AELAW Booklet / 3

Iberian

Language / Writing / Epigraphy

Noemí Moncunill Martí

Javier Velaza Frías

INTRODUCTION[*]

The Iberian language is principally documented by more than 2000 inscriptions dated between the fifth century BCE and first century CE, drawn from a region of the Mediterranean belt that stretches from the Hérault river in French Languedoc to Almeria. It is currently an undeciphered language. We are able to read its texts fairly reliably and even analyse the briefest and most formulaic of them with some competence, but nonetheless are unable to understand its meaning. From a typological perspective, it is almost certainly an agglutinative language which may present ergative features. Its hypothetical relationships with other languages, ancient or modern, are, however, still unproven: although a relationship with Aquitanian or ancient Basque is not impossible, it is unclear whether this would be genetic or through contact.

**Unless otherwise indicated, all dates are BCE. The inscriptions are cited according to J. Untermann's *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum*, e.g. C.18.5 for inscriptions and A.78 for coin legends, or, if missing from that work, according to *Hesperia. Banco de datos de lenguas paleohispánicas* (http://hesperia.ucm.es), e.g. Z.09.24.

The study of the Iberian language, like that of the other Palaeohispanic languages, goes back to the works of the numismatists, from Antonio Agustín and Velázquez to Delgado and Zóbel de Zangróniz. They are responsible for identifying the script and deciphering the first signs. When Emil Hübner published the first corpus of pre-Roman Hispanian inscriptions at the end of the nineteenth century, however, the system of transcription was still very deficient and did not even serve to reveal that these inscriptions were in fact evidence of various languages that are very different to one another. The first major step towards decoding the Palaeohispanic signs was the work of Manuel Gómez Moreno in 1925: it was he who discovered their semi-syllabic character and who correctly distinguished the value of a large number of them. Later works, nevertheless, such as those by J. Maluquer, F. Villar, and J. Ferrer, have contributed to refining many transcriptions, and even today there are still some poorly-understood aspects, which invites the belief that a definitive decipherment remains to be achieved. The relationship between different Palaeohispanic signs also has yet to be defined, as well as the manner of its expansion and the sociocultural context in which that expansion took place.

The geographical area across which Iberian inscriptions have been found is, as previously stated, very wide. Classical sources record that this region was home to numerous peoples — *Cerretani*, *Indicetes*, *Laietani*, *Ausetani*, *Ilergetes*, *Laietani*, *Cessetani*, *Sedetani*, *Ilercavones*, *Edetani*, *Contestani*, *Oretani* and *Bastetani*, among others — whose customs and material culture, nevertheless, vary widely. The fact that, despite this, the Iberian inscriptions of these regions reflect a single language has been a source of confusion and controversy. J. de Hoz proposed that Iberian was not, in fact, the vernacular language for the whole region described, but only of Contestania and part of Edetania, and that from there it would have spread to the other areas as a *lingua franca*. The volume of inscriptions, however, is too large to have been produced by one social group alone (traders), besides which, there do not seem to be any remains of other vernacular languages, the anthroponymy is homogenously Iberian, and the cities expressed themselves epigraphically through coinage that has no significant linguistic variants. The most likely hypothesis, therefore, suggests that the Iberian language was patrimonial throughout the geographical region in which it is documented, which perhaps would have been occupied in a relatively recent past, judging by the meagre discernible evidence of dialectalisation.

The fact that Iberian is a language without close proven relatives undoubtedly limits the opportunities to decode it. There are, furthermore, only a few supposedly bilingual inscriptions, almost all fragmentary and scarcely noteworthy. The great master of Iberian studies in the twentieth century, Jürgen Untermann, developed a method of internal combinatorics for linguistic analysis which is now universally accepted and applied. In spite of all the limitations, in the last three decades, knowledge of the language has advanced notably in some areas.

WRITING

To write the Iberian language, different scripts were employed, which will be discussed below, in order of most to least common. It should be borne in mind that there is still no unanimous agreement about differentiated notation of texts written in different scripts. The following system will be used here: bold for texts written in non-dual Iberian script

(**neitinke**), bold italics for texts in dual script (***baidesbi***), italics for Graeco-Iberian texts (*naltinge*), capitals for texts in Latin script (ESCRAD[]), and Greek letters for texts in Greek (Ναλβεαδιν).

The north-eastern script

This script, also called Levantine or, simply, Iberian, is used in more than 2000 inscriptions. Like all the scripts that belong to the Palaeohispanic family, it is not an alphabet, but a semi-syllabary, which attributes a letter to each phoneme in the series of vowels (a, e, i, o, u), and of continuous voiced consonants (r, ŕ, s, ś, ḿ, m, n, l), but which behaves like a syllabary with the series of labial occlusives (ba, be, bi, bo, bu), dental occlusives (ta, te, ti, to, tu, da, de, di, do, du), and velar occlusives (ka, ke, ki, ko, ku, ga, ge, gi, go, gu). The confirmation that the north-eastern script was originally dual, meaning that it distinguished between the voiced and voiceless dental and velar series, is recent: the graphic procedure was to add an extra stroke to indicate voicelessness. There does not seem to have been graphic differentiation for the labials, perhaps because in Iberian the voiceless labial did not exist, which is apparently corroborated by its absence in Graeco-Iberian texts. Very recently, J. Ferrer proposed the existence of secondary dualities, a question which is still being debated.

The oldest inscriptions written in north-eastern script come from the end of the fifth century and the vicinity of Ullastret, but from the fourth century the system was already in use from the south of France to Valencia, and it continued in use in some places into the first century CE. From the second century, however, the variant of the script that cannot mark the opposition between voiced and voiceless became widespread; the cause of this phenomenon is still unclear.

The south-eastern script

This is also a semi-syllabary which presents an identical distribution of alphabetical and syllabogram signs as the north-eastern script. It has recently been demonstrated that it, too, had the ability to mark the opposition between voiced and voiceless in the velar and dental series, but in this case, the procedure was the inverse of the north-eastern script: the additional sign appears in the voiced variants, and the unmarked characters are voiceless. The relationship between the north-eastern and south-eastern scripts still needs to be elucidated. For a long time, it was believed that the north-eastern script derived from the south-eastern, but the arguments supporting this theory were weak and contradicted the chronology of the inscriptions, which are older in the north. The realisation that the two systems use inverse procedures for marking opposition between voiced and voiceless could suggest a common ancestor for both scripts.

The south-eastern script was in use from the fourth century to the first, in the south of the province of Valencia and in those of Alicante, Murcia, Albacete, Almería, and Jaén, although the number of surviving inscriptions is not very high (only around 70). A large number of them are written from right to left, although the most recent are written from left to right, perhaps influenced by Latin writing.

It is notable that both the north-eastern as well as the south-eastern scripts reveal deficiencies in writing the Iberian language. It is known, for example, that Iberian had occlusive consonants at the end of syllables and in the absolute final position in words — as is demonstrated by forms in Graeco-Iberian alphabet, such as *ganikbos* and *boistingisdid* — whose explicit notation is impeded by the syllabic nature of the script in these series. This is most probably evidence that, in fact, neither of the two graphic varieties was originally created to write the Iberian language.

