A COMPARATIVE INSIGHT INTO ENCOUNTERS, TERRITORIALITIES, IDENTITIES, AND VIOLENCE: PHOENICIANS IN SOUTHWESTERN IBERIA AND PORTUGUESE IN AFRICA

PEDRO ALBUQUERQUE

Pedro Albuquerque, Doctor, post-doctoral researcher
FCT, Uniarq, University of Seville
Chair CIPSH of Global Studies, Aberta University, Portugal
e-mail: albuquerque@us.es, pedro.albuquerque@campus.ul.pt
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4800-7343

Dr. Pedro Albuquerque (Lisbon, 1978) is in the present-day a post-doctoral researcher from Foundation for Science and Technology (Portugal), Uniarq, University of Seville and Chair for Global Studies, Aberta University. His PhD thesis was focused on a comparative study of Tartessos from an archaeological and literary point of view. He is author of several papers of cross-cutting research about the Iberian Iron Age Archaeology, the depiction of ancient Iberian communities in Classical and Near Eastern literature, and in the sixteenth century Historiography. He is currently working on the Iron Age and Roman settlement of the Lower Guadiana Valley (eighth century BC to first century AD) in the context of a project dedicated to the enhancement of the archaeological heritage in the Luso-Spanish frontier. His research interests also focus on the Cartography and the construction of borderlands from the Middle Ages to the present-day. He is also researcher in several international projects, both in Portugal and Spain.

ABSTRACT

By examining the relationship between territoriality and identity construction, this paper aims to provide a comparative analysis of three contexts where encounters between foreign colonial powers and local autochthonous communities took place. The comparison is thus focused on the interaction between Africans and Portuguese in two different contexts (São Jorge da Mina/ Elmina, Ghana between the fifteenth and the nineteenth centuries, and colonial Angola from the 1850's onwards), on the one hand, and on the encounters between Phoenicians and Autochthonous communities of Southwestern Iberia (Tartessos?) in the first half of the first Millennium BC. This study raises new questions about the role played by sanctuaries and violence in the deconstruction of indigenous territorial perceptions and the subsequent construction of colonial territories in the Iron Age of Southwestern Iberia. Also in examination are the relevance and usefulness of a comparative methodology in the analysis of encounters between diverse cultural actors as expressed in the archaeological record.

Keywords: Iron Age, Ancient Iberia, comparative history, cultural encounters, São Jorge da Mina, Angola, Phoenicians

INTRODUCTION[1]

This paper examines three different historical contexts, seen by the author as comparable case studies. Firstly, a focus is placed on the wealth of archaeological evidence relating to the Phoenician expansion along the Southwestern territories of the Iberian Peninsula and the issues it raises. After that, the focus shifts towards the Portuguese presence in the Ghanaian commercial trading post São Jorge da Mina and, subsequently, towards the Portuguese colonial project in Angola. This contribution aims at examining the impact of the Phoenician presence among the autochthonous communities in the Iberian Peninsula's Iron Age by reassessing the archaeological and the historical records in a comparative view.

The limits of comparison have been the subject of discussion since the earliest publications on the relationship between History and other Social Sciences at the end of the 19th century. Nevertheless, the comparative method helps to raise new questions and, hence, to validate hypothesis, to identify singularities and to define future research paths (Bloch, 1928; Bintliff, 1991; Kocka, 1999; cf. Werner, Zimmermann 2005), in this case on the Iberian Iron Age Archaeology.

This perspective focuses mainly on changing territorialities and identity discourses as consequences of encounters. The three historical contexts examined here are viewed as sharing substantial commonalities, crucial in the development of a comparative analytical methodology capable of reassessing the archaeological and the historical records in novel ways. The wealth of written sources, oral traditions and, to a lesser extent, the archaeological record found in the African contexts of the fifteenth – twentieth centuries can be used to gauge the impact of Near Eastern/Phoenician communities on the lives of indigenous populations of Iron Age Iberia from a comparative perspective, as well as the *etic* depiction of the pre-roman communities in written sources. The choice of case studies or comparison units is determined by what we wish to know about one of

---

[15] The abbreviations of the "Greek-English Lexicon" (Liddell and Scott) and the "Oxford Latin Dictionary" were used. The author would like to thank Ms. Clareana Marques for the care taken in reviewing this text, as well as the reviewers for their thorough comments on the first version of this paper.

them. That is, by identifying some case studies in African contexts (e.g., the impact on indigenous territorialities), it is possible to raise new questions to the Phoenician presence.

The common denominator in all three situations is that they represent the establishment of a foreign presence in a previously occupied territory which paved the way for different kinds of interaction depending on the power relations. Such encounters between different lifeways, political organizations, and ideology and identity discourses often lead to the development of new hybrid realities. The examination of African cases for comparative purposes is then useful for questioning our perspectives about encounters, on the one hand, and about the written sources which depict other communities, on the other.

Then, this paper highlights the impact of such intercultural contacts in the material record and the reconstruction (or deconstruction) of identities. Territorial markers are especially relevant as they reflect territorial perception and, thus, are one of the clearest indicators of drastic changes or adaptations (Henriques 2004). The main issue in this discussion is, then, how to recognize in the archaeological record the response of indigenous communities to foreign input, which provides a complementary view that does not focus only on peaceful commercial contacts and political alliances between equals. A complementary and equally pertinent issue is how to recognize changes in the foreign response to indigenous inputs.

Within this scope, we consider that violence (both implicit and explicit) is present in these contacts, while also assessing the role of resident communities in the construction of colonial identities (Gosden 2008). The diversity of sources available (travel accounts, political documents, chronicles, iconography, etc.) allow us to identify some of these aspects and to discuss the image of pacific encounters between the Phoenicians and the autochthonous Iron Age communities of Southwestern Iberia between Cadiz (Spain) and Sagres (Portugal), both in inland and coastal territories. It is noteworthy that the scarcity of direct Phoenician sources is not balanced out by the existence of other Eastern, Greek, or Latin texts. These Phoenicians, as well as the Iberian Iron Age communities, are depicted from an *etic* point of view. Consequently, we consider that these sources do not constitute *per se* evidence for the examination of encounters in the Iberian Peninsula, but they provide information about territorialities and identity construction through territorial markers.

From the outset, we are dealing with aprioristic views of these encounters. The image of a fascinated indigenous (Moreno 2001)

that accepts the "progress" and emulates Near Eastern aesthetics and habits is often present in the historical and archaeological discourse. Conversely, explicit or implicit violence in these contacts has received limited attention from scholars. For example, the study of African cases reveals that strictly commercial contacts like the first centuries of São Jorge da Mina (1482 onwards) do not change drastically a community's cultural background (e.g., religious beliefs, mortuary practices). However, colonial encounters (far more violent) with hegemonic purposes in Angola from the second half of the nineteenth century onwards bring about significant changes in many aspects of populations' lifeways. The identification of these issues is then applied to the examination of the Indigenous-Phoenician encounters in Southwestern Iberia from an archaeological point of view, considering, e.g., the role of oriental-style sanctuaries built on strategic places.

Why this comparison matters? The statements presented here can shed some light on the so-called tartessic question. Tartessos is frequently perceived as a hybridization of Phoenician and indigenous communities or as a result of a "selective acculturation" of its elites within peaceful contacts (see a thorough discussion about these encounters in Celestino and López-Ruiz 2016, with different perspectives about this topic). By raising different questions on territoriality and identity constructs based on the African cases, an attempt is made to present a complementary view of these encounters. That is why it is useful to take a first look on two important concepts: territory and territoriality.

TERRITORY AND TERRITORIALITY AS KEY CONCEPTS FOR COMPARISON

"Territory" can be conceived from three points of view: physical/environmental, social, and thought/symbolic (Criado 1999, 6). "Territoriality" determines the relationship between a group and others by creating and maintaining borders (Castro and González 1989, 10ff.; cf. Henriques 2004, 20). We consider here that territorial perceptions reflect the sense of belonging of a collective personality, which differs from a "cartographic" way of depicting territories (Tilley 1994). So, as I. Castro Henriques argued, "The territory is the space needed for the installation of structures and communities invented by men, and is also indispensable for the creation, preservation and strengthening of identity" (Henriques 2004, 20, translated by the author).

This challenges us to "think outside the map" and to discuss the relevance of territorial markers as elements recognized by groups in the construction of collective identities. In other words, territorial markers embody a way of thinking. Hypothetically, the newcomers reshape the indigenous territories and can generate conflicts or even the destruction and desacralization of previous markers.

Territoriality and symbolic construction of landscape has received limited attention by Iberian Iron Age scholars. These issues are critical to understanding and characterising intercultural encounters and the impact of new social, political, and economic realities in spaces previously controlled by resident communities. Newcomers create foundation myths and accounts that invoke old frequentations of these spaces, e.g., the Tyrian expedition for the foundation of Gadir (related to Melqart-Hercules) as transmitted by Strabo (3.5.5; cf. Pi., *N.* 3.19–25). On the other hand, it is not difficult to find accounts describing the destruction of markers such as places of cult or necropolises associated with autochthonous communities. In ancient literature, the integration of these communities in a colonial system is then a major concern, particularly when considering the possible destruction of existing tangible symbols of collective memory and the construction of new ones in the context of the reorganization of landscape by the newcomers, as can be seen in African cases (Henriques 2004; Nordman 2005).

Let us take a couple of examples from ancient sources to illustrate these statements. Herodotus described sanctuaries as places that centralize and symbolize collective identities and political partnerships (Panionion: Hdt. 1.142–143; 148; Zeus Karios' sanctuary in Mylasa: Hdt. 1.171; see Saviano 2018; cf. Hdt. 8.144, and Albuquerque 2014, 80–92). On the other hand, the Old Testament (OT) also provides good examples of the relationship between territorial markers, identity, and collective memory (e.g., Wright 1961, 169ff.; Margueron 1984, 24; Glinister 1997, 62ff.; Marín 2010; Kim 2014, 276ff; see Ex. 19.9–13; Gn. 28.10–22; 35.6–8 and 13–15; Dt. 12.3; J. *A. J.* 8.318).

This association between territorial markers and identity is also cogent for the study of Phoenician colonization strategies in Southwestern Iberia, namely the construction of sanctuaries in areas of strategic access to raw materials and trade routes, particularly after the seventh century BC. Until then, this use of sanctuaries as territorial markers with associated political, religious, and economic roles was unknown to the indigenous communities. This is critical to question what the impact of these buildings in local lifeways was, but firstly it is useful to consider the two African cases discussed here to identify some issues of these encounters, as well as clues for its interpretation.

