^{124}\) Arruda, Ana Margarida. “Phoenician Colonization on the Atlantic Coast” Pp. 113-130.
when these regions were settled, the location of Santarem is over twenty-five miles upriver from the Atlantic coast. Compared to the location of Morro de Mezquitilla, which was no more than a few hundred meters from the coast, there is clearly a notable difference in the location selected for settlement. The upriver location ensures the defining characteristic of an aquatic route offering protection from the sea is met, but also indicates either a more exploratory nature to the Phoenicians’ travels along the Atlantic Coast or pre-existent knowledge of the region as the result of previous interaction between the Mediterranean and Iberia.

Much like Huelva and the settlements located within the Straits region, the Tagus estuary experienced centuries of habitation, limiting accessibility to deeper strata. Our understanding of these regions is thus scanty, but we do know that they were extensively inhabited by indigenous populations. Examining these indigenous settlements for signs of Phoenician culture provides us with information about the interactions between the groups and a means of gauging Phoenician activity for signs of intensification.

The settlements themselves are a meager source of information since only a small number of them have been excavated. Those that have been studied are predominately isolated rural dwellings, preserved due to their location outside of continuously inhabited areas. As the easternization period grew near, these subterranean pit structures with dirt floors and wooden walls began incorporating more durable materials into their construction. Stone foundations, cobbled entrance ways, protective walls, and bastions are associated with the growing Phoenician presence and investment in industry.\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{125} Ortiz, Mariano Torres. “Tarsis, Tartessos, Turdetania” Pp. 251-283.
There is little variation in the industries that were being developed during this time. Mining and metallurgy had yet to reach their peak output, but the technologies of bivalve molds, lost wax casting, and ornate gold working that began emerging during the fourteenth/thirteenth century BCE were becoming more widespread reaching as far as Santa Olaia in the Mondego estuary of Northern Portugal.\textsuperscript{126} The Tartessian economy was centered around agriculture, predominately the raising of cattle and farming of wheat, but the growing appearance of vineyards and olive bushes suggests growing regional stability.\textsuperscript{127} The manufacturing of pottery by local populations remained unchanged until the ninth century BCE.\textsuperscript{128}

The lack of a complete pottery chronology in Southern Iberia prevents archaeologists from relying on pottery as a concise means of dating.\textsuperscript{129} Despite the absence of an extensive pottery catalog, the defining features of local forms are that they are all handmade and as a result are distinguishable from the Phoenicians’ wheel-made pottery, which replaced local handmade wares as the most popularly used during the ninth century BCE.\textsuperscript{130} The change in manufacturing technique brought new decorative patterns, most notably the heavy burnished red slip ware used by Phoenicians.\textsuperscript{131}

\textsuperscript{126} Notable as being one of the Atlantic’s Northernmost Phoenician settlements, Santa Olaia is also acclaimed to be one of their most thoroughly industrialized locations on Iberia’s Western Coast. Its location suggests that the Phoenician presence on the Atlantic was in no way restricted to the southern region, but rather extended much further north. How far is impossible to definitively state without additional data, but the recent find of a Phoenician earring in Saint Gregoire Ille-et-Vilaine on France’s northern coast, an area known to have conducted trade with Iberia, suggests our current understanding of Atlantic exchange systems and the Phoenicians’ activity on the Atlantic coast may under-represent the actual state of affairs. For information on Santa Olaia see Neville, Ann. “Settlement Topography.” Pp. 11-46. For information the Phoenician earring see Burgess, Colin, and Brendan O’Connor. “Iberia, The Atlantic Bronze Age and the Mediterranean”.

\textsuperscript{127} Ortiz, Mariano Torres. “Tarsis, Tartessos, Turdetania” Pp. 251-283.


\textsuperscript{129} Semmler, Maria Eugenia Aubet. “Some Questions Regarding the Tartessian Orientalizing Period” Pp. 199-224.


\textsuperscript{131} Ortiz, Mariano Torres. “Tarsis, Tartessos, Turdetania” Pp. 251-283.
After years of adherence to their own pottery the use of foreign pottery suggests an acceptance of foreign culture. Examining how foreign pottery was used indicates an unprecedented level of permeation of culture. The necropolis of Les Morers in Alicante, Spain, was in use by local populations from the mid-ninth - sixth century BCE. The graves located there show a gradual inclination toward the usage of wheel made urns for the purposes of burial, which are not limited to inhumation. The continued use of the necropolis suggests that the peoples using it continue to identify with those already interred. Their adoption of cremation signifies that they were not only adopting Phoenician material culture, but also ritual. Although this approach can also be applied further westward at the necropolis of Sexi in Malaga, the availability of known necropoli in Iberia prevent the application of this approach unilaterally throughout the Peninsula.

