

Journal of Field Archaeology

Human subsistence dynamics in the Southern Iberian Neolithic: a systemic approach based on archaeobotany and archaeozoology from Dehesilla Cave --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Full Title:	Human subsistence dynamics in the Southern Iberian Neolithic: a systemic approach based on archaeobotany and archaeozoology from Dehesilla Cave
Article Type:	Unsolicited Original Research Paper
Keywords:	Human Ecology; Neolithic; Iberian Peninsula; Farming; Livestock; Economy
Corresponding Author:	Daniel Garcia-Rivero University of Seville Faculty of Geography and History: Universidad de Sevilla Facultad de Geografia e Historia SPAIN
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author's Institution:	University of Seville Faculty of Geography and History: Universidad de Sevilla Facultad de Geografia e Historia
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Daniel Garcia-Rivero, PhD
First Author Secondary Information:	
Order of Authors:	Daniel Garcia-Rivero, PhD
	Esteban Garcia-Vinas, PhD
	Guillem Perez-Jorda, PhD
	Ruth Taylor, PhD
	Eloisa Bernaldez-Sanchez, PhD
	Leonor Pena-Chocarro, PhD
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Abstract:	Archaeology has incorporated the methods of the natural sciences and the theoretical principles of the overarching scientific framework. Most archaeologists acknowledge the importance of a systemic perspective in the study of the evolution of human behaviour, with emphasis on the contexts in which individuals and populations lived and interacted. This article develops an ecological approach to the subsistence patterns and dynamics of the Neolithic populations in the western-most regions of the Mediterranean. Methodologically, it implements a systematic quantitative exploration of the structure and evolution of the botanical and zoological taxa documented in a human settlement. Empirically, it begins with one of the most complete and relevant Neolithic sequences in the region, Dehesilla Cave, which has provided a rich data set from a high resolution stratigraphy. The new results are then compared with the available archaeobotanical and archaeozoological records throughout the South of the Iberian Peninsula.
Additional Information:	
Question	Response
Author Comments:	
Suggested Reviewers:	Beatriz Gavilan-Ceballos University of Huelva beatriz.gavilan@dhis1.uhu.es She is Associate Professor in the University of Huelva, Spain. Her main scientific

	contribution is to the development of knowledge on the Late Prehistory in the South of the Iberian Peninsula, becoming one of the most recognized specialists on the matter, especially on the Neolithic and Copper Age periods.	
	Antonio F. Carvalho University of Algarve a.faustino.carvalho@gmail.com He is Associate Professor in the University of Algarve, Portugal. His principal research lines are Iberian Neolithic, Pottery, Anthropology and Archaeological theory.	
	Juan F. Gibaja CSIC, Rome jfgibaja@gmail.com Dr Gibaja Bao specializes in the multidisciplinary study of Neolithic societies in the Iberian Peninsula. His work has dealt with numerous dimensions of these communities, including the exploitation of natural resources and the study of agricultural systems, the technological analysis of lithic production and use, the funerary record, etc. He is currently involved in several international research projects on the evolution and spread of Neolithic populations throughout the Mediterranean.	
Funding Information:	Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (PGC2018-096943-A-C22)	Dr. Daniel Garcia-Rivero
	Universidad de Sevilla (VI PPITUS)	Dr. Daniel Garcia-Rivero
	Universidad de Sevilla (III PPDUS)	Dr. Daniel Garcia-Rivero
	Universidad de Sevilla (Facultad Geografía e Historia)	Dr. Daniel Garcia-Rivero
	Universidade de Coimbra (CIAS)	Dr. Daniel Garcia-Rivero

Human subsistence dynamics in the Southern Iberian Neolithic: a systemic approach based on archaeobotany and archaeozoology from Dehesilla Cave

Daniel García-Rivero^{1*}, Esteban García-Viñas², Guillem Pérez-Jordà³, Ruth Taylor¹, Eloísa Bernáldez-Sánchez² and Leonor Peña-Chocarro⁴

¹ Departamento de Prehistoria y Arqueología, Universidad de Sevilla, Doña María de Padilla, s/n, 41004, Seville, Spain. ORCID: DGR: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6112-3181>, RT: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1565-4915>

² Instituto Andaluz de Patrimonio Histórico, Junta de Andalucía, Camino de los Descubrimientos, s/n, 41092, Seville, Spain. ORCID: EGV: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8607-7505>, EBS: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7467-2139>

³ Departamento de Prehistoria, Arqueología e Historia Antigua, Universidad de Valencia. Avda. Blasco Ibáñez, 28. 46010, Valencia, Spain. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1459-0219>

⁴ Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales, CSIC, Albasanz 26, 28037, Madrid, Spain. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7807-8778>