The Graeco-Iberian script

This script, in which only a little over 30 inscriptions are known, was used during the fourth century in a fairly small area across the provinces of Alicante and Murcia. It was in fact an alphabet, borrowed from the Phocaean, whose presence and activity in the area are revealed by archaeological evidence. The Iberians adapted this alphabet with minimal modifications: they employed the *omicron* for the Iberian o and the *eta* for the e; they assigned the *sampi* and the *sigma* to each of the two sibilants; and used a diacritic tilde to mark the difference between the two vibrants in Iberian.

Latin and Greek alphabet

Only very exceptionally, the Iberian language was written on a few occasions in Latin alphabet. This happened, for example, in the mosaic of La Alcudia (G.12.4), in which only a few names appear; more obscure, in contrast, is the interpretation of an inscription on stone from the necropolis of Cástulo (H.6.1), with elements unquestionably in Latin, and other indigenous elements which cannot with confidence be classified as Iberian language. Finally, the use of the Greek alphabet should be considered merely episodic: until now, it has been documented only in a graffito from Ampurias (C.1.9), and perhaps also in a pair of graffiti, both with the same name, on two skyphoi from Peyriac de Mer (Hesp. AUD.7.1 and 2).

LANGUAGE

As said above, the Iberian language remains undeciphered. Our knowledge of its phonetics and phonology, its morphology, its syntax and its lexicon remain deficient, but the most reliable data and some of the more commonly accepted theories are described below.

Phonetics and phonology

Our data on the phonetics and phonology of Iberian are limited by the writing systems used and by the uncertainties that still accompany the transcription of some signs. For vowels, there seems to have been a pentavocalic system /a-e-i-o-u/, and there is no evidence of an opposition of quantity; this is confirmed in the Graeco-Iberian script, which dispensed with the *omega* and *epsilon*, although this question should perhaps be

reconsidered if the existence is confirmed of a dual system for vowel signs as well. The most common diphthongs are /ai/, /ei/, /oi/ and /au/, but /eu/ and /ou/ may also have existed, which are more rarely documented. Two series may be identified of velar and dental occlusives, which are usually interpreted as voiced-voiceless, although the opposition may also be of another type: for example, /t/ and /d/; /k/ and /g/. This opposition does not seem to have existed consistently in the labial series, although, on one hand, some labial syllabograms seem to have an additional stroke and, on the other hand, what are likely to be voiceless labials are found in Latin transcriptions such as ESTOPELES, or Greek ones such as ΒΑΣΠΕΔ[---. Normally, it is accepted that there was only a single continuant, but the question must remain open because some alphabetic inscriptions seem to include a graphic symbol of [l] with a diacritic stroke, in addition to which, a sign always associated with /l/ is recorded in the Iberian syllabary, with which it could have formed a digraph which would be used precisely to mark this second lateral sound.

It is certain that two vibrants existed, which are conventionally transcribed as **r** and **ŕ**, but whose type of opposition is unclear; the fact that the Celtiberians took the second to write the only vibrant in their language would speak in favour of that one being the unmarked one, and, in fact, that is the same vibrant that appears written without a diacritic in the Graeco-Iberian script. Two letters are also recorded for sibilants, **s** and **ś**, but in this case, too, the data are not illuminating enough to be able to determine their features: perhaps one of them could have been fricative and the other palatal or affricate — in possible adaptations of Gaulish names ending in *-rix* to Iberian, the use of the marked sibilant could be significant here — but the question remains open. The situation is no clearer for nasals: if in the south-eastern and Graeco-Iberian scripts there does not appear to have been more than one character for nasals, in the north-eastern script there are three, whose relationship is obscure. Two of those could correspond to /n/ and /m/, but the third, which is transcribed here as **ḿ**, appears in contexts in which its value is more debatable: this is the case with the common suffix **-ḿi** — which in Graeco-Iberian seems to correspond to *-nai* — and which appears in pre- or inter-consonant sequences such as **ḿlbe-** and **-nḿkei**, which means it could correspond to a nasal sound formed with a vocalic element.

Morphology

Iberian morphology is still poorly understood. As this chapter will demonstrate, we can identify personal names with some reliability, which has to a certain extent assisted the analysis of sequences and the isolation of recurring morphological elements.

There are, for example, a series of suffixes that usually accompany anthroponyms: the most characteristic are **-ar** (*biuŕtaŕ-ar* C.1.31) and **-en** (**iltiŕbikis-en** F.5.1), which can occasionally appear isolated by interpunctuation, and which are found in texts whose content seems to indicate possession or dedication. The previously-mentioned **-ḿi** (**leisir-en-ḿi** AUD.5.38a, **ḿlbebiuŕ-ar-ḿi** B.41.2) is usually associated with them, although it can also appear alone (**ikonḿkei-ḿi** E.8.1), or in more complex sequences; it may perhaps have a value approaching the pronominal. Other relatively common suffixes following anthroponyms are **-e**, which at least in some contexts seems to designate the recipient of the text, and **-ka**, which is repeatedly documented in front of numeral

expressions, probably indicating the people who have lent or owe some quantity. The suffix **-te**, widely documented, will be discussed below.

In some Iberian coinage, the suffix **-ken** or **-(e)sken** is documented, which accompanies toponymic forms: **neron-ken** (A.1), **auśes-ken** (A.7), **untikes-ken** (A.96), **laieś-ken** (A.13), etc. These have been interpreted as ethnonyms, from **untikesken** / ΕΜΠΟΡΙΤΩΝ. The element **-o** may also form toponyms, such as in the cases of *Lauro* (<**lauŕ-o**) and *Ilturo* (<**iltur-o**). The sequence **usekeŕte-ku**, documented in the mosaic from Caminreal (K.5.3 = E.7.1), allows the isolation of the suffix **-ku**, although its value is far from clear. A suffix **-r** can also apparently be isolated after some toponymical forms, such as, for example, in **iltiŕtar** (A.6) and **śaitir** (A.35).

There are few Iberian words that can be characterised with any reliability as common nouns — although, as discussed later, some of the formant elements of personal names must surely be such. The word **eban**, which recurs after two personal names, may perhaps mean 'son' (other authors consider it a verbal form); its feminine form would be **teban**. If this equivalence is correct, the possibility arises that Iberian used a dental prefix to form the feminine — which could be supported by series of pairs such as **olor / t-olor**, **oŕtin / t-oŕtin**, **unti / t-unti**, **uŕki / t-uŕki**, **leis / ti-leis**, **lauŕ / ti-lauŕ**, **baś / ti-baś**, **bilos / ti-bilos**, **beŕi / ti-beŕi**. In addition, the word **seltar** could have a similar meaning to 'tomb' and the term **iltiŕ** has been interpreted within the semantic field as something like 'city', principally from the presence of this root in pre-Roman toponymy, although it has not been possible to confirm the meaning of this term directly in the Iberian texts. Other words seem closely related to a particular semantic field, which is determined by the support on which they are habitually documented: thus, for example, the term **kaśtaun**, and some of its variants, always appears on spindle whorls; **eŕiar** always appears on painted ceramic vases from Llíria; **baikar** on certain vessels, perhaps with a ritual function; **bitiar/betiar** on silver plates from Abengibre, etc. It is therefore believed that these words could also belong to the common lexicon. Several of these forms could be followed by an element **-ban**, which, it has been suggested, may be interpreted as a determinant; in fact, some researchers use the presence of a structure X-**ban** or PN-**ar/en**+X as a method for identifying possible common nouns.