The southwest is bereft of any burials that allow an examination of a transitional period from local to foreign customs. The cessation of inhumation by the locals and the simultaneous appearance of artifact deposits in bays and rivers led scholars to suggest that aquatic burials became the region’s common funerary practice. Comprised of both pottery and over 400 bronze artifacts, among which are swords which appear to have been ritually bent or broken, the Ria de Huelva hoard is cited by Mariano Ortiz as a possible aquatic necropolis. Others believe it to the remains of a shipwreck, whose cargo was lost during its sinking and further dispersed during hydraulic dredging of the river. Regardless of what was practiced prior to the Phoenician

influence, cremation became the primary means of burial within the region and continued to be practiced by the Lusitani who inhabited the region after the Phoenician decline in Iberia.  

The absence of traceability through burials in Southwestern Iberia does not leave us without a means of examining Phoenician influence on local populations. The warrior stelae mentioned in the previous chapter are the greatest visual representation of an object of Iberian culture taking on Phoenician influence. The aforementioned shift in their purpose as grave stones to territorial markers came with changing iconography. The oldest stelae are the simplest and contain combinations of three types of images: swords, shields, and spears.

Given the rise of warrior culture in the southwest, these images are not out of place, nor is the subsequent inclusion of helmets. The shape of the helmets included in the stelae is however conical, unlike anything found in Iberia, identical to those used in Assyria, and therefore the first indication of foreign influence manifesting itself via these stelae.

Assyrian helmets were not the only foreign objects depicted on the stelae. Items of eastern origin such as combs, tweezers.

---


138 Despite their appearance on the stelae, only one helmet suggesting an Assyrian origin was excavated in Iberia. For more information see Burgess, Colin, and Brendan O’Connor. “Iberia, The Atlantic Bronze Age and the Mediterranean”
mirrors, and chariots began appearing in earnest as the Phoenician presence in the region expanded. Inclusion of items whose purpose is not directly related to warfare is linked with the change in function of the stelae. No longer intended for horizontal display, the stelae were erected vertically like those seen in Phoenician tophets. Instead of being commemoratory, the stelae became a means of delineating territory through the posturing of one’s own power and clout. Depictions of weaponry and fallen adversaries clearly illustrate a sign of caution to those who may be enemies, while foreign objects suggest that there was power to be gained by associating with the Phoenicians. Based on archaeological evidence these associations appear to have been inflated, with the intent being the artificial bolstering of one’s prestige. While all the items depicted on the stelae are found in Iberia, only a single example of an Assyrian helmet and chariot have ever been found. Compared to

their prolific appearances in stelae, the exclusivity of these artifacts suggests that they were never as commonplace as the stelae lead us to believe and demonstrate the extent of Phoenician influence over the elite members of the warrior class.

In addition to the depictions of material culture, stelae also began including anthropomorphic figures as their focal points, with material possessions taking a secondary role surrounding them. There are numerous classifications of anthropomorphic figures: single warriors, warriors standing over individuals who are either subordinates or defeated enemies, women with prominent headdresses, pairs of individuals, and horned individuals, the latter of which has long been associated with the easternization of Iberia.\(^{141}\) Their rise in popularity is concurrent with the disappearance of conical helmets and may suggest nothing more than a change in headwear, however. The reverence for horned individuals and bulls by Eastern Mediterranean populations, as demonstrated in the horned god and ingot god figurines found at Kittion, Cyprus, and the bull stelae from Beth-Saida and Harran,

Israel, suggests that these depictions of horned individuals possessed a spiritual connotation that was foreign to Iberia.\textsuperscript{142}

Our knowledge of pre-Phoenician Tartessian religious customs is limited and prevents us from being able to discern how foreign influence may have initially pervaded the practicing of religious rituals. The earliest excavated Phoenician temple in Iberia is that of the 9\textsuperscript{th} century BCE Castro dos Ratinhos in Alqueva, Portugal. Its large rectilinear structure and unmistakably eastern floor plan make it an oddity in the native settlement in which it was built.\textsuperscript{143} Construction of an inland temple and growing usage of Phoenician religious iconography suggests that Phoenician spiritualism was well ingrained in Tartessian society prior to Phoenician power

reaching its zenith in the west. The absence of ox-hide shaped altars seen in other Phoenician temples such as those in Coura and Badajoz suggests that these distinguishing features were adopted later and are a hybridization of native Iberian and Phoenician culture resulting from the importance of cattle and metals to a settlement’s success.