* Corresponding author: garciarivero@us.es

Abstract:

Archaeology has incorporated the methods of the natural sciences and the theoretical principles of the overarching scientific framework. Most archaeologists acknowledge the importance of a systemic perspective in the study of the evolution of human behaviour, with emphasis on the contexts in which individuals and populations lived and interacted. This article develops an ecological approach to the subsistence patterns and dynamics of the Neolithic populations in the western-most regions of the Mediterranean. Methodologically, it implements a systematic quantitative exploration of the structure and evolution of the botanical and zoological taxa documented in a human settlement. Empirically, it begins with one of the most complete and relevant Neolithic sequences in the region, Dehesilla Cave, which has provided a rich data set from a high resolution stratigraphy. The new results are then compared with the available archaeobotanical and archaeozoological records throughout the South of the Iberian Peninsula.

Key words:

Human Ecology, Neolithic, Iberian Peninsula, Farming, Livestock, Economy

Funding details:

This work was supported by FEDER/Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation, under the project "High-resolution chronology and cultural evolution in the South of the Iberian Peninsula (circa 7000-4000 cal BC): a multiscalar approach" (PGC2018-096943-A-C22). The data presented here are provided by the project "Cueva de la Dehesilla: Estudio arqueológico y paleoambiental para el conocimiento de la ocupación humana prehistórica de la Sierra de Cádiz". The 2017 archaeological field season received financial support from several funding programs of the University of Seville (VI Plan Propio de Investigación y Transferencia, III Plan

Propio de Docencia, Facultad de Geografía e Historia and Dpto. de Prehistoria y Arqueología), as well as from the Research Centre for Anthropology and Health (CIAS) of the University of Coimbra.

Disclosure statement:

The authors report here there no competing interests to declare.

Acknowledgements:

A number of people and entities have collaborated with logistic support and diverse resources for the development of the Dehesilla Project during the 2017 season: Algar Local Council, Jerez de la Frontera Archaeological Museum, EvoCultura-Association for the study of human behaviour and cultural diversity, and the Díaz Romero family. Drs João Cascalheira and Célia Gonçalves from the Interdisciplinary Centre for Archaeology and Evolution of Human Behaviour (ICArEHB), Universidade do Algarve, helped set up of the georeferencing system used in the field. María Barrera, Manuel J. Díaz, David López, Patricia Viriño, Pablo Gutiérrez, Jericó Mancera, Elena Trujillo and Araceli Barrera took part in the archaeological excavations.

Human subsistence dynamics in the Southern Iberian Neolithic: a systemic approach based on archaeobotany and archaeozoology from Dehesilla Cave

Authors

Abstract:

Archaeology has incorporated the methods of the natural sciences and the theoretical principles of the overarching scientific framework. Most archaeologists acknowledge the importance of a systemic perspective in the study of the evolution of human behaviour, with emphasis on the contexts in which individuals and populations lived and interacted. This article develops an ecological approach to the subsistence patterns and dynamics of the Neolithic populations in the western-most regions of the Mediterranean. Methodologically, it implements a systematic quantitative exploration of the structure and evolution of the botanical and zoological taxa documented in a human settlement. Empirically, it begins with one of the most complete and relevant Neolithic sequences in the region, Dehesilla Cave, which has provided a rich data set from a high resolution stratigraphy. The new results are then compared with the available archaeobotanical and archaeozoological records throughout the South of the Iberian Peninsula.

Key words:

Human Ecology, Neolithic, Iberian Peninsula, Farming, Livestock, Economy

Funding details:

Anonymized

Disclosure statement:

The authors report here there no competing interests to declare.

Acknowledgements:

Anonymized

1. Introduction

The study of the Neolithic in the South of the Iberian Peninsula dates back approximately one century (Bosch-Gimpera 1920), although it was in the decade of the 1960s, and particularly in the 70s and 80s, that notable progress was made possible by a number of excavation projects aiming to explore the stratigraphic sequences and to establish the chronological and cultural periodisation of the Iberian South. Several of these sites remain fundamental references today. Cave sites are clearly preeminent, for instance Nerja (Pellicer 1963; Jordá-Pardo 1986; Pellicer and Acosta 1997), Carigüela (Pellicer 1964), Murciélagos de Zuheros (Vicent and Muñoz 1973), Murciélagos de Albuñol (López-García 1980) and Dehesilla (Acosta and Pellicer 1990), in comparison to open-air settlements such as Los Castillejos (Arribas and Molina 1979). Other open-air sites on the coast have been located and excavated more recently, for instance El Retamar (Ramos and Lazarich 2002) and Embarcadero del río Palmones (Ramos 2006). The available radiocarbon dates indicate that the Neolithic populations arrived in the Western-most regions of the Mediterranean around the mid-6th millennium cal BC (Martín-Socas et al. 2018).

