Athenian Figure-Decorated Pottery for Whom? A View from Eastern Andalucía (Spain)

<A> Abstract

Athenian pottery started to arrive in the Iberian Peninsula in significant numbers in the fifth century BCE, with a peak in the fourth century. Both black-gloss and figured-decorated pots were exported, being the first largely more popular in all the Iberian regions but one: Eastern Andalucía. Earlier scholarship has explained the preference of the native communities of that area for vases with images as a case of interpretatio iberica *whereby some repetitive Athenian images were particularly favoured because they could be assimilated with concepts known in Iberian society. I now propose to look further into this question and assess whether there are any distinctive patterns in the distribution/deposition of red-figure and black-gloss pots within that region and whether the theory of prestige signalling works in contexts where red-figure pottery outnumbers black-gloss. Taking as case studies the necropoleis of Galera and Baza, in Granada, and Castellones de Céal, in Jaén, I place the "Andalusian exception" within the larger context of the consumption of Athenian pottery in Iberia and within its own local context, revealing a world fascinated with images that served the socio-political and ritual needs of the Iberians of this region in the momentous passage from life to death.*

<A> Introduction

Athenian black-gloss pottery, that is, ware manufactured in Athens that was decorated with a black slip, or gloss, without any kind of figured decoration, formed the vast majority of exported vessels from the Athenian workshops.[1] It is a common occurrence in the western shores of the Mediterranean Sea, where it was particularly appreciated, and it is one of the very few pottery types in Antiquity that was distributed widely and in great quantity, reaching distant shores consistently for over two centuries, from the sixth to the end of the fourth century BCE.[2] Black-gloss pottery is much more common than red-figure in almost all regions of the Iberian Peninsula, what has contributed to the consideration of red-figure pots,

less prolifically distributed, as *diacritical insignia*[3] that would mark the status of their owners, a role which is anyway granted to imported goods in general and to Attic pottery in particular in the Iberian Peninsula.[4] But there is one region in Iberia that shows a different consumption pattern, with a clear preference for figure-decorated pottery: Eastern Andalucia, more specifically, the Upper Guadalquivir and its tributary, the Guadiana Menor River.[5]

The predominance of black-gloss in the Iberian Peninsula and the special case of Eastern Andalucía has often been highlighted in Spanish scholarship.[6] The preference for images there has been explained as a case of *interpretatio iberica* whereby some repetitive Athenian images like the draped youths, Dionysos and Ariadne, or the banquet scenes were particularly favoured because they could be assimilated with concepts known by the Iberians, who would use those figured pots in the mortuary realm, becoming essential tools for sociopolitical reproduction in the first century of the High Iberian Period (450/425-200 BCE).[7] In this context, the presence or absence of figure-decorated pottery and/or black-gloss in a tomb is thought to relate to the social identity of the deceased, with black-gloss traditionally considered the "cheap" alternative to red-figure for those with more limited means.[8] I now propose to look further into this particular consumption situation in Eastern Andalucía by addressing the topic in two parts: first, to assess whether there are any distinctive patterns in the distribution/deposition of red-figure and black-gloss that would indicate that red-figure pottery was indeed used in a diacritic way in opposition to black-gloss, that is, if figured-vases alone, irrespective of shape, "marked" wealthy individuals while black-gloss was reserved for those who could not afford more; and, second, to contextualize the preference for Athenian images that we do attest in the region, in particular in connection with one specific ceramic shape, within the wider use of images in the same contexts. I provide a working hypothesis to explain that particular consumption practice which recognizes the special

consideration granted to Athenian pottery in the Iberian Peninsula but is also sensitive to the previous material practices and traditions of the region under study.

The dataset are three necropoleis of the area of the Guadiana Menor River: the necropolis of Túgi (Galera, Granada), the necropolis of Cerro del Santuario (Baza, Granada), and the necropolis of Los Castellones de Céal (Hinojares, Jaén) (fig. 1). I have chosen these three necropoleis because, despite the fragmentary nature of their archaeological record, they have been intensively investigated through the application of several theoretical frameworks for over 50 years now and we count with a remarkable body of scholarship ranging from excavation reports and analyses of specific types of grave-goods to sophisticated models of social organization based on detailed study of the burial grounds. Rooted in the principles of the New Archaeology, such studies go nowadays much beyond a direct reading of the funerary record in terms of social structure and incorporate newer perspectives and consideration of aspects such as gender, ritual experiences, or astronomy. Thus, they offer an excellent case study to address the research questions posed in this article. The Athenian pottery from these sites was studied, partially, by Gloria Trías and Pierre Rouillard,[9] but the most complete catalogue is that of Carmen Sánchez,[10] which I take as a starting point for my research; I have been able to update and revise her catalogue with new fragments coming from recent excavations or found among the holdings of the National Archaeological Museum (see infra for Galera).

The article is organized in two main sections, each addressing one part of the research question. The first presents the data from the three archaeological contexts and includes, for each site, a brief introduction and an overview of current thinking on the social structure of the necropolis followed by an analysis of the Athenian pottery with specific regard to the

distribution of red-figure and black-gloss. For each necropolis and as an appendix to this article, I provide a list of all the grave goods from tombs with Athenian pottery and a table with the breakdown of pots by tomb, technique and shape, including other relevant information such as tomb typology, non-Athenian items, chronology, number of people interred, and whether the tomb has been looted. In the conclusions to this section, I argue against the traditional association of a particular technique with elite/non-elite burials while also supporting previous scholarship which did identify a type of figure-decorated object that is undoubtedly associated with the most important burials of the area: the red-figure krater. Decorated with a limited range of themes and having a utilitarian function as cineraria in well-appointed graves, the red-figure krater is at the core of the theory of the *interpretatio iberica.* For that reason, I use Carmen Sánchez' classical case study of the Tomb 43 of Baza to theorize the practice and conclude that it is not the image alone but the aggregate of technique, iconography, and shape what signals a particular social identity in this area.

Part two integrates Athenian pottery with the remaining material culture of the necropoleis, showing how the preference for figure-decorated vases is not an isolated occurrence and does not fully work along the lines of the prestige signalling theory attested in other regions.[11] I argue that such preference must be understood within the context of the marked fascination for images of all sorts that are ubiquitous inside the graves, not only on imported pottery but on local productions too—clay vessels, stone larnakes and sculpture—and on the very walls of some tombs, providing a case study that exemplifies the dialogue between imported and local images in those contexts. While there has been a tendency to consider this region as less prolific in images than the neighbouring Contestania,[12] my research joins recent efforts to nuance such discourse and emphasize the highly visual world of the communities of the High Andalucía.[13] Lastly, I interrogate the origin of this taste for images by looking at similar

practices in pre-Iberian times, drawing a parallel between the use of the so-called Orientalizing pottery with figured-decoration and the later use of Athenian red-figured kraters. In doing so, I situate the “Andalucian exception” within a wider material culture context, demonstrating that Athenian images are but one element of an iconographical microcosmos that served the various socio-political and ritual needs of the Iberians of this region in the momentous passage from life to death.

The findings of the research apply to the area under discussion, the Upper Guadalquivir and Guadiana Menor River, and are not meant to be extrapolated elsewhere in the Iberian Peninsula. It is precisely the unique red-figure/black-gloss consumption pattern of this region what is interrogated in the present article. A legitimate objection can be raised about a potential bias in the dataset, since ritual contexts, including funerary and votive contexts, tend to include on average more figure-decorated pottery, even in areas where black-gloss is predominant, like in Contestania.[14] While this is true and hints at the importance of the image in the ritual realm, red-figure does still not outnumber black-gloss in necropoleis outside our area (e.g. counts for the necropoleis from Murcia, or Cabezo Lucero in Alicante).[15] Unfortunately, none of the settlements associated with our necropoleis has been fully excavated/published and therefore we cannot compare both types of contexts, but in the case of Castellones de Céal, for which we have some limited data about the settlement (see case study infra), black-gloss is also a minority. Lastly, I will avoid referring to the elite groups represented in our necropoleis as “aristocrats” because the use of this term has been contested in the last years[16] and the specific social structure of the Iberian world is still unknown to us. Nevertheless, the term will appear occasionally in this text because the social structure of the Iberians of our region was indeed defined as aristocratic by Ruiz and Molinos.[17]

<A> The Necropolis of Túgi (Galera)

<B> Introduction to the site

The archaeological complex of Túgi lays near the modern village of Galera (Granada), in the region of Huéscar-Baza, and includes an Ibero-Roman city at Cerro del Real, its associated necropoleis, and a periurban sanctuary at Cerro del Castillo (formerly identified as production areas – pottery workshops) (fig. 2).[18] In this article, Túgi and Galera are both used indistinctly to refer to the necropolis.

Its chronology spans the sixth to the third centuries BCE but the remains of the two first centuries are scanty.[19] Juan Cabré and Federico de Motos, who established the first official excavations in 1918,[20] divided the necropolis into three areas comprising a total of 134 numbered burials. Sectors I and II were the wealthiest; the first, with 85 tombs, was the "preferred for the better off families of Túgi", being the burials of the second area (49) "more homogeneous" and maybe for "families with certain economic and social limitations". Section III, in turn, was that of the "ordinary people".[21] The form of burial in this area was usually an urn placed in a hole dug on the rock. As they lacked monumental architecture, no numbering was assigned to them.[22] From 2000, Maria Oliva Rodríguez Ariza and her team carried out work in the site and were able to identify 80 of the 134 tumuli numbered by Cabré plus a further six tombs.[23]

The total number of burials attested in the necropolis is 166, distributed by sector as follows: sector I, 93 tombs; sector II, 50; and sector III, 20, plus another two tombs between sectors I and II. Of all the tombs, only 47-48 have allowed for chronological estimations, with three

burials dating to the late fifth century BCE (sector I), 30 to the fourth century BCE (all sectors), 13 to the third century BCE (all sectors) and 2 dating to the first century BCE.

<B> Social *personae*

The Iberian necropoleis of the south of the Iberian Peninsula have offered a fertile ground on which to try various models of social organization. Starting with the seminal study of Arturo Ruiz and colleagues on the necropolis of Baza (see infra), other scholars have applied similar models to other burial grounds. In Galera, analysis of the grave-goods and the spatial distribution of the tombs reveals a clear internal structuration of the burial areas which is understood as the translation to the funerary realm of a highly hierarchical social structure, with a number of visually prominent burial mounds of nobles acting as attracting points for their clients and servants, who are buried nearby.[24] Those models are generally valid today, although with some nuances and refinements.

Athenian pottery has always played an important role in those interpretations: an exogenous element with, initially, a restricted distribution, it concentrates in tombs of a certain wealth as expressed by other items in the assemblages and the constructive characteristics of the tombs, mainly weapons, sculpture, funerary structures with high expenditure of time and resources (e.g., chamber tombs), wall painting, local polychrome vessels of special types, and objects with ritual connotations, like phialai and bronze jugs. It has therefore been considered a diacritic element related to social class and power.[25] Indeed, in Galera, most of the tombs with Athenian pottery concentrate in sector I of the necropolis, especially in subsector Ia, the area with the highest number of tombs (50) and those including the most remarkable grave-goods.

Rodríguez Ariza has offered a tentative interpretation of the social structure reflected in the necropolis of Túgi,[26] which we largely follow here.

Within sector I of the necropolis, three clusters of tombs can be identified, subsectors Ia, Ib, and Ic (fig. 3). Subsector Ia contains tombs 1 to 50, with Athenian pottery attested in eight of them—I include here tomb 25bis, which has an imitation of a red-figure krater—. The set red-figure bell-krater and black-gloss cup appears in the three main tombs of the area: numbers 11, 20 and 34. These are the earliest (late fifth-century BCE) and largest tombs and contain exclusive items such as polychrome amphorae, Eastern Greek core-formed glass amphoriskoi, Iberian urns with bell-shaped necks with remains of painting and, in some instances, fabric, sculpture (Lady of Galera) and weapons (see appendix 1). The three tombs are equidistant from one another and organize the necropolis. The remaining five tombs with Athenian pottery in subsector Ia surround the three main tombs (11, 20, and 34) and include only one item. The other burials with Athenian pottery in sector I come from subsector Ic: tombs 75, 76, 77, 82, and 83, which are, again, the most prominent of the area, in the case of tomb 75 and 76, also of the necropolis. Tomb 82, for example, was a triple burial with three red-figure kraters used as cinerary urns and one of them had been repaired in Antiquity.

Therefore, regarding the presence of Athenian pottery, two groups can be distinguished: tombs with two items, a red-figure krater and a black-gloss cup, and those with only one object, either a cup or a krater. Most of the tombs with Athenian pottery include weapons, being the spear and falcata—the Iberian curved sword—, and maybe the *solliferreum* or javelin, the basic set. These are only lacking in two cases, tomb 20 and 34 (both looted), but tomb 20 had sculpture, a statuette of, probably, the Phoenician goddess Astarté. Athenian pottery is naturally absent in the third century tombs although there is an interesting curation

in a grave 149 from sector III. The tombs that include the combination of weapons and pottery are those in the central area of section Ia and the most peripheric ones do not include any of them. Despite the well-known case of the tomb of the Lady of Baza, a female tomb with weapons,[27] it is usually held that tombs with weapons signal male warriors, who have a prominent place in Iberian society and therefore have proper representation in their necropoleis, while female tombs are placed slightly apart. An apparent exception to this are tomb 20 and 34, which are foundational and very central in the necropolis, with impressive grave-goods, including imported items, but no weapons. But looking at the grave-goods and the afterlives of the tombs, other identities beyond the warrior-character of the founders are more prominent in Túgi, with a clear emphasis on religion and ritual (esp. libation), the appropriation of the past and the creation of linage, becoming true places of memory for the Túgi community.

On the basis of the study of the grave-goods and constructive characteristics of the tombs, Rodríguez Ariza therefore distinguishes three levels of burial in section Ia: a group constituted by the oldest three tombs, and probably also tomb 2, followed up by a group of surrounding smaller tombs that included the traditional prestige objects such as weapons and Athenian pottery, and lastly, tombs without prestige items and placed around the second group.[28] As for the relationship between the three or four foundational tombs, two models have been proposed: either the founding couple of the linage was buried together in tomb 20 or only the female of the couple was in that tomb whereas the man would lay in tomb 11,[29] with the close relatives buried in the immediate vicinity. The circles around tombs 34 and 2 would include the clients. A piece of evidence that might reinforce the second hypothesis is the presence in both tomb 20 and 11 of curated Athenian vases, a red-figure bell-krater by Polygnotos dated (on style) to ca. 440 BCE and a Cástulo cup of the old type (therefore, ca.