The reverence of cattle and the ox-hide shape continued to manifest independently of religion. Elaborate examples of its use in craftsmanship exist all over Phoenician occupied Iberia. The Carambolo hoard of Seville in Andalusia, Spain contains two highly detailed ox-hide shaped pectorals that were worn as adornments. An ivory box carved into an ox-hide was found among the grave goods in the La Joya necropolis of Malaga, Spain. Earrings in the shape of bull’s heads were present amongst many other golden adornments found in Portugal’s Ebora hoard. These items are all luxury goods, whose rarity in both form and the materials used in their creation limits their availability to the elite members of society. These individuals are commonly accepted to be the means by whom the Phoenicians came to power in Iberia, and when considering the growing associations these elite members of society were willingly making between themselves and the Phoenicians there is little doubt they shared a flourishing relationship.

Initial interactions between the Phoenicians and Iberians were conducted on the basis of trade, via networks previously established by the Mycenaeans and Cypriots. Upon gaining control of these routes, scholars believe that the Phoenicians began conducting unfair exchanges with the natives. Goods of high value were traded to the Phoenicians at rates that were so low that the profit margins were exceedingly high. These conclusions are largely based on textual evidence from

---

Herodotus, who recounts Colaeus’ voyage to Iberia as earning him “…the greatest profit…no one could compete with…”, and Diodorus who openly states that the natives were “…ignorant of the use of silver…” and thus the Phoenicians were able to acquire it “…for wares of little if any worth.” 147 Two points must be noted in respects to this evidence. Firstly, there is no archaeological evidence, other than that suggesting the Phoenicians’ rapid forming of relationships with the Iberian elite, to support claims of unequal trading. Secondly, the cross-cultural valuation of goods is not uniform. Diodorus himself was ignorant of this, but we must not perpetuate his error. Silver, though at one time precious to groups within Iberia (as evidenced by the silver diadem of La Almoloya) evidently held less value to the Iberians than the foreign luxury goods for which it was exchanged. 148 In contrast we know that these foreign objects were of importance to native Iberians because of their inclusion on stelae, in graves, and their continued use throughout the easternization period.

The Phoenicians’ intent in these interactions is open to criticism since they can be considered tantamount to economic coercion. 149 Implying a sinister purpose to something as inherently profit-driven as trade is challenging, and with nothing more than the claims of ancient writers to suggest this approach, we cannot consider them to be fact. The Phoenicians’ connection to the Iberian elite is unsurprisingly widespread, with evidence indicating that warriors drew their power from the foreign objects depicted on their stelae and other elites purchased lavish foreign objects as a means of associating with the Phoenicians. The goods exchanged in the growing trans-Mediterranean trade network were rarities and would have only been available to those who could pay a premium. These artifacts were then visual representations of an individual’s ability to acquire

---

147 Herodotus. 1, 163. And Diodorus. 5, 35.
148 Lull, Vicente,. “La Almoloya …” Pp. 41-59
the connections and wealth necessary to gain access to and afford these goods, which in turn became symbols of status and power.

Such a concept is not unique and, with globalization increasing, is a common contemporary experience. Objects associated with American culture—fast food, sports teams, and products such as Coca Cola—have been observed to be objects of status in foreign places to people who have no understanding of the price or associations of these items in their place of origin. Instead, through a process referred to as indigenization they create their own associations within the culture they permeate.\textsuperscript{150} Applying this to the Late Iberian Bronze Age, we can see a similar trend in which Phoenician culture is appropriated by the Iberians for their own purposes. The resulting preferential treatment enabled the Phoenicians to penetrate Iberian culture with great ease.