Verb morphology remains a little-explored field. A verbal character could possibly be attributed to the form **ekiar**, which is repeatedly documented following a personal name, generally with the suffix **-te**, in inscriptions that may indicate authorship; a minority of scholars consider the word a substantive. There may also perhaps be a verb in the expression **aŕe teki / aŕe take**, which in one bilingual inscription seems to be translating the formula *hic situs(-a) est*. Deducing from context, words such as **iunstir** and even **śalir** could also belong to the verbal category, although others consider the latter a substantive. The sequence most commonly agreed to possess a verbal character, however, is represented by a paradigm comprising forms such as *]**dinbaś-te-eŕoke** C.17.1,A-1; **baśtu<u>bar</u>er-te-ŕokan-utur** D.0.1,A; **basikor-te-ŕ[oka]n-sba** H.0.1,B.b-1; **śalaiaŕkis-te-ŕokan** C.21.10,2, **]kaul-te-biteŕokan** H.0.1,B.b-3, and others like them. It is possible that present in those amalgams may be various agglutinated morphemes.

The existence of pronominal paradigms has been postulated for generally brief elements such as **aŕe**, **baŕ**, **baś**, **eta**, **iŕ**, and **bin**, but, although such forms can undeniably be isolated, their value has yet to be confirmed.

In recent years, a relationship has been proposed between a series of elements from the Iberian lexicon and forms of Basque numerals: **erdi** / *erdi* would be ½; **ban** / bat would be 1; **bi(n)** / *bi* 2; **lau(r)** / *lau(r)* 4; **bors(te)** / *bortz* 5; **śei** / *sei* 6; **sisbi** / *zazpi* 7; **sorse** / *zortzi* 8; **(a)baŕ** / *(h)amar* 10; **oŕkei** *(h)ogei* 20. These elements are also documented in apparent composition, in forms such as **oŕkeikelaur** (D.12.1). The hypothesis is still under discussion, but, without anticipating the consequences for linguistic history that may result, it is certain that the formal similarities are very striking.

Syntax

Detecting syntactic structures in Iberian texts paradoxically becomes more complicated the longer the text in question. In some of the shortest and most formulaic it is possible, nevertheless, to try to identify interesting structural phenomena.

The formula PN**te ekiar** occurs frequently, for example, documented in instances such as **kaŕesiŕ-te-ekiar** F.13.3,1; **śaleibeki-t(e)-ekiar** F.13.4; **neŕsetikan-t(e)-ekiar-m̂i[** F.15.1; **unskel-t(e)-ekiar** F.13.21; **iltubokon-t(e)-ekiar** F.11.28; **aŕsbikis-te-ekiar** A.33-2 (some texts, mostly from the south of France, seem to register a variant *tagiar*: **biuŕbedi-tagiar** B.8.20; **latubaŕen-tagiar** B.1.364; **ibeitigeŕ-tagiar** B.7.32, **biuŕko-tagiar** B.7.32, etc.). In all these cases, the epigraphic context indicates that the personal name corresponds to someone who does something, or who ensures that something is done. The formula PN**-te** can also be detected followed by other elements like **iuśtir** (**betukine-te iuśtir** F.17.2,B.a; **sakaŕatin-te iuśtir** F.17.2,A-1; **saltutibai-te iumstiŕ** F.13.5), like **śalir** (**bilosiun-te-śalir[** F.17.1,A-1; **aiunortin-ite śalir-otanai** C.21.6,B-2**;]ultibeika-te śalir** C.21.6,B-3), or like the amalgam of a verbal character, mentioned above (**śalaiaŕkis-te-ŕokan** C.21.10,2, among many others). All these examples seem to suggest that in such phrases, the subject is the element marked with a suffix which may perhaps have a value approaching that of the ergative, or of an antipassive structure, as some authors propose.

In the identification of other syntactic phenomena, such as group flexion or coordination, efforts so far can only be considered working hypotheses. The data currently available to determine Iberian word order are not sufficient to say anything with confidence. In nominal syntagmata formed by two elements, it seems that the nucleus preferably occupies the second position, which can seemingly be deduced from forms like **iltiŕtaśalir**, which can be interpreted as the **śalir** of **iltiŕta**, and **kalunseltar**, the **seltar** of **kalu(n)**. In terms of phrase structure, it had been believed that some indications pointed to an SOV typology, but some inscriptions discovered more recently seem to fit an OSV structure, in some cases, and an SVO structure in others. In any case, there remains much exploration to be done in this field.

ANTHROPONOMY

As previously stated, the area of Iberian lexicon best known to modern scholarship is that of anthroponomy. The process of the formation of Iberian personal names was elucidated, however, thanks to a Roman document known as the Ascoli Bronze, or *Turma Salluitana* (CIL I² 709), which granted citizenship to a series of Hispanian soldiers who

served under Pompey Strabo. Names such as *Sanibelser Adingibas f(ilius), Vmargibas Luspangibas f(ilius),* and *Balciadin Balcibil f(ilius)* revealed that Iberian names were largely bimember — with some exceptions, such as *Beles* — and formed by two elements which, furthermore, could on occasions constitute the first or the second element of the compound (as may be observed from the pair *Balci-adin / Adin-gibas*).

Extrapolating this formative system to the Iberian epigraphic corpus made it possible to corroborate what was observed in the Ascoli Bronze, and to add some further evidence:

1. The majority of Iberian personal names are composed of simple formants, the approximate number of which now reaches almost two hundred. Some of the most common are **adin**, **balke**, **baś**, **beleś**, **bilos**, **biuŕ**, **ildiŕ**, **ildur**, **iskeŕ**, **sosin**, **taŕ** and **tigeŕ**.
2. Some examples, such as **iunstirlaku** F.9.5 and **iunstibas** K.1.3 I-49, have demonstrated something which in any case seems natural: that beyond onomastic composition, the formants can be independent words that belong to different categories.
3. Some of those simple elements can appear in first or second position in the compound, but some seem to have a clear tendency to occupy one or the other of those positions.
4. In a small number of cases, the second element is monosyllabic, such as in **śani·ko** (F.20.3), **lauŕ·to** (C.2.4), and *Biur·no* (CIL I² 709), although it is unknown whether this characteristic differentiates them in some way from those in the canonical form.
5. A few instances can be singled out in which — at least apparently — the composition procedure is altered by a prefix (**is·betar·tiker** F.11.3, **o·tikiŕ·tekeŕ** C.2.10) or an infix (**oto·iltiŕ** versus **oto·ke·iltiŕ** F.21.1).
6. In some Latin inscriptions, Iberian feminine names appear which seem to have specific elements entering their composition, like *-(iaun)in* (e.g. *Bastogaunin* CIL II 6144, *Galduriaunin* CIL II 5922 and VNINAVNIN H.6.1) or *-eton* (*Bileseton* CIL II 3537, *Sergeiton* CIL II 2114). Other evidence suggests, however, that a feminine name did not have to be restricted to these particular formants (e.g. *Asterdumari* CIL II 5840).
7. We know barely any Iberian theonyms. The example of *Salaeco*, however, found in Cartagena, which seems to contain the formants **śalai·ko**, suggests that the formation process of theonyms was at least sometimes comparable to that of personal names.