460-50 BCE) in tomb 20. I have argued elsewhere that these items could have been part of the family cupboard which would have amassed some half a century of history before being reused in the tombs.[30]

<B> Distribution of Athenian pottery

The necropolis yielded a large amount of Athenian pottery, but much useful contextual information has been lost to looting. It is attested in 18 out of the 33 tombs of the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, most of them in sector I, and in a third century tomb from sector III (number 149) (Appendixes 1 and 4). At least seven relatively complete red-figure kraters are documented;[31] these come from the wealthiest sectors, I and II. Besides them, there are hundreds of fragments of the same shape as well as several red-figure pelikai, cups and skyphoi, and black-gloss cups and bolsals. Most of the material is kept in the National Archaeological Museum of Madrid, with the rest in the Peabody Museum (Cambridge, MA), the Archaeological and Ethnological Museum of Granada, the Foundation Rodríguez Acosta (Granada), the Museum Joan Cabré de Calaceite (Teruel), the Museum of Murcia, the Archaeological Institute of the University of Barcelona, and the city council of Galera.[32]

Carmen Sánchez records 166 items of Athenian pottery from Túgi, numbers 100-265 of her catalogue.[33] Two entries involve several fragments but just one vase (193-194, and 187-191) and fragment number 159 has now been joined to one of the bell-kraters from tomb 82 (Sanchez' number 105). This results in a count of 160 distinct pieces or fragments from Galera in her 2001 publication, 17 of them from tombs and 143 without affiliation. In 2016, I examined the items stored in the Archaeological Museum of Madrid, with the following results: among the fragments without tomb number, I could match 41 of Sanchez' entries with

items currently in the collection, note the absence of 99 fragments catalogued and drawn by her,[34] and add 89 new fragments. This results in 229 items, which added to the 20 pieces coming from tombs (three more have appeared since Sanchez' catalogue) gives a total of 249 entries for this necropolis. The total counts offered in appendix 1 are slightly higher (254 items) because they include several instances of Iberian imitations of Athenian pottery. Discrepancies between counts given in different publications and first-hand autopsy of the material are common in any large-scale archaeological research involving old collections and, in this case, might be attributed to the relocation of the material during the refurbishment works of the National Archaeological Museum (2008-2013).

<B> Red and Black

Athenian pottery concentrates in the tombs of the better-off in Galera, those which are also remarkable by the effort invested in their construction. Red-figure pottery is overall more abundant, both counting the total number of vases from the tombs and the fragments without tomb affiliation: red-figure is four times more common than black-gloss. There is only one instance of a tomb with black-gloss and no red-figure and one case where the ratio of black-to-red is two-to-one. But despite the numerical superiority of red-figure, black-gloss is not an indicator of a lower socio-economic status; on the contrary, the tombs where it appears are amongst the most remarkable of the necropolis. Indeed, previous research has identified an interesting phenomenon of curation of Athenian pottery, particularly black-gloss Cástulo cups of the old type in Galera that argues against any type of hierarchical superiority of red-figure pottery versus black-gloss.[35] The three foundational tombs included a Cástulo cup, and at least two of them had been in circulation for some decades before being used in the funerary context. This is the case of the old-type Cástulo from tomb 20 and most likely the one in

tomb 11 too, which also included a ca. 25 year-old krater by Polygnotos (fig. 4). A striking curation of an old-type Cástulo is attested in the third century tomb 149, in sector III, the only one in that sector that included Athenian pottery. Tomb 149 was a humble burial for the cremated remains of a female-male couple.

If we rule out a diacritical use of Athenian pottery based on decorative technique, we could wonder about other ways in which it could have been used to signal off particular people in the necropolis. Indeed, as mentioned above, Ariza observed that the most accomplished tombs included two items whereas the rest limited to one and therefore there would be a slight tendency towards accumulation of imported items in those tombs. Such situation is more obvious in the necropolis of Baza (see infra) and might also be the case in Galera, but the nature of the evidence here makes any conclusions highly speculative. While no specific signalling strategy can be identified regarding the distribution of red-figure versus black-gloss in Túgi, there is a clear preference for red-figure pottery that fits in very well within the explosion of imagery attested on the local polychrome vessels, on the stone larnakes or on the walls of the chamber tombs (more on this infra, section 5). Beyond this, the higher number of red-figured vases here has to do with the preference for one ceramic shape which was an essential functional item in the mortuary assemblages: the bell krater, used as cinerary urn, and for which there is no black-gloss alternative.[36] The importance of the krater is emphasised by the presence of undecorated local iterations of the shape in two tombs of sector Ia, numbers 25bis and 26, something that we will encounter in higher numbers in Baza. So, evidence suggests that there is no meaningful social or, largely, identity differences between those who only receive red-figure and those who also receive black-gloss, but it is nevertheless apparent that black-gloss, in Galera, did not signal restricted means and neither followed a different distribution circuit.

<A> The Necropolis of Baza

<B> Introduction to the site

The necropolis of Cerro del Santuario lies in the municipality of Baza (Granada) and is one of the two necropoleis that served the settlement of *Basti*, located in the nearby Cerro Cepero. The second and main necropolis was on Cerro Largo, where recent works have revealed a largely untouched site with a longer chronological span than the one at Cerro del Santuario, from the fifth century BCE to the second-third centuries CE.[37] The chronology of the necropolis of Cerro del Santuario has been established in the fourth century BCE, either 410-350 BCE,[38] or 400-300 BCE[39] and, most recently, 450-275 BCE.[40] The three "cerros" or hills make up the archaeological complex known as Los Santuarios de Baza (fig. 5).

Francisco Presedo, who carried out official excavations in the site from 1968 to 1971, excavated 179 tombs that he organized into different types and subtypes according to their constructive characteristics.[41] That typology was simplified in 2009 by Julià Gil.[42] The most common type of burial is a simple pit to receive the cinerary urn (Type 1), followed by those with a discrete mud structure (type 2). The two most complex types are the small chamber/shaft tomb (type 3) and the large chamber tombs (type 4), being these two the least common in the necropolis. The superstructure of the tombs has not been preserved in any case. Although judging by current standards Presedo's publication has important limitations and several studies have shown some of its inaccuracies,[43] the necropolis of Cerro del Santuario is one of the most studied and excavated of the area and is therefore a usual suspect in the discussions of Iberian society. Recent years have seen the publication of various studies

that reassess aspects ranging from the funerary structures,[44] the material assemblages[45] and the chronology of the necropolis[46] to the reinterpretation of later architectural elements in the area.[47]

<B> Social *personae*

The necropolis of Cerro del Santuario holds a central place in the various models of social organization that have been proposed for the Iberian societies of the area of the High Andalucía. A landmark study was the paper presented by Arturo Ruíz, Carmen Rísquez and Francisca Hornos[48] to the *First Conference of Iberian Archaeology*, devoted to the necropoleis, and which has been revisited and developed further in recent years, together with Manuel Molinos.[49] In that contribution, they offered an analysis of the spatial distribution of the tombs and their grave-goods as reflecting the social structure of the *oppidum* of Basti. Starting with what was thought at the time to be the oldest burial, tomb 155,[50] they identified nine different social levels represented in the necropolis, of which the first four would organize the space while the rest sit in the surroundings of the established areas. Such division would reflect two distinct groups: the aristocrats and the clients, being the classical example of a "necropolis gentilicia", that is, reflecting a particular social structure where the clients are incorporated in the linage through a pact *in fides* with their patrons whereby, they "forget" their own ancestors to act as if they were genetically related with the patrons. The different levels would be marked by specific sets of funerary goods, with various subgroups for each set, from burials with only one or two items of Iberian pottery to those which include imports, weapons and items of personal adornment, sculpture (one case, tomb 155) and even a chariot (or parts thereof, tombs 176 and 9). According to this view, the necropolis would reflect the existence of an Iberian linage that would include the tombs of an old-generation

(the mythical ancestors represented by a couple of Bronze Age burials without continuity); the founding members of the linage (tomb 155 and, recently, 183), which are part of the semi-mythical ancestry; the first prince or political founder (tomb 176); the aristocratic clientele (tombs 43 and 130), and the groups of clients and blood relatives of the founder of the linage.[51] Athenian pottery behaves slightly differently in the tombs of these two groups: it is more common in the group of the clients than in the relatives, evidencing, maybe, access to different distribution networks within the site.

New excavations at Cerro del Santuario, led by Andrés Adroher and Alejandro Caballero, are changing the traditional understanding of this necropolis. They have re-excavated and studied old tombs (130, 155, 176) and found new structures, amongst them, tomb 183,[52] the oldest of the necropolis after the Bronze Age tombs 32 and 33. These discoveries together with further study of the main necropolis at Cerro Largo and the re-assessment of Presedo's work, are challenging—but also complementing—the previous model and offering a new understanding of the necropolis from the chronological and social points of view. Adroher and his team have recently proposed that the Iberian necropolis at Cerro del Santuario was the space chosen by a specific linage to develop their ritual, sacred, and social space. This linage would have flourished in the fourth century BCE and disappeared progressively in the third century BCE. They rightly highlight the connection of this space with Punic *Baria* (Villaricos), stressing the usually overlooked semitic component of the communities of the Early Iberian period and hypothesize whether the linage at Cerro del Santuario was not ethnically Iberian as opposed to those buried at Cerro Largo.[53]

<B> Distribution of Athenian pottery

The data used for the shape/distribution table (appendix 2) of Athenian pottery is drawn mainly from Presedo's publication.[54] This dataset has some limitations though, as, for example, several instances of what he identifies as black-gloss Attic bowls might well be Roman Republican wares/Hellenistic wares produced in Italian workshops, if we judge by the profile drawings (e.g. tomb 9). Carmen Sánchez recorded 73 entries for Baza[55] and the database of the centre Iberia Graeca includes 75 entries.[56] Justin Walsh's list (75 entries) is drawn from the catalogues of the above-mentioned authors.[57] Antonio Uriarte published a study of the ceramic grave-goods of Baza that I have also used for this research.[58] I have examined most of the pots first-hand thanks to the generosity of Montserrat Vall-Llosera, Durán Farrell's widow[59], who let me study her late husband's collection in their home at Premià de Dalt in the summer of 2017. Other objects from Baza are now in the National Archaeological Museum of Madrid. As with the pottery from Galera, it has sometimes been difficult to match some of the vases in the private collection (and also recorded by Sánchez) with those mentioned by Presedo, so it is possible that there might be some duplicates amongst my counts, especially in the column of vases and fragments without tomb number.

The Athenian pottery from Cerro del Santuario dates to the fourth century BCE notwithstanding the presence of an old-type Cástulo cup from tomb 131 and a couple of skyphoi with single curve that sit more comfortably within the fifth century BCE. The range of shapes is the typical of the region; most common are the red-figure stemless cups of the Group of Vienna 116, followed by black-gloss bowls, of which the ones with incurving rims are slightly more abundant than those with outturned rims. The numbers here can go either way though because there are 13 bases that could belong to bowls of either type. Red-figure kraters were also abundant, with 10 examples recovered from individual tombs and a further two from the surface, together with over two dozen small fragments. Unlike the bowls or

even the red-figure cups, which are more evenly spread, the kraters concentrate in only two burials (43 and 176)[60] (fig. 6) that received the bodies of prominent individuals/families of *Basti*. Special mention deserves the Iberian production of column kraters, which appear in tombs 130, 12, 98, and 43 (smaller size), sometimes accompanied by other Athenian items and sometimes with other local productions. These kraters are an excellent example of Philipp's Stockhammer's concept of *material entanglement* as applied by Iván Amorós to the study of similar Greek inspired Iberian productions at the site of Bastida de Les Alcusses.[61] The remaining shapes are anecdotal in the necropolis: lekythoi, skyphoi and cup-skyphoi, fragments of a lamp, a fishplate, two jugs, and a rather unusual shape: the calyx-cup with a head of a satyr in relief on the bottom.[62] This is a rare type in the West and not abundant in Greece either other than an example from Olynthos and a couple more from the Agora. In the Western Mediterranean there is one example in Ensèrune (France) and another in El Sec (Mallorca).[63]

The funerary assemblages from Baza are rather heterogenous. There is an apparent correlation between the architectural complexity of the burial and the amount and wealth of its items—fewer and rarer items in the simplest tombs—but the variability of the objects and their associations prevents us from establishing clear cut distinctions between sets of grave-goods. We see a majority of people accessing a modest funerary ritual characterised by the presence of an urn and a number of optional elements linked to various activities, from drinking and libation to perfume and food. The simpler tombs, especially those including weapons, often also include an Athenian kylix, not as part of a drinking set but as lid to the cinerary urn. In contrast, there is a smaller group of people who has access to what Uriarte has labelled "scenographic" objects,[64] that is, sets of vases which look similar, like batches of polychrome Iberian vessels, Athenian kraters, or urns with bell-shaped neck, and offer a

certain homogeneity to the assemblage (more on this, infra, section 5). As in Galera, these items evidence an interest in the painted image, both the anthropomorphic figure and geometric and phytomorphic motives. Athenian pottery concentrates in higher numbers in such tombs, particularly those of the types 3 and 4 (9, 43, 130, 131, 176), the wealthiest, which, as mentioned, accumulate many objects. The association between krater and cup in those tombs and their referential character to the banqueting and libation activities of the elites has been noted in the past.[65] Black-gloss bowls are also a frequent occurrence in those tombs.

<B> Red and Black

The relationship between red-figure and black-gloss in Baza is slightly different to our other case studies in that black-gloss is more abundant than red-figure (appendix 2). This is true if we look at the total count of vases from tombs and the single vases without tomb affiliation. The total entries for the necropolis yield a higher number of red-figure instances, 83, versus 73, but this is due to the higher number of fragments of red-figure cups and kraters without tomb number counted in the previous column. Although no joins have been identified among those fragments and they are given as individualized vases, we do not have minimum count of vessels. Also, some of the fragments are too small to identify joins so the “fragments without tomb affiliation” column of appendix 2 is probably slightly misleading. Therefore, despite the total numbers reflected in the last column, black-gloss was indeed slightly more common. There are also slight differences in the shapes attested. While bell-kraters are as popular in Baza as they are in Galera—although in Baza they concentrate in fewer tombs—, red-figure cups are more common in Baza, as it will also be the case in Castellones, our next

necropolis. Within the black-gloss shapes, there is a shift between the Cástulo and black-gloss cups more common in Galera to the bowls with incurving and outturned rims in Baza.