Conclusion

Iberia’s prehistory provides a framework to conceptualize the growing Eastern Mediterranean presence of the fifteen - tenth centuries BCE. Neolithic populations arrived along Iberia’s shores millennia before the Mycenaeans, Cypriots, and Phoenicians, and dispersed throughout the Peninsula, relying upon the same bays and rivers that would become instrumental in establishing Bronze/Iron Age settlements. Within just two hundred years, both Iberia’s coast and interior were settled by a group of people who relied on wicker boats and cabotage to venture out of the Mediterranean.\textsuperscript{151}

While Iberia’s geography aided the spread of peoples it also furthered their diversification. A topography littered with elevation changes and drastic climate variation divided the inhabitants, limiting not only their ability to maintain contact between one another, but also their access to important resources such as arable land and water.\textsuperscript{152} Iberia’s arid climate lent itself to the development of different strategies, terraced farming, a pursuit of crops that required limited water, and the establishment of fortified structures as a means of defending their access to this valuable resource. The spread of defensive architecture during the Chalcolithic brought with it a sharp increase in social stratification notable through varying amounts of grave goods, which in turn indicates the development of another of Iberia’s natural resources.\textsuperscript{153}

\textsuperscript{151} Isern, Neus. “Modeling the Role of Voyaging in the Coastal Spread of the Early Neolithic in the West Mediterranean”
\textsuperscript{152} Strabo. \textit{The Geography of Strabo}. Pp. 151-185.
Iberia’s rich supply of ores, particularly copper, tin, gold, and silver, were critical to the establishment of Chalcolithic and Bronze Age settlements constructed long before the arrival of Eastern Mediterranean populations. Our current understanding of Los Millares is that its society was centered upon the strict control of metallurgical technology, creating a community divided by both the walls of its settlement and the knowledge available to them.\(^{154}\) Its successor, El Argar, indicates that this technology did not remain secret, but rather spread throughout the Southeastern Iberia as Argaric settlements expanded their control over naturally occurring sources of ore. While similar settlements existed along Iberia’s Atlantic coast, their metallurgical pursuits were comparatively lax. Instead of metal goods, bell beaker pottery was the chief contribution of Atlantic Iberia. Its rapid dispersal across Europe attests to the emergence of maritime trade, of which Iberia was clearly a part. In addition to exchanging pottery with other European regions, the presence of ostrich eggs and ivory combs—clearly indicative of a North African origin—are substantial proof of Iberia’s early involvement in the Mediterranean’s growing interconnectivity.\(^{155}\)

In respects to pre-colonization this information allows for Iberia to be understood as it was when Eastern Mediterranean populations arrived. The Iberian Peninsula was home to diverse groups of peoples who adopted different strategies to cope with the challenges of their environment. These different approaches led to various developments in architecture, social organization, metallurgy, and agriculture. While all of these were impacted by foreign influence during subsequent periods, their origins are undeniably Iberian. Appropriating them accordingly

\(^{154}\) Lull, Vicente. “Metal and Social ....” Pp.323-347.
\(^{155}\) Cunliffe, Barry. Facing the Ocean... Pp. 1-514
not only credits the region’s inhabitants for their accomplishments, but also allows us to better understand the effects of Eastern Mediterranean influence.

The first period of interaction between Iberia and the east is attributed to the Mycenaeans during the fifteenth – thirteenth/twelfth centuries BCE. The earliest available evidence of contact between these two groups are the two sherds of pottery from Llanete de los Morros. Alone they do not confirm a Mycenaean presence. Their meager quantity is more suggestive of indirect contact, but when expanding our scope to include other forms of artifactual evidence the case for Mycenaean contact is bolstered.

The carnelian beads dotting the Iberian coast do not naturally occur on the Iberian Peninsula and are therefore indicative of exchange. Carnelian’s availability and usage in the Eastern Mediterranean paired with the depiction of an eastern style ship in Laxe Auga do Cervos are the best available indicators of the stones’ origin. In addition to beads the Atlantic coast also yielded finds of poorly worked iron. Our current understanding of Western Iberia’s metallurgical ability is that it was less developed than that of Eastern Iberia, making finds of iron surprising. Considering this, Ruiz-Galvez’s work associating the Mediterranean palatial breakdown with the dispersal of artisans throughout the Mediterranean provides a clear explanation of not only how this technology appeared in Iberia, but also insight into their motivation for voyaging to Iberia.