EPIGRAPHY

The Iberians' adoption of writing is explained within the framework of cultural contacts, established within the colonial context. Although the earliest datable Iberian inscription is usually believed to be a graffito on Attic pottery whose support dates back to the end of the fifth century (C.2.30), it is likely that by this period, those Iberians who traded with the Greeks would already have adopted from them the habit of using lead as the support for their commercial correspondence and their account-keeping. Evidence of this may be provided by Greek leads that appeared in Pech Maho and Ampurias, and mention in their texts people with Iberian names who participated in their transactions. During the fourth and third centuries, nevertheless, the use of writing seems restricted to precisely this commercial class, and did not extend to other epigraphic functions. As well as the leads with probably epistolary content (in some, the name of the sender or recipient is clearly

preserved separately), to this period should be attributed stamped inscriptions related to the production and/or distribution of *dolia* and amphorae, and a large number of graffiti on pottery which inform us, at the very least, of a certain spread of the habit of writing. To the Greek model should likewise be attributed a small number of *ostraka* about whose function little can be said.

At the end of the third century, a certain expansion of literacy into other areas may be detected: for example, at least some of the rock graffiti found in recent years in the region of la Cerdanya seem to date to this period, to which it is also possible to ascribe a votive function. At the close of that century is also dated the oldest coin inscribed in Iberian script, minted — surely not by chance — in *Arse*, Sagunto, one of the most prosperous cities of that time.

It would be necessary to wait, however, until well into the second century and the influence of Roman presence to witness the emergence of Iberian epigraphy in such areas as funerary, monumental, and perhaps honorary inscriptions. At that time, writing started to be added to funerary stelae of the indigenous tradition which, until that moment, had only displayed an iconographic language; it is possible to trace how writing gradually won a role on stelae until it became the only protagonist. In some cities, like Ampurias, Iberian inscriptions were produced in the same epigraphic workshops as their contemporary Greek and Roman ones, and even share with them a common epigraphic landscape, were it the necropolis or the forum of the city itself. During the second and first centuries, Iberian inscriptions would not only become a feature of collective self-representation, through the production of civic coinage, but also probably of self-representation by their élite, in sanctuaries such as those of Muntanya Frontera and Cerro de los Santos.

The use of Iberian script would thus extend, in some places, until the end of the first century BCE and the start of the first century CE: the bilingual inscription on the architrave from Sagunto, and that found in the theatre of the same city, perhaps one of the *subsellia* from the *cavea*, very probably represent some of the latest surviving examples, just before the final abandonment of the Iberian script and the wholesale adoption of the Latin alphabet and language.

SURVEY OF INSCRIPTIONS

It is difficult to give an exact number of all the known Iberian inscriptions, since the corpus is constantly growing and being restructured. Excluding marks without clear graphemic value, and single-sign inscriptions, more than 2,250 inscriptions can currently be numbered. Some of those comprise more than one text, although many others present only brief sequences, sometimes of only two or three signs.

Of these 2,250 inscriptions, it is calculated that some 700 use the north-eastern script system in its dual variant, and that they are, therefore, actually from the pre-Roman period; from the same period come approximately 35 inscriptions in Graeco-Iberian and at least 17 of the inscriptions in south-eastern script. This would mean that broadly a third of the Iberian epigraphic corpus is datable between the fifth and third centuries, and the remaining two thirds in the Roman period.

I. Coin legends: *c.* 230
    a. We have evidence of almost a hundred Iberian mints, which produced some 230 legends. The oldest, which principally issued drachmas that imitated Emporitan ones (210-180), number no more than 50 and produced not more than one legend in each case. During the second to first centuries, in contrast, more than 50 known mints produced some 180 different legends.
II. Inscriptions on metal: *c.* 155
    a. 127 on lead: of this total, more than 115 are sheets or plaques; approximately 10 other inscriptions survive on different objects, like monetiform leads, shots, a slingshot, a pair of ingots, etc. Many of these pieces were chance discoveries, which means they are not datable by archaeological context. Using both palaeographic and archaeological criteria, some 27 could date back to the fifth to third centuries (10 of those use the Graeco-Iberian script and 17 are clearly written in dual script); 10 date from between the end of the third and start of the second centuries; at least 13 come from the second to first centuries. The chronology of the rest of the pieces (over half) is, however, unknown.
    b. 20 on silver: principally on *paterae* and luxury bowls; there is also some jewellery, such as a ring. From this collection, at least 13 artifacts date from the fifth to third centuries and 7 from the second to first; the chronology is unknown in one case (the ring).
    c. 5 on bronze: 3 are sheets and the remaining two monetiform objects. They seem largely to be pieces from the Roman period (second to first century).
    d. A single inscription on iron is known, a falcata, datable between the fourth to third centuries.
III. Inscriptions on pottery: *c.* 1600
    a. The principal techniques used are graffito, either *ante* or *post cocturam* (*c.* 1400), painting (*c.* 132) and stamping (*c.* 72).
    b. The most common supports are: every type of receptacle (*c.* 1450), from containers such as *dolia* or amphorae, to imported luxury ceramics, via common vessels for domestic use; objects used for weaving and spinning are also common, such as loom weights (*c.* 116) and spindle whorls (*c.* 26). In smaller quantities, there are also some *ostraka* (around 10), amphora covers, and even some game pieces.

Regarding the chronology of the inscriptions on ceramics, some 250 date from the fifth to third centuries and around 800 from the second to first centuries; the rest are of uncertain date. Palaeographic criteria, however, suggest that at least 600 graffiti would be compatible with the dual system of writing and would thus belong to the earliest period.

IV. Inscriptions on stone: *c.* 270
    a. Around 50 inscribed rocks are known, with some 150 texts in total. The majority of those are concentrated in the Pyrenees region, where 37 inscribed rocks have been recorded (vs. another 10 distributed throughout the rest of the territory). These inscriptions cannot be dated by archaeological context, but, according to a rough calculation, more than half of those documented in Pyrenean la Cerdanya could be written in the

dual system, and would therefore pre-date the Roman period (fifth to third centuries).

b. Slightly more than 10 graffiti on walls or building materials, such as an adobe or brick. Within this group, the most important collection is that of the four inscriptions from Minerva Tower, in Tarragona's Roman wall (third to second centuries).

c. Around 70 are distributed among stelae and stones, mostly funerary.

d. The corpus also includes 10 plaques, which are principally concentrated in Ampurias, and, to a larger extent, in Sagunto.

e. At least 5 are found on pedestals, all of which come from the sanctuary in Muntanya Frontera, near Sagunto.

f. Approximately ten are documented on loom weights and weights.

g. Among other, less common supports are found: no more than 6 statues, 2 arulae, 1 slab, a small plaque in the shape of a label, some ashlars, architrave, a catapult ball, and even personal objects, such as a pendant.

Apart from the rock inscriptions, the chronology of the Iberian inscriptions on stone is principally from the Roman period. The only exceptions would be a few southern inscriptions, a pair of inscriptions from the south of France (the Pech Maho slab and the so-called Cruzy stone), and two inscriptions from Ullastret (a stone block of unknown function, and an ashlar from the city wall).