Regarding the distribution of the two techniques in the burials and leaving aside the *ustrinum* (the place for the funerary pyre), eleven tombs (out of 24) containing Attic pottery only had black-gloss (mainly peripheral tombs with the Athenian pot as lid), six only contained red-figure (a kylix used as lid), three had equal number of red-figure and black-gloss, one had more red than black, and three had more black than red. It is therefore a rather equal distribution and, if we leave aside for a moment the case of the kraters, the use of black-gloss, mainly bowls, or red-figure, mainly cups, does not seem to bear any diacritic value with regards to the inferred status of the deceased. The best examples are tombs 43 and 176 (fig. 6). The second, maybe the tomb of the first prince, according to Ruiz and Molino's model—or the couple, as it is a double cremation—is the wealthiest burial of the necropolis (only comparable to tomb 155) and contains an impressive lot of black-gloss to go with the kraters, whereas tomb 43, almost as relevant as tomb 176, does not include black-gloss in the tomb itself - it comes from the ustrinum. So, black-gloss bowls and red-figure cups were used in similar ways and by people of similar status and were largely functionally interchangeable in this context.

But if we take into account the role of the kraters and that, in this necropolis, they are indeed being used and, in some cases, accumulated, in a diacritic way in the tombs of the very top rank members of the society (tombs 176, 43, 130, 9), some of which also contained parts of a chariot, we could indeed articulate that Athenian images seem to have been reserved for the Iberian notables.[66] Previous research has shown that the assemblages where the kraters belong articulate a series of ideas that point to a shared aristocratic ritual restricted to the upper

classes where banquets and libations feature prominently (see case study below). The images on the kraters, mainly banquet and Dionysiac scenes, reinforce this. Therefore, in Baza, the situation is again more complex than a mere neat distinction between black-gloss and red-figure. To my mind, red-figure *per se* does not signal anything different to black-gloss; it is only the combination of shape, style and iconography, which does.

<A> The necropolis of Los Castellones de Céal

<B> Introduction to the site

The site of Los Castellones de Céal (Jaén) includes one of the most important Iberian necropoleis of the region of the Upper Guadalquivir, only second to Galera, Baza and Toya, and an associated settlement established at around 400 BCE. Castellones de Céal enjoys a privileged position in a difficult terrain in the valley of the Guadiana Menor River and controlled the main communication route between the Upper Guadalquivir and Granada's highlands and to the south and southeastern coasts of the Peninsula further on (fig. 7). The discovery of the site did not take place until the mid-20th century, and so it escaped the bad fortune of other necropoleis, especially Galera and Toya, targets of extensive looting and destruction earlier in that century.

It is estimated that over 100 tombs were discovered in the early years at Castellones, *ca*. 90 tombs were excavated by Concepción Fernández-Chicarro in 1956 and 1958-1960[67] and an unknown number were destroyed during the road construction works that led to the discovery of the necropolis. Another 15 tombs/funerary structures and 13 cremation places were documented from 1985 to 1991, when systematic work was undertaken under the direction of

Teresa Chapa, Juan Pereira, Antonio Madrigal, and Victorino Mayoral.[68] The graves belong to two chronological phases, the First Iron Age (seventh and sixth centuries BCE) and the Iberian period (late fifth to second centuries BCE). The burial types attested range from simple pits (type 1), cist graves (type 2), and hollow tumuli with space for the urn and grave-goods built on a stone basement ("empedrados tumulares", type 3), to complex, monumental shaft graves (type 4) in the line of tombs 130 and 155 of Baza, and the type of chamber tombs (type 5) topped by great tumuli so well known in the nearby necropoleis of Toya and Galera and of which there are two examples in Castellones.[69] The distinction between the two last types is mainly the presence of door and corridor in the case of the latter, that is, horizontal versus vertical access. Multiple burials, both simultaneous and consecutive, some containing five people, have been documented at Castellones.[70] The associated settlement has also been documented and investigated[71] but the material has not been fully published yet, except for the Attic pottery, included by Carmen Sánchez in her catalogue.[72]

<B> Social *personae*

The team excavating Castellones has also looked at the funerary assemblages and the tomb structure to draw conclusions about the social backgrounds of the people interred there, but once more, the heterogeneity of the grave-goods seems to be the norm. There is a lot of variability in the composition of the assemblages, with only one constant element: the cinerary urn. Seven types of goods have been defined by their excavators,[73] which I have recorded in the second box in the table of this necropolis (appendix 3) with the exception of Group 1, which consists of just the cinerary urn with or without lid and never includes imported pottery. Of the seven groups, only number four, the one with weapons, would correlate with a higher social status of the deceased and would therefore signal hierarchy.

The differences between individuals as perceived by the analysis of the funerary goods and tomb structure are less salient in this necropolis but are nevertheless expressive of elite rank, with an important role of family relations, as evidenced by the number of multiple/family burials identified. Castellones de Céal was a more modest settlement founded to alleviate demographic pressure in the nearby Tugia (Toya) and with a very defined purpose to control a trade route through which imported goods were channelled towards the area of the Upper Guadalquivir and the export goods passed either towards Murcia and Almería or to the south, through Baza and Guadix.[74] Quite plausibly the inhabitants of Castellones were of a lower social status than those from their larger oppidum of origin, or this, at least, is what the funerary assemblages seem to suggest.

<B> Distribution of Athenian Pottery

Out of the 66 tombs preserved, there are 27 belonging to the fourth century BCE, of which 14, (almost 50%) include Athenian pottery; there is one more instance of a tomb with fragments of Athenian pottery (XXXIII) but is very destroyed, includes only fragments of painted Iberian pottery and nothing else, and could not be dated. Six, and potentially seven of the tombs are multiple burials, and another seven contain only one individual. There is no correlation between the type of structure (i.e., effort invested) and the presence or absence of Athenian pottery: while it appears in tomb 11/145 and tomb VIII— types 4 and 3—most tombs with Athenian pottery fall within the simpler types 1 and 2, that is, pits and cist graves. The absence of this material from the chamber tomb (tomb 11) might surprise but the grave-goods point to a dating in the late fourth or early third century, when Athenian products were scarce or non-existent at all in the area. In fact, one of the Iberian kalathoi and an urn

deposited in the tomb received a surface treatment that recalls the look of Athenian black-gloss productions, what has been interpreted as a conscious attempt at imitating these prestigious productions at a time when they were not available anymore.[75]

Athenian pottery appears more often in tombs with more varied funerary assemblages, with the presence of various groups of grave-goods and, especially, weapons (appendix 3). Out of the 14 tombs with Athenian pottery, eight, that is, 57%, include weapons, whereas only three out of 12 without Athenian pottery do include weapons. The chronology is mainly the fourth century BCE, except for some late-fifth-century items and two old-type Cástulo cups (mid-fifth century BCE).[76] As for shapes, the catalogue is less varied than in Galera and Baza. Kraters are not as common in Castellones, with only three examples each coming from three tombs and several fragments without tomb affiliation. Cups are popular, especially in the red-figure version, and other drinking vessels are also attested, like red-figure skyphoi and black-gloss cup-skyphoi. Black-gloss bowls with outturned rims and a bolsal are recorded but mostly outside the tombs. In fact, during the excavations, most fragments of Athenian pottery were found spread all over the necropolis, dissociated from any particular burial, what points to the intense use of the necropolis and destruction of previous tombs to make space for the new. Some of them might have come from the settlement too. There are some remarkable concentrations of fragments that could be joined and made whole vases in some areas of the necropolis, what has led Carmen Sánchez[77] wonder about the existence of funerary banquets or ritual deposits similar to the *silicernium* attested at Los Villares, Albacete.[78]

Regarding the settlement, the survey carried out by Teresa Chapa and her team recovered many fragments of Iberian and Attic pottery, among them red-figure cups of the Group of Vienna 116, cup-skyphoi and skyphoi of the Fat Boy Group, but also black-gloss bolsals and

bowls, recovered from a building destroyed by fire around the middle of the fourth century BCE.[79] Except for the fragment of a pelike and a rolled-rim plate which appear in the settlement and not in the cemetery, the range of shapes is very similar in both, but we should wait for the full publication of the settlement findings to be able to draw any conclusions.

<B> Red and Black

Red-figure pottery is more common than black-gloss in Castellones, both in the necropolis and in the settlement (appendix 3). Leaving aside tombs XV and XIX, which contain a cup of an unspecified style, there are three tombs out of the remaining 12 (25 %) that only contain black-gloss; six (50 %) with only red-figure, and another three (25 %) with both styles. The average of Athenian pots per tomb is of only one item, except for those with both black-gloss and red-figure, which accumulate more vases on average, for example, tomb 8 and I, with three and six Athenian items, but these are also multiple burials of four and three people respectively. There is no correlation between the number of imported vases and the tomb structure, that is, the effort invested, which is usually understood as reflecting higher social status. Indeed, the more elaborated tomb with Athenian pottery, tomb 11/145, only contained one red-figure cup, which was probably also a curated object (fig. 8). In fact, most tombs with Athenian pottery fall within the simple types 1 and 2, as mentioned above.

As for the tombs with black-gloss only, the aspect that sets them apart is that none contained weapons but there are also instances of red-figure-only tombs without weapons. The tombs with black-gloss are all very simple structures, type 1, but so too are the structures with only red-figure. Gender does not seem to be meaningful for the deposition of one or the other type in Castellones either, for example, tomb 11/145 was the grave of an elite male and contained

one red-figure cup, whereas one of those interred in tomb 8, which included both black-gloss and red-figure, was also a man. So, the earlier findings about the variability in the composition of the funerary assemblages in this necropolis, in particular the absence of defined groups of goods for defined groups of people, seems to apply to the distribution of red-figure and black-gloss too.

<A> Beyond Red or Black: The Figure-Decorated Krater

The previous analyses indicate that, in our area, there is no direct correlation between the presence or absence of red-figure and/or black-gloss pottery in a tomb with the supposed inferred status of the deceased. There is no strong evidence to support a potential diacritic use of red-figure and/or black-gloss pottery, whereby any of them would signal a particular social *persona*, as it might be the case in areas where circulation of red-figure pottery was more restricted, as it has been proposed for La Bastida de Les Alcusses.[80] Evidence suggests that the traditional understanding of black-gloss as a "cheap" alternative to red-figure for those with more limited means does not hold true in our case. While Athenian pottery in general only appears in tombs of a certain level of wealth in our region and there is a marked preference for figured vases, no rules are obvious behind the deposition of one or the other type in a given tomb. Burials of both high- and mid-ranking individuals and clients equally include red-figure and/or black-gloss and similarly humble tombs within those parameters can include one or the other.

Some differences are noticeable among the necropoleis though: while in Galera, tombs containing only black-gloss are rare and the black-gloss Cástulo cups seem to have been treasured possessions of the elite (therefore a reversed pattern of what is usually assumed

about the relation between black-gloss and red-figure), in Baza, black-gloss is numerically superior to red-figure and there are more black-gloss-only tombs than red-figure-only. Finally, in Castellones, the balance tips to red-figure but the figures for black-gloss-only and red-figure-only tombs almost level out. In all cases, the heterogeneity of grave-good assemblages beyond the presence of one or two essential objects (e.g., the container for the ashes) is characteristic and also applies to the distribution of red-figure and black-gloss.

Therefore, as it was advanced for the cases of Galera and Baza, if we want to find a type of material culture that is more commonly associated with elite burials in our area, we must go beyond the mere distinction between red and black and turn to a particular shape: the krater, which is invariably figured, and which does indeed not appear often in lesser tombs. Kraters, used as cineraria, are evenly distributed in Galera in the main tombs of sectors I and II and are accumulated in two tombs of Baza forming iconographical "programmes"[81] which, here and in other necropoleis of the area, such as Toya, previous scholarship has successfully read "though the Iberians' eyes", in particular the scenes of the Dionysian *thiasus* and the banquet scenes in general[82] and, more recently, what I have called the "delocalized" athletic scenes.[83] Although this matter has often been discussed in Spanish scholarship, it is worth exemplifying through a case study from one of our tombs.

<B> The Iberian Interpretation of Greek imagery: Tomb 43 of Baza

This is an undisturbed triple burial with 10 items of Athenian pottery, including three cinerary red-figure bell-kraters (for full assemblage, with bibliography, see annex XX; for a reconstruction of the tomb, fig. 6). It has been repeatedly studied by Carmen Sánchez[84], whose interpretation we follow. The first krater[85] (fig. 9a) has been attributed to the Oinomaos

Painter[86] and bears a peculiar scene with Dionysos and Apollo on side A that Ricardo Olmos identified as Dionysos leaving the Delphian sanctuary upon the return of Apollo from his winter stay among the Hyperboreans. Apollo, naked and with a laurel branch, sits in the centre, flanked by a maenad holding a tray with grapes to the left and an eros with a fillet to the right. Next to the maenad, a smaller youth with thyrsus mirrors Apollo's pose, while, higher up, a satyr holds a grapevine. They all look to the right (except for Eros), to a couple leaving the scene: Dionysos, identified by his thyrsus, and Ariadne. The second krater[87] (fig. 9b), also by the Oinomaos Painter, bears a banquet scene on side A with three pairs of man and youth sharing *klinai* and playing *kottabos* while an *auletris* plays in the centre. The third krater[88] (fig. 9c), attributed by Sánchez to the York Reverse group and probably slightly later than the other two, is decorated with an Amazonomachy on side A, with two Amazons on horse defeating two Greek soldiers on foot. The sides B of the three kraters are very similar: draped youths with aryballoi or staffs, and *diskoi* suspended. They are dated in the first quarter of the fourth century BCE.

The scenes represented on the kraters are the three most common subjects in the red-figure pottery from our region: banquet scenes, Amazonomachies (and Gryphomachies)[89] and Dionysian scenes, and their popularity in the area has been explained alluding to a process of *interpretatio iberica* whereby these scenes were favoured because they could be assimilated with concepts known in Iberian society. Before advancing the argument, it is worth pausing on how such process would have worked. An inherent problem to understand a potential *interpretatio iberica*, in particular when compared with the parallel and better documented phenomenon of the *interpretatio etrusca*[90] is the partial understanding of Iberian visual culture itself. This is due to the fragmentary nature of the evidence as a result of old excavations and uncontextualized finds, what leaves us with isolated images to be interpreted

on their own without reference to a larger visual system. The lack of emic textual information about the Iberian system of beliefs and the little understanding of the Iberian language (while the script has been deciphered to various extents, the language itself remains largely unknown) all contribute to a poor understanding of Iberian iconography. The situation has improved since Olmos and Sánchez' research on this matter, with a better general knowledge of Iberian iconography, in particular, during the Late Iberian period (200/50 BCE)[91] but much of what we know for earlier periods is still based on learned guesses and intuitions rather than on positive evidence, a situation that Ricardo Olmos already acknowledged in 1987.[92] Most relevant in this regard, is Adolfo Domínguez' opinion that "we project too many of our ideas of how we think the Iberians "must have" interpreted Greek images".[93] While I share his view, I also think that the main lines to understand the Iberian interpretation of Greek imagery, at least in general terms, are plausible and new findings contribute rather than contradict previous research.