Whether the contact observed in this period was directly between Mycenaean and Iberian populations is ultimately unimportant in the broader discussion of pre-colonization. The importance is the undeniability of early Eastern Mediterranean interaction on the Iberian

Peninsula. These exchanges appear to be conducted primarily for the purpose of trade with no impact observed in native settlements, burials, or social organization. They do, however, indicate an immediate interest in Iberia’s supply of metals which would become significant in future interactions with Eastern Mediterranean populations.

The next phase discussed in the above body of work is that of the Cypriots. If the aforementioned Mycenaean contact was conducted directly with Iberia it experienced overlap during the thirteenth century BCE when the Cypriots slowly became the Peninsula’s dominant trade partner. This transition can be partly explained by Ruiz-Gálvez’s idea of multi-cultural crews. Instead of perceiving Bronze Age trade as being conducted solely between Mycenaeans and Iberians, Ruiz-Galvez posits that the crew members likely hailed from a variety of places. While this conflicts with the naming convention of the phases, it does explain why transitions between the Mycenaean and Cypriot, as well as the later Cypriot and Phoenician phase are conducted so smoothly. Multi-national crews would have fostered the spread of knowledge regarding ports and areas to trade. This conceptualization of Bronze Age trade depicts the Mediterranean exchange network as one of growing interconnectivity, in which dominant powers are absorbed into extant trade networks rather than establishing their own.

The earliest evidence for Cyprus’ introduction to the Iberian Peninsula is seen along Iberia’s Mediterranean coast. The gold and iron works seen in the Villena hoards and at Almolya suggest a Cypriot connection with el Argar before its collapse. Technologies such as lost wax casting, welding, and the use of nails were common in Cyprus but prior to these instances were not observed in Iberia.\(^{158}\) While this is only the initial Cypriot foray into Iberia, the association

with metals builds upon that already established in the Mycenaean phase. Vessels containing the geometric patterns common in Cypriot wares and larger wheel-made pithoids have been found in Purullena.\textsuperscript{159} These finds indicate both continued contact—since this was also the region in which the Mycenaean sherds were found—and the beginning of a gradual adoption of foreign wheel-made pottery over local handmade wares. The importance of pottery cannot be overstated as it demonstrates the first permeation of Iberian cultural practices by foreign goods, with pithoid burials becoming commonplace in el Argar.\textsuperscript{160}

Our knowledge of funerary practices in the Straits of Gibraltar and Atlantic regions of Iberia is unfortunately scanty. The only known Final Bronze Age burial of Central Portugal is that of Roça do Casal do Meio, but its corbeled ceilings and lavish burial goods are highly suggestive of a strong Eastern Mediterranean presence on the Atlantic.\textsuperscript{161} Although burials and pottery offer little insight into foreign activity on the Atlantic coast, the metallurgical evidence is staggering. Hoards like those of Berzocana and Baiões show that the quality of metal working has increased to match that seen in Eastern Iberia, but with greater cultural significance. They were found with bronze bowls that, using the work of Carlos Zorea, can be traced to the Tjeker peoples who migrated from Israel, to Cyprus, and evidently Iberia. Additional eastern influence can also be seen in their manufacturing as well as their correlation between their weights and those of the Microasiatic shekel.\textsuperscript{162} Their purpose is uncertain. We cannot tell simply by their existence whether they were no more than gifts or held some functional purpose as ornate weights. What

\textsuperscript{159} Mederos Martín, Alfredo. “The Mycenaean Contacts with the Iberian Peninsula…”
\textsuperscript{160} Lull, Vicente, “La Almoloy…” Pp. 41-59.
\textsuperscript{161} Ruiz-Gálvez Priego, Marisa. “The West of Iberia…” Pp. 93-120.
can be said is that they are a sign of hybridization, demonstrating a unique blend of foreign and
native culture.

The Baiões hoard is larger and comprised of iron works, attesting to the presence of Ruiz-
Gálvez’s theorized skilled migrant traders. These iron artifacts are of tremendous importance
because in instances such as the wheeled stand of Baiões they contain signs of influence from the
Eastern Mediterranean and the British Isles. Further supporting the connection among the British
Isles, France, Iberia, Cyprus, and Sardinia are a slew of metal goods, including rotary spits, flesh
hooks, cauldrons, swords, and fibulae.¹⁶³ Each of these artifacts offer insight into the nature of
Bronze Age trade and suggest an astounding level of interconnectivity.