Regarding the specific topic of this paper, there is, at present, a notable amount of archaeological data and knowledge about the Neolithic paleoenvironment and ecology, especially from the last three decades of research (e.g. López-García 1986; Stevenson and Harrison 1992; Rodríguez-Ariza 1996; Riquelme 1998; Bernáldez and Bernáldez 2000; González-Urquijo et al. 2000; García-Rivero 2004; Liesau and Morales 2012; Peña-Chocarro et al. 2013; Rodríguez-Rodríguez et al. 2013; McClure and Welker 2017). Our own work has included new excavations at Dehesilla Cave, one of the key Neolithic sites in the South of the Iberian Peninsula, located in the Sub-Baetic mountain range (Fig. 1), with the aim to advance the understanding of the evolution of the ecological patterns and use of natural resources throughout the Iberian Neolithic (García-Rivero et al. 2019).

The main results obtained from the pilot study, based on pollen, carpological and zoological remains from area C003, indicated a Neolithic environment essentially composed of holm oak and wild olive forests, together with evidence of an oscillating presence over time of agriculture and livestock, especially sheep and goats. The data available for the Early Neolithic B (second half of the 6th millennium BC) was suggestive of small human populations with a mixed cereal and livestock-based economy. The Middle Neolithic A (circa 4800-4500 cal BC) displayed a significant change resulting in an economy based almost entirely on the monoculture of naked wheat, with a limited presence of naked barley. This new scenario was probably linked to a shift from intensive to extensive agriculture, and appears, in fact, to have caused significant pressure on the landscape, leading to the a loss of forest cover and the creation of Mediterranean thermophile forests clearly documented from the middle of the 5th millennium BC (García-Rivero et al. 2019).

Following this paleoecological line of research, this paper expands the systemic analysis at Dehesilla Cave through the analysis of the new data from the archaeological area C006, excavated in 2017. As in our previous work, our aim is to understand and explain the nature and evolution of the diversity and variation of the botanical and zoological populations in relation to a human settlement. For this purpose, we theoretically assume that the different components that make up the natural system (including humans) interact and coexist under common principles of historical change. The methodological design ensures that the analysis of the data belonging to each period provides a detailed synchronic picture, while the comparison between the data from different periods permits a diachronic analysis, in such a way that the

structure of the diversity and variation of this archaeological record may be explored in and over time.

The specific objectives of this paper are, first of all, to present the archaeobotanical and archaeozoological data of the Neolithic sequence (from the 6th to the 4th millennium cal BC) recently documented in a new archaeological area (C006) at Dehesilla Cave. Secondly, and within the framework of a cumulative and progressive perspective of knowledge, a systematic comparison is made between the new results and those previously known from C003, with an analogous Neolithic sequence. This exercise enables us to explore the implications of the most recent data within the previous observations and working hypotheses, and therefore to assess and update the interpretation of the Neolithic record at the site. More specifically, it allows us to compare the empirical patterns of the two excavation areas, and to identify which are convergent and which are dissimilar. While the former may express consistent empirical patterns linked to the behaviours of individuals and populations over time, the latter may be linked to a range of explanatory scenarios. Among these, significant differences between the data provided by comparable units -archaeological periods- in both areas may indicate empirical bias or instability in the record of a particular area, or may be interpreted as evidence of distinct functional patterns in the usage of the different rooms of the cave. Finally, the paper highlights which of the changes and differential replication patterns of the botanical and zoological populations are corroborated, and which must be rejected or require additional testing. This, in turn, enables an in-depth revision of the explanatory hypotheses for these differential patterns, which are discussed within the context of the use of plant and animal resources by Neolithic human populations in the South of the Iberian Peninsula.

2. Data and methods

The data used in this study comes from the recent excavations carried out within the project *Dehesilla Cave: Archaeological and paleoenvironmental study for the knowledge of the prehistoric human occupation of the Sierra de Cádiz*, and, specifically, from the excavation during 2017 of a new archaeological area (C006), located in one of the deepest and most inaccessible rooms of the cave (Room 4) (Fig. 2). The location and delimitation of the excavation area correspond to an area where the surface sheet of flowstone was broken and absent. This circumstance accounts for the irregular shape of the trench, with an area of approximately 5 m², 5 m (N-S) along the western wall of the room by a width of 1 m (E-W). The levels disturbed by contemporary anthropogenic and animal activities are limited to the upper strata, located immediately below the flowstone sheet. The rest of the sequence is intact, reaching a depth of 1.5 m, and containing levels formed in several specific Neolithic periods: Early Neolithic B (ENB), Middle Neolithic A (MNA), Middle Neolithic B (NMB) and Late Neolithic (LN) (García-Rivero et al. in press).