Ricardo Olmos proposed four categories or paths that images can go through when crossing cultural boundaries and these include both the reception and understanding of a foreign image and the potential subsequent local realization of the same image by the receiving culture.[94] These are: 1) equation: when the meaning of an image is maintained; 2) des-mythologization: when an originally mythological image is understood as an ornament; 3) trans-mythologization: when the mythical content of the image mutates; and 4) mythologization: when an ornamental image or motif becomes mythological. All four instances—the first one to a very little extent and maybe limited to Greek images in the colony of Empúries— can be attested in the Iberian Peninsula, with the third being the most common in the kraters of our area. This category or path works mainly through the matching of Iberian eschatological ideas and shared ideals about the aristocratic way of life with elements of the iconography of

the kraters, with one main line being the identification (and heroization) of the deceased whose ashes rest in the krater with the central figure of the scene. It is within this context that the images on the kraters of tomb 43 of Baza have been understood.

Banquet scenes like the one represented on krater 3 acquired a funerary meaning in various regions outside Athens, especially in Etruria[95] and South Italy,[96] and most probably also among the Iberians. Carmen Sánchez interpreted this and similar scenes in funerary contexts as alluding to the heroization of the deceased,[97] who, as shown in the first part of this article, is always a member of the ruling elites. The dead would participate in an afterlife of luxury and abundance, where all-male feasting and entertainment never stops. He would see his status reinforced and re-enacted by being imagined partaking in the communal meal, and such scene would contribute to class cohesion and peer recognition. This is not an alien idea among the Iberians as wine consumption is attested since, at least, the Late Bronze Age, and banquets existed well before the arrival of Athenian fine-ware.[98] Krater number 2, with a scene of Amazonomachy, would resonate with the Iberians in various ways. The weapons in the image, in particular in association with the horse, would evoke warfare and warrior/rider status, of paramount importance in Iberian society.[99] This krater was placed not on the bench like the other two, but on the ground, next to the weapons, creating a visual parallel between painted image and grave-goods. Sánchez also suggested a possible psychopomp role for the horse, a guide of the souls to the underworld, which is also in line with evidence from other vases, Iberian funerary sculpture,[100] and the presence of equestrian equipment in most funerary assemblages of high-ranking individuals (refer to tables). Lastly, krater 1, with a highly specific iconography that would necessitate a good knowledge of Greek mythology, most likely experienced a process of trans-mythologization in the Iberian context, whereby the deceased would be identified (and therefore heroized) with the naked central figure

(Apollo, in an Athenian reading) tended by wonderful beings, i.e., satyrs, women offering luscious fruit, and winged demons, and set in an Iberian equivalent to the Garden of the Blessed. Like the banquet scene, it evokes Dionysos' world of abundance and merriness, the most common theme of the Athenian figure-decorated pottery exported to the Iberian Peninsula (and elsewhere), in particular in the shape of the less specific iconography of the Dionysian *thiasus*.

Tomb 43 of Baza offers a good entry point to elucidate the Iberian interpretation of Athenian imagery. The three scenes resonate with various elements of the Iberian eschatology, revolving around the idea of the heroization of the dead through music, wine, and war. While they evoke the aristocratic way of life, characterised by practices of commensality restricted to the upper echelons of society or by warfare and the possession of weapons, in the space of the tomb, these images offer glimpses of what awaits "at the other side", presenting the afterlife as an eternal banquet, where the soul of the dead, transported by psychopomp horses, is received by exuberant beings in a state of permanent bliss. But as mentioned above, other authors reject such specific iconographical readings as modern projections on the Iberian way of thinking and emphasize the shape as the most important factor in the Iberian use of the Greek vase.[101] I do agree that shape and not image was probably the defining factor, what is supported by the fact that when Iberians produce local iterations of Athenian vases, they disregard the decoration. In that sense, also the interchangeability of black-gloss bowls and red-figure cups in Baza mentioned above derives from their utilitarian role as lids. Unfortunately, there were no black-gloss kraters so we cannot know if they would be interchangeable with the figure-decorated ones, but in the region under analysis, and considering the wider context to be discussed infra, I do think that images are not just contingencies. While, to my mind, Iberians did not buy Athenian vases for their images and a

special iconography was never developed by the Athenian workshops for Iberia, the characteristically unspecific and relatable fourth-century iconography enhances the shape in a way that makes it suitable/necessary for the Iberian notables; otherwise, they would use their own undecorated urns and there would be no demand for or acceptance/Iberianization of the foreign object.

<A> A World of Images

Athenian pots were not the only bearers of images in the contexts under study but are just one element of a particularly rich iconographical microcosmos developed across a number of key burials in the necropoleis of the Guadiana Menor River. In this section I will pause on the iconographical and material contexts where Athenian pottery is integrated and will conclude with some working hypotheses to account for the preference for images of all sorts among the communities interred in these burial grounds. The examples that I will discuss include polychrome Iberian vessels, stone larnakes, wall painting/tapestries and sculpture.

<B> Polychrome Iberian vessels

Beyond Athenian kraters, another *leit-motif* of the foundational tombs of these necropoleis is the presence of, usually, four polychrome Iberian vessels, mainly amphorae/amphoroids and ovoid urns with bell-shaped necks.[102] These are Iberian vases produced with the customary decoration of red/brown concentric bands singularized before their use in a funerary context by the application of a second, polychrome decoration on a white slip using expensive pigments, like blue, red, black and white, that were usually reserved to the elites. The decoration consists of phytomorphic and geometric motives, what has traditionally been

interpreted as an example of the hybridism of foreign (Greek) and local iconographical traditions (e.g., tomb 155 of Baza[103]), but also zoomorphic motives of Orientalizing stock (e.g., tomb 34 of Galera) (fig. 10). Maria Isabel Moreno has suggestively linked the choice of shape with the age of the deceased, with the ovoid urns being associated with adult individuals and the amphorae, with children or young adults.[104] Adroher understands the amphorae as relating to the use of wine, either as synecdoque or as evidence of the actual use of wine in the funerary rituals and highlights the probable semitic origin of the use (cf. Punic necropolis of Trayamar, Málaga). On the other hand, he rightly takes the decoration of the painted urns with bell-shaped necks as reflecting textiles,[105] a practice—covering urns with clothes—which, due to the fragility of the material, has been attested only sporadically in the archaeological record, but interestingly, one of the few examples comes from the necropolis of Castellones de Céal.[106]

The practice of pottery repaint goes back to the second half of the sixth century BCE, when the cremated remains of the female member of the aristocratic couple interred in the hypogeum of Cerrillo de la Compañía de Hornos de Peal, near Tugia/Toya (Jaén), were deposited in an early sixth century BCE Toya-type urn which had been repaired and repainted.[107] The repaint and repurposing of an old vase is a material practice that starts to be used by the Iberian elites in this period of transition and political reorganization (sixth-fifth centuries BCE) and the resulting object reifies the values and attributes that support and legitimize the new sociopolitical order, which revolve around the notions of, paradoxically, the long history—mythical or real—of the aristocratic lineage, the prestige and memory of the past,[108] and the weight of tradition.[109] According to Moreno's research,[110] the polychrome Iberian vessels can therefore be understood as prestige vases used in a moment of transition that play an important role in the identity discourses deployed in the foundational tombs of

the area of the Guadiana Menor River. Some of these tombs (e.g. tomb 20 of Galeria) also functioned as open-air sanctuaries, therefore becoming mnemonic landscapes where the mythical histories of the ancestors and the lineage are re-enacted and re-created through the display of objects/iconographies and, we assume, ritual acts on special occasions.

Indeed, Antonio Uriarte rightly referred to the group formed by the polychrome Iberian vessels and the Athenian kraters as “scenographic” vases,[111] that is, sets of vases that look similar and offer a certain homogeneity to the assemblage, marking the elevated social status of the deceased.[112] The scenographic role of these objects, as active agents in a landscape which would act as a backdrop to various actions performed on special occasions of ritual or political importance, is precisely one of the roles of art proposed by DeMarrais and Robb: to create sites of activity.[113] Art establishes settings for actions and frames open air spaces used for “gatherings, public events, or collective actions”, creating sites for the “reenactment of shared memories”.[114] The shared experience of viewing and appreciating contributes to the creation of social relationships.

<B> Stone larnakes

Together with the ceramic vessels, another major support of iconography are the stone boxes/ larnakes. These are little limestone boxes that contained the cremated remains of the deceased and received figurative decoration; they are also one of the material elements chosen by Almagro-Gorbea to characterize archaeologically the Iberian region of Bastetania versus the neighbouring region of Contestania, well-known for the presence of pillar-stelai as tomb-markers.[115] A remarkable example of the type is the larnax from tomb 76 of Galera (fig. 11).[116] It presents a complex iconography extending, presumably, over its four sides, although only

two are preserved. On one side, there are two figures, one of them—next to a rosette—might be a goddess or a figure close to the divinity, and the other, a seated figure variously identified as man or woman, might be the deceased.[117] One of the short sides is decorated with the figure of a griffin. The box is topped up with the figure of a feline that serves as a handle. Because of its fragmentary state, the narrative discourse cannot be fully reconstructed but Teresa Chapa[118] interprets the decoration as constructing a symbolic microcosmos populated by apotropaic beings, otherworldly creatures and human figures destined to house and protect the deceased in the journey to the underworld.

This larnax offers an interesting case to explore the dialogue between local and imported images and the adoption of Greek motifs by the local workshops. Griffins are hybrid creatures, largely uniting a feline body with a bird head. They first appear in the Mesopotamian and Egyptian art of the third millennium BCE and were incorporated in the visual culture of various peoples of the Near-East under very diverse local typologies, e.g. Aegean/Mycenaean, Sirio-Palestine, Minoan, Phoenician, Cypriot, etc.[119] The various types are organized more widely into two groups: Near-Eastern and Greek. The Near-Eastern motif was brought west through Phoenician trade in the first two centuries of the first millennium BCE, appearing in Iberia on ivory plaques and jewellery, both as imports and linked to colonial (Phoenician) and local workshops. The griffins on the belt of the Aliseda Treasure (Cáceres, seventh c. BCE)[120] are considered the oldest in the western Mediterranean.[121] Griffins also appear on a number of Phoenician ivory plaques from funerary contexts of the seventh-sixth centuries BCE in the area of the Lower Guadalquivir (e.g. Bencarrón, Cruz del Negro, Setefilla),[122] some of which are nowadays in the Hispanic Society of New York (fig. 12), as well as on some remarkable examples of the Orientalizing pottery with figured-decoration (more on this infra) like the pithoi from Carmona (fig. 13) and Cerro de Alcalá.

These griffins are of an eastern passant type, with wings, feline body and bird head, with open beak[123] and show similitudes with the Nimrud ivories from Fort Shalmaneser, most of which are now in the British Museum. But there are also occasions where the local craftsmen adapt the oriental griffin type to the local tastes, as evidenced by the two pithoi with griffins from Cerro Alcalá, one more faithful to the foreign model and the other showing a local iteration of the same motif (see infra fig. 18a).[124]

As for their meaning, in the Near-East, griffins have a marked magical/religious significance related to concepts of divine power, protection and guardianship, and are also related to the underworld as apotropaic and psychopomp beings. In the Iberian Peninsula, such symbolism is kept, particularly the funerary connection, as many of the ivory and bone plaques belong to funerary boxes, even when their initial use might have been different.[125] The fight between griffin and hero is also present on those plaques (fig. 12) and in monumental sculpture, such as in the so-called mid-fifth century BCE "Iberian Gryphomachy" of Porcuna (Cerrillo Blanco, Porcuna, Jaén) (fig. 14)[126]. There is an emphasis on the *agon* between the monster and the civilizing hero that, when transferred to the funerary realm, fits perfectly within the Iberian conception of the combat as heroizing, an initiatory event through which the deceased will achieve immortality.[127]

With the motif of the griffin already known in Iberia for over two centuries, it is then not surprising that Greek griffins were well received in the fifth and fourth centuries BCE.[128] Although less popular than Dionysian scenes, griffins/gryphomachies are common occurrences on the Athenian pottery imported to this area, in particular in Galera and the nearby Toya.[129] Greek griffins differ from the typically oriental iconography in that the bird head turns into a more equine morphology, with ears, wide neck, and mane-like crest, and

this new iconography is taken up in Iberian works like the larnax from tomb 76 that we are discussing. But although inspired by the Greek model, the style and some other iconographical features are purely Iberian, like the addition of teeth or the heraldic position with left paw raised and extended wings. Purely Athenian griffins can be found, twice, on the neighbouring tomb 77, flanking the Arimaspian head on side A of a cinerary pelike (fig. 15a).[130] The pelike was covered with a black-gloss bowl with outturned rim and stamped decoration that, Sánchez suggested,[131] the Iberians probably interpreted as the starry sky (fig. 15b). Like the Iberian larnax, the set of pelike and bowl, is constructed as a final resting "house", a microcosmos where the deceased is protected by magical beings in their journey to the after-life. Both reify the same idea, using similar elements in different languages. This case study reinforces the argument made throughout this article that the popularity of Athenian figured pottery in this area is not so much related to its perception as "luxury goods" but to the existence of an already rich visual world in which the foreign image could be integrated; these are images that "made sense" within the visual world and eschatological ideas of the Iberians interred there.