Feasting artifacts such as cauldrons are common across all the locations mentioned in the
above paragraph, but flesh hooks and rotary spits are rarer in Cyprus and Sardinia. Their location
in situ with cauldrons in the Atlantic attests to their usage, but within the Mediterranean they are
found in hoards or funerary offerings, suggesting the attribution of prestige value in place of
functionality.¹⁶⁴ Huelva type swords are representative of the same connection between the
Atlantic and Mediterranean, but also highlight the start of Iberian influence being felt in these
locations. The Nantes and Sa-Idda sword types of France and Sardinia are now understood to be
variations of the original Huelva type, indicating that Iberia was actively maintaining enough
contact with both regions to influence their material culture.¹⁶⁵ The reach of Iberia’s influence is

Magdalena Moskal-del Hoyo. “Las Espadas en Lengua del Carpa …” Pp. 431-456. And Burgess, Colin, and
Brendan O’Connor. “Iberia, The Atlantic Bronze Age and…”
most visible through the dispersal of Huelva style fibulae throughout the Mediterranean during the Late Bronze Age.¹⁶⁶

The significance of foreign artifacts in both Iberia and the Eastern Mediterranean during the Cypriot phase cannot be overstated as they indicate an increasing of exchange of artifacts. Unlike the Mycenaean phase, artifacts in the Cypriot period also show indications of influence over the cultural practices of each group, be it burials, feasting, or local stylistic modifications to foreign goods. This coincides with phase three of Gilman’s theory of growing Mediterranean interconnectivity. Although her model fails to capture the circumstances surrounding Iberia and Mycenaeans, the increasing Cypro-Phoenician contact in the Mediterranean is clearly building as the tenth century approaches.

The arrival of the Phoenicians in Iberia is a point of contention, with literary sources and archaeological evidence differing by over a century. This thesis attributes a tenth century date predominately because that is when the earliest archaeological evidence can be dated to, but also because that date provides ample time for both the mythology centered around Melqart and the Iberian silver industry to develop. Rather than being pushed to Iberia by a need for silver, the Phoenicians inherit the Cypriots’ role as the region’s most dominant trade partner. Their spread from the interior of the Mediterranean to the Atlantic in twenty-five years is a testament to their reliance on the connections first established by the Mycenaeans and then maintained by the Cypriots.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁷ Arruda, Ana Margarida. “Phoenician Colonization on the Atlantic Coast” Pp. 113-130.
Like these previous phases of interaction archaeological evidence attests to a Phoenician presence in the Mediterranean, Atlantic, and Straits regions of Iberia. Activity in each area provides different insight into their interactions with local populations. The many settlements on Malaga’s coastline—particularly Morro de Mezquitilla—indicate a tenth century BCE arrival date and continued usage of nearby necropoli confirm their continued presence until circa the seventh century BCE. Terraced hillsides indicative of farming, pottery kilns, and the presence of a forge suggests that a wide variety of industries were eventually pursued, attesting to the Phoenicians’ diverse interests, routine voyages, and the developing permanence of their settlements.168

Activity along the Atlantic coast is difficult to measure given our limited knowledge, but indicates a continuity of Mediterranean activity. While the Tagus estuary was the focal point of Mediterranean interaction on the Atlantic, Santa Olaia in the Mondego emerged as the most industrialized settlement along the Atlantic coast. Although this relocation appears to signify change, it is merely a continuation of the thriving metallurgical industry seen flourishing along the Atlantic.169 Southern Iberia is where the growing connection between local populations and Phoenicians can best be observed.

The continued inhabitation of former Tartessian settlements and the encroaching coast of the Iberian Peninsula limit the ability of archaeologists to excavate prominent sites such as Cadiz and Huelva, but that does not entirely curtail archaeological pursuits. Emergency excavations at Huelva yielded thousands of Phoenician pottery sherds before being impeded by the area’s water table.170 The sheer quantity of these sherds is an affirmation of increased trade between Iberia and

---

170 Bell, Carol. “Phoenician Trade: The First 300 Years” Pp. 91-105.
the Eastern Mediterranean, but the inability to excavate deeper strata prevents access to information about the settlements’ founding. Similarly, silt deposits and changing coast lines caused so much change to the landscape of Cadiz that one of the three islands is now gone, once again limiting the ability of archaeologists to excavate sites pertinent to the early Phoenician interaction in Iberia.171