The sedimentological characteristics indicate that several of the strata in C006 were caused by natural phenomena, materialising torrential and depositional episodes in the form of stone blocks and sediments washed down from the adjacent and higher Room 2. Other levels are markedly different in origin, including several clearly anthropic depositional events (García-Rivero et al. 2020, 2021). The analysis of the archaeological materials, especially the pottery, confirms that the assemblages are coherent and synchronic in the ENB and MNA periods, while the NMB and LN levels include occasional residual fragments from earlier periods

(García-Rivero et al. in press). This circumstance forewarns of the necessary caution in the observations and inferences made from the latter two periods.

The materials considered here are remains of seeds and fruits, and fauna. In contrast to the study of area C003 (García-Rivero et al. 2019), suitable pollen data for meaningful comparison was not available for C006, due to its location in one of the deepest rooms of the cave. All of the samples and remains have been recorded in their particular stratigraphic unit of C006, making an allowance only in the specific cases in which there was not a complete correspondence to a single unit, in which case they have been labelled and considered accordingly. This procedure makes it possible to assign all of the elements with the greatest possible precision and without compromising the guarantee of strict rigour of the record.

The comparative study with C003 makes use only of the data ascribed to exclusive (single) stratigraphic units. In addition, it must be noted that the systematic comparison has greater potential for the data sets from the Early Neolithic B, Middle Neolithic A and Middle Neolithic B periods, which are present in both excavation areas (Table 1). The Early Neolithic A is not documented in area C006, and the Late Neolithic is not clearly defined in area C003 (García-Rivero et al. 2018: 131).

20% of the excavated sediments from each stratigraphic unit was set aside for flotation in the lab. The rest was screened manually in the field, and all visually identifiable small remains were collected. Thus, the volume of processed sediment is 100% and the number and density of remains are true to the total contents of each unit throughout the sequence.

Seeds and fruits were recovered through flotation. The flotation system collected the denser materials inside the tank in a 1 mm mesh, while the material that floated was collected in a 0.25 mm mesh on the overflow. Both fractions were dried in the laboratory, where they were processed manually under a 10-15x magnifying glass. The identification of seeds and fruits was carried out by the Institute of History of the CSIC in Madrid. The denomination of wild taxa followed Castroviejo (1986-2012) and that of cultivates followed the binomial classification (Zohary et al. 2012). The quantification of the material was problematic due to the small number of samples and remains. However, two fundamental criteria were used, namely the ubiquity of each of the taxa and the number of remains.

The zoological remains were recovered directly in the field, in the manual screening of the sediments and, to a lesser extent, in the heavy fraction of the flotation. The zoological analysis established several quantifications of the material according to the number of identified specimens (NISP), the number of remains -including unidentified remains- (NR), the weight (g) and the minimum number of individuals (MNI). The sedimentological volume of each level was considered in the diachronic analysis and the variables retained for the comparative quantitative study were the density of specimens (DSP) and individuals (DI). The number of remains did not count the fragments resulting from fresh breakage, the unfused epiphyses belonging to the same bone and the isolated teeth. Two types of indeterminate bones have been considered: some that cannot be identified at the anatomical level, and therefore not at the species level either (indeterminate), and others which are anatomically recognisable, but do not display any characteristic that enables them to be ascribed to a specific species. The latter are included in two groups based on size, following the biostratigraphic results of Bernáldez (2009, 2011). Class I includes the skeletal remains of vertebrates with a body mass greater than 250 kg (cows and equids) and Class II those with a body mass between 18 and 250 kg (sheep, goats, suids, deer). In addition to the taphonomic analysis of traces of erosion and

usage (Lyman 1994; Fernández-Jalvo and Andrews 2016), the state of conservation of the bones has been assessed by the fragmentation index (IF) method described by Bernáldez and Bernáldez (2000), in which $IF = \text{Log} (NRT / NISP)$, where NRT is the total number of remains. Since animals with a body mass greater than 18 kg are generally better represented in the record (Bernáldez 2002, 2009, 2011), this index has been calculated using only the values obtained for animals belonging to this group. Finally, the average weight (Mm) of the elements and the percentage of indeterminacy have been calculated.

3. Results

3.1. Seeds and fruits

A total of 30 samples from the Neolithic sequence were processed. 29 of these, with a total volume of 254 litres (l) of sediment and from nine different stratigraphic units, contributed carpological remains preserved by carbonisation. A total of 336 individuals have been identified, corresponding to nine botanical taxa (Table 2).

The majority of the remains belong to cultivated plants and within these, cereal caryopses are by far the most abundant and frequent (Fig. 3). Legumes make up the other group of cultivated plants, but are only present in the most recent phase. Wild plants are also present, but display a decreasing trend over time.