SÃO JORGE DA MINA AND ANGOLA

It must be stated that the two African cases were chosen because they represent two different kinds of interaction between resident communities and Portuguese groups in different moments. The first case was well studied from an archaeological perspective which was related to Portuguese documents and oral traditions. The second one was studied by I. Castro Henriques from a thought-provoking point of view (2004). The process of the destruction, deconstruction, and reconstruction of territorial perceptions in colonial Angola is also well documented and studied, which is a reason for choosing these cases for our comparative analysis.

São Jorge da Mina (SJM) was a fortified trading post founded in 1482 by the Portuguese on the *Costa do Ouro* (Gold Coast, West Africa). The Portuguese built this fortified settlement for commercial purposes with no ambition of conquering or exploiting adjacent territories by force or political alliances, what J. Alvar called a *non-hegemonic contact mode* (Alvar 2000). Its founders, attracted mainly by the region's gold wealth, sought to monopolize the trade and to protect it with a permanent settlement (Baalong 1993, 52ff; DeCorse 2001).

The first encounters between the foreign newcomers and the local resident communities reveal the interests of each of these parties (About the baptism of local leaders and their reluctance, see Baalong 1993, 60ss.; Barros, quoted in Brásio 1952, 24–26; DeCorse 2001, 179–180) and can be examined from the point of view of territoriality. After initial negotiations that brokered the acceptance of the newcomers by the neighbouring communities, confrontations between the former and the latter broke out due to the use of a sacred rock as a quarrying site (R. Pina, Ch. 2, *apud* Serra 1790, 16; cf. Barros, *apud* Brásio 1952, 27):

> Before he withdrew, the captain went with the craftsmen he had brought to lay the foundation of the fortress [with stone] which they took from the top of some high rocks which were sacred to the blacks and adored by them. [...] When the blacks saw so much damage being done to their sacred rocks, and their hopes of salvation destroyed, they reach very strongly and, burning with fury, took up their arms and treated the workmen so harshly that they could not resist and fled back to their boats. (Translated by M. Newitt 2010, 94)

The examination of this example is stimulating, as it exposes the existence of a natural marker not recognised as such by the

Portuguese. Even after an initially favourable reception by local elites, sources reveal that the Portuguese were not widely accepted in this new land and had to negotiate their position constantly (Baalong 1993, 60). Moreover, it seems that the hinterland trade routes were controlled by Africans (Ibid., 73). This means that the encounters between the latter and the Portuguese, though tense, were quite different from later colonial contacts in the nineteenth century, because there was no systematic destruction of local sacred places or buildings (DeCorse 2001, 180–181), or even control of trade routes.

The Portuguese were a minority in a territory controlled by local political powers, continually changing as they were integrated into the Atlantic trade. These changes affected mostly local economic systems, now responding to the new demands of gold and slaves from the settlers of SJM and the European merchants (DeCorse 2001, 175ff.). These changes lead to the abandonment of some regions, while previously peripheral territories stood out in the African new political contexts. In sum, the communities either integrated the new systems or protected themselves from it (MacIntosh 2001).

The Eurocentric image of the locals as passive receptors and emulators of European lifeways does not survive a rigorous analysis of the relevant written, oral, and archaeological sources. The integration of imported goods into existing African lifeways and the survival of indigenous ceremonies and religious beliefs reveal that commercial contacts did not have such a deep impact on the behaviours and the material culture (*latu sensu*) of both groups involved in these encounters. Also noteworthy is the fact that African food consumption habits, a most telling identity marker and social relationship indicator, did not change drastically with European presence, notwithstanding the acquisition of imported pottery by the resident communities (DeCorse 2001, 177–178).

However, colonial rule did prompt truly striking changes in the lifeways of indigenous population during the nineteenth century. As C. DeCorse (2001) argues:

> Even more telling is the gradual disuse and destruction of formerly sacred groves. Such transformations may be indicative of an increasing tempo in the changes that occurred in coastal Ghana. Yet, even so, such changes cannot be divorced from their distinctive local context and indigenously articulated expression. (DeCorse 2001, 191)

These phenomena can be linked directly to the increasing role of the Europeans in African affairs, and even with the domination and

knowledge of the hinterland, as can be seen in the colonial rule of Angola by the Portuguese.

The common denominator in these historical contexts was the impact of colonization on the exploitation and organization of landscapes, which was always adapted exclusively to the interests of the Europeans. The colonial administrative reorganisation of an area was tantamount to significant changes in the resident communities. For the colonizer, the land was alienable, while for the Africans it was inhabited by forces of nature, by spirits and by ancestors (Henriques 2004).

Founding accounts, ceremonies, the daily life of populations, their economic activities or even production logistics, legitimized the construction of identity discourses both on the territorial perception and occupation (Henriques 2004, 14–22). In this context, territorial markers again were a significant part of the perpetuity of the *emic* perspective of collective identity and history. They were a useful reminder of an old episode (e.g., the founding of a village) and a vehicle for the consecration of space (Tilley 1994, 20–21).

Thus, the deconstruction of the preexisting structures and markers was a strategy to impose a new political and economic reality with European overtones. In other words, it proceeded to desacralize African territories, integrating them into the symbolic system of Western representation, which included the delimitation of properties, new borders, and the mapping of the colonized territory (Garcia and Santos 2000; Henriques 2004, 30ff., images 15–18). This process had four main phases. It started with a long tradition of commercial contacts with African leaders. Subsequently, a discreet foreign presence was established in a village or on its outskirts with outsiders separated from the local communities and dependent on their sovereigns. The convergence and reorganization of existing commercial spaces followed. And, finally, the Portuguese proceeded with the destruction of the African "commercial houses" and imposed their dominance (Henriques 2000, 77).

The latter coincided with the migration and subsequent rise of the White population. Consequently, there was a clash between territorial perceptions, organization and "civilizational logics". The colonizer was the one overturning "African systems of land occupation and management, replacing them with the violence of individual property and the logic of industrial production [...]" (Henriques 2004, 14–15, translated by the author).

The new mode of conceiving, organizing, and perceiving the human landscape led to a new social order determined and ruled by the White, which affected social and economic habits and traditions

(e.g., taxes and large-scaled production systems). Flags and churches stand out as new symbols of the presence, domination, and identity of the colonizers in a reorganized territory previously defined in the Berlin Conference in 1884 (Ibid., 30–37). Resident communities, faced with this new reality, proceeded with a readjustment aimed at maintaining some ancestral elements and guaranteeing their autonomy in contexts of evident loss of political power.

This imposition of a new reality would have been impossible without the help and connivance of local elites. Notwithstanding, it gave way to adaptation strategies aimed at maintaining identities in a context of changing economic and social relations. These communities sought to preserve their values and collective identities, even after being forced to accept the changes imposed by the Portuguese (Henriques 2004, 46). The appropriation of some elements associated with the colonizer (e.g., the house architecture) and the adaptation or Africanisation of others indicate that the resident communities were not passive agents but played a fundamental role in the configuration of new social realities (Ibid., images 28–30), even considering that these communities were somehow forced to change.

The study of these African cases is useful for examining the Phoenician presence in Iberia during the Iron Age and the interactions that took place. Furthermore, taking as an example the European ethnographic discourses about African communities and the invention of ethnic groups, it is possible to examine the *etic* depiction of the pre-Roman communities in Classical sources (Moret 2004). The analysis of the criteria used in ancient geography and ethnography allows us to identify depictions of communities that the transmitter is not acquainted with. As J. Horta pointed out, the observer and the transmitter are not always the same person (Horta 1995), a statement confirmed by the information acquired indirectly in the elaboration of ethnological maps and by the difficulties colonial scholars had in distinguishing and individualizing ethnic groups.

This was the main goal of the Portuguese *Censos* (surveys) in Angola. In these works, ethnologists tried to identify similar physical attributes, social organization, language and even material culture, but these criteria were insufficient to individualize communities (Mendes Correa, *apud* Estermann 1983, 18–19; Henriques 2004; 2020). E.g., a group could speak the same language as others without sharing a common identity, and material culture was often the same between communities that spoke different languages.

It can be said that ethnic affiliation can be forged by the colonizer and appropriated by resident communities (Amselle 1987; Amselle and M'Bokolo 1999; Henriques 2004; Moret 2004). Such

a phenomenon can be better understood by examining the modes by which these ethnonyms were transmitted on the written record. Firstly, there is the name that the group used to identify itself. Then, we have the name by which the neighbours knew that group. Sometimes that name was given by external observers (e.g., a merchant, a voyager, or a colonizer), who were not well-acquainted with the reality of those groups and, possibly, came to know these names only indirectly (Crowley 1993, 280–284). This is equally valid for the examination of the ethnonyms of the Iberian pre-Roman communities mentioned in ancient sources (see Moret 2004).

SOME NOTES ABOUT ANCIENT COLONIAL ENCOUNTERS

The topics exposed above set the stage for a reanalysis of the pre-Roman Iberian communities mentioned in Classical sources, as well as for the interpretation of the archaeological record of the Phoenician presence in the Iberian Peninsula. Similarities between the latter and the African examples must be studied, while having in mind the geographic, chronological, and cultural differences that distinguish them.

One of the clearest similarities is conceptual, namely the framework of colonization and colony, which is largely applied to ancient and modern contexts although it embodies the nineteenth and twentieth centuries colonialist ideology. This Eurocentric perspective has been dominating the interpretation of ancient encounters. This, however, does not mean that those communities in the past shared those very same ideas, concepts, or goals in their expansion process, as demonstrated in recent works (Sommer 2011; 2012; Celestino and López-Ruiz 2016, 125ss.).

Colonial encounters in the Iberian Peninsula during the Iron Age were recently re-examined through a postcolonial lens (Dietler and López-Ruiz, eds. 2009; Celestino and López-Ruiz 2016; Martín-Aguilera, ed. 2018, etc.). One of the premises of the Postcolonial view is the examination of the changes that occurred in both communities after the first contacts. In fact, the notion of "negotiated identities", expressed in terms such as "encounters, entanglements, and transformations" (Dietler, *apud* Celestino and López-Ruiz 2016, 127; Vives-Ferrándiz 2005), has prevailed upon the old-fashioned concept of *acculturation* in recent years, which means that Indigenous communities are no longer viewed as passive receptors of the "civilizing" action of the newcomers, but as important agents in the construction

of hybrid realities and confluences (Amselle 1990; Cruz Andreotti 2019).