V. Miscellaneous

There are a small number of inscriptions on rare supports such as, for example, a pair of inscriptions on bone (second to first centuries) and two mosaics, also from the Roman period.

THREE IBERIAN INSCRIPTIONS

Inscription on lead from La Serreta, Alcoy, Alicante (G.1.1)

Rectangular lead sheet, 17.1 x 6.2 cm. It is inscribed on both sides, using the Graeco-Iberian script. The letters measure around 0.5 cm. It was discovered, folded, in 1921 in the excavations of the town of La Serreta, and can be dated to the fourth century. It is conserved in the Museo Arqueológico de Alcoy.

Face A, text I:

iŕike : orti : gaŕokan : dadula : baśk : / buiśtiner : bagaŕok : sssX< : tuŕlbai/luŕa : / leguśegik : baseŕokeiunbaida : / uŕke : basbidiŕbartin : iŕike : baseŕ/okar : tebind : / belagaśikauŕ : isbin/ai : asgandis : tagisgaŕok : binike/bin : śalir : kidei : gaibigait :

Face A, text II:

sakaŕiskeŕ/arnai :

Face B:

iunstir : śalirg : basiŕtiŕ : sabaŕi/dai : birinaŕ : guŕś : boiśtingiśdid : / seśgeŕśduŕan : sesdiŕgadedin : / seŕaikala : naltinge : bidudedin : ildu/niŕaenai : bekoŕ : sebagediŕan

Bibliography: R. Vicedo, *Historia de Alcoy y su región*, Alcoy 1922, p. 161; M. Gómez-Moreno, "De epigrafía ibérica. El plomo de Alcoy", *REF* 9, 1922, pp. 341-66; H. Schuchardt, "Die Bleitafel von Alcoy", *RIEV* 14, 1923, pp. 507-511 (= "El plomo de Alcoy", *ibid.* 512-516); J. Cejador, *Ibérica I: Alfabeto e inscripciones ibéricas*, Barcelona 1926, pp. 137 ff.; G. Bähr, *Baskisch und Iberisch*, Bayona 1948, pp. 401-415; J. Vallejo, "Exploraciones ibéricas IV", *Emerita* 22, 1954, pp. 227-257; M. L. Albertos, "Lenguas primitivas de la Península Ibérica", *Boletín Sancho el Sabio* 17, 1973, p. 92; M. Beltrán Lloris, "La palabra ibérica iunstir, el plomo de Alcoy y algunos problemas de vascoiberismo", *Homenaje P. Beltrán*, 1974, pp. 27-66; D. Fletcher and L. Silgo, "El plomo ibérico escrito Serreta I. Comentarios y traducciones", *Recerques del Museu d'Alcoi* I, 1992, pp. 9-36.

The first text on face A is perhaps a letter written for commercial purposes, which may be deduced by the presence of numerals and words common to this type of document. The sheet was later used to write a second letter, perhaps the response to the previous one, which was written on the opposite face; the name of the recipient of the second letter, *sakaŕiskeŕ*, was written in the second text on face A, which must have remained visible once the lead was folded.

Architrave of Sagunto, Valencia (F.11.8)

Parallelepiped block of local sandstone broken into two pieces which fit together; the left hand fragment is mutilated and the right hand one perhaps complete (14) x (50) x 24 cm. There are two lines of text: the top line is in Latin letters, the bottom in non-dual north-eastern Iberian script. The letters measure *c.* 4 cm. The two fragments were found separately, without archaeological context. It can be dated to the early first century. It is preserved in the Museo Arqueológico de Sagunto.

[---]IVS M(arci) · L(ibertus) ISIDORVS · COERAV[it?]

[---]++ŕ · tebanen · otar · koroto[---]

Bibliography: CIL II 6342; F. Fita, "Noticias", *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 20, 1892, p. 208; M. Gómez-Moreno, "La escritura ibérica y su lenguaje", *Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia* 112, 1943; A. Tovar, "Ibérico eban 'piedra'", *Boletín de la Real Academia Española* 25, 1946; A. García y Bellido, "Die Latanisierung Hispaniens", *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt* I, 1, 1972, p. 487; F. Roca, "Una inscripción latino-ibérica inédita en Sagunto", *Arse* 13, 1974; J. Untermann, "Inscripciones sepulcrales ibéricas", *Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología Castellonenses* 10, 1984, pp. 111-119; J. Velaza, "Iberisch *-eban, -teban*", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 104, 1994, pp. 142-150; J. Rodríguez, "El término (t)eban(en) en la lengua íbera: *'coeravit'* vs. *'filius'*", *Arse* 35, 2001, pp. 59-85; J. Velaza, "*Eban, teban,* diez años después", *Estudios deLenguas y Epigrafía Antiguas* 5, 2004, pp. 199-210.

This is one of the few known bilingual Iberian inscriptions, which means it has frequently been used in the literature to look for lexical equivalents. Judging by the analysis of the sequence of its terms, however, it is not certain that the texts are equivalent. Its probable function as an architrave also renders it exceptional, since it makes it one of the few Iberian inscriptions intended to be placed on a building.

3. Pavement from La Caridad, Caminreal, Teruel (E.7.1)

Pavement laid in *opus signinum*, decorated with black and white tesserae. It measures 9.20 x 6.50 m. The inscription is situated within a cartouche of white tesserae 0.19 x 2.46 m. The text uses non-dual north-eastern Iberian script. The letters measure 16 cm. It was discovered in 1984 at the site of La Caridad, where it is preserved *in situ.* It can be dated to the second half of the second century.

likinete · ekiar · usekeŕteku

Bibliography: J. D. Vicente, "El yacimiento de 'La Caridad' (Caminreal, Teruel)", *Arqueología Aragonesa*, 1984, pp. 83-91; L. Silgo, "Las inscripciones ibéricas de los mosaicos de Camínreal (Teruel) y Andelos (Navarra)", in J. I. Adiego *et al.* (eds.), *Studia palaeohispanica Untermann oblata*, Barcelona 1993, pp. 281-286; J. D. Vicente, Mª. P. Punter, C. Escriche and A. I. Herce, "Las inscripciones de la 'Casa de **likine**' (Caminreal, Teruel)", *Actas V Coloquio de Lenguas y Culturas Paleohispánicas*, Salamanca 1993, pp. 747-72; J. Velaza, "Ibérico *-te*", *Palaeohispanica* 2, 2002, pp. 273-275; E. R. Luján, "Las inscripciones musivas ibéricas del valle medio del Ebro: una hipótesis lingüística", *Palaeohispanica* 10, 2010, pp. 289-301; F. Beltrán, "¿Firmas de artesano o sedes de asociaciones comerciales? A propósito de los epígrafes musivos de Caminreal (E.7.1), Andelo (K.28.1) y El Burgo de Ebro (*HEp* 11, 2001, 621 = *AE* 2001, 1237)", in: E. Luján and J. M. García Alonso (eds.), *A Greek man in the Iberian Street. Papers in Linguistics and Epigraphy in Honour of Javier de Hoz*, Innsbruck 2011, pp. 139-147; I. Simón, "Epigrafía ibérica en espacios domésticos", *Antesteria* 1, 2012, pp. 273-275; I. Simón, "Treinta años de investigaciones sobre la inscripción musiva de Caminreal (Hispania Citerior; *MLH* E.7.1 = K.5.3), *Palaeohispanica* 15, 2015, pp. 87-127.