Five samples (35 l) belong to the ENB phase. The sample from Unit 10-Locus 1 is the only one without cereal remains, which are the most abundant type in the other four samples from this period. The number of remains is always low, although by density two samples (from Units 11 and 8) stand out from the rest (Fig. 4). The number of different taxa identified in Unit 13 is also noteworthy. Among the cereal caryopses, wheat is most common. It has only been possible to confirm the presence of *Triticum aestivum-durum*, to which barley displays a similar ubiquity (Fig. 5). As it is poorly preserved, it is not possible to confirm the variety of the latter. The wild plants present are Fabaceae, *Malva* sp. and Poaceae.

Only two samples (19 l) belong to the MNA phase, and their carpological content is extremely poor. A single caryopsis of a naked wheat and a fragment of *Triticum* sp. are identified alongside other fragments of cereals, which are not possible to determine at genus level, and another unidentified remain.

The largest number of samples, 13, comes from the MNB phase, with a total volume of 119 l of sediment. These samples contained a low number of remains, a reduced number of taxa and an irregular, although also low, density. The remains consist almost exclusively of cereal caryopses, with one legume (*Medicago/Melilotus*) and one Poaceae (*Phalaris* sp.) among the wild plants. The dominance of naked wheat is evident, with a much smaller presence of barley, although, again, it is not possible to determine the variety.

There are 9 samples (81 l) from the LN phase, with a very high density of remains. Two samples contributed almost all of the material, while the other seven samples are generally poor, with a very limited diversity of taxa and a very low density. The remains correspond exclusively to cereal caryopses, with a greater presence of naked wheat than of barley. The two richest samples display different characteristics. The smaller sample from Unit 1 yielded a concentration of wheat, among which only naked wheat is confirmed, although naked barley is

also present. The only wild plant is an oat caryopsis (*Avena* sp.). The other sample, belonging to a hearth (Unit 4), has a very high density of remains and the highest diversity of taxa among all of the analysed samples. The main components are naked barley and, to a lesser extent, naked wheat. Alongside the cereals, there is a broad bean (*Vicia faba*), the only cultivated legume documented in this area of the cave. Wild plants are very scarce and belong to taxa (Chenopodiaceae, *Coronilla* sp. and Poaceae) that may be identified as weeds associated with cereals, or as ruderal plants growing around the cave entrance, which may have been introduced into the cave by human or animal activities.

3.2. Fauna

The total zoological assemblage from area C006, including molluscs and vertebrates over 1 kg in body mass, is composed of 4,819 skeletal NISP and 620 malacological NISP. The material securely attributed to single stratigraphic units totals 3,719 NISP (77% of the total) and 484 mollusc remains (78% of the total), which are distributed over the four Neolithic periods considered below. The total data is, however, useful in the analysis of the overall Neolithic picture, since the entire sequence belongs to this period.

The number of indeterminate specimens at anatomical and species level amounts to 43% of the total (4,819 NISP). This group is made up of small fragments with an average weight of 0.72 g. The remains of Class I and II vertebrates amount to 54% of the total NISP, although only 46% were assigned at the species level. This assemblage is composed of *Bos taurus*, *Cervus elaphus*, *Sus* sp., *Ovis aries* and *Capra hircus*. In addition, bones of *Oryctolagus cuniculus*, *Lynx pardinus* and *Canis* cf. *familiaris* have been identified. They must, however, be set apart from the ungulates because they are still under study and belong to Class III, with a different fossil potential from the above mentioned Classes I and II (Bernáldez 2009). As is the case at other Neolithic sites, rabbits and ungulates are most abundant animal remains in area C006. The finding of rabbit remains at cave sites can have several explanations, including human consumption, or the use of the cave as habitat or shelter by rabbits or by their predators. The malacological record is dominated by terrestrial gastropods, although freshwater gastropods and bivalves and marine bivalves have also been identified. Among the species identified, *Otala lactea* stands out in number and *Glycymeris* cf. *insubrica* and *Ruditapes decussatus* (both found in the MNB levels) because they provide evidence of mobility or contact with the coast.