This "decolonization of mind" must invariably note that there are always two opposite or complementary perspectives of such encounters. Literary narratives often present views about the "others", which are strongly conditioned by the cultural background of the observers and may not be reliable in the study of depicted communities or individuals (Hartog 1991; Horta 1995; Amselle 1996). This is particularly relevant for rethinking colonization, seeing as conventional perspectives often convey a benevolent view of intercultural contacts.

In addition, there are two polarized views of ancient colonization. On the one hand, there are those, like M. I. Finley, who believe that there were, within these processes, massive human displacements, land appropriation, subjugation, and political control, assuming the dominance of the colonizer groups and the inability of the indigenous to confront them (Finley 1976). On the other hand, Finley's statements have been criticized by scholars who defend a viewpoint that ancient colonization does "...not reflect foreign domination over local communities..." (Stein 2005, 10; Vives-Ferrándiz 2005, 27ss.; Gosden 2008, 13ff.) and that such a line of thought leads to a historical discourse in which indigenous groups do not have their own history (Henriques 2020).

Postcolonial views then focus on the role of the indigenous communities in these encounters without excluding implicit or explicit violence (Stein 2005; cf. Celestino and López-Ruiz 2016). Entanglement, on the other hand, was not always part of the agenda in these intercultural contacts (Henriques 2020). So, let it be clear that the study of violence is not necessarily incompatible with the enhancement of the role of the "colonized" in the processes of interaction (Moreno 1999; 2000; 2008; Wagner 2005, 178ss.; Henriques 2004, 14–15; Arruda 2010, 448; Albuquerque 2014, 82–84).

The literary evidence provides some examples of the destruction of territorial markers by the newcomers, which can be considered for the examination of territoriality in other contexts where literary evidence is lacking. Taking the example of the OT, the depiction of the religious reforms of Josiah in 2Kings 23.14–18 clearly reveals the importance of territoriality in the social and ideological shaping of collective memory and identity:

> He smashed the sacred pillars and cut down the sacred poles, filling the places where they had been with human bones. Josiah also tore down the altar that was in Bethel. That was the

> shrine made by Jeroboam, Nebat's son, who caused Israel to sin. Josiah tore down that altar and its shrine. He burned the shrine, grinding it into dust. Then he burned its sacred pole. When Josiah turned around, he noticed tombs up on the hillside. So, he ordered the bones to be taken out of the tombs. He then burned them on the altar, desecrating it. (This was in agreement with the word that the Lord announced by the man of God when Jeroboam stood by the altar at the festival.) Josiah then turned and saw the tomb of the man of God who had predicted these things. 'What's this gravestone I see?' Josiah asked. The people of the city replied, 'That tomb belongs to the man of God who came from Judah and announced what you would do to the altar of Bethel.' 'Let it be', Josiah said. 'No one should disturb his bones'. So they left his bones untouched, along with the bones of the prophet who came from Samaria. Moreover, Josiah removed all the shrines on the high hills that the Israelite kings had constructed throughout the cities of Samaria. (Translation in https://www.biblestudytools.com/ceb/2-kings/23.html, 13/11/2020)

This depiction is the subject of an interesting discussion about the historicity of King Josiah's reform, the role of 2Kings 23 in the Deuteronomistic historiography, and how archaeological data can explain the text (or *vice versa*; Lowery 1991, 190–209). This is not the place to discuss it, but it is noteworthy that the act itself can be recognized by the receptors as a common mode of imposing a new or renewed ideology.

In this case, the literary evidence seems to reflect the stages of the centralization of worship and the annihilation of foreigner cults in Judah after the downfall of the Assyrian Empire in the west. As R. H. Lowery concludes, "Josiah's Deuteronomic reformation was part of a comprehensive view of the world deeply rooted in the ancient traditions of Judah, tempered by the historical experience of foreign domination, and reflecting the changed reality of national independence" (Lowery 1991, 209).

This reshaping of the historical and theological discourse did not contradict Deuteronomist views about the relationship between the sons of Israel and other peoples, which also involved territoriality (see Dt. 12.1–3, from the fifth – fourth centuries BC). These examples do show that replacement and destruction of places of cult and/or burials is a common issue both in the ancient Near Eastern and Classical literature, as seen in the depiction of the "purification" of Delos (Hdt.1.64; Th.1.8), and many others (cf. Albuquerque 2014).

It then seems conceivable that the Phoenician cult places built in the Far West could also have had such a role in strengthening the identity of migrants and in the construction of territorial perceptions. The founding of Gadir and its temple and the fact that these are narrated in much later sources seem to exemplify an instance in which a place was clearly connected with the collective memory of a particular group (D.S. 5.20.1; Str. 3.5.5; Vell.1.2). In Strabo's account, the remote presence of Melqart in these territories seems to be a strategy for the revindication of a particular sense of belonging. Such a territorial marker was determinant for the worldview expressed in Greek Literature, for it marked the end of the known world and its conquest by ancestors like Melqart/ Hercules (Philostr., Vit. Ap. 5,1; Pi., N. 3.19–25; cf. Wagner 2008).

Conversely, earlier depictions of the Iberian Peninsula and its inhabitants are not useful in examining or trying to understand the cult buildings that appear in the Iberian Peninsula from the ninth century BC onward, nor even the ethnicity of its inhabitants during the first encounters (see discussion of these texts in Álvarez 2009; Albuquerque 2013; Celestino and López-Ruiz 2016). Archaeology, however, can shed some light on this question and break the silence of the written sources. As mentioned above, some perspectives about these contacts depict them as peaceful. Trade and wealth, for the *communis opinio*, lead to the empowerment of indigenous leaders, to the emulation of the colonizers' lifeways and to a selective acculturation. Looking at the systematic construction of territorial markers (like cult places) between the ninth and the sixth centuries BC in Iberia, one can postulate that they were crucial for the organization and control of trade routes and for the reorganization of previous social and economic structures, as well as material culture (*latu sensu*).

It then seems plausible that this organization followed the outsiders' interests and ways of thinking and does not reflect any kind of continuity from previous territorialities. Taking again the example of SJM, trade *per se* does not appear to have had an insurmountable impact in local groups. The site was obviously designed for Atlantic Trade and African communities were reorganized basically to provide the Europeans with the products they demanded. There were no dramatic changes in African lifeways, rituals or even architecture and hybridity was clearly not part of the agenda. Conversely, as stated before, the imposition of new territorialities and political/ economic organization in colonial encounters did lead to drastic changes in local lifeways, even considering the Africanization of the elements associated to the colonizer.

If we compare these African examples with the Iberian archaeological record, it seems evident that the new territorial markers could be a symptom of an unfriendly presence and not only of negotiations between equals. It is widely accepted that autochthonous communities acquired oriental goods, lifeways, and even rituals. So, from the point of view presented here, these changes can be a reaction to the deconstruction of previous territorialities or new identity manifestations of communities that came from other (abandoned) territories. To discuss this point of view, it could be useful to look into the construction of sanctuaries in Southwestern Iberia between c. ninth and sixth centuries BC.

ENCOUNTERS AND SANCTUARIES IN SOUTHWESTERN IBERIA DURING THE IRON AGE

From a strictly theoretical point of view, there is no clear evidence with regards as to what distinguishes the "indigenization" of oriental elements and the "orientalization" of the autochthonous background. Nevertheless, it is commonly assumed that Phoenicians lived in coastal sites, while the Indigenous occupied the hinterland. Furthermore, all that is not canonically Phoenician is usually interpreted as local responses to the Near Eastern stimulus. To solve these methodological problems, researchers still maintain, consciously or not, the polarization between the two entities and, concomitantly, assume that Tartessos was a result of hybridization.

Additionally, the assumption that Iberian Late Bronze Age is poorly known has created an aura of contradiction around this discussion. The possible existence of precolonial contacts without permanent settlements seems to be a suitable solution to explain the role of the newcomers on an indigenous *longue durée* historical process (Celestino et al. 2008; Celestino and López-Ruiz, 2016). Scholars proposed, in this context, that warrior stelae are "the single most important corpus of information that we have about Tartessic society before the colonial wave" (Ibid., 159), but its interpretation is problematic (see discussions in Moreno 1999; 2000; 2008; Celestino 2001; Wagner 2005; Celestino and López-Ruiz 2016: 148ff.). The famous Ría de Huelva hoard (Ibid., 158–159, with bibliography; Escacena 2018, 151–152) is also mentioned as a proof of these precolonial contacts and of the wealth of autochthonous society, even considering that the apparent lack of clear indicators of settlement

in the Low Guadalquivir prior to the Phoenician presence (Escacena 1995).

The lack of archaeological contexts for this corpus of information is an obstacle for the proper identification and characterization of mutual influences. Notwithstanding, little attention has been paid to the presence of weapons both in the stelae and in the hoard as a possible indicator of an escalating violence prior to the founding of permanent Phoenician settlements. In the last decades, some scholars postulated the existence of violence associated with the abandonment of settlements and the construction of defensive structures in search for protection (Moreno 1999, 164–165; *Od.* 1.398). This process can be compared with the early modern texts about the slave trade, as it is described, e.g. by the Flemish trader E. de la Fosse (1479–1480; see also McIntosh 2001 for the slave trade in Senegambia from an archaeological perspective):

> [...] they brought us women and children for sale, who we bought, and then we resold them in the same places or elsewhere. Mother and son cost us in this act a razor, and 3 or 4 large brass rings. Then, when we were already in the *Mina de Ouro*, we sold women and children for a good 12 or 14 *pesos* of gold, and each *peso* worth 3 *estrelinos* of gold. The profit was enormous. (Alvim 1992, 62, translated by the author)

The description provided by De la Fosse can illustrate the acquisition of prestige goods. This kind of trade had a significant impact on the populations and was crucial for the development of militarized communities and for the displacement of human groups. It, then, can be postulated that violence or even slave trade was (at least partially) in the agenda of the newcomers and their first contacts in the Iberian Peninsula. For the sake of this argument, it is also noteworthy that heroic tales, like the works of Heracles in the Far West, have more to do with an idea of violent conquest of the world ends than with peaceful relations with the "Other" (Wagner, 2008).