Lastly, the dialogue between local and imported images extends to the decorative motifs too. The egg pattern of the pelike, which is also commonly found around the handles of the kraters, is repeated on the lid of the larnax, while the meander interrupted by rosettes of the box reminds of the Attic running meanders punctuated by saltire crosses (e.g. krater from tomb 83),[132] and the frieze of waves bordering the griffin panel immediately recalls the same motif on the Amazonomachy krater of tomb 43 of Baza (figs. 9c, 11, and 15a). Similar waves, in red and outlined in black, were part of the wall decoration of the tomb, as the few fragments recovered by Rodríguez Ariza and her team attest.[133] The palette used for the wall painting, mainly red, black and white, also provides a visual continuity with the Athenian

pottery from the tomb, of which we unfortunately only have fragments (krater(s) and cups are recognizable among them). Such dialogues are not exclusive of this tomb/necropolis but are also attested in Baza.[134]

<B> Wall painting and sculpture

Wall-painting is another medium that adds to this world of images. Due to its fragility, we do not preserve any complete murals but the references to fragments of painted stucco in the excavation reports is commonplace, in particular in Galera. Precisely from tomb 2 of Galera comes an extraordinary group of paintings. Both the walls and the floor of this chamber/shaft tomb received painted decoration, applied in a second phase of use of the structure or to restore the previous, maybe damaged, paintings.[135] On the walls, over a painted socle, the decoration consisted of geometric motifs and florals, including ivy leaves and zig-zags. The painting on the floor (fig. 16) has been interpreted as the first attestation of the Oriental tradition of covering floors and walls of royal tombs with tapestries, following famous examples like that of Midas' tomb in Gordion.[136] Indeed, on the basis of its iconography—six rows of four lotus flowers over a red/purple background—, dimensions, and palette, Almagro-Gorbea argues that the painting represents a Phoenician tapestry used as a carpet on top of which the ashes of the deceased, inside the urn, would be laid, a practice attested in Mesopotamia and Phoenicia but also in some princely tombs of the Hallstatt period (Hochdorf). The tomb had been looted and no grave-goods were found but the "royal tapestry" points to its owner as a "*rex*" of Túrugi, in Almagro's terminology,[137] and would further provide material evidence to his hypothesis of the existence of royal elites of Oriental origins in pre-Roman Iberia.[138]

Lastly, we need to add the remains of monumental sculpture. Although not as common as in other Iberian territories, monumental sculpture is indeed documented inside and outside the tombs in our necropoleis. This includes both anthropomorphic sculpture (in addition to the well-known Lady of Baza) recovered in a very fragmentary state in some prominent tombs, and zoomorphic sculpture (bull and deer) presumably placed outside the tomb in the necropolis of Castellones de Céal and also in the neighbouring Toya.[139] All the evidence therefore shows that images are plentiful in these contexts despite previous thinking that these communities made little use of monumental iconography.[140] This view derives from the fact that many of these images concentrate *inside* the tombs, which must not be a problem *per se* but an aspect of a very specific personality of this area where images played a prominent role in the discourses surrounding death and afterlife and the narratives developed by the new elites to navigate time and space together.

<A> Forerunners

It is time now to investigate the origins and reasons for this specific taste for images shown by the elites of the region of the Upper Guadalquivir/Guadiana Menor River in the early part of the High-Iberian period (450/425-200 BC). In my view, these can be traced back to pre-Iberian times, to the seventh century BCE, when the local population was first exposed to Orientalizing[141] objects and lifestyles as a result of the interactions with the Phoenician colonial world that had been developing around a number of factories in the coastal areas of the Peninsula since the ninth century BCE. The first productions from local potteries incorporating the technological innovations brought by the Phoenicians, including the potter's wheel, are attested in Eastern Andalucía from around 650-600 BCE and are clearly influenced by the colonial repertoire although further developing according to autochthonous

tastes and needs.[142] One of these productions is precisely the so-called Orientalising pottery with figural decoration, which came to be associated with the ruling elites and used in a diacritical way as prestige vessels and which, to my mind, might help explain why figured-pottery, in particular, kraters, were so well received in those lands later on.

By "Orientalizing pottery with figured decoration", it is understood a series of heterogenous pottery productions of clear semitic influence coming from indigenous centres of the south of the Iberian Peninsula—and maybe also from colonial contexts—starting in the seventh century BCE or even earlier.[143] These are mostly big shapes, like *amphorai* or *pithoi,* that receive a colourful decoration, monochrome, bichrome or polychrome—a technique imported by the Phoenicians—, consisting of motives of oriental stock, like griffins, bulls, and sphinxes, usually deployed in the central uninterrupted band of the vase and framed between further bands with geometric or phytomorphic motives (fig. 17). They come from two different areas in Andalucía, the Lower Guadalquivir River (e.g., Carmona, Setefilla, Montemolín in the current provinces of Sevilla and Córdoba) and the area of Jaén and the Upper Guadalquivir (e.g., Maquiz, Cerro Alcalá, Pinos Puente, all in Jaén) which would correspond to different workshops, the Jaén one deeply rooted in the local Late Bronze Age traditions[144] and the other one bearing a strong Phoenician flavour.[145] These productions appear in "special" contexts, both in settlements and necropoleis, and the religious character of their iconography has been widely acknowledged. In settlements they come from structures linked to religious or palatial areas where some rituals might have been performed with the contents held within (e.g., wine, oil, etc), as in the cases of Montemolín, Mesa de Setefilla, and Carmona.[146]

Regarding the interpretation of these wares, several hypotheses have been proposed, all of them making emphasis on their role as prestige objects linked to the ruling elites during the Orientalizing period and beyond.[147] When the Phoenicians arrived in the Peninsula, the autochthonous populations were developing towards hierarchical societies and soon capitalized on sumptuary objects like metal vessels, ivories, and pottery, that were being brought to their lands by the foreigners. Access to those objects was limited to those with the right connections and in the socio-political models that see an evolution from a divine monarchy system with a sacred king at the top in the Near Eastern tradition to the later Iberian aristocratic system,[148] these objects would be linked to the royalty, with the local kings assimilated with the semitic gods of the Phoenicians. This changes in the sixth century, when, according to Juan Pachón and colleagues, the use of the Orientalizing figured-pottery extended more widely within the society, but always restricted to the aristocratic classes which took over the old monarchies and adopted their distinctive material culture.[149] The distribution circuit of these wares seems to be rather select, mainly aristocratic and sacred, with examples coming both from tombs and cultic contexts in urban spaces. The polychrome *amphorai* from tomb 34 of Galera—if of a fifth century chronology and not curations—can be seen as one of last examples of the type, together with the extraordinary polychrome krater of Atalayuelas (fifth century BCE) (fig. 18), which is not so much an imitation of an Attic krater but an original local production where the new fashions brought by the Greeks were reinterpreted and subjected to the weight of the Orientalizing tradition or, depending on our perspective, where the Orientalizing model was revisited and updated according to the new Greek fashions.[150]

The above analysis therefore shows that prior to the arrival of the Athenian figure-decorated pottery there was already a keen interest in images used in selected contexts in relation with

prominent members or groups of the society. Images, including those brought from Athens, were a key element in the identity and legitimacy discourses of the ruling elites in the High Iberian period and aspects of that future use are already present in pre-Iberian times. In this regard, I would like to finish with an example of the use of the image for legitimacy purposes that foreshadows later Iberian developments. In the cremation tomb of a woman buried with other members of her social group in the seventh century BCE funerary cluster at El Cerro de Los Vientos (Puente del Obispo, Baeza, Jaén), excavators recovered an extraordinary local bowl with incised figured decoration.[151] This consists of a frieze divided in metopes defined by geometric motives framing three figurative images of two stags and a sprig of wheat which have been interpreted in connection with agriculture, hunt and the mythical world, ultimately related to the concepts of fertility and renewal, and conceived as symbols of the lineage of the woman cremated there. From a morphological point of view, the bowl fits within the Late Bronze Age but its iconography points to a moment of change, fully within the Orientalizing period, and it develops a complex discourse about power and linage legitimized in a woman who also possessed exogenous objects, like cornaline beads, among her grave goods.[152] According to Miguel Ángel Lechuga and colleagues,[153] the tomb is part of a small cluster of cremations (CE1) possibly belonging to a powerful family who started a funerary area that would eventually be discontinued and who are showing their status in that space through elements of material culture connected to their collective memory and personal prestige.

It is therefore within this context that we need to understand the popularity of Athenian figure-decorated pottery in this region in absolute terms compared with other territories. When Athenian pottery started to arrive in the area, objects bearing iconography, from pottery and ivories to metalware, had long been used in sacred contexts (sanctuaries, tombs, votive

deposits) by the better-off of the society, whether kings or aristocratic groups. Images became a key resource for the definition of social identities, signalling the participation of the group or person in the new fashions (and commercial networks) coming from abroad while also highlighting their belonging to the place and the local tradition.[154] Images became mnemonic tools that helped people navigate time and space together, in particular, in periods of turmoil. The popularity of Athenian figured-pottery can therefore be explained because it fulfilled a particular need of the consumers of this region. But while acknowledging this fondness for images and understanding it within the local context and traditions, the archaeological record strongly argues against the old idea that black-gloss pottery was a cheap alternative to red-figure or that it followed different distribution circuits aimed at different sectors of the society. Black-gloss pottery was equally appreciated, curated and treasured, and whether as cups or bowls, it was an important part of the mortuary assemblages of those who were granted visible burial in the fifth and fourth centuries BCE in our necropoleis. Even though, the association of images with elite or, otherwise, wealthy burials is not wholly misplaced either. From the previous research, it also follows that if we combine a specific technique, red-figure, with a particular shape, the bell-krater, an essential functional item in the tombs of the elite, we could maybe conclude with a more positive note, suggesting that while black-gloss pottery was not second to red-figure pottery, Athenian images, even if only on bell-kraters, were indeed reserved for the Iberian notables of this region in the momentous passage from life to death.

<A> Figure captions

Figure 1.- Map of the Iberian Peninsula with the three case studies discussed in the text. 1) Necropolis associated to the Iberian settlement of Túgi (Galera, Granada); 2) Necropolis of

Cerro del Santuario, associated to the Iberian settlement of Basti (Baza, Granada); 3) Necropolis associated to the Iberian settlement of Los Castellones de Céal (Hinojares, Jaén). (Own elaboration. Base map: Iberpix, https://www.ign.es/iberpix/).

Figure 2.- Situation map of the archaeological complex of Túgi, including the Iberian necropolis (marked in yellow, with three zones: I, II, and III), the settlement at Cerro del Real (brown), and the modern town of Galera (green). (After Rodríguez Ariza et al. 2023, fig. 1).

Figure 3.- Map of the Iberian necropolis of Túgi showing zones Ia, b and C, and zones IIa, and B. (After Rodríguez Ariza 2014, 251, fig. 281).

Figure 4.- Drawings of the grave-goods from tomb 11 of Galera, including Athenian krater and Cástulo cup. From glass plate negative. (Juan Cabré de Motos, Archivo Cabré, 1202. IPCE. Ministerio de Cultura y Deporte. CC-BY-NC-ND).

Figure 5.- Map of the archaeological complex Los Santuarios of Baza. The Iberian settlement was at Cerro Cepero, served by two necropoleis, the one at Cerro del Santuario (our case study), and another one at Cerro Largo. (After Adroher Auroux and Caballero Cobos 2012, 61, fig. 3).

Figure 6.- Above: recreation of the tomb 43 from Baza, with original grave goods (Madrid, Archaeological Museum). Below: Five Athenian kraters and black-gloss bowls from tomb 176 of Baza (Own photograph. Private collection, Fundación Durán Vall-Llosera, Premià de Dalt, Barcelona).

Figure 7.- Oppidum and necrópolis of Castellones de Céal (Hinojares, Jaén, España) (Instituto de Arqueología Ibérica, Universidad de Jaén, Spain - CC BY-NC). https://www.europeana.eu/item/2020738/3DICONS_6974).

Figure 8.- Grave-goods from tomb 11/145 of Castellones de Céal (Hinojares, Jaén, España). (Instituto de Arqueología Ibérica, Universidad de Jaén, Spain - CC BY-NC). https://www.europeana.eu/item/2020738/3DICONS_8658).

Figure 9.- Athenian red-figure kraters from tomb 43 of Baza. A) Krater 1, side A: Apollo and Dionysos, side B: draped youths (Madrid, Archaeological Museum 1969/68/27); B) Krater 2, side A: Banquet scene (Madrid, Archaeological Museum 1969/68/28); C) Krater 3, side A: Amazonomachy (Madrid, Archaeological Museum 1969/68/29).

Figure 10.- A) Polychrome amphorae from tomb 34 of Galera; B) Polychrome amphorae from tomb 155 of Baza; C) Polychrome urns with bell-shaped neck from tomb 155 of Baza. (After Moreno Padilla 2023, figs. 6a.b, 6b, and 8b).

Figure 11.- A) Drawings of the funerary stone box (larnax) from tomb 76 of Galera, ht. 27.10 cm, lgth. 31.50 cm, wth. 32.20 cm (after Ariza 2014, fig. 216) and B) enhanced colour photograph of box using DStretch (after Chapa 2023, 305, fig. 4.7).

Figure 12.- Tartessian bone plaque from the necropolis of Bencarrón (Mairena del Alcor, Seville). Hispanic Society of America, New York, D.513. (Copyright: Laura Alcalá-Zamora).

Figure 13.- Polychrome pithos from Carmona, Palacio del Marqués de Saltillo (Seville, Museo de la Ciudad de Carmona).

Figure 14.- Gryphomachy. Statue group of Cerrillo Blanco (Porcuna, Jaén, Spain). (Instituto de Arqueología Ibérica, Universidad de Jaén, Spain - CC BY-NC).

Figure 15. – A) Athenian red-figure pelike from tomb 77 of Galera (Madrid, Archaeological Museum 1922/3/GAL/T77/1) and B) black-gloss bowl (Madrid, Archaeological Museum 1922/3/GAL/T77/2) PENDING MUSEUM PHOTOGRAPH OF THE BOWL.

Figure 16.- Drawing of the floor paintings from tomb 2 of Galera. From glass plate negative (Juan Cabré. Archivo Cabré, 0670. IPCE. Ministerio de Cultura y Deporte. CC-BY-NC-ND).

Figure 17.- A) Polychrome amphora from Cerró Alcalá (Jaén, Brazam Collection); B) Polychrome pithos from Carmona, Palacio del Marqués de Saltillo (Sevilla, Museo de la Ciudad de Carmona); C) Polychrome urn from the Museum of Cabra (Museo de Cabra, Córdoba).

Figure 18.- Polychrome krater from Atalayuelas (after Pachón et al. 2007, figs. 3-5; photograph and drawings by C. Anibal Gonzalez).