While our knowledge of coastal cities is limited, the rural interior of the Southern Peninsula provides us with a surfeit of information. Interaction with Phoenicians led to the resurgence of better building techniques, incorporating stone and elaborate floor plans. The ninth century BCE Phoenician temple of Castro dos Ratinhos—the oldest in Iberia—is an example of foreign influence on both architecture and religion.172 Its construction prior to Iberia’s colonization is indicative of a substantial Phoenician presence in the region, and when viewed in tandem with other known adoptions of foreign practices by the Iberian peoples is suggestive of the initial permeation of local religion by foreign customs.

The evolution of Iberian stelae from simple grave markers to elaborate means of asserting one’s wealth and power through an association to foreign culture, marks a dramatic shift in Southern Iberia’s power dynamic.173 Local elites were deriving power from their ability to acquire and flaunt foreign goods. This indigenization of eastern goods not only fostered a rapid consumption of Phoenician culture by the Iberian ruling class, but over time would make the Phoenicians the source of their power. The subsequent rise to prominence of ox-hide shaped symbols in adornments, hearths, and temple altars is but another example of Iberian populations

adopting foreign customs to gain power. In relation to pre-colonization this relationship is tremendously important as it demonstrates a high level of influence over native populations and an acquisition of power by the Phoenicians. The willingness with which Phoenician culture appears to be absorbed by native Iberians suggests that after centuries of benefiting from an association with foreign culture native Iberians were welcoming of any opportunity to further that connection. This and the peaceful nature of Phoenician colonization is the greatest proof of Iberia’s pre-colonization.

The information gathered above demonstrates that during the seven centuries preceding Phoenician colonization the Iberian Peninsula engaged in prolonged interaction with Eastern Mediterranean peoples. Dividing that period into smaller phases allows a distinction to be made in the nature of each. Contact during the Mycenaean phase was brief and solely for the purposes of trade, but it did provide the stimulus for the development of more advanced forms of metallurgy along the Atlantic coast. Comparatively the Cypriot phase contains greater quantities of artifactual evidence, not only confirming continuation but also the increasing frequency required by required by Esquerra in his theory of SHMC. The appearance of Cypriot pottery, bronze bowls of eastern origin, neck torcs that indicate an understanding of Iberian culture and a simultaneous incorporation of eastern significance into their manufacturing are matched by the Iberian influence of a developing feasting culture, changes to sword types across Europe, and the use of Huelva pins in the Levant confirm that Esquerra’s pre-requisite of intensifying contact is also met via the exchange of cultural practices and artifacts.

Does this then designate the Cypriots as pre-colonizers? In his application of colonial theory to the Phoenician colonization of Iberia Michael Dietler applies the works of Nicholas Dirks, who states “you can’t ascribe intention or systematicity to interactions occurring without coordination.” While this approach is sufficient in a theoretical model, it severely undermines the Cypriots’ role. Ruiz-Gálvez considers the changing socio-political factors within Phoenicia to have led them to eclipse Cypriot influence within the Mediterranean exchange network. While her stance is tantamount to citing luck as the reason the Phoenicians overtook the Cypriots’ as the most influential group within Iberia, historical and archaeological evidence upholds the validity of her claim. Their continued interaction with the Iberian Peninsula fulfils the requirements of increased frequency and intensity established by Esquerra in his definition of a SHMC. Furthermore, if credit is to be awarded for instituting a trans-Mediterranean trade route and therein introducing the Phoenicians to Iberia and its goods, it belongs to Cyprus. Without both their continuation of exchange and intensification of interaction with the Iberian Peninsula, the development of a Late Bronze Age Exchange network would not have occurred. As such, they are responsible for initiating the Peninsula’s pre-colonization.

Ultimately the Phoenician phase of interaction is a continuing trend of increased contact and cultural exchange established by the Cypriots. The willing acceptance of foreign culture by Iberian populations created a social climate in which Phoenician culture was held in such high regard that it became a source of power. By attributing power to Phoenician goods Iberians also provided power to the Phoenicians themselves. The amenability with which the Iberians allowed

foreign culture to permeate their own is the result of centuries worth of intensifying and continuing contact culminating in the pre-colonization of the Iberian Peninsula.
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