On the other hand, Warrior stelae, brilliantly compiled and examined by S. Celestino (2001) as manifestations of the precolonial (i.e., Tartessian) communities and of the acquisition of prestige goods, were then reinterpreted as a manifestation of slave capture expeditions in hinterland taking as examples the African cases (Moreno 1999; 2000; Wagner 2005) and a possible motive for the large voyages along the Mediterranean by the Phoenicians before the foundation of permanent settlements.

This led us to another topic also related with the identification of Indigenous communities, i.e., the interpretation of handmade

pottery in Iron Age sites. Some archaeologists, when finding materials that fit into Late Bronze Age (or non-Phoenician) typologies, tend to automatically postulate that the in-question site is autochthonous (e.g., Castro Marim: Oliveira 2012; Arruda et al. 2017; Tavira: Maia and Silva 2004). However, even considering the participation of local groups in oriental-style settlements (Wagner 2005, 184–185), there are no clear indicators of hybridization. The presence/ absence of handmade or wheel-made pottery does not necessarily prove that the ones who used it were locals or newcomers, except if it is considered that some of these goods are used for the negotiation or for the affirmation of individual identity (when related, e.g., with the consumption of a particular kind of food). Micro-scale archaeological analysis is then necessary to provide a new insight into these questions.

Notwithstanding, there are other features that can be used for the interpretation of these processes from the point of view of territoriality or settlement patterns. The cases exposed below allow us to state that cult buildings, let alone walled settlements, can be manifestations of tense or unequal relations between locals and newcomers based on the deconstruction of territorial perceptions. It must be noted that this does not necessarily exclude hybridization, entanglements, or complicities. It is not implausible that hostility and mistrust could be a common behaviour of these communities, particularly at the onset of contacts or even during the (re)organization of the territory by the foreign groups.

As mentioned above, the so-called Phoenician or oriental-style sanctuaries were erected in strategic places that allowed settlers to control the trade routes between the sea and the inland territories. So, the first Iron Age occupation of *Spal* (present-day Seville) in the ninth century BC (Escacena and García Fernández 2012) is believed to have been complemented by the Carambolo sanctuary, founded on the opposite riverbank of the Guadalquivir River. This site was found in 1958 by workers during the construction of a building for the *Sociedad de Tiro de Pichón* and was particularly relevant for the invention (not for the "discovery") of an archaeological image of Tartessos by scholars such as J. Maluquer de Motes and J. de Mata Carriazo. The former considered that indigenous or non-Phoenician material culture should be identified as Tartessian even before the findings of El Carambolo (cf. the papers collected in Bandera and Ferrer, eds., 2010, and the historiographic works of M. Álvarez Martí-Aguilar; Celestino and López-Ruiz 2016, 11–16). Before the twenty-first century's excavations carried out in this site, M. Belén and J. L. Escacena (1997; cf. Correa 2000) postulated that the placename

Spal has a Semitic origin and, consequently, that the present-day Seville was founded by the Phoenicians and that El Carambolo could be a Phoenician sanctuary. Recently, M. Torres Ortiz (2016) has argued that the site was first occupied by a Late Bronze Age community and, consequently, it would not have been a Phoenician foundation or even a sanctuary.

The role played by this hypothetical earlier (stable?) occupation in the context of the Guadalquivir River traffic is not well known, leaving the process without plausible and convincing explanation. Was there a continuity? Or a rupture? If the first supposition is accepted, why did this building follow a Near Eastern model? If, alternatively, there was a rupture, what was this building's meaning in indigenous territorial perceptions?

If the interpretation previously proposed in this article is accepted, this cult building can be seen as a dismantling of existing territorial perceptions and a strategy for imposing a new power and its ideology on a reorganized territory. A scenario of complicity cannot and should not be excluded, but traces of prior use may indicate that the El Carambolo sanctuary is a testimony to first contacts or, alternatively, that the place was sacred to the indigenous people (Fernández and Rodríguez 2010, 214ff. proposed that there is a possibility of a ritualistic use of this space by the previous settlers).

Also noteworthy is the fact that the sanctuary was built on a hilltop that stands out visibly in the landscape and that it seems to reproduce a Near Eastern way of thinking (see, e.g. the sacralization of hills in the OT: De Vaux 1992, 370–373; cf. Psalms 2.6 and 3.5, Isaiah 27; Ezekiel 20.40). Its architecture, construction materials, helioscopic orientation, shell floors and the altars of its subsequent phases suggest a reproduction of a foreign ideology and its possible imposition on the organization and control of the Guadalquivir's trade route (Escacena and Vázquez 2009, 57ff.; Fernández and Rodríguez 2010, 219–221; Escacena 2018, 143ff.; cf. Ezekiel 47.1; De Vaux 1992, 417; Gómez Peña 2017).

The settlement pattern also seems to reflect, as J. L. Escacena (2018) has recently suggested, a Phoenician trend which has been identified in other sites, namely *Onoba* (Huelva)-Aljaraque, and Ayamonte-Castro Marim. The city was built on the eastern side of a river, while the sanctuary was erected on the western side. However, it must be noted that Lisbon and Almaraz are urban enclaves that occupy both sides of the Tagus River, but no sanctuary has been found there.

Yet, according to Strabo's account, the founders of the first Phoenician colony in the Iberian Peninsula "[…] founded the temple

in the eastern part of the island, and the city in the west" (Str. 3.5.5, translated by Hamilton, Falconer 1857). Our knowledge of this temple has been dependent solely on the written sources and the findings of statuettes near Sancti-Petri (Cádiz) (Corzo 2005). More recently, however, archaeological work in the nearby Chiclana unearthed a fortified settlement founded in the ninth – eighth century BC (Bueno Serrano and Cerpa Niño, 2008), i. e. with the same chronology of Castillo de Doña Blanca (Escacena 2018, 148), and built following Near Eastern models, evidence which could hypothetically reinforce Escacena's (still unconfirmed) statements. This scholar adds that the (probably apotropaic) shell floors identified in the *Teatro Cómico* of Cádiz could be part of a cult place dedicated to Astarte (Ibid., 147–150), but these remains are essentially urban.

Back on the Baetis Valley, *Caura* (Coria del Río, Seville), Montemolín (Marchena) and *Carmo* (Carmona, Seville) are additional regional examples of cult places built on strategic trade route locales. As in other cases, these sites reflect a choice made by their builders to occupy a place of prominence in the surrounding landscape, a clear indicator of their importance as territorial markers.

Caura has been identified by M. Belén with the *Mons Cassius* mentioned by Avienus (fourth century AD), i.e. a possible sanctuary dedicated to Zeus Cassius or Baal-Saphon (Avienus *O.M.* 255–257; Belén 1993, 49; Escacena and Izquierdo 2001, 123–126; for the identification of the Mons Cassius, see Bonsor 1922, 27–28). Erected at the beginning of the eighth century BC and associated with a "Phoenician neighbourhood", the cult building sits on the San Juan hill and faces the *Cerro de Cantalobos,* an indigenous habitat located on the opposite elevation. These hills dominated the maritime landscape of *Lacus Ligustinus.* Some scholars admitted that *Caura* was previously occupied by an autochthonous community, basing their assumptions on the interpretation of this placename as Indo-European (Padilla 1993; on the issues raised using placenames as sources for the archaeologists, see Albuquerque, 2018, with previous bibliography). Notwithstanding, the oriental origin of this building and of its functionality are clearly demonstrated, for example, by its architecture during its five construction phases (eight – sixth centuries BC), by its open spaces and red floors, and by the possible use of the royal cubit of c. 55 cm (Escacena and Izquierdo 2001, 147; about the seventh century BC altar, see Gómez Peña 2010, 142; 2017).

Montemolín (Marchena) was located inland, near the Corbones river (tributary of the Guadalquivir). It occupies a prominent place in the surrounding landscape and is associated with the nearby Vico settlement, a clear indicator of its importance as a territorial marker

(Chaves and Bandera 1982). The occupational sequence of this sacrificial complex between the tenth and the sixth centuries BC reveals several overlaps between buildings with different architectural features, which seem to evidence a hybrid mode of visual communication. Wheel-made pottery was gradually introduced throughout the second half of the eighth century BC (phase II), together with a large building of stone, mud, and adobe (Bandera et al. 1993, 22–25). In the next phase (IIIA, end of the eighth century BC), an orthogonal building (B) coexisted with an oval-shaped structure (A), which overlapped the building of the previous phase. Both had red-painted floors, a feature which usually distinguishes oriental buildings. By the middle of the seventh century BC, the building C overlapped B, and a few years later, the D overlapped A. The last phase was the compartmentalisation of building C during the sixth century BC. The incomplete stratigraphy of the nearby settlement, Vico, can be useful for comparison with the evolution of Montemolín, as revealed by the substitution of the circular by the orthogonal plant, and the integration of new techniques and products from the end of 8th century BC onwards. The site was still inhabited after the abandonment of the sacrificial complex (Bandera and Ferrer 2002, 127–128; 144).

Not far from *Spal* – El Carambolo*, Carmo* is also interpreted as an indigenous settlement located in the vicinity of *Lacus Ligustinus* (for the attempts of defining its occupational sequence and indigenous origins, see the works of J. M. Carriazo – K. Raddatz, and Amores – Pellicer, quoted in Pellicer 2007, 235ff; Mederos 2008, 121–123). In this city, a sanctuary was built at the beginning of the seventh century BC on San Blas neighbourhood (Marqués del Saltillo Palace and Diego Navarro St., 20), a prominent location possibly previously used as a metallurgical workshop (Román and Belén 2007, 500–501). Given the archaeological data from other parts of *Carmo*, it is possible to state that the sanctuary was erected on an unoccupied locale in the same period as the Alcores' necropolises (Bonsor 1899 [1997]; Amores 1982; Jiménez 2002). The most interesting feature is the building's downfall in the middle of the sixth century BC. It was abruptly abandoned without traces of violence and all that was in use at that time was left behind. Some vessels contained remains of birds (wild pigeons, partridges, and chickens) and fish (sea bream and a ray) in anatomic position. The building was reoccupied in the fifth century BC, after a period of dereliction, and was not used again as a cult place.

The seventh century BC, therefore, seems a crucial period for the examination of territoriality processes in Southwestern Iberia.