The inscription of La Caridad has generated extensive discussion among researchers, especially because of its striking similarity to another pavement with very similar characteristics discovered in Andelo, Navarra (K.28.1), and, further away, to the Roman one found at the site of la Cabañeta, el Burgo de Ebro, near Zaragoza (AE 2001, 1237).

It is indisputable in this case that the language in which the text is written is Iberian. In it can be identified a personal name, **likine**, and a toponym, **usekeŕte** with the suffix **-ku**, corresponding to the city of *Osicerda* mentioned in the ancient sources, which minted coins with the Iberian legend **usekerte** (A.26). Although the debate remains open, it is possible that **likine** was the benefactor who funded the building, probably of public or collegiate character, rather than the artisan who laid the pavement.

Further Reading

For a general introduction, see J. Velaza, *Epigrafía y lengua ibéricas,* Madrid 1996 and J. de Hoz, *Historia lingüística de la Península Ibérica en la antigüedad* vols. I and II, Madrid 2010 and 2011. The standard reference catalogue for the study of Iberian inscriptions is the *Monumenta Linguarum Hispanicarum* by Jürgen Untermann, published between 1975 and 2000. The volumes that concern Iberian directly are vol. I, with coin inscriptions, (Wiesbaden 1975); vol. II, containing Iberian inscriptions from the south of France (Wiesbaden 1980); and vol. III, which includes an introductory section, whith maps, tables cataloguing the signs and their allographs, and anthroponymic indices, as well as lists of suffixes and lexemes etc., and a second part with the corpus of Iberian inscriptions found in Spain (Wiesbaden 1990). Also useful are: J. Untermann, *Iberische Bleiinschriften in Südfrankreich und im Empordà*, Berlin 2014; for inscriptions on stone and stamped inscriptions: I. Simón, *Los soportes de le epigrafía paleohispánica. Inscripciones sobre piedra, bronce y cerámica*, Zaragoza 2013.

The Iberian epigraphic corpus is currently being re-edited and updated on the online database, Hesperia (open access at: http://hesperia.ucm.es), a project undertaken by a group of researchers from various universities, mainly Spanish. New inscriptions are published principally in *Palaeohispanica. Revista sobre lenguas y culturas de la Hispania antigua*. This journal also regularly publishes a *Chronica Epigraphica*, which collates developments which have been circulated in other publications. The journal now also publishes the proceedings of the Coloquia on Palaeohispanic Languages and Cultures, of which there have been eleven editions to date.

Various Iberian lexica exist, which collect all the words documented in the epigraphic texts. The most recent, and therefore up-to-date, are: J. Velaza, *Léxico de las inscripciones ibéricas (1976-1989)*, Barcelona 1991; N. Moncunill, *Lèxic d'inscripcions ibèriques (1991-2006)*, Barcelona 2007. On anthroponymy: J. Gorrochategui, "La onomástica aquitana y su relación con la ibérica", *Lengua y cultura en la Hispania prerromana*, Salamanca 1993, pp. 609-633; A. Marques de Fária, "Crónica de onomástica paleo-hispânica" (published between 2000-2015, in *Revista Portuguesa de Arqueologia*); J. Untermann, "La onomástica ibérica", *Iberia* 1, 1998, pp. 73-85; N. Moncunill, *Els noms personals ibèrics a l'epigrafia antiga de Catalunya,* Barcelona 2010; J. Rodríguez, "Nuevo Índice Crítico de formantes de compuestos de tipo onomástico íberos", *Arqueoweb: Revista sobre Arqueología en Internet*, vol. 15.1, 2014, pp. 1-158. On phonetics and morphology, recently: A. Quintanilla, *Estudios de fonología ibérica*, Vitoria 1998; E. Orduña, *Segmentación de textos ibéricos y distribución de los segmentos*, Tesis Doctoral UNED, Madrid, 2005. On the subject of Iberian numerals and their implications for the Vasco-Iberian hypothesis, a line of enquiry currently receiving great interest: E. Orduña, "Sobre algunos posibles numerales en textos ibéricos", *Palaeohispanica* 5, 2005, pp. 491-506; J. Ferrer, "El sistema de numerales ibérico: avances en su conocimiento", *Palaeohispanica* 9, 2009, pp. 451-479; J. Lakarra, "Haches, diptongos y otros detalles de alguna importancia: notas sobre numerales (proto)vascos y comparación vasco-ibérica (con un apéndice sobre hiri y otro sobre bat-bi)", *Veleia* 27, 2010, pp. 191-238; E. Orduña, "Los numerales ibéricos y el protovasco", *Veleia* 28, 2011, pp. 125-139.

An overview of current research into Palaeohispanic scripts can be found in: J. Ferrer, N. Moncunill and J. Velaza, "Towards a systematisation of Palaeohispanic scripts in Unicode: synthesising multiple transcription hypotheses into two consensus encodings", *Palaeohispanica* 15, 2015, pp. 13-55.

[[[PIES DE FOTO]]]

MAPA 1: Poner el mapa y el pie de figura que aparece al comienzo de "Celtiberian"

Figs 1-6. Iberian coins which mention different ethnonyms (A.7, A.6, and A.13).

Some of the Iberian settlements mentioned by ancient geographers and historians can also be identified in the coins issued in Iberian language and script. From left to right are

the legends untikesken, associated with Indigetes (Plin. *NH*. III 21), auśesken, associated with Ausetani (Plin. *NH*. III 23), and laieśken, associated with Laeetani (Plin. *NH*. III 21), all situated in the area of modern-day Catalonia.

Figs 7-8. Bilingual stelae from Tarragona (C.18.5 and C.18.6).

These two inscriptions, found in the port of Tarragona in 1749 and 1801 respectively and now lost, are known thanks to various historical drawings, such as these by Alexandre de Laborde (*Voyage pittoresque et historique de l'Espagne*, Paris 1806). They are among the few known examples of bilingual Iberian inscriptions. As may be observed, the texts are very short. The fact that the onomastics are not repeated in the Latin and Iberian parts makes it impossible to determine if the inscriptions were equivalent, complementary, or if they simply reveal the re-use of the support and, therefore, that the texts were in fact independent. In any case, from these two examples it is generally accepted that the Iberian expression **aŕe take** or **aŕe teki**, which is documented repeatedly on stone inscriptions, could correspond to the Latin *hic situs est,* and therefore constitute a characteristic element of a funerary formula.

Figs 9-10. Face A of the Ullastret Lead, Girona (C.2.3).

Inscriptions on lead are highly characteristic of Iberian epigraphic practice. This example is inscribed in north-eastern Iberian script in its dual variant (fifth to third centuries).

Fig. 11. Drawing of face B of the lead from la Bastida de les Alcusses, in Moixent, Valencia (G.7.2).

This lead, datable to the fourth century, is a good example of south-eastern Iberian script in its dual variant. The direction of the text runs from right to left, which is usual practice in this script system. In the text, it is possible to identify a series of personal names followed by suffixes and quantities, expressed in this case with a series of dots arranged vertically. For this reason, it may be attributed a function related to accounting, perhaps at the mill at which it was found. This sheet also stands out because the text was crossed out almost in its entirety, perhaps to indicate that the debt had been repaid.