The results obtained for each period are presented in Table 3. The ENB strata correspond to an excavated volume of 0.84 m³, the largest volume of those studied in this area. A total of 1,548 NISP have been documented, of which 634 are indeterminate fragments, 513 NISP are *Oryctolagus cuniculus*, 1 is *Canis* cf. *familiaris* and 3 are carnivores. Class I and II vertebrates make up a total of 397 NISP, although only 223 were determined at the species level. Based on this record, at least 24 individuals have been estimated: 4 *Bos taurus*, 3 *Cervus elaphus*, 5 *Sus* sp., 5 *Ovis aries*, 3 *Capra hircus* and 4 *Ovis aries/Capra* sp. The percentage of indeterminate fragments is 40.96%, a value that increases to 61.49% if the calculation is made using only the data from Class I and II species. The average weight of these indeterminate fragments is 0.62 g and the fragmentation index is 0.48. The malacological assemblage is composed of 139 fragments from 136 individuals: 1 Unionidae (4 fragments), 1 freshwater gastropod, 65 *Otala lactea*, 2 *Rumina decollata*, 1 *Caracollina lenticula*, 1 *Cernuella virgata/Xerosecta promissa* and 64 unidentified pulmonate gastropods.

The MNA levels in C006 belong to a discrete ritual context (García-Rivero et al. 2020) and, therefore, the volume of sediment is small (0.08 m³). The fauna record totals 168 NISP, of which 77 are indeterminate fragments and 18 belong to *Oryctolagus cuniculus*. The remaining

79 NISP belong to bones of Class I and II vertebrates, although only 57 were determined at the species level. In total, 8 individuals have been estimated: 3 *Cervus elaphus*, 2 *Sus* sp. and 3 *Ovis aries*/*Capra* sp. The overall percentage of indeterminacy is 46.95%, rising to 49.36% when limited to Class I and II species. The mean weight of these indeterminate fragments is 0.71 g, and their IF is 0.74.

The MNB levels total a volume of 0.66 m³. The fauna assemblage counts 1,353 NISP, of which 631 are indeterminate fragments, 306 correspond to *Oryctolagus cuniculus*, 2 to *Lynx pardinus*, 1 to a *Canis* cf. *familiaris* and 1 to a carnivore. The Class I and II vertebrates total 412 bone elements, 193 of which were determined at the species level. A minimum of 20 individuals has been estimated: 3 *Bos taurus*, 3 *Cervus elaphus*, 4 *Sus* sp., 5 *Ovis aries*, 1 *Capra hircus* and 4 *Ovis aries*/*Capra* sp. The overall percentage of indeterminacy is 46.64%, or 60.50% if considering only the remains of Class I and II. The fragmentation index is 0.50. The average weight of the indeterminate fragments is slightly heavier, but still does not reach 1 g (0.87 g). The malacological assemblage includes 224 fragments of 208 specimens: 1 *Glycymeris* cf. *insubrica*, 1 *Ruditapes decussatus*, 3 *Potomida littoralis*, 2 specimens of the family Unionidae (18 fragments), 1 *Melanopsis praemorsa*, 111 *Otala lactea*, 2 *Rumina decollata*, 1 *Cochlicella* sp. and 86 unidentified pulmonate gastropods.

The excavated volume corresponding to the LN is 0.58 m³. The faunal remains from this period amount to 653 NISP, of which 274 are indeterminate fragments, 213 are *Oryctolagus cuniculus* and 1 is a *Canis* cf. *familiaris*. Class I and II vertebrates account for 165 NISP, although only 83 were determined at the species level. At least 8 individuals have been estimated: 1 *Bos taurus*, 1 *Cervus elaphus*, 2 *Sus* sp., 1 *Ovis aries*, 1 *Capra hircus* and 2 *Ovis aries*/*Capra* sp. The overall percentage of indeterminacy of 41.96%, and that of Class I and II species of 62.41%, follow the same pattern as the previous levels. The fragmentation index is 0.46. The average weight of the indeterminate fragments is 0.62 g. The malacological assemblage is composed of 117 fragments of 102 specimens: 2 *Potomida littoralis*, 2 specimens of the family Unionidae (17 fragments), 1 *Melanopsis cariosa*, 53 *Otala lactea*, 1 *Cochlicella* sp. and 43 unidentified pulmonate gastropods.

4. Discussion

4.1. Previously known empirical patterns at Dehesilla Cave in the light of the new results

The excavation areas C006 and C003 have different sizes and sedimentological volumes. However, the fragmentation index and the percentage of indeterminacy of Class I and II animal remains from the two zoological assemblages are suitable indicators of equitability between the two areas, thus enabling meaningful comparison. Moreover, comparison is carried out on both the botanical and the zoological assemblages using weighted measures: the density of individuals (DI) and the density of identified specimens (DSP) of the ungulate remains by period and area, and the relative proportion of the different species based on the minimum number of individuals (MNI); and, in the case of botanical remains, the density of remains by period and area, as well as relative proportions of the different taxa.