As it was then that not only the maximum development of sanctuaries like El Carambolo occurred, but also the foundation of new ones along the Atlantic coast and inland. Sanctuaries such as those built in *Onoba* (Huelva), *Baesuris* (Castro Marim), *Balsa* (Tavira), Abul and *Beuipo* (Alcácer do Sal) were important territorial markers in the context of the fluvial and maritime trade routes and key for the control of access to raw materials. These, however, raise some noteworthy questions regarding the indigenous or exogenous roots of the places where they were built, which will be explored in the next paragraphs.

Following Escacena's settlement pattern hypothesis, Aljaraque (Huelva) may have also been a seventh – sixth century BC sanctuary that reproduced or was inspired by oriental models in its architecture, like its shell floor and the vessel associated with it (Escacena 2018). The apotropaic meaning of these floors, as proposed by this author in previous papers, can be compared to other Near Eastern examples and written sources (see the aforementioned comments on *Teatro Cómico* of Cádiz shell floor). The archaeologists who excavated this site in 1968 overlooked its possible ritualistic purposes (Blázquez et al. 1971).

Additionally, archaeologists have unearthed a building in Méndez Núñez Street (Huelva) that has been correctly interpreted as a cult place, judging by the materials found in it. This building was probably in use until the fifth century BC, even after a *tsunami* in the first quarter of the sixth century BC (Osuna et al. 2000; González de Canales et al. 2010). Underneath it, a deposit containing materials dated from c. 900–770 was found, but the circumstance of its remotion is an obstacle for a proper interpretation of the occupational sequence. Other scholars have associated present-day Saltés with the island consecrated to Herakles/Melqart, using as a reference Strabo's account of the second Tyrian expedition to the Far West in the search of the Pillars of this hero (Str. 3.5.5). The findings of a terracotta "Herakles' head" around 1925 and bronze statuettes, during underwater works, have been also used as arguments to postulate the existence of a sanctuary on this island (Mederos 2006, 170–171; Truszkowski et al. 2007).

The identification of the founders of the ancient *Onoba/Onuba* has too been debated, as has the role of this city as a symbol of the indigenist paradigm of Tartessos (see recent discussions of the identification of Huelva with Taršiš/Tartessos in Padilla 2016; Ferrer and Prados 2018). This city is commonly viewed as an autochthonous/precolonial foundation. Such an indigenous origin has yet to be

sufficiently proved, even despite the efforts of researchers to find and overestimate data that could fit these views.

The *Ría de Huelva* hoard, the hand-made pottery found in different parts of this settlement (particularly in *Cabezo de San Pedro* and *Cabezo de la Esperanza*), its toponym, and other findings that indicate the performance of metallurgical and agricultural activities, have all been considered indicators of an indigenous origin (Padilla 2016, 97–98; Escacena 2018, 151). In a very similar fashion, the extraordinary variety of ceramics present in Huelva's oldest phases has been used to suggest the existence of a multicultural community in that city (Padilla 2016, 100).

Both Castro Marim (*Baesuris*) and Tavira (*Balsa*) have comparable interpretation issues. The lack of clear archaeological indicators has, yet again, not prevented their widespread identification as sites founded by indigenous communities. The former was founded on an elevation of a peninsula in the vicinity of the right bank of the Guadiana River, and is barely mentioned in written sources (It. Ant. 425.6 and 431.4–8; Rav. 305.9; it is absent from Str. 3.1.9). This identification is based on legends of coins (cf. Arruda 1999– 2000, 36). Its most telling feature is its positioning which affords visual control over the Guadiana's mouth and provides great defensibility, both exceptionally relevant in the context of the terrestrial and fluvial trade routes (among many others, Arruda et al. 2009; 2017; Oliveira 2012). Other sources reveal that Castro Marim was still a Peninsula in the sixteenth century (cf. D'Armas 1510; Klein 2019). Inland, Mértola was a relevant port located at the end of the navigable section (Albuquerque and García Fernández 2017).

The first phase of this site is represented by a pit located on a peripheral area; the second by the construction of houses with an orthogonal plan on areas unoccupied during the seventh century BC. This may indicate a growth of the settlement during this period or, alternatively, an *ex-novo* occupation. This leaves us with a conundrum. If we accept the first hypothesis, then an integration of this site in the Mediterranean *koine* without clear signs of adaptation is to be assumed. If, in turn, we postulated that the site is an Iron Age foundation, the pit and the data found in it cannot be properly integrated in the analysis of a historical process, as we saw in Huelva's case. Whether Castro Marim's expansion was the result of internal changes, or the imposition of new models, is a question that remains unanswered. What seems clear, though, is that after the seventh century BC (phases II and III), the site followed strictly oriental models. Such a trend is particularly visible, during the phase III, in the construction

of a cult building with an altar and shell floor and in its surrounding urbanism (Arruda et al. 2007; 2009).

Less than 25 km away, towards the West, is the ancient site of *Balsa*, underneath what today is the city of Tavira. It too was interpreted as an autochthonous foundation, due to the findings of Late Bronze Age material culture. In this case, the previous occupation of this site seems to be more obvious or, at least, more visible than in Castro Marim, but the interpretation of this process is still challenging (Arruda 2014; Covaneiro and Cavaco 2017, 221–223).

This site is located on Santa Maria's hill, at the mouth of the Gilão river, and was first occupied at the end of the eighth century BC. This choice of location reveals that, from outset, its settlers were interested in the benefits of the contacts with the sea and the hinterland. In this period, there were people living and being buried in Ayamonte, at the right bank of the Guadiana's mouth (Marzoli and Teyssandier 2019), as well as in Castro Marim Iron Age seems a time of growth for this settlement, with an apparent intensification of nautical activities and a noticeable concern for defence. The building of a strong wall with casemates appears indicative of social environment in turmoil, from the end of the seventh century BC onwards. However, it is noteworthy that Castro Marim was not fortified during this period, even considering that the Gilão and Seco rivers were not navigable as the Guadiana (Maia, *apud* Pappa 2015, 12).

Excavations carried out at Tavira's Palácio da Galeria uncovered an assemblage associated with ritual pits (or *bothroi*). The partially published findings were recently re-examined by E. Pappa (2015) in a work that lent new credence to the interpretation of the building as a cult place. Previous research postulated the existence of a cult to Baal in *Balsa*, citing evidence that ranged from references in the placename to Baal-Shamen (Maia and Silva 2004; see discussion in Albuquerque 2018, 149) to possible depictions of religious symbols relating to Baal or Melqart on coins produced between 47 and 44 BC and laconic data from later Classical sources (cf. Albuquerque 2014, 202–204). Such speculation can neither prove the existence of a cult place in *Balsa*, nor can it relate the iconographic evidence to lost foundation accounts (Maia and Silva 2004). However, the available data does suggest that the interpretation of Palácio da Galeria as a Phoenician sanctuary can be accepted, even if it is as a necropolis later sacralised (Arruda et al. 2008, 148–149; Pappa 2015, 47). An indigenous origin for this settlement, its cult place or even the necropolis found in Convento da Graça cannot be categorically postulated (Arruda et al. 2008).

Located at the westernmost point of Portugal's southern coast, the Sagres Promontory, also known as *Hieron Akroterion* (the "Sacred Cape"), was considered to be the end of the inhabited world (Str. 3.1.4). References to the use of this natural territorial marker are far from conclusive as are the different interpretations of the textual tradition about a place that is archaeologically invisible (Albuquerque 2014, 206–208). Unsurprisingly, this type of geographical landmarks was often sacralized, especially due to their importance for seamen and their association with the aforementioned *bamot* (Marin 2010). Unfortunately, the lack of archaeological data prevents further discussion here.

Lastly, we would like to highlight the problematic case of Castro dos Ratinhos (Moura, Portugal), a fortified settlement located on a hilltop near an unnavigable section of the Guadiana River. Recent excavations on this site have unearthed a plausible early date sanctuary, apparently the end of the ninth century BC. The structure identified as a cult place displays an orthogonal plan. Further pointing to this being a Phoenician milieu, are a possible *ashera* and a betyl found in its interior. As around this unique building, houses kept their circular plant. In addition, iron or wheel-made pottery are absent. Scholars have been prone to postulate that Castro dos Ratinhos was a typical Late Bronze Age site in which a Phoenician or oriental-style sanctuary was raised only to be destroyed some 30 years later (Berrocal Rangel and Silva 2010).

It is tempting to see this process as an example of the construction of a new territorial marker associated with a foreign ideology that stood out in this settlement for c. three decades. Curiously, after the fire that destroyed the *temenos* and the sanctuary, a new building was raised with the "old" circular model. The examination of the short life of this sanctuary is problematic due to the excavation methodology, which compromised the stratigraphical and chronological interpretation of the site (Ibid., 51ff.), but it is clearly a case of an unsuccessful imposition of a new ideology, symbolized by a marker erected on a place that is far from discrete in the context of this settlement. Although this could be conjectural, let us take the example of 1 Kings 16.31–33, which describes the marriage between the king Achab and Jezebel, daughter of the Ethbaal of Sidon (cf. Briquel-chatonnet, 1998): the former built, in the context of this contract, an altar to Baal and an Asherah in the building founded by him in Samaria. Is it possible that Ratinhos' sanctuary was built within an unequal relationship or was part of a political treaty?

RETHINKING PHOENICIAN COLONIZATION FROM A COMPARATIVE POINT OF VIEW

These last lines will hopefully help outline some guidelines for a more complete understanding of the range of relations and dynamics that must have taken place in the encounters between Mediterranean and Indigenous communities in the Southwestern Iberia based on the comparison with African cases. Even though limited in number, the cases examined show that archaeological research is still dealing with interpretation issues when it comes to the before-after of these encounters. The interpretation of these processes must go beyond the identification of hand-made or wheel-made pottery with indigenous or foreign presence.

Scholars do often admit that indigenous communities had different local responses to external stimuli and postulate a diversity of "indigenizations" of the elements associated with the newcomers (an example in Cruz Andreotti 2019), but often overlook signs of violence, as well as the relationship between territoriality and identity discourses. This is especially relevant for the interpretation of the dissemination of cult buildings throughout Southwestern Iberia.

As stated above, territorial markers can be used as symbols of the ties between a community and the land, structuring identity discourses and the collective image of the past. Construction, as well as destruction, of cult buildings and necropolises can be a consequence of a new dominant ideology being imposed upon a territory. We must insist that territoriality embodies a way of thinking and conceiving collective identities and social relationships. It is, thus, essential to recognise that opportunistic collaboration and forced compliance do not necessarily mean that a group adopts the architectural models, territorialities, and lifeways of the newcomers without questioning them. It is naḭve to postulate that there were sites founded exclusively by newcomers without the help or participation of local communities, or that the foreign groups remained unaffected by indigenous presence. This topic is widely discussed by S. Celestino and C. López-Ruiz (2016).