Figs 12-13. Lead from El Cigarralejo, Mula, Murcia (G.13.1).

The lead from El Cigarralejo is one of the longest surviving texts written in Graeco-Iberian alphabet, and can be dated to the fourth century.

Table 1. The Iberian and Graeco-Iberian scripts

The left of the table shows Iberian syllabaries in their reduced dual variants, that is, collecting the simple and complex variants of the signs only for the series of syllabograms.

These dualities served, during the archaic period (fifth to third centuries), to mark the voiced/voiceless opposition in the series of occlusive consonants, a distinction that disappeared gradually from the Roman period (second century BCE to first century CE). Inscriptions with alphabets, found over recent years, demonstrate that this duplication may have existed in vowels and continual consonants, but research has so far been unable to clarify whether the variants are significant or not in this case. The right hand side of the table shows the signs used in an adaptation of the Greek alphabet also used to write Iberian, the so-called Graeco-Iberian alphabet.

Figs 14-15. Inscription on opisthographic stone from Cástulo, Jaén (H.6.1).

This inscription from Cástulo could be one of the very rare examples of Iberian text written in Latin alphabet. It is an opisthographic ashlar. The first line of face A gives a Roman name with the usual triple name, *M(arcus) Folui(us) Garo[s]*. The other four lines record a text which is very difficult to interpret, and probably includes various anthroponyms, as well as some abbreviated words:]A VNINAVNIN VE /]BAG MARC LA L /]VNININIT / SIEROVCIVT. The text on face B reads: P CORNELIVS P L / DIPHILVS / CASTLOSAIC, in which the ancient toponym of Cástulo may be identified, which is also documented in the coin legend **kaśtilo** (A.97).

Fig. 16. Graffito on the exterior of a ceramic base from Peyriac de Mer, Aude (AUD.7.2).

This is one of the few examples of the use of Greek alphabet to write Iberian language. The inscription KANIKΩNE could be interpreted as an Iberian personal name *kanikon*, suffixed with -e. This suffix appears in other inscriptions which can be interpreted as dedications, possibly marking the recipient of the text.

Figs 17-18. Funerary stelae from Badalona (C.8.10 and C. 8.11).

Funerary inscriptions on stone are characteristic of the second phase of Iberian epigraphy, marked by the influence of Roman epigraphic habit. The first of these two pieces displays the text **ḿlbebiuŕar**, while the other, beneath a decoration of spears, reads: **bantuinḿi ḿlbebiuŕ ebanen**. The first pertains to an individual called Nalbebiur, while the second is probably dedicated to his son, Bantui, son of Nalbebiur. The word **eban** appears very frequently in funerary inscriptions and always after two personal names, for which reason it fits well with an interpretation as 'son'. The introduction of the patronym in the indigenous onomastic formula also appears to be the result of Romanisation.

Figs 19-20. Face A of the lead from la Serreta, Alcoy (G.1.6).

This piece, probably used for accounting, mentions two names, **sakalaku** and **siketaneś**. Both bear the suffix **-ka**. A numeric expression follows them, which could be introduced by the initial of the metrological unit .

Figs 21-25. Spindle whorl from El Gebut, Lleida (D.11.3).

There are various Iberian inscriptions on spindle whorls and loom weights, which are tools used for spinning and weaving respectively. The inscription **kaśtaunbankuŕs** can be read around the perimeter of this spindle whorl from El Gebut, in this exceptional case written from right to left, contrary to usual practice in north-eastern Iberian script. In the sequence, it is possible to isolate the term **kaśtaun**, which is repeatedly documented on other spindle whorls and which could be interpreted as a reference to the object itself. It is followed by the element **ban**, perhaps a determinant, and, after that, the word **kuŕs**, which is attributed a pronominal value.

Fig. 26. Fragment of an inscription painted on ceramics, from Sant Miquel de Llíria, Valencia (F.13.24).

In this inscription, unfortunately incomplete, it is possible to restore the word eŕ]iar, which is always documented on this particular type of ceramic piece. A morpheme, **ban**, follows it, which is common after forms that could be common nouns and thus interpreted as a determinant. Following it, the personal name **bastesiltiŕ** has been identified, which bears the suffix **-te**, probably conferring the sense of the agent of the action. In the lost part of the inscription, the word **ekiar** could have existed, completing the formula.

Tables 2-3. Two examples of a possible authorship formula.

Table 4. Possible greeting or propitiatory formula.

Table 5. Possible possession formula.

Figs 27-28. Inscription on the border of a painted Iberian ceramic kalathos, from Sant Miquel de Llíria, Valencia (F.13.5).

The *tituli picti* from Sant Miquel de Llíria are an important collection of inscriptions on decorated vases. These texts were painted while the clay was still soft, in the workshop itself, for which reason they have been considered status objects commissioned by the elite. It seems that some of these inscriptions can be precisely related to such commissions, indicating who ordered the piece and for whom. This may be the case for the inscription reproduced here, in which it is possible to identify various personal names, as well as the known word ***egiar***, which has a meaning close to the Latin *fecit* or *faciendum curavit*.

Figs 29-30. Inscriptions on painted Iberian ceramics from Sant Miquel de Llíria, Valencia (F.13.3).

Sometimes, on painted ceramics from Llíria, the inscription is inserted directly among the iconography. In these instances it is likely that the text not only contains the dedicatory formula, but also that it is complementing the scenes depicted. This appears to be the case on this jar, decorated with a series of horsemen, vegetal motifs and borders. On it, as well as reproducing a formula similar to that which appears in the inscription illustrated in figures 25-26, other more complex sequences appear. The word **elbebebebeber**, inscribed near an equine figure, could be the onomatopoeia of a horse's whinny, or reproduce the horseman's voice as he herds.

Figs 31-32. Inscribed lead sheet from Tivissa, Tarragona (T.7.3).

The syntax of inscriptions on lead remains impenetrable, due principally to the notable complexity and length of some of these texts. The second line of the inscription from Tivissa, nevertheless, contributes some interesting data about the order of elements in Iberian phrases: the sequence **śalaiaŕkist(e) eŕokan śalir oIII** may be interpreted as a personal name, **śalaiaŕkis**, suffixed by **-te**, probably with the value of agent; after this would be a verb, **eŕokan**, and a possible common noun, followed by a quantified metrological expression, which would fit well with an interpretation as the object of the verb. This being the case, it therefore appears to have an SVO structure.

Fig. 33. Ascoli Bronze, Rome (CIL I^2 709).

The Ascoli Bronze, discovered in Rome in 1908, is the most important piece for the study of Iberian anthroponymy. It is an inscription in Latin dated to the year 89 which includes a list containing the names of a series of soldiers from the Hispanian cavalry, native to the Middle Ebro Valley, who were granted Roman citizenship in reward for their actions in the so-called "Social War". This list of names revealed the system used to compose Iberian anthroponyms.

Table 6. The Iberian onomastic formula.

Table 7. The incorporation of Iberian anthroponymy into the Latin onomastic formula.

Figs. 34-35. Graffiti on ceramics from Terrassa, Barcelona (B.16.3) and Ensérune, Hérault (B.1.29).