<A> Appendixes captions:

Appendix 1.- Athenian pottery from the necropolis of Túgi (Galera, Granada)

Appendix 2.- Athenian pottery from the necropolis of Cerro del Real (Baza, Granada)

Appendix 3.- Athenian pottery from the necropolis of Castellones de Céal (Hinojares, Jaén)

Appendix 4.- List of tombs and grave-goods

<A> List of works cited

Adroher, A. M. 1992. “Reinterpretación cronológica de la necrópolis ibérica del Cerro del Santuario (Baza, Granada).” *Florentia Iliberritana: Revista de estudios de antigüedad clásica* 3:9-38.

Adroher, A. M. 2004. “La necrópolis ibérica de Galera. Nada antes de Cabré.” In *El arqueólogo Juan Cabré (1882-1947): la fotografía como técnica documental*, edited by J. Blánquez and B. Rodríguez, 221-234. Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

Adroher, A. M. 2022. “El ajuar funerario de la Dama de Baza (Granada, España). Un caso práctico de contextualización en época íbera.” *Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología de la Universidad de Granada* 32:37-67.

Adroher, A. M., and A. Caballero. 2010. “El contexto de la Dama en el territorio de Basti.” In *La Dama de Baza: Un viaje femenino al más allá: actas del Encuentro Internacional Museo Arqueológico Nacional, 27 y 28 noviembre 2007,* edited by M. T. Chapa and M. I. Izquierdo, 57-72. Madrid: Museo Arqueológico Nacional.

Adroher, A. M., A. Caballero, M. Ramírez, and J. Antonio Salvador. 2022. “Reexcavando una necrópolis clásica: el Cerro del Santuario de Baza (Granada).” In *El reflejo del poder en la muerte. La cámara sepulcral de Toya*, edited by C. Rísquez, C. Rueda and A. B. Herranz, 351-376. Jaén: Universidad de Jaén.

Almagro-Gorbea, M. 1982. “Tumbas de cámara y cajas funerarias ibéricas. Su interpretación sociocultural y la delimitación del área cultural de los Bastetanos.” In *Homenaje a Conchita Fernández Chicarro* 250-257. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.

Almagro-Gorbea, M. 1993a. “Palacio y organización social en la Península Ibérica.” In *V Coloquio sobre lenguas y culturas prerromanas*, 21-48. Salamanca.

Almagro-Gorbea, M. 1993b. “Tarteso desde sus áreas de influencia: la sociedad palacial en la Península Ibérica.” In *Los enigmas de Tarteso*, edited by J. Alvar and J. M. Blázquez, 139-161. Madrid.

Almagro-Gorbea, M. 1996. *Ideología y poder en Tartessos y el mundo ibérico*. Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia.

Almagro-Gorbea, M. 2008. “Un tapiz fenicio en Galera (Granada, España). Tapices y tejidos hispano-fenicios.” *Lucentum* 27:51-60.

Almagro-Gorbea, M. 2005. “Ideología ecuestre en la Hispania Prerromana.” *Gladius* 25:151-186.

Amorós, I. 2022. “Más allá de la imitación. Vajillas ibéricas con formas áticas en La Bastida de les Alcusses (Moixent, Valencia).” *Archivo de Prehistoria Levantina* XXXIV:173-197.

Amorós, I., and J. Vives-Ferrándiz 2022. “De las políticas comensales a las relaciones sociales: cerámicas áticas en La Bastida de les Alcusses (Moixent, Valencia).” *AEspA* 95:1-19.

Amorós, I., and J. Vives-Ferrándiz 2023. “Le rouge et le noir. Cerámicas áticas figuradas en La Bastida de les Alcusses.” In *La cerámica ática fuera del Ática. Contextos, usos y miradas*, edited by C. Sánchez and J. Tomás, 29-48. Rome: “L’Erma” di Bretschneider.

Aubet, M.E. 1978. “Los marfiles fenicios del Bajo Guadalquivir: I. Cruz del Negro.” *Boletín del seminario de estudios de arte y arqueología* 44:15-88.

Aubet, M.E. 1980. “Los marfiles fenicios del Bajo Guadalquivir: II. Acebuchal y Alcantarilla.” *Boletín del seminario de estudios de arte y arqueología* 46:33-92.

Aubet, M.E. 1981. “Los marfiles fenicios del Bajo Guadalquivir: (y III). Bencarrón, Santa Lucía y Setefilla.” *Pyrenae* 17:231-279.

Belén, M., A. Rut, M. C. García, and J. M. Román. 2004. “Imaginería orientalizante en cerámica de Carmona (Sevilla).” *HuelvaArq* 20:151-169.

Blanco, A. 1959. “Cerámica griega de los Castellones de Céal.” *AJA* 32 (99-100):106-112.

Blánquez, J. 1992. “La lectura iconográfica de las necrópolis ibéricas.” In *La sociedad ibérica a través de la imagen*, edited by R. Olmos Romera, 216-223. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.

Blánquez, J. 2000. “Conjunto de vasos áticos del silicernio de Los Villares (Albacete).” In *Los griegos en España. Tras las huellas de Heracles*, edited by P. Cabrera Bonet and C. Sánchez Fernández, 411-412. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.

Blánquez, J. 2003. “Las cerámicas orientalizantes del Museo de Cabra (Córdoba).” In *Seres híbridos. Apropiación de motivos míticos mediterráneos*, edited by I. Izquierdo and H. Le Meaux, 211-227. Madrid: Casa de Velázquez.

Blázquez, J.M. 1998-1999. “Temas religiosos en la pintura vascular tartésica e ibera y sus prototipos del Próximo Oriente fenicio.” *Lucentum* 17-18:93-116.

Boardman, J. 1988. “Trade in Greek Decorated Pottery.” *OJA* 7 1:27-33.

Bundrick, S. 2019. *Athens, Etruria, and the Many Lives of Greek figured pottery*. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Caballero, A., and A. M. Adroher 2015. “Perduración simbólica en el uso de una necrópolis ibérica. El edificio funerario de Cerro del Santuario (Baza, Granada).” *Lucentum* 34:247-260.

Caballero, A., A.M. Adroher, M. Ramírez, J.A. Salvador, and L. Sánchez. 2013. “Nueva tumba, de inhumación infantil, en la necrópolis ibérica de Cerro del Santuario (Baza, Granada): resultados preliminares.” *Bastetania* 1:115-131.

Cabré, J., and F. Motos. 1920. *La necrópolis ibérica de Tútugi, Galera, Provincia de Granada*. Vol. 21 (1918), *Junta Superior de Excavaciones y Antigüedades*. Madrid.

Cabrera, P. 1997. “El viaje al allende a través del mar: un ‘ascos de Escila’ en el M.A.N.”, *Boletín del Museo Arqueológico Nacional* 15, 77-90.

Cabrera, P. 1998. “Dioniso en un jardín: el espacio de la iniciación en la iconografía de los vasos apulios.” In *En los límites de Dioniso: Actas del simposio celebrado en el Museo Arqueológico Nacional: Madrid, 20 de junio de 1997*, edited by P. Cabrera and C. Sánchez, 61-87. Madrid: Museo Arqueológico Nacional.

Cabrera, P., and P. Rouillard. 2003. “Le vase grec dans les nécropoles ibériques.” In *Le vase grec et ses destins* edited by P. Rouillard and A. Verbanck-Piérard, 187-195. Munich: Biering and Brinkmann.

Carrasco, J., J. Pachón, and C. Anibal. 1986. “Cerámicas pintadas de Bronce Final procedentes de Jaén y Córdoba.” *Cuadernos de prehistoria granadina* 11:199-235

Chapa, T. 2023. “Iconografía y prácticas funerarias en el Guadiana Menor (Jaén).” In *El reflejo del poder en la muerte. La cámara sepulcral de Toya*, edited by C. Rísquez, C. Rueda and A. B. Herranz, 299-322. Jaén: Universidad de Jaén.

Chapa, T., A. Madrigal, and J. Pereira. 1990. “La cámara funeraria de Los Castellones de Céal (Hinojares, Jaén).” *Verdolay. Revista del Museo de Murcia* 2:81-86.

Chapa, T., J. Pereira, and A. Madrigal. 1999. “El poblamiento de época ibérica en el área del Guadiana Menor: El caso de Los Castellones de Céal (Hinojares, Jaén).” In *De las sociedades agrícolas a la Hispania romana. Jornadas Históricas del Alto Guadalquivir. Quesada (1992-1995)*, edited by V. Salvatierra. Jaén: Universidad de Jaén.

Chapa, T., J. Pereira, A. Madrigal, and V. Mayoral. 1998. *La necrópolis ibérica de los Castellones de Céal (Hinojares, Jaén)*. Sevilla: Junta de Andalucía.

Chapa, T., J. Pereira, A. Madrigal, V. Mayoral, and A. Uriarte. 2002-2003. “Esculturas funerarias ibéricas de los Castellones de Céal (Hinojares, Jaén).” *Boletín de la asociación española de amigos de la arqueología. Homenaje a la Dra. Dña. Encarnación Ruano* 42:143-169.

Chapa, T., J. Pereira, A. Madrigal, V. Mayoral, and A. Uriarte. 2015. “La necrópolis de Castellones de Céal (Hinojares).” In *Jaén, tierra ibera. 40 años de investigación y transferencia*, edited by A. Ruiz and M. Molinos, 145-160. Jaén: Universidad de Jaén.

Chaves, F., and M. L. de la Bandera. 1984. “Avance sobre el yacimiento arqueológico de Montemolín (Marchena, Sevilla).” In *Papers in Iberian Archaeology*, edited by T. F. C Blagg, R. F. J Jones and S. J. Keay. Oxford: BAR International Series.

Chaviara, A, and E. Aloupi. 2016. “The story of a soil that became glaze: Chemical and microscopic fingerprints on the Attic vases.” *JAS: Reports* 7:510-517.

Codina, F., A. Martín, and G. De Prado. 2017. “La influencia de la cerámica ática en las producciones del período ibérico pleno en Ullastret.” In *Homenaje a Glòria Trias Rubiés*, edited by X. Aquilué, P. Cabrera and M. Orfila, 150-162. Madrid: Centro Ibera Graeca.

DeMarrais, E., and J. Robb. 2013. “Art Makes Society: An Introductory Visual Essay.” *World Art* 3 (1):3-22.

Desplanques, E. and B. Cutillas-Victoria. 2025. “El empleo de tejidos como envoltura en la necrópolis ibérica de Los Nietos (Cartagena, España): caracterización técnica e interpretación.” *ArchEspArq* 98: 725

Dietler, M. 1999. “Rituals of commensality and the poitics of state formation in the “princely” societies of Early Iron Age Europe.” In *Les princes de la Protohistoire et l’émergence de l´état*, edited by P. Ruby, 132-152. Rome: École française.

Dietler, M. 2010. *Archaeologies of Colonialism: Consumption, Entanglement, and Violence in Ancient Mediterranean France*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Domínguez, A. 1999. “Hellenisation in Iberia: The Reception of Greek Products and Influences by the Iberians.” In *Ancient Greeks West and East,* 301-329. Leiden: Brill.

Domínguez, A. 2003. “El uso de la cerámica ática en celebraciones religiosas colectivas no griegas en la Península Ibérica.” In *La cerámica ática fuera del Ática. Contextos, usos y miradas,* edited by C. Sánchez and J. Tomás, 143-166. Rome: L’Erma di Bretschneider.

Domínguez, A. 2022. “The New Life of Greek Images outside Greece. The Case of Iberia.” In *Iconotropy and Cult Images from the Ancient to the Modern World*, edited by J. Tomás and S. Sáenz-López, 77-98. New York: Routledge.

Domínguez, A. 2025. “Classical Attic Pottery in Non-Greek Environments: Transport, Distribution, Uses”. In *Over Land and Sea. The Long-distance Trade, Distribution and Consumption of Ancient Greek Pottery*, edited by A. Garés, D. Rodríguez and A. Díez, 17-26. Oxford: BAR.

Domínguez, A., and C. Sánchez. 2001. *Greek Pottery from the Iberian Peninsula. Archaic and Classical Periods*. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill.

Escacena, J. L. 1980. “La cerámica ibérica de la Mesa de Setefilla (Sevilla).” *Pyrenae* 1980 (15-16):181-210.

Fernández-Chicarro, C. 1955. “Prospección arqueológica en los términos de Hinojares y La Guardia (Jaén).” *Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Gienenses* 2 (6):89-99.

Fisher, N. and H. van Wees, ed. 2015. *Aristocracy in Antiquity: Redefining Greek and Roman Elites (Greece, Rome and Beyond).* Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales.

Frankenstein, S., and M. J. Rowlands. 1978. “The Internal Structure and Regional Context of Early Iron Age Society in South-Western Germany.” *BIALond* 15:73-112.

García, J.M. 1979. “Cerámica ática de Galera (Granada) en el Museo Arqueológico Provincial de Murcia.” *Pyrenae* 15-16:229-239.

García, J.M., and Gil, F. 2009. *La cerámica ática de figuras rojas: talleres y comercio (siglo IV a.C.). El caso de Coimbra del Barranco Ancho (Jumilla, Murcia).* Murcia: Editum.

García, J. 2011. “Reflexiones en torno al banquete funerarion ibérico”. *Arys. Antigüedad: Religiones y Sociedades* 9:119-153.

García Martín, J.M. 2003. *La distribución de cerámica griega en la Contestania ibérica: El puerto comercial de La Illesta del Banyets*. Alicante: Instituto Alicantino de Cultura "Juan Gil-Albert".

García y Bellido, A. 1956. “Materiales de arqueología hispano-púnica. Jarros de bronce.” *ArchEspArq* 29:85-104.

Garés, A., D. Rodríguez, and A. Diez. 2025. *Over Land and Sea. The Long-distance Trade, Distribution and Consumption of Ancient Greek Pottery.* Oxford: BAR.

Gil, S. 2009. “La sociedad y sus ajuares. La necrópolis ibérica de Baza 40 años después.” *Arqueología y Territorio* (6):107-121.

Gil, R., and R. Olmos. 1983. “Un escifo del grupo del cisne procedente de la necrópolis de Galera (Granada).” *Boletín del Seminario de Estudios de Arte y Arqueología* 49:31-38.

Gill, D. 1991. “Pots and Trade: Spacefillers or Objets d'Art?” *JHS* 111:29-47.

González, E. M. 2012. “Estructuras funerarias de la Necrópolis de Cerro del Santuario (Baza, Granada)”. *Arqueología y Territorio* 9:117-130.

Huerta, P. 2023. “¿Imágenes de Hermes o imágenes de Dioniso? Hacia una deconstrucción de la herma en la pintura vascular ática dionisíaca del s. IV a.C.” In *La cerámica ática fuera del Ática. Contextos, usos y miradas*, edited by C. Sánchez, 277-297. Rome: L’Erma di Bretschneider.