Even admitting that previous cultural phases are poorly documented, it seems obvious that the establishment of sanctuaries in locations of strategic relevance for trade routes and that of necropolises in unused sites are novelties that can be associated with the arrival of the Phoenicians in Southwestern Iberia in the Iron Age. Equally quite telling, food and drink consumption and the imitation of ceramic wares point toward a hybridization of identities, lifeways, the so-

called "internal borders", and of the *habitus* during this time (Jones 1997; Pech et al. 2008; García Fernández and García Vargas 2014 for a later period). Food consumption is crucial for determining inclusion or exclusion in and from a group as a symbolic marker (for this concept, see Henriques 2004, 22ff.; cf. Hdt. 1.133, about the birthday parties among the Persians) and is a promising research avenue (Gómez Bellard et al. 2020 with a great number of contributions about the Phoenician – Punic food consumption).

In fact, Late Bronze Age settlement patterns evidence no signs of continuity into the Iron Age; on the contrary, a new orientation toward the occupation of places located near the navigable rivers or the sea becomes visible at the very end of the later period (i.e., during the transition to the Iron Age). The formation of these novel multicultural social contexts may have been a consequence of new economic and political strategies (e.g. the establishment of trading outposts). Thus, it would not be surprising to find in the new Iron Age settlements, some of which were probably established for commercial purposes in new strategic locations (like a river mouth), people of different origins, both autochthonous and foreign (cf. *supra* SJM, and the example of the Luso-African, examined by Horta 2009; Hdt. 7.90 also provides a telling example of the diversity among the Cypriots).

However, the most common feature in these sites is the use of the Near Eastern matrix, both in the architecture and cult. This may be a symptom of the type of opportunistic alliances and dependence relationships commonly found in the Ancient Near East (Ruiz and Wagner 2005), as well as of the (violent?) imposition of a new dominant ideology.

Still, territoriality is far more than settlement patterns, exploitation of natural resources, or defence of territories and its borders (cf. López Castro 2011). It is also an identity discourse that projects itself in a territory, delimiting it and creating a sense of belonging for a collective memory. Having this in mind, the reassessment of the written sources becomes clearly necessary to understand processes perhaps only accessible through the examination of archaeological evidence. Even considering that is not a direct source for the topic studied here, the literary depiction of Josiah's reform is especially interesting, as it shows how a reform can be both ideological and territorial.

By the end of seventh and the beginning of sixth century BC, an apparent expansionist project becomes archaeologically visible. It was marked by the fortification of several cities, the foundation of

new sanctuaries along the Atlantic coast and in the hinterland, the reformation of others previously founded, and the dissemination of Near Eastern architecture (orthogonal plant). In the following decades, more cult places were built in hinterland, especially in the Guadiana Valley, among them are Cancho Roano, La Mata del Campanario, Casas de Turuñuelo, and Cabeço Redondo to name a few (e.g., the outstanding works of the project *Construyendo Tarteso*; Celestino and López-Ruiz 2016, 208ff.). The dissemination of these buildings throughout those hinterland territories should be discussed from the point of view presented in this paper, namely analysing the nature of the relationship between local communities and possible newcomers. This, however, is a subject that must be addressed in future research endeavours.

CONCLUSION

The use of a comparative methodology in the analysis of ancient encounters, both from an archaeological and a literary point of view, provides some new research paths. The cases studied in this paper can be used as steppingstones in the selection of other subjects for comparison and, consequently, of new questions about the nature of encounters and entanglements throughout the Mediterranean Iron Age.

From a literary point of view, sanctuaries can be viewed as identity markers and symbols of alliances and conquests. Not surprisingly, they were centres where foundation discourses (Marín and Jiménez 2004; 1 Samuel 31.8; cf. the Samian account of Kolaios in Hdt. 4.152; Albuquerque 2014, 148ff.), solidarity networks and political links between cities (Ferrer 2019, 81ff.; Álvarez 2019, 113ff.) were forged and perpetuated. It is significant that traditions preserved in later periods focus on the antiquity of the city and the links with the motherland, more than on convivence, entanglements, or connivance with other communities, like the foundation account of Gadir (Ferrer 2019, 85–86; see Celestino and López-Ruiz 2016, 106–111, for the so-called Myth of Gargoris and Habis, with discussion about its indigenous or exogenous origin).

The reassessment of archaeological and literary data reveals that some questions raised by the former can help to shed some light on the issues of the latter. This does not mean that we postulate a reawakening of antiquated methodologies with dubious nationalistic underpinnings. As recent works on Historiography have revealed, some aprioristic views are still very much an important part of the

historic and archaeological discourse about Tartessos and the encounters between indigenous and foreign groups.

The diverse views about what Tartessos is (and is not) are particularly relevant in this analysis. Researchers, on the one hand, frequently use the terms "Tartessic" and "Tartessos" in reference to a historical entity, an archaeological culture, or a chronological concept (Ferrer and Prados 2018, 73–74; Celestino and López-Ruiz 2016). Classical sources, on the other hand, have described it throughout the centuries as a river, a city, or a territory, as well as a mythical place controlled by monsters or supernatural beings (cf. Albuquerque 2013).

As seen, the search for an autonomous history of local communities often leads to debate, confusion, and an exclusion of possible violent encounters or even violent/ forced entanglements (e.g., Hdt. 1.146.2–147.1). As seen in this paper, the recognition of this kind of phenomena can be another step toward the decolonization of historical and archaeological thought. However, we are still waiting for a methodology that will allow us to recognize archaeologically an "occidentalization" of features associated with the newcomers, or an "orientalization" of the local background. Given the lack of autochthonous written sources or clear archaeological indicators, this goal can be unrealistic. However, if it is admitted that a great part of archaeological data is associated with changes among Indigenous groups, especially in the funerary record, then we can hypothesize that there should have been a reinvention of Indigenous identity discourses or territorialities as a response to the new circumstances. We must insist that there are no similar manifestations prior to the oriental-style elements (e.g., sanctuaries or orthogonal architecture), so this assumption is based on the absence of similar Indigenous features, or even occupation, which indicates discontinuities.

In sum, we argue that a comparative analysis of the encounters between the Portuguese and the Africans in two different contexts (commercial and colonial) can be used to demonstrate that cultural change is more evident when there is a systematic destruction of territorial markers and construction of new ones. Having this in mind and taking the examples provided by Classical and Near Eastern literature, it is plausible that the encounters between the Phoenician and the indigenous communities of Iron Age SW Iberia could have been violent.

REFERENCES

Albuquerque, P. (2013). "Tartessos e Tartéssios, de Estesícoro a Éforo." In: *Arqueologia em Portugal: 150 anos.* Lisboa: AAP, 633–638.

Albuquerque, P. (2014). *Tartessos: a construção de identidades através do registo escrito e da documentação arqueológica. Um estudo comparativo.* PhD Thesis. University of Lisbon.

Albuquerque, P. (2018). "A toponímia proto-histórica como ferramenta do arqueólogo? Comentários sobre uma relação problemática." *Gerión* 36 (1), 141–161.

Albuquerque, P. and García Fernández, F. J. (2017). "Mértola entre el Bronce Final y el inicio de la presencia romana: problemas y perspectivas de investigación." *Habis* 48, 7–30.

Alvar, J. (2000). "Comercio e intercambio en el contexto precolonial." In: Fernández Uriel, P., López Pardo, F. and Wagner, C. G. (coords.), *Intercambio y Comercio preclásico en el Mediterráneo.* Madrid: CEFYP, 27–34.

Álvarez Martí-Aguilar, M. (2019). "Tyrian Connections: Evolving Identities in the Punic West." In: Cruz Andreotti, G. (ed.), *Roman Turdetania. Romanization, Identity and Socio-Cultural Interaction in the South of the Iberian Peninsula between the 4th and 1st centuries BCE.* Leiden: Brill, 108–139.

Alvim, P. (1992). *Eustache de la Fosse: Crónica de uma viagem à Costa da Mina no ano de 1480.* Lisboa: Vega.

Amores, F. (1982). *Carta Arqueológica de los Alcores.* Sevilla: Diputación Provincial.

Amselle, J.-L. (1987). "L'ethnicité comme volonté et comme représentation: à propos des Peuls du Wasolon." *Annales (ESC)* 42 (2), 465–489.

Amselle, J.-L. (1990). *Logiques métisses. Anthropologie de l'identité en Afrique et ailleurs*. Paris: Payot.

Amselle, J.-L. (1996). "L'étranger dans le monde manding et en Grèce ancienne: quelques points de comparaison." *Cahiers d'études africaines* 36 (144), 755–761.

Amselle, J.-L. and M'Bokolo, E. (1999). *Au coeur de l'Ethnie. Ethnies, Tribalisme Et Etat En Afrique*. Paris: La Découverte.

Arruda, A. M. (1999–2000). *Fenicios en Portugal: Fenicios y mundo indígena en el centro y sur de Portugal (siglos VIII – VI a.C.)*. (*Cuadernos de Arqueología Mediterránea* 5–6).

Arruda, A. M. (2010). "Fenícios no território actualmente português: e nada ficou como dantes." In: Bandera, M. L. and Ferrer (coords), *El Carambolo: 50 años de un tesoro*. Sevilla: EUS, 439–453.

Arruda, A. M., Carretero, P., Freitas, V. T., Sousa, E. and Bargão, P. (2009). "Castro Marim: un santuario en la desembocadura del Guadiana." In: Mateos, P., Celestino, S., Pizzo, A. and Tortosa, T. (eds.) *Santuarios, Oppida y ciudades: Arquitectura sacra en el origen y desarrollo urbano del Mediterráneo Occidental.* Mérida: CSIC, IAM, 79–88.

Arruda, A. M., Convaneiro, J. and Cavaco, S. (2008). "A necrópole da Idade do Ferro do Convento da Graça, Tavira". *Xelb* 8, 141–160.

Arruda, A. M., Freitas, V. T. and Oliveira, C. F. P. (2007). "Os fenícios e a urbanização no Extremo Ocidente: o caso de Castro Marim." In: López Castro, J. L. (ed.), *Las ciudades fenicio–púnicas en el Mediterráneo Occidental.* Almería, CEFYP: EUA, 459–482.