These two graffiti, engraved on black-glaze ceramics made in Italy, record the same name, **talskubilos**, most probably indicating the owner of the piece. The fact that the same name is documented in places so far apart reveals the notable uniformity of the anthroponymic system throughout the entire Iberian linguistic sphere.

Figs 36-37. Graffito on ceramics from de La Cabañeta, El Burgo de Ebro, Zaragoza (Z.11.11).

This graffito, inscribed on the exterior of the base of a common ceramic vase, presents an interesting text arranged in a spiral: **teitataŕeseŕasoankeibonatintaneśte**. Since it has been written in continuous script without separation between words, its interpretation poses significant challenges. Two anthroponyms can nevertheless be distinguished, **teitataŕ** and **atintaneś**, the latter followed by the suffix **-te**, perhaps a mark of agency (cf. figs 29-30).

Figs 39-40. Stamps on ceramics with Iberian inscriptions from the south of France (B.7.32 and B.1.351).

These two stamps, printed on large ceramic storage jars, undoubtedly refer to the artisans who made them. In the example on the left (B.7.32), there are two Iberian names, **biuŕko** and **[i]beitigeŕ**, which are both followed by the expression **tagiar**, creating a structure which could be interpreted as "this person has done", or "work of this person". In the example on the right (B.1.351), we only find the name of the producer: **tesile**, perhaps a Gaulish anthroponym adapted to the Iberian language.

Figs. 38. Rock inscription from la Cerdanya.

One of the most remarkable collections in the Iberian epigraphic corpus comprises the rock inscriptions from la Cerdanya, in the Pyrenees, perhaps of a votive or religious nature. This interpretation appears to be confirmed by the recent discovery of a series of inscriptions with alphabets, such as that documented in Ger (Baixa Cerdanya, Girona), which is dual, and is illustrated here.

Figs. 41-42. Plaques with Iberian inscription from Ampurias, Girona (C.1.1 and GI.10.07).

These two inscriptions, originating from ancient Emporiae, are a clear illustration of the impact of Romanisation on Iberian epigraphic practices. The influence of Latin epigraphy is demonstrated both in the appearance of the inscriptions, which clearly imitate Latin capital letters, as well as in the formula used: in the text of C.1.1 it is possible to recognise, in the third line, the name **koŕnel+[**, undoubtedly an adaptation to Iberian of the Latin *nomen Cornelius*; on the other piece (GI.10.07), the toponym **auśes** can be identified, which may be related to the Αὔσα mentioned by Ptolomey (II 2, 69) and which appears to show the introduction of the *origo* into the Iberian onomastic formula.

Figs 34-44. Stele from Caspe, Zaragoza (E.13.1).

The stele from Caspe, datable to the second century, is a good example of Iberian funerary inscription. It is presided over by an animal figure, whose head has not been preserved,

and a series of oblong and circular shields, which means the owner can be identified as a member of the local aristocracy. Its text is written across at least four lines, the last of these incomplete: **ośortaŕbanen / siltar iaribeŕ /]ariŕeboretar++ / [---]esaŕ[---]**. The interpretation of the text is not at all clear, but it is likely that **ośoŕtarban** was the name of the deceased; the term **siltar / seltar**, identified next, is frequently documented on stelae, often, as in this case, after a personal name followed by a suffix **-en** or **-ar**, conferring the value of possession. Because of this, it has been suggested that this structure could have the sense of "tomb of this person".

Figs 45-46. Stele from La Vispesa, Tamarite de Litera, Huesca (D.12.1).

In spite of its fragmentary state of preservation, the stele from La Vispesa is perhaps the most spectacular surviving Iberian funerary stele. It presents a complex iconographic discourse that includes a soldier in its lower section, vultures circling a cadaver in its upper section, and a series of severed right hands (trophies of war?). It furthermore presents the singularity of being the only Iberian inscription on stone whose text is in relief, rather than incised, as is customary.

Its inscription is unfortunately very incomplete: **[---]śkeŕ / [---]+n oŕkeikelaur ekisiŕan neitin[---]**. In spite of the difficulties of interpretation, it is possible that the name of the deceased may appear in the central text, in which an anthroponym ending in **i]śker** could be restored. The sequence **oŕkeikelaur**, which is read in the lower part of the vertical text, has traditionally been interpreted as an anthroponym, but should probably be interpreted as a numeral with the value of 24 (perhaps indicating the age of the deceased?); the structure of the following form **ekisiŕan** would allow this word to be interpreted as a verb. Finally, in the last part it is possible to restore the formula **neitin[iunstir**, which is interpreted as an expression of greeting or a propitiatory-type expression, and which is not exclusive to funerary texts.

Figs 47-48. Silver *patera* from Castellet de Banyoles, in Tivissa, Tarragona (C.21.2).

In 1927 the so-called "Treasure of Tivissa" was discovered, an extraordinary collection of 17 pieces of elegantly crafted silver work (fourth to third centuries). The majority of these pieces are silver vessels with a probably ritual function. Some of them bear inscriptions in Iberian incised in drypoint. The vessel on the left, C.21.2, may be read *badeiŕebaikarśokinbaikar*, wherein the word *baikar* is repeated twice. This is a well-documented term in Iberian, perhaps related to the cultural use of this vessel.

Figs 49-50. Silver vessel from Castellet de Banyoles with the head of a wolf in relief in the interior, Tivissa, Tarragona. The exterior bears an incised inscription (C.21.1).

Piece C.21.1 is one of the four spectacular decorated paterae recovered in the "Treasure of Tivissa". On the upper surface, the omphalos shaped as the head of an aggressive wolf is especially striking, around which is articulated a complex iconography engraved with

sheets of gilded silver. As it is an imported object, the Iberian inscription which is found on the lower surface of the piece does not seem to be associated with the message of the images. The text says **tautintibaś sani giŕśdo uŕketigeś**, in which it is possible to identify at least three personal names, perhaps those of the individuals who paid for or offered the piece.

Map 2. Distribution of Iberian inscriptions

Figs 51-52. Small stone pendant discovered in Gambús, Terrassa, Barcelona (Hesp.B.19.04).

The text of this unique piece could contain a dedication to a female figure: **deśailauŕ beŕśir[eba]n bitan astébeibaseban**, which could broadly be interpreted as, "To Desailaur, daughter of Bersir, offered by Astebei, her son".

Figs. 53-55. Gray ceramic jar from la Joncosa, Jorba, Barcelona (Hesp.B.26.1).

With over 350 signs distributed across 10 lines, the inscription on the jar from la Joncosa is one of the longest in the Iberian language, and the longest if the inscriptions on lead sheets are discounted. The text was incised *ante cocturam* and displays a repetitive and formulaic style, for which reason it has been ascribed a cultic character. It is curious, in any case, that the piece has a manufacturing defect, as one of the two handles is obviously twisted. This could explain why it was discovered in a secondary context, among materials piled up in a cistern, where the jar could have been discarded after it was considered defective and unusable for its purpose.

Figs 56-57. Tracing of the two faces of the Graeco-Iberian lead from La Serreta (G.1.1).

Fig. 58. Bilingual inscription, Latin and Iberian, from Sagunto (F.11.8).

Fig. 59. Drawing of the Iberian inscription from La Caridad (E.7.1).