Lechuga, M. A, M. I. Moreno, and M. Soto. 2022. “El área funeraria del Cerro de Los Vientos (Puente Obispo, Baeza, Jaén). Un ejemplo de hibridación de las élites locales durante el periodo orientalizante en el Alto Guadalquivir.” In *El reflejo del poder en la muerte. La cámara sepulcral de Toya*, edited by C. Rísquez, C. Rueda and A. B. Herranz, 187-210. Jaén: Universidad de Jaén.

Mata, C., and H. Bonet. 1992. “La cerámica ibérica: ensayo de tipología”. In *Estudios de arqueología ibérica y romana. Homenaje a Enrique Pla Ballester* 117-173.

Mancebo, J. 1998. “La cerámica pintada figurativa orientalizante de la Cueva Baja del Guadalquivir.” *Antiquitas* 9:13-24.

Maniatis, Y., E. Aloupi, and A. D Stalios. 1993. “New Evidence for the Nature of the Attic Black Gloss.” *Archaeometry* 35 (1):23-34.

Manso, E. 2019. “Reordenando colecciones: los materiales de Galera de la colección de Federico Motos en el Museo Arqueológico Nacional.” *Boletín del Museo Arqueológico Nacional* 38: 45-72.

Miguel, P. , M.A. Rodríguez, F. Morales, D. Rodríguez and M. García. 2005. *Un depósito de ofrendas de cerámica ática y ungüentarios en la necrópolis ibérica de Alarcos III (Poblete, Ciudad Real). ArchEspArq* 98.

Moreno, M. and P. Cabrera. 2014. “Entre Amazonas y Grifos. Viajes por las imágenes de frontera en el siglo IV a.C.”. *ArchEspArq* 87:41-58.

Moreno, M. I. 2023. “Estética e identidad: vasos de prestigio iberos en las tumbas fundacionales del Guadiana Menor (segunda mitad del siglo V a. C.).” *Complutum* 34 (1):177-196.

Negueruela, I. 1990. *Los monumentos escultóricos ibéricos del Cerrillo Blanco de Porcuna (Jaén)*. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.

Olmos, R. 1990. “Orgiastic Elements in Iberian Iconography?” *Kernos* 5:153-171.

Olmos, R., and C. Sánchez. 1995. “Usos e ideología del vino en las imágenes de la Hispania prerromana.” In *Arqueología del vino. Los orígenes del vino en Occidente*, edited by S. Celestino, 105-136. Jerez: Consejo regulador de las denominaciones de origen de Jerez-Xeres-Sherry y Manzanilla Sanlúcar de Barrameda.

Olmos, R., T. Tortosa, and P. Iguácel, eds. 1992. *La sociedad ibérica a través de la imagen*. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.

Olmos, R. 1984. “The Assimilation of Classical Iconography in the Iberian World, Vth-IVth Century B.C.” In *Praktiká tou Diethnoús Sunedríou KlasikésArchaiologías. Athéna 4 - 10 Septembríou 1983*, 191-196. Athens.

Olmos, R. 1985. “Interpretations ibériques des vases grecs: le IVème s. av. J.C.” In *Ancient Greek and Related Pottery*, edited by H. A. G. Bridjer, 218-223. Amsterdam: Allard Pierson Museum.

Olmos, R. 1987. “Iconografía griega, iconografía ibérica: una aproximación metodológica.” *Revue des Études Anciennes* 89.3-4:283-296.

Olmos, R. 1996. “Caminos escondidos. Imaginarios del espacio en la muerte ibérica.” *Homenaje al Prof. Manuel Fernández-Miranda, Complutum extra* 6, 2:167-176.

Olmos, R. 2002. “Los grupos escultóricos del Cerrillo Blanco de Porcuna (Jaén). Un ensayo de lectura iconográfica convergente.” *ArchEspArq* 75:107-122.

Olmos, R. 2003a. “La imagen en la cultura tartésica.” In *Cerámicas orientalizantes del Museo de Cabra*, edited by J. Blánquez, 32-55. Córdoba: Ayuntamiento de Cabra.

Olmos, R. 2003b. “Vaso griego e imagen orientalizante en la Andalucía ibérica: la colisión de dos tradiciones iconográficas (siglos V-IV a.C.).” In *Il greco, il barbaro e la ceramica attica: immaginario del diverso, processi di scambio e autorappresentazione degli indigeni*, edited by F. Giudice and R. Panvivi, 219-228. Rome: L'Erma di Bertschneider.

Olmos, R. 2005. “Memoria histórica y tradición orientalizante en la iconografía ibérica.” In *El periodo orientalizante. Actas del III Simposio internacional de arqueología de Mérida: Protohistoria del Mediterráneo Occidental*, edited by S. Celestino and F. J. Jiménez, 1063-1075. Mérida: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

Pachón, J., J. Carrasco, and C. Aníbal. 2007. “Realidad imitada, modelo imaginado, o revisión de las tradiciones orientalizantes en tiempos ibéricos, a traves de la crátera de columnas de Atalayuelas (Fuerte del Rey/Torredelcampo, Jaén).” *Antiquitas* 18-19:17-42.

Pachón, J., J. Carrasco, and C. Aníbal. 1989-90. “Decoración figurada y cerámicas orientalizantes. Estado de la cuestión a la luz de los nuevos hallazgos.” *Cuadernos de prehistoria granadina* 14-15:209-272.

Pachón, J., J. Carrasco, and C. Aníbal. 2008. “El conjunto orientalizante de Cerro Alcalá (Torres, Jaén). Cuestiones de cronología, contexto e interpretación”. *Archivo de prehistoria levantina* 27:115-159.

Pachón, J., J. Carrasco, and C. Aníbal. 2009. “Producción anfórica andaluza y decoración figurativa orientalizante. Análisis interno y proyección iconográfica: el paradigma de Cerro Alcalá.” *Antiquitas* 21:71-96.

Pereira, J. 1988. “La cerámica ibérica de la cuenca del Guadalquivir. I. Propuesta de clasificación.” *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 45: 143-173.

Pereira, J., Chapa, T., Madrigal, A., Uriarte, A., and Mayoral, V., ed. 2004. *La necrópolis ibérica de Galera (Granada). La colección del Museo Arqueológico Nacional*. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.

Pereira, J., and C. Rísquez. 2006. “Las manifestaciones cerámicas en el Ibérico Antiguo en Andalucía Oriental (El Alto Guadalquivir).” In *De les comunitats locals als estats arcaics: la formació de les societats complexes a la costa del Mediterrani occidental. Homenatge a Miquel Cura*, edited by M. C. Berlarte and J. Sanmartí, 9. Barcelona: Institut Català d'Arqueologia Clàssica.

Presedo, F. J. 1982. *La Necrópolis de Baza*, *Excavaciones arqueológicas en España*. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura. Dirección General de Bellas Artes, Archivos y Bibliotecas.

Quesada, F. 1997. *El armamento ibérico: estudio tipológico, geográfico, funcional, social y simbólico de las armas en la cultura ibérica (siglos VI-I a.C.).* Montagnac: M. Mergoil.

Ramos, A., E. Rull, J. C. Aznar, M. M. Osuna, and A. M. Adroher. 2001. “La necrópolis ibérica de Basti en Cerro Largo y su estatua funeraria. Un caso de estudio de impacto arqueológico en la Depresión de Baza (Granada).” *Anuario arqueológico de Andalucía* 2:177-197.

Remesal, J. 1975. “Cerámicas orientalizantes andaluzas.” *ArchEspArch* 48 (131-132):3-21.

Rísquez, C., and M. I. Moreno. 2024. “Nuevas miradas al mundo funerario. El fenómeno de los repintados en el valle del Guadiana Menor.” In *Arturo C. Ruiz Rodríguez y la arqueología íbera en Jaén: Homenaje a 50 años de trayectoria*, edited by C. Rísquez, C. Rueda, M. Molinos, J. P. Bellón and F. Hornos, 231-240. Jaén: Universidad de Jaén.

Rodríguez, M. O. 2008. “Túgi: del sueño a la realidad.” In *Viejos yacimientos, nuevas aportaciones. Ciclo de conferencias, 10-11 de diciembre de 2008*, edited by A. Rodero and M. Barril. Madrid: Museo Arqueológico Nacional.

Rodríguez, M. O. 2014. *La necrópolis ibérica de Túgi (2000-2012)*. Jaén: Universidad de Jaén.

Rodríguez, M. O., F. R. Molina, and R. Turatti. 2001. “Trabajos de documentación arqueológica en la necrópolis ibérica de Túgi (Galera, Granada).” *Anuario arqueológico de Andalucía* 2:144-150.

Rodríguez, M. O., E. M. Montes, P. Muriel, and C. Rueda. 2023. “El santuario periurbano de Túgi (Cerro del Castillo, Galera, Granada).” *MM* 64: 136-167.

Rodríguez, D. 2019. “La vida social de la cerámica ática en la Península Ibérica: la amortización de las copas Cástulo de tipo antiguo.” *ArcEspArq* 92:71-88.

XXXXXXX

Rouillard, P. 1991. *Les Grecs et la péninsule ibérique du VIIIe au IVe siècle avant Jésus-Christ, Publications du Centre Pierre Paris*. Paris: De Boccard.

Rouillard, P. 2024. “Exchanges between the Greek World and the Iberian Peninsula from the Eighth to the Fourth Century BC.” In *The Greeks in Iberia and their Mediterranean Context*, edited by J. A. Karsilnikoff and B. Lowe, 33-50. London and New York: Routledge.

Rueda, C. 2011. *Territorio, culto e iconografía en los santuarios iberos del Alto Guadalquivir (ss. IV a.n.e-I d.n.e).* Jaén: Universidad de Jaén

Ruiz, A. 2020. “Keimelia, anastasis y otras formas de memoria en la cultura de los iberos del sur.” In *Satyrica signa: estudios de arqueología clásica en homenaje al profesor Pedro Rodríguez Oliva*, edited by J. M. Noguera, I. López and L. Baena, 143-154. Comares.

Ruiz, A., and M. Molinos. 1993. *Los íberos. Análisis de un proceso histórico.* Barcelona: Crítica.

Ruiz, A., and M. Molinos. 2022. “La secuencia genealógica de los linajes íberos a través de los paisajes de la muerte: de Baza a Cástulo.” In *El reflejo del poder en la muerte. La cámara sepulcral de Toya*, 41-92. Jaén: Universidad de Jaén.

Ruiz, A., C. Risquez, and F. Hornos. 1992. “Las necrópolis ibéricas en la Alta Andalucía.” In *Congreso de arqueología ibérica. Las necrópolis*, edited by J. Blánzquez and V. Antona, 397-430. Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.

Ruiz-Gálvez, M. 2018. “¿Sociedad de clase o sociedad de casa? Reflexiones sobre la estructura social de los pueblos de la Edad del Hierro en la Península Ibérica.” In *Más allá de las casa. Familias, linajes y comunidades en la protohistoria peninsular,* edited by A. Rodríguez, I. Pavón, and D. Duque, 13-40. Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura.

Sánchez, C. 1992a. “El comercio de productos griegos en Andalucia oriental en los siglos V y IV a.C: estudio tipológico e iconográfico de la cerámica.” Departamento de Prehistoria, Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Sánchez, C. 1992b. “Imágenes de Atenas en el mundo ibérico: análisis iconográfico de la cerámica ática del siglo IV a.C. hallada en Andalucía Oriental.” *Anuario del Departamento de Historia y Teoría del Arte* 4:23-34.

Sánchez, C. 1993. “Las crateras áticas procedentes de Galera (Granada) en el Museo Arqueológico Nacional.” *Boletín del Museo Arqueológico Nacional* 11 (1):25-54.

Sánchez, C. 1997. “Imágenes de la muerte en una tumba ibérica. El ajuar ático de la tumba 43 de Baza (Granada).” *Boletín del Museo Arqueológico Nacional* 15:37-48.

Sánchez, C. 1998. “Dioniso en el paraíso o el privilegio de la muerte.” In *En los límites de Dioniso: actas del simposio celebrado en el Museo Arqueológico Nacional: Madrid,*

20 de junio de 1997, edited by P. Cabrera and C. Sánchez, 105-118. Madrid: Museo Arqueológico Nacional.

Sánchez, C. 2000. “Los pintores del Grupo de Telos.” In *La céramique attique du IVe siècle en Méditerranée occidentale. Actes du Colloque International*, edited by B. Sabattini. Naples: Centre Jean Bérard.

Sánchez, C. 2012. “La cerámica griega en Iberia: las vajillas de mesa y representación.” In *El legado arqueológico griego en la península Ibérica*, edited by X. Aquilué and P. Cabrera, 58-66. Girona: Centro Iberia Graeca.

Sánchez. C. 2017a. “Contexts of Use of Fourth-Century Attic Pottery in the Iberian Peninsula.” In *Greek Art in Context. Archaeological and Art Historical Perspectives,* edited by D. Rodríguez, 185-198. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Sánchez, C. 2017b. “Selecting an Assemblage for the Dead. Athenian Pottery of Two Rich Burials in Baza (Granada).”*Ancient West and East* 16: 97-111.

Sánchez, C., and D. Rodríguez. 2024. “Images in Motion. Fourth Century BC Athenian Pottery from the Iberian Peninsula: Workshops and Iconography.” In *The Greeks in Iberia and Their Mediterranean Context*, edited by Jens A Krasilnikoff and B. Lowe, 160-174. London and New York: Routledge.

Sánchez, J. 2004. “La arquitectura de la necrópolis de Galera.” In *La necrópolis ibérica de Galera (Granada). La colección del Museo Arquelógico Nacional*, edited by J. Pereira, Chapa, T., Madrigal, A., Uriarte, A., and Mayoral, V., 195-212. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.

Schattner, T. G. 2002. *Zu den Megalographien in der tartessischen Vasenmalerei. MDAI(M)* 63, 154-187.

Trias, G. 1967. *Cerámicas griegas de la Península Ibérica*. Valencia: William L. Bryant Foundation.

Uriarte, A. 2011. “Los ajuares cerámicos de la necrópolis ibérica del Cerro del Santuario (Baza, Granada). Una propuesta de análisis e interpretación.” *Boletín del centro de estudios Pedro Suárez* 24:11-38.

Vidal, M.M. 1975. *La iconografía del grifo en la Península Ibérica.* Barcelona: Instituto de Arqueología y Prehistoria.

Walsh, J. 2014. *Consumerism in the Ancient World, Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies*. New York and London: Routledge.