The fragmentation index and the percentage of indeterminacy of Class I and II vertebrate remains indicate that the state of preservation of the zoological samples is similar between most of the periods under study. For the most part, the first measure provides an index around

0.5 (Fig. 6) and the second a percentage in the region of 60%. The only two exceptions are the levels attributed to the ENA in C003 and those associated with the NMA in C006. The former has not been documented, in any case, in the subsequent excavation area and is therefore not considered in the comparison below. The dissimilarity of the NMA values in C006 is due to the very nature of the formation of these units -as a discrete ritual funerary deposit- in such a way that caution must be applied in the comparison between the assemblages of this period. Apart from these two specific cases, it can be postulated that the preservation of the taxa is similar in the remaining levels and periods considered and, therefore, that the comparison between the data sets can be assumed with confidence.

The carpological records from areas C003 and C006 display relatively similar characteristics, although there are also some differences. In general, the density of remains is slightly higher in C006, although not necessarily with a higher number of remains. On the other hand, while C003 shows the highest concentration of materials in the MNA, this phase has yielded one of the lowest densities of materials in C006. As mentioned above, this is explained by the funerary and punctual character of the deposit known as *Locus 2* (García-Rivero et al. 2020). In C006, two prominent seed concentrations are observed in two of the LN samples. One of these samples comes from Unit 1, although the remaining seven samples from the same level display average densities, sometimes even lower than those of the rest of the sequence. The other sample, with the highest number of remains of the entire study (243), belongs to a hearth (Unit 4), thus probably explaining its contrast to the rest of the samples.

Regarding the cereal remains, the C006 record displays some convergent characteristics with those documented previously in C003 (García-Rivero et al. 2019). The predominance of naked wheat and naked barley can be noted, although hulled wheat is not present in C006 (Fig. 7). In addition, there are hardly any legumes in C006, and these appear only in the most recent phase (LN) -and only *Vicia faba*-, while in C003 they are documented from ENB to MNB. However, the point of greatest difference between the two areas is, perhaps, the absence of wild fruits in C006. In sharp contrast, these were proportionally the most prominent group in the MNB and MNB-LN phases in C003. This may be linked, in all likelihood, to the differential use of the areas near the cave entrance with respect to the deeper areas of the cavity.

The comparison by period sheds further detail on the results. The data corresponding to the ENB period in both excavation areas converge in the existence, with the same proportion/ubiquity, of *Triticum aestivum-durum* and *Hordeum vulgare*. The presence of hulled wheat is only documented in C003. Wild fruits (wild olive and azofaifo) are also only documented in C003, while in C006 there are very rare remains of wild plants that could be identified as weeds growing among the cereal fields.

In the MNA period, there are marked differences between the carpological records of both areas. In C003, in addition to the presence of *Hordeum vulgare*, *Vicia/Lathyrus* and *Pistacia lentiscus*, a clear predominance of *Triticum aestivum-durum* was documented, which supported the hypothesis of a preference for the cultivation of naked wheat. However, in C006 the record is very poor. The presence of naked wheat can be confirmed together with fragments of indeterminate cereals. It must be noted that this contrast between the two areas may be explained by the different characteristics and uses of both spaces during this period. The area near the entrance (C003) may have had a domestic character, while the use of the deep room (C006 in Room 4) was limited to a one-off funerary event (García-Rivero et al. 2020; García-Rivero et al. in press).

For the MNB, the volume of floated sediment, the number of samples and the density of remains are higher in C006 than in C003. Regarding cereals, in both cases there is a dominance of naked wheat, with a much smaller presence of barley, which, in this case, only appears in C006. The fundamental difference lies, again, in the absence of wild fruits in C006, while these were abundant in C003. The geomorphological and sedimentological characteristics of the MNB levels documented in C006 suggest that they may have been washed down from another part of the cavity. In this case, it must be considered that the torrential and depositional episodes would have conditioned the formation process of the archaeological record, including its botanical remains.

As noted above, no explicit comparison can be made between the records of the two areas for the LN period, given their imprecise material definition in the C003 sequence. However, at least some relevant points are worth mentioning. In the level probably corresponding to this period in C003 (Unit 11), wild fruits are proportionally predominant, and naked wheat and barley are hardly attested, with one identification of each. The majority of samples from C006 show a similar situation in terms of the scarcity and low density of remains, among which naked wheat stands out above naked barley and the presence of wild fruits is not documented. However, two LN samples from C006, and especially that from Unit 4, show a much higher density and number of remains, as well as a greater taxonomic diversity. Naturally, this situation is due to the functional and selective nature of this context, a hearth in which, in addition to some wild plants, there are abundant remains of naked barley and, to a lesser extent, naked wheat. This sample, therefore, must be considered as an accumulation of materials, in a functional context that promoted their carbonisation, and in which, unlike the rest of the samples, there is a predominance of naked barley. This sample has also provided the only cultivated legume, a broad bean, documented in this area of the cavity.