Arruda, A. M., Freitas, V. T. and Oliveira, C. F. P. (2017). "Castro Marim entre indígenas, fenícios e tartéssicos." In: Jiménez, J. (ed.) *Sidereum Ana III: El río Guadiana y Tarteso.* Mérida: Consorcio de Mérida, 443–466.

Ballong-Wen-Mewuda, J. B. (1993). *São Jorge da Mina: 1482–1637*. Lisboa, Paris: FCG, CCP.

Bandera, M. L. and Ferrer, E., coords. (2010). *El Carambolo: 50 años de un tesoro.* Sevilla: EUS.

Belén, M. (1993). "Mil años de historia de Coria: la ciudad prerromana." *Azotea* 11–12, 35–60.

Belén, M. and Escacena, J. L. (1997). "Testimonios religiosos de la presencia fenicia en Andalucía Occidental." *Spal* 6, 103–131.

Berrocal-Rangel, L. and Silva, A. C. (2010). *O Castro dos Ratinhos (Barragem do Alqueva, Moura). Escavações num povoado proto-histórico do Guadiana, 2004–2007. Suplemento de O Arqueólogo Português* 6. Lisboa: MNA.

Bintliff, J. (1991). "The Contribution of the Annaliste/Structural History Approach to Archaeology." In: Bintliff, J. (ed.) *The Annales School and Archaeology*. Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1–33.

Blázquez, J. M., Luzón, J. M. and Ruiz Mata, D. (1971). "La factoría púnica de Aljaraque en la provincia de Huelva." *Noticiario Arqueológico Hispánico* 13–14, 304–331.

Bloch, M. (1928). "Pour une histoire comparée des sociétés européenes." *Revue de Synthèse Historique* 46, 15–50.

Bonsor, G. (1899) 1997. *Las Colonias agrícolas prerromanas del Valle del Guadalquivir* (Maier, J., ed.). Écija: Gráficas Sol.

Bonsor, G. (1922). *Tartesse*. NYC: HSA.

Brásio, A. (1952). *Monumenta Missionaria Africana*, Vol. 1, *África Ocidental (1471–1531)*. Lisboa: AGU.

Briquel-Chatonnet, F. (1998). "Les royaumes de Tyr et de Sidon dans la Bible." In: Lemaire, A. (ed.) *Le Monde de la Bible*. Paris: Gallimard, 325–328.

Bueno Serrano, P. and Cerpa Niño, J. A. (2008). "Un nuevo enclave fenicio descubierto en la bahía de Cádiz: El Cerro del Castillo, Chiclana." *Spal* 17, 169–206.

Castro Martínez, P. V. and González Marcén, P. (1989). "El concepto de Frontera: implicaciones de la noción de territorio politico." *Arqueología Espacial* 13, 7–18.

Celestino, S. (2001). *Estelas de Guerrero y estelas diademadas. La precolonización y la formación del mundo tartésico*. Barcelona: Crítica.

Celestino, S. and López-Ruiz, C. (2016). *Tartessos and the Phoenicians in Iberia.* Oxford: OUP.

Celestino, S., Rafel, N. and Armada, L., eds. (2008). *Contacto cultural entre el Mediterráneo y el Atlántico (siglos XII–VIII a.n.e). La precolonización a debate*. Madrid: CSIC.

Chaves Tristán, F. and Bandera Romero, M. L. (1982). "Estela decorada de Montemolín (Machena, Sevilla)." *Archivo Español de Arqueología* 55, 137–147.

Correa, J. A. (2000). "El topónimo Hispal(is)." *Philologia Hispalensis* 14, 181–190.

Corzo Sánchez, J. R. (2005). "Sobre las primeras imágenes y la personalidad originaria del Hercules Gaditanus." *Spal* 14, 91–112.

Covaneiro, J. and Cavaco, S. (2017). "Evolução do espaço urbano da cidade de Tavira: resultados preliminaries." *Sciencia Antiquitatis* 1.2, 219–242.

Criado, F. (1999). *Del Terreno al Espacio: Planteamientos y Perspectivas para la Arqueología del Paisaje.* Santiago de Compostela: USC.

Crowley, E. L. (1993). *Contracts with Spirits: Religion, Asylum and Ethnic Identity in the Cacheu Region of Guinea – Bissau*. Michigan: Bell & Howell.

Cruz Andreotti, G. (2019). "Preface: Spanish Turdetania, a Case Study for Shared Identities." In: Cruz Andreotti, G. (ed.) *Roman Turdetania. Romanization, Identity and Socio-Cultural Interaction in the South of the Iberian Peninsula between the 4th and 1st centuries BCE.* Leiden: Brill, VII–XVI.

De Barros, P. L. (2001). "The Effect of the Slave Trade on the Bassar Ironworking Society, Togo." In: DeCorse, C. R. (ed.) *West Africa during the Atlantic Slave Trade: Archaeological Perspectives.* London, NYC: LUP, 59–80.

De Vaux, R. (1992). *Instituciones del Antiguo Testamento*. Barcelona: Herder.

DeCorse, Ch. R. (2001). *An Archaeology of Elmina. Africans and Europeans on the Gold Coast.* Washington, London: SIP.

DeCorse, Ch. R., ed. (2001). *West Africa during the Atlantic Slave Trade: Archaeological Perspectives*. London, NYC: LUP.

Detienne, M. (2008). *Comparing the Incomparable.* Standford: SUP.

Dietler, M. and López-Ruiz, C. eds. (2009). *Colonial Encounters in Ancient Iberia. Phoenician, Greek, and Indigenous relations.* Chigaco: UCP.

Escacena, J. L. (1995). "La etapa precolonial de Tartessos. Reflexiones sobre el "Bronce" que nunca existió." In: *Tartessos 25 años después* (1968–1993). Jerez de la Frontera: Ayuntamiento de Jerez de la Frontera, 179–214.

Escacena, J. L. (2018). "Huelva-Aljaraque y el patrón poblacional fenicio de la costa tartésica." In: Campos, P. (ed.) *Arqueología y territorio en la provincia de Huelva: veinte años de las Jornadas de Aljaraque (1998–2017).* Huelva: Diputación de Huelva, 137–177.

Escacena, J. L. and García Fernández, F. J. (2012). "La Sevilla Protohistórica." In: Beltrán Fortes, J. and Rodríguez Gutiérrez, O. (coords.) *Hispaniae urbes. Investigaciones arqueológicas en ciudades históricas.* Sevilla: EUS, 763–814.

Escacena, J. L. and Izquierdo, R. (2001). "Oriente en Occidente: Arquitectura Civil y Religiosa en un Barrio Fenicio de la Caura Tartésica." In: Celestino, S. and Ruiz Mata, D. (eds.) *Arquitectura Oriental y Orientalizante en la Península Ibérica*. Madrid: CSIC, 123–157.

Escacena, J. L. and Vázquez, M. I. (2009). "Conchas de salvación." *Spal* 18, 53–84.

Estermann, C. (1983). *Etnografia de Angola (Sudoeste e Centro)*. Lisboa: IICT.

Fernández, A. and Rodríguez, A. (2010). "El Carambolo, secuencia cronocultural del yacimiento. Síntesis de las intervenciones 2002–2005." In: Bandera, M. L. and Ferrer, E. (coords.) *El Carambolo: 50 años de un tesoro.* Sevilla: EUS, 203–270.

Ferrer, E. (2018). "El río que nos lleva. *Caura* y el poblamiento en la desembocadura del *Tartessi Amnis.*" In: Escacena, J. L., Gómez Peña, A. and Pérez-Aguilar, L. G. (coords.) *Caura: Arqueología en el Estuario del Guadalquivir.* Sevilla: EUS, 73–96.

Ferrer, E. (2019). "Ethnic and Cultural Identity among Punic Communities in Iberia". In: Cruz Andreotti, G. (ed.) *Roman Turdetania. Romanization, Identity and Socio-Cultural Interaction in the South of the Iberian Peninsula between the 4th and 1st centuries BCE.* Leiden: Brill, 70–88.

Ferrer, E. and Prados, E. (2018). "Tarteso = Huelva: una identificación controvertida." In: Campos, P. (ed.) *Arqueología y territorio en la provincia de Huelva: veinte años de las Jornadas de Aljaraque (1998–2017).* Huelva: Diputación de Huelva, 217–248.

Finley, M. I. (1976). "Colonies: An Attempt at a Typology." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 26, 167–188.

García Fernández, F. J. and García Vargas, E., eds. (2014). *Comer a la moda: Imitaciones de vajilla de mesa en Turdetania y la Bética occidental durante la Antigüedad (S. VI A.C. – VI D.C.)*. Barcelona: UB.

Garcia, J. C. and Santos, M.ª E. M. (2000). "A representação antes da alienação: imagens cartográficas da organização do espaço angolano (c. 1883 – c. 1930)." In: Santos, M.ª E. M. (dir.) *A África e a instalação do Sistema colonial (c. 1885 – c. 1930).* Lisboa: CEHCA/IICT, 91–115.

Glinister, F. (1997). "What is a Sanctuary?" *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glötz* 8, 61–80.

Gómez Bellard, C., Pérez Jordá, G. and Vendrell Betí, A., coords. (2020). *La alimentación en el ámbito fenicio-púnico: producciones, procesos y consumos.* Sevilla: EUS.

Gómez Peña, A. (2010). "Así en Oriente como en Occidente: el origen oriental de los altares taurodérmicos de la Península Ibérica." *Spal* 19, 129–148.

Gómez Peña, A. (2017). *La piel de toro como símbolo religioso y marcador identitario de la colonización fenicia de la península ibérica. Una lectura darwinista*. PhD Thesis. University of Seville.

González de Canales, F., Serrano, L. and Llompart, J. (2010). "El inicio de la Edad del Hierro en el Suroeste de la Península Ibérica, las navegaciones precoloniales y cuestiones en torno a las cerámicas locales de Huelva." In: Pérez, J. A. and Romero, E. (eds.) *IV Encuentro de Arqueología del Suroeste Peninsular.* Huelva: SPUH, 648–697.

Gosden, C. (2008). *Arqueología y Colonialismo: el contacto cultural desde 5000 a.C. hasta el presente.* Barcelona: Bellatierra.