<Endnotes>

[1] On the technology of black-gloss pottery, see Maniatis et al. 1993, and Chaviara and Aloupi 2016.

[2] On the mechanisms of long-distance trade, distribution and consumption of ancient Greek pottery, see Garés et al. 2025.

[3] Amorós and Vives-Ferrándiz 2023, 43; Dietler 1999, 146.

[4] See, e.g., Sánchez 2012, 65.

[5] Cf. the general breakdowns of red-figure vs black-gloss pottery in the Iberian Peninsula provided by Josep Miquel García in his study of the Athenian pottery from Illeta del Banyets (Alicante) (García Martín 2003, 92), with data from Pierre Rouillard's 1991 catalogue (Rouillard 1991). Although in need of revision now, they offer a good illustration of the overall picture of the distribution of both techniques in Iberia.

[6] Domínguez and Sánchez 2001, 444. Most recently, Domínguez 2025.

[7] Domínguez and Sánchez 2001, 445-448. See also, e.g., Olmos 1984, 1985.

[8] See old debate on the value of Athenian pottery between Boardman and Vickers and Gill, e.g. Boardman 1988; Gill 1991.

[9] Trias 1967; Rouillard 1991.

[10] Domínguez and Sánchez 2001.

[11] Briefly summarized, the prestige-goods theory as formulated by Frankenstein and Rowlands (1978, especially 75-84) posits that economy's political power is associated with the control of the procurement and distribution of exotic goods, which were assigned high status.

[12] Almagro-Gorbea 1982.

[13] Chapa 2023.

[14] Amorós and Vives-Ferrándiz 2023, 39. For the use of Athenian pottery in non-funerary ritual contexts, see Domínguez 2003, 143-166. Most recently, Miguel et al. 2025.

[15] García Martín 2003, 92.

[16] Fisher and van Wees 2015

[17] Ruiz and Molinos 1993, 262. *Contra* Ruiz-Gálvez 2018, 24.

[18] Rodríguez et al. 2023; Adroher 2004.

[19] The earliest instance is a mid-sixth century BCE black-figure skyphos by the Swan Group that was possibly a product of Phoenician or Phocaean trade. Cf., Gil and Olmos 1983, 35.

[20] Cabré and Motos 1920.

[21] Cabré and Motos 1920, 19, 43, 51.

[22] On the architectural aspects of the tombs of Galera, see Chapa et al. 1998, 17.

[23] Rodríguez et al. 2001, 146; Rodríguez 2014, 17-20.

[24] Rodríguez 2008, 24.

[25] We need to bear in mind though that not all Iberian elites used Athenian pottery to mark themselves off and be cautious not to infer an automatic link between Athenian pottery and elite consumption. Indeed, the recent study of the Athenian pottery from the settlement of La Bastida de les Alcusses (Valencia) by Amorós and Vives-Ferrándiz (2023) reveals the existence of heterogenous elites with differential access to goods and various strategies of self-definition, some of which involved no use of Athenian pottery at all or an emphasis on their own local tradition and attachment to the place.

[26] Rodríguez 2014: 67-68.

[27] Scholarship has usually signalled the presence of weapons in a female tomb as problematic, but that view is affected by two preconceptions: that grave-goods signal qualities or identities of the deceased in a straightforward way, and that all items of the assemblages were deposited simultaneously, which is not always the case. For an analysis that considers the diachronical dimension in the formation of the funerary assemblage that accompany the woman from tomb 155 of Baza, see, Adroher 2022.

[28] Rodríguez 2014: 69-72.

[29] Refer to the discussion on the cremated bones from this tomb in the entry for tomb 11 in the list of grave-goods and tombs in Appendix 4.

[30] XXXXX.

[31] Sánchez 1993; Domínguez and Sánchez 2001, 201-228; García 1979, 455-464; Trias 1967.

[32] Pereira 2004, 55-63.

[33] Domínguez and Sánchez 2001, 201-230.

[34] I have not subtracted those 99 fragments seen by Sánchez as they have most likely been misplaced in the storerooms, but they do exist.

[35] Rodríguez 2019.

[36] On the importance of shape vs image, see Domínguez 2022, and infra.

[37] Adroher et al. 2022, 353; Ramos et al. 2001, 178-179.

[38] Ruiz et al. 1992, 415.

[39] Adroher 1992.

[40] Adroher et al. 2022, 370-371.

[41] Presedo 1982.

[42] Gil 2009.

[43] For example, funerary structures not represented in the excavation plan, misplaced or wrongly oriented; duplicate numbering; lack of correspondence between description of tomb and graphic representation in the plan.

[44] González 2012.

[45] Gil 2009; Uriarte 2011.

[46] Adroher 1992.

[47] Caballero and Adroher 2015.

[48] Ruiz et al. 1992.

[49] Ruiz and Molinos 2022.

[50] Tomb 155 was in fact cutting an earlier burial. The latest excavations at Cerro del Santuario have revealed an older, maybe foundational tomb, numbered as 183. Cf. Caballero et al. 2013; Adroher et al. 2022.

[51] Ruiz and Molinos 2022, 45-47.

[52] Caballero et al. 2013; Adroher et al. 2022.

[53] Adroher et al. 2022, 373.

[54] Presedo 1982.

[55] Domínguez and Sánchez 2001, 184-201.

[56] https://web.iberiagraeca.net/base-documental/?lang=en

[57] Walsh 2014, 184.

[58] Uriarte 2011.

[59] Durán Farrell was a businessman who bought half of the hill of Cerro del Santuario and sponsored the excavations. Due to an old-fashioned law, he received ownership of the findings.

[60] And possibly also in tomb 131. This tomb had been extensively looted before the excavations but judging by the extent of the fragmentary material recovered, it seems likely that it originally included krater/s too.

[61] Amorós 2022. See also Codina et al. (2017) for influences of Athenian pottery on Iberian wares during the High Iberian period in Ullastret.

[62] See drawing in Sánchez 1997, 47.

[63] Domínguez and Sánchez 2001, 343, fig.99, n.98.

[64] Uriarte 2011, 33.

[65] Pierre Rouillard coined the idea of the “Andalusian service” for the association of krater and cup in the Andalusian tombs. Most recently, Rouillard 2024, 44.

[66] Most recently, see, e.g. Huerta 2023.

[67] Fernández-Chicarro 1955. Fernández-Chicarro's excavations were not published in full. Brief notes about the Athenian pottery from the site were published by Blanco (1959) and Trias (1967).

[68] Chapa et al. 1998.

[69] Chapa et al. 1998, 166.

[70] Chapa et al. 1998, 145-145, 155-156.

[71] Chapa et al. 1999.

[72] Domínguez and Sánchez 2001, 239-245.

[73] Chapa et al., 1998, 153-156.

[74] Chapa et al. 1998, 177.

[75] Chapa et al.1990, 84-85.

[76] On these, see Rodríguez 2019, 80.

[77] Chapa et al. 1998, 189.

[78] Cf. Blánquez 2000.

[79] Chapa et al. 2002-2003, 144.

[80] Amorós and Vives-Ferrándiz 2023.

[81] I use this term in a rather loose way, implying a potential selection of suitable images by the deceased or their family but leaving aside the question of specific commissions or a potential targeted market from Athens, which, to my mind, did not exist. See also Domínguez 2022. Nonetheless, it is nowadays undisputed that some of these vases travelled together and form clear production/distribution batches, as it has been convincingly demonstrated by Carmen Sánchez for the kraters and bowls from tomb 176 of Baza (Domínguez and Sánchez 2001, 453; Sánchez and Rodríguez 2024, 160-163). For some personal thoughts on commissions to Iberia in the fourth century BCE, cf. XXXX

[82] Sánchez 1992b, 1998; Cabrera 1998; Olmos and Sánchez 1995; Cabrera and Rouillard 2003; Olmos 1990; Olmos et al. 1992.

[83] Sánchez and Rodríguez 2024, 163-168.

[84] Sánchez 1992b, 1997, 2017a, 2017b. Also in Sánchez and Rodríguez 2024, 166-168.

[85] Madrid, Archaeological Museum, 1969/68/27; BAPD 6345.

[86] Sánchez 2017b, 98; Cano and Gil 2009.

[87] Madrid, Archaeological Museum, 1969/68/28; BAPD 9032330.

[88] Madrid, Archaeological Museum, 1969/68/29; BAPD 28596.

[89] On the reasons for the popularity of Amazonomachies and Gryphomachies in the Iberian Peninsula (and also in the Black Sea area), cf. Moreno and Cabrera 2014.

[90] On this, see the excellent work by Sheramy Bundrick (2019).

[91] E.g. Rueda 2011.

[92] Olmos 1987.

[93] Domínguez 2022, 90.

[94] Olmos 1987, 292.

[95] Bundrick 2019, 63-71. For the Greek vase as Etruscan cineraria, see 161-206.

[96] Cabrera 1997.

[97] Sánchez 1997, 46.

[98] On the Iberian funerary banquet, cf. Rodríguez 2018, 82-83; García 2011.

[99] Quesada 1997; Almagro-Gorbea 2005.

[100] E.g. the riders from the Iberian necropolis of Los Villares, Albacete. Cf. Blánquez 1992: 221.

[101] Most importantly, Domínguez 2022.

[102] They are attested, at least, in tombs 155 and 183 of Baza, 11, 20 and 34 of Galera and 11/145 of Castellones de Céal.

[103] *Contra,* Adroher 2022, 49, 51.

[104] Moreno 2023, 191.

[105] Adroher 2022, 49-51; Almagro-Gorbea 2008, 55.

[106] One of the urns from tomb 11/145. Cf. Chapa et al. 2015, 158.

[107] Moreno 2023, 180; Rísquez and Moreno 2024.

[108] Arturo Ruiz (2020) has recently explored the use of memory and tradition for legitimacy purposes in the Iberian period, with a focus on how these categories can be identified in the archaeological record and material culture.

[109] This is also emphasized if, following Adroher's proposal (2022, 51), we understand some of these paintings as intending to reflect textiles, since these can also embody genealogical relationships, as in the case, for example, of the Scottish clans' tartans. Most recently, remains of textiles have been found mineralized onto iron weapons in the necropolis of La Loma del Escorial de Los Nietos (Murcia). Cf. Desplanques and Cutillas-Victoria 2025.

[110] Moreno 2023, 179.

[111] Uriarte 2011, 33.

[112]The way these vessels are laid out in the tomb also reinforce their "scenographic" purpose. Cf. the four painted amphorae placed in the corners of the tombs of the Lady of Baza (155). On the grave-goods of this tomb, see most recently, Adroher 2022.

[113] DeMarrais and Robb 2013, 7.

[114] DeMarrais and Robb 2013, 7.

[115] Almagro-Gorbea 1982.

[116] Most recently, Chapa 2023, 307-309.

[117] Chapa 2023, 308.

[118] Chapa 2023, 309.

[119] On the iconography of the griffin in the Iberian Peninsula, cf. Vidal, 1975.

[120] Madrid, Archaeological Museum 28562.

[121] Blázquez 1998-1999, 96.

[122] On the Hispano-Phoenician ivory and bone plaques, cf. Aubet 1978, 1980, 1981.

[123] Vidal 1975, 66.

[124] Cf. Pachón et al. 2008

[125] Vidal 1975, 138.

[126] Cf. Negueruela 1990.

[127] Moreno and Cabrera 2014, 55; Olmos 1996 and 2002, 111.

[128] Similarly, see Dominguez's remarks on the Iberian understanding of griffins in Dominguez 2022, 88-91.

[129] For a list of the twenty-seven vases form the Iberian Peninsula bearing griffins/gryphomachies, cf. Moreno and Cabera 2014, 53.

[130] It is plausible that the larnax also had two griffins, one on each short side, but the second side is lost.

[131] Sánchez 2017, 187.

[132] Madrid, Archaeological Museum 1979/70/GAL/T.83.2

[133] Rodríguez 2014 (cd), 190 and 192, figs.215.18.

[134] The fragmentary amphoriskoi found in the recently discovered inhumation tomb 183 of Baza present a decoration that emulates that on the walls of the tomb. Cf. Caballero et al. 2013, 120, 125-126; Adroher 2022, 45. Also, for a similar dialogue between the decoration of the Lady of Baza and the gravegoods (tomb 155), cf. Moreno 2023, 186-190.

[135] Cabré and Motos 1920, 21-22.

[136] Almagro-Gorbea 2008.

[137] Almagro-Gorbea 2008, 53, 58.

[138] He dates the tomb in the first half of the fifth century and even going back to the sixth, which seems to be an excessively high chronology considering the lack of stratigraphic data and the dating of the other tombs of the area 1 of the necropolis, including tombs 11, 20 and 34.

[139] Chapa 2023, 309-316.

[140] Almagro-Gorbea 1982.

[141] The term “Orientalizing” was introduced in Spanish scholarship by Antonio García y Bellido in reference to material culture assemblages of the south of the Iberian Peninsula which exhibit influences of the Phoenician-Punic art. García y Bellido 1956, 50.

[142] Pereira and Rísquez 2006, 26.

[143] Pachón et al. 1989-90, 266. But Domínguez (1999) has argued for a Greek origin of the motifs on these “orientalizing” productions and most recently, Schattner (2022) connects them with Corinthian productions but, to my mind, the paralells are convincing. Unfortunately, space contraints do not let us delve into more detail on this point.

[144] The local Late Bronze Age tradition is seen in the existence of monochrome and bichrome productions where the painting is applied directly on the vase as it was customary in the Late Bronze Age, together with the motives used for the secondary decoration, widely attested in the painted and incised pottery productions of the indigenous Late Bronze Age (Pachón et al. 1989-90, 238). See also, Carrasco et al. 1986.

[145] Pachón et al. 1989-90, 238.

[146] Belén et al. 2004; Chaves and de la Bandera 1984; Escacena 1980; Mancebo 1998, 21.

[147] Pachón et al. 1989-90, 2009; Belén et al. 2004; Blánquez 2003; Remesal 1975; Escacena 1980.

[148] Almagro-Gorbea 1993a, 1993b, 1996.

[149] Pachón et al. 1989-90, 37-39.

[150] For an in-depth analysis of this work, see Pachón, Carrasco, and Aníbal 2007.

[151] Lechuga et al. 2022.

[152] Lechuga et al. 2022, 194-198.

[153] Lechuga et al. 2022, 198-199.

[154] On the use of the Orientalizing image in the Tartessian and Iberian periods, see Olmos 2005, 2003a, 2003b. Also, Olmos et al. 2012.