Hartog, F. (1991). *Le miroir d'Hérodote. Essai sur la représentation de l'autre*. Paris: Gallimard.

Henriques, I. C. (2000). "Comércio e organização do espaço em Angola (c. 1870–1950)." In: Santos, M.ª E. M. (dir.) *A África e a instalação do sistema colonial (c. 1885 – c. 1930).* Lisboa: CEHCA/IICT, 71–90.

Henriques, I. C. (2004). *Território e Identidade. A construção da Angola Colonial (c. 1872 – c. 1926).* Lisboa: UL/CH.

Henriques, I. C. (2020). *A descolonização da História. Portugal, a África e a Desconstrução de Mitos Historiográficos*. Lisboa: Caleidoscópio.

Horta, J. S. (1995). "Entre história europeia e história africana, um objecto de charneira: as representações." In: *Colóquio Construção e Ensino da História de África*. Lisboa, Grupo de Trabalho do Ministério da Educação para as Comemorações dos Descobrimentos Portugueses, 181–200.

Horta, J. S. (2009). "Ser 'Português' em terras africanas: vicissitudes da construção identitária na 'Guiné do Cabo Verde' (sécs. XVI–XVII)." In: Matos, S. C., Henriques, I. C., Fernandes, H. and Horta, J. S. (eds.) *Nação e Identidades. Portugal, os portugueses e os outros.* Lisboa: UL/CH, Caleidoscópio, 261–274.

Jiménez, A. M. (2002). *Pueblos y Tumbas: El impacto oriental en los rituales funerarios del Extremo Occidente*. Écija: Gráficas Sol.

Kashtan, N. (2000). "Phoenicia, Palestine and the Sea: Biblical and Hellenistic Perceptions of the Coast." In: Aubet, M. E. and Barthélemy, M. (eds.) *Actas del IV Congreso Internacional de estudios fenicios y púnicos,* Vol. IV. Cádiz: SPUC, 379–384.

Kim, S. (2014). *The Concepts of Sacred Space in the Hebrew Bible: Meanings, Significance, and Functions*. PhD Thesis. Boston University.

Klein, T. (2019). "Estudios geoarqueológicos en Ayamonte y su entorno." In: Marzoli, D. and García Teyssandier, E. (eds.) *La necrópolis fenicia de Ayamonte (Huelva): Memoria de la excavación del año 2013, estudios previos y complementarios*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucia, 19–28.

Kocka, J. (1999). "Storia comparata." In: *Enciclopedia delle Scienze Sociali*, Vol. 8. Roma: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 389–396.

Lowery, R. H. (1991). *The Reforming Kings: Cults and Society in First Temple Judah.* Sheffield: JSOT Press (=*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series* 120).

MacIntosh, S. K. (2001). "Tools for Understanding Transformation and Continuity in Senegambian Society: 1500–1900." In: DeCorse, C. R. (ed.) *West Africa during the Atlantic Slave Trade: Archaeological perspectives.* London, NYC: LUP, 14–37.

Maia, M. G. P. and Silva, L. F. (2004). "Culto de Baal em Tavira." *Huelva Arqueológica* 20, 171–194.

Margueron, J.-C. (1984). "Prolégomènes à une étude portant sur l'organisation de l'espace sacré en Orient." In: Roux, G. (dir.) *Temples et sanctuaires. Séminaire de recherche 1981–1983. Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient*. Lyon: Maison del'Orient et de la Méditerranée Jean Pouilloux, 23–36.

Marín Ceballos, M. C. (2010). "Imagen y culto de Astarté en la Península Ibérica. I: las fuentes griegas y Latinas." In: Bandera, M. L. and Ferrer, E. (coords.) *El Carambolo: 50 años de un tesoro.* Sevilla: EUS, 491–512.

Marín Ceballos, M. C. and Jiménez Flores, A. M. (2004). "los santuarios fenicio-púnicos como centros de sabiduría: el templo de Melqart en Gadir." *Huelva Arqueológica* 20, 215–239.

Martín-Aguilera, B. ed. (2018). *Repensar el colonialismo: Iberia, de colonia a potencia colonial.* Madrid: JAS Arqueología.

Marzoli, D. and García Teyssandier, E. (2019). *La necrópolis fenicia de Ayamonte (Huelva).* Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía.

Mederos, A. (2006). "Fenicios en Huelva, en el siglo X AC, durante el reinado de Hîrâm I de Tiro". *Spal* 15, 167–188.

Mederos, A. (2008). "Estratigrafías para Tartessos: Doñana, Mesas de Asta, Cateia, Carmona y Huelva". *Spal* 17, 97–136.

Moreno, F. J. (1999). "Conflictos y perspectivas en el mundo precolonial tartésico." *Gerión* 17, 149–177.

Moreno, F. J. (2000). "Tartessos, Estelas, Modelos Pesimistas." In: Uriel, P., Wagner, C. G. and López Pardo, F. (eds.) *Intercambio y Comercio preclásico en el Mediterráneo*. Madrid: CEFYP, 153–174.

Moreno, F. J. (2008). "En *El Corazón de las tinieblas*. Forma y dinámica en la colonización fenicia de Occidente." *Gerión* 26, 35–60.

Moret, P. (2004). "Ethnos ou Ethnie? Avatars anciens et modernes des noms des peuples ibères." In: Cruz Andreotti, G. and Mora Serrano, B. (eds.) *Identidades étnicas – identidades políticas en el mundo prerromano hispano*. Málaga: CEDMA, 32–62.

Newitt, M. (2010). *The Portuguese in West Africa, 1415–1670*. Cambridge: CUP.

Nordman, D. (2005). "Identidades territoriales." In: Boissinot, P. and Rouillard, P. (coords.) *Lire les territoires des sociétés anciennes. Mélanges de la Casa Velázquez* 35 (2), 147–157.

Oliveira, C. F. P. (2012). "O Bronze Final no Castelo de Castro Marim." In: Jiménez Ávila, J. (ed.) *Siderum Ana II: El rio Guadiana en el Bronce Final*. *Anejos de AEspa*, LXII. Mérida, IAM, CSIC, 345–362.

Osuna, M., Bedia, J. and Domínguez, A. M. (2000). "El santuario protohistórico hallado en la calle Méndez Núñez (Huelva)." In: Cabrera, P. and Santos, M. (coords.) *Ceràmiques Jònies d'època arcaica: centres de producció i comercialització al Mediterrani Occidental. Monografies Emporitanes* 11, 177–188.

Padilla, A. (1993). "*Caura*: el topónimo." *Azotea* 11, 63–64.

Padilla, A. (2016). "Huelva y el inicio de la colonización fenicia de la Península Ibérica." *Pyrenae* 47 (1), 95–117.

Pappa, E. (2015). *The Phoenician Sanctuary of Palácio da Galeria in Tavira (Portugal). Cuadernos de Arqueología Mediterránea* 23.

Pech Salvador, C., Rizo García, M. and Romeu Aldaya, V. (2009). "El *habitus* y la intersubjetividad como conceptos clave para la comprensión de las fronteras internas. Un acercamiento desde las propuestas teóricas de Bourdieu y Schütz." *Frontera Norte* 21 (41), 33–52.

Pellicer, M. (2007). "Pasado y presente de la investigación protohistórica en Carmona." In: Bendala, M. and Belén, M. (dirs.) *El Nacimiento de la ciudad: la Carmona Protohistórica*. Sevilla, Carmona: EUS/Ayuntamiento de Carmona, 227–255.

Román Rodríguez, J. M. and Belén Deamos, M.ª (2007). "Fenicios en Carmona: novedades arqueológicas." In: Bendala, M. and Belén, M. (dirs.) *El Nacimiento de la ciudad: la Carmona Protohistórica*. Sevilla, Carmona: EUS, Ayuntamiento de Carmona, 479–510.

Ruiz Cabrero, L. and Wagner, C. G. (2005). "David, Salomón e Hiran de Tiro: una relación Desigual." *Isimu* 8, 107–112.

Saviano, M. (2018). "Il santuario di Zeus Cario a Milasa." In: *Radici. Studi di storia e storiografia greca offerti a Clara Talamo*. Roma: Aracne, 79–98.

Serra, J. C. da (1790). *Collecçaõ de livros ineditos de historia portugueza, dos reinados de d. Joaõ I., d. Duarte, d. Affonso v., e d. Joaõ II.* Lisboa: Academia Real das Sciencias de Lisboa.

Sommer, M. (2011). "Colonies – Colonization – Colonialism: A Typological Reappraisal." *AWE* 10, 183–193.

Sommer, M. (2012). "Heart of Darkness? Post-colonial Theory and the Transformation of the Mediterranean." *AWE* 11, 235–245.

Stein, G. (2005). "The Comparative Archaeology of Colonial Encounters." In: Stein, G. (ed.) *The Archaeology of Colonial Encounters: Comparative Perspectives*. Santa Fe, Oxford: School of American Research, 3–31.

Tilley, C. R. (1994). *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments (Explorations in Anthropology).* Oxford: Berg.

Torres Ortiz, M. (2016). "Algunas consideraciones cronológicas sobre el yacimiento tartésico de El Carambolo." *Cadernos do Museu da Lucerna* 1, 79–96.

Truszkowski, E., Villanueva, H. and Villanueva, M.-Ch. (2007). "Une tête d'Héraclès en terre cuite à Huelva." *Revue Archéologique* 2, 269–292.

Vives-Ferrándiz, J. (2005). *Negociando encuentros: situaciones coloniales e intercambios en la costa oriental de la Península Ibérica (ss. VIII–VI a.C.).* Barcelona: Universidad Pompeu Fabra (=*Cuadernos de Arqueología Mediterránea* 12).

Wagner, C. G. (2005). "Fenicios en el Extremo Occidente. Conflicto y violencia en el contexto colonial arcaico." *Revista Portuguesa de Arqueologia* 8 (2), 177–192.

Wagner, C. G. (2008). "Tiro, Melkart, Gadir y la conquista simbólica de los confines del mundo." In: González, R., López, F. and Peña, V. (eds.) *Los Fenicios y el atlántico.* Madrid, CEFYP, 11–29.

Werner, M. and Zimmermann, B. (2005). "Beyond Comparison: Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity." *History and Theory* 45 (1), 30–50.

Wright, E. G. (1961). "The Temple in Palestine-Syria." In: Friedman, D. N. and Wright, G. E. (eds.) *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, vol. I. NYC: Anchor Books, 169–184.