The bone assemblage makes up the largest part of the faunal record documented in both areas, with over 90% of the remains (the remaining 10% corresponds to malacofauna). As is the case at other Neolithic sites (Saña 2013; Morales and Riquelme 2004; Valente 2016; Bernáldez et al. in press), rabbits and ungulates are the most common animals in both sequences. In the bone assemblages of both excavation areas, preliminary taphonomic results help to discern between a type of deposit formed by animals with less than 1 kg body mass (rodents, chiroptera, birds, reptiles), the origin of which cannot be attributed to human action, and another certainly anthropic group composed of ungulates, including deer and domesticated species such as cows, pigs, sheep and goats.

In general terms, the slightly higher number of caprine (sheep and goats) over other ungulates previously observed in C003 is corroborated in C006, in which the former are twice as common as the latter. In C006, the number of identified sheep is higher than the number of goats.

The densities of NISP and MNI (DSP and DI) by period display a similar structure and diachronic dynamics in both areas, with the exception of the ENA period -not documented in C006- and the MNA -scarcely present in C006 due to the punctual nature of the ritual funerary deposit. The graphical comparison between the different periods based on the DI and DSP of ungulates (Fig. 8) shows relatively convergent results for both areas, indicating, in addition, that the ENB and MNB periods, followed by the LN, have the highest DI and DSP of ungulates. There are, however, slight differences between the two areas, such as the alternating predominant positions between the DIs and DSPs of the ENB and MNB periods. The most notable difference in DSP is observed in the MNB period.

Figure 9 also shows a comparison between periods and areas based on the relative proportions of the MNI of the different ungulate species. In general terms, there is a notable recurrent pattern, in which caprines (sheep and goat) show the highest percentages in all periods of both areas, generally followed by suids and, in smaller proportions, by deer and bovids.

The results obtained for the ENB show some differences between the two areas in terms of the faunal composition, although the densities of NISP and MNI are similar. In C003, suids and caprines have similar percentages of accumulation, while in C006 caprines are more abundant. The results obtained from the second excavation area may be considered more consistent, due to the larger sample size, and they are also in line with what has been described at other cave sites of the Early Neolithic of the Iberian Peninsula (see below).

The MNA period marks an inflexion point in the sequence, with a notable decrease in faunal density. This decrease correlates inversely with the increase in cereal production documented in C003 (García-Rivero et al. 2019), although it has not been possible to corroborate this pattern in C006 due to the specific non-domestic use of this part of the cave. This circumstance also accounts for the differences in both the number of documented remains and the relative proportions of the different species of ungulates (especially bovids and cervids).

In the MNB, DI and DSP increase again (only the DSP of C003 does not clearly follow this pattern). This observation may, in turn, be linked to the increase of coprophilous fungi and plant species indicative of livestock activities recorded in the pollen sequence of C003 (García-Rivero et al. 2019). As for the relative proportions of the different domestic ungulate species, the record from C003 -as was the case for the ENB period- shows identical percentages of MNI between suids and caprines (sheep and goat). However, the new data from C006 indicate a clear predominance of caprines, and within this group, of sheep over goats. We cannot, at present, suggest that the results of one area should prevail over those of the other. Although the sedimentological volume, number of remains and densities of these ungulates are much higher and presumably more reliable for C006, we cannot rule out the possibility of residual bone elements (especially in Units 6b, 6 and 5) from previous periods, as indicated by the pottery record (García-Rivero et al. in press). This circumstance makes it difficult to assume these results and leaves open the assessment of this issue in future excavations.

A similar situation arises from the analysis of the LN period, not only because of the possible existence of residual bone materials in Unit 1 of C006, but also because this period has not been clearly defined in C003. However, most of the values converge in pointing to a slight decrease in faunal density compared with the MNB. This observation is not subject to the stratigraphic scenario referred to in C006, and can therefore be assumed momentarily. The relative proportions of the different livestock herds follow the same trend described above for the ENB and the MNB, and are, in turn, consistent with the records from other Andalusian and peninsular sites.

4.2. Impact of the results on the paleoecological knowledge of the Iberian Peninsula

Naked wheat and naked barleys are the most common taxa at Early Neolithic sites, not only at Dehesilla Cave but also throughout most of the South of the Iberian Peninsula (Pérez-Jordà et al. 2017: 176-ff.). There are several coetaneous archaeobotanical data sets for this period in Andalusia (Rovira I Buendía 2007; Peña-Chocarro et al. 2013, 2018; Pérez-Jordà et al. 2017). The richest come from the hinterland, from the sites of Los Castillejos de Montefrío, Cueva de los Murciélagos de Zuheros and Cueva de los Mármoles (Fig. 10). These assemblages are very

similar to that of Dehesilla Cave. This early phase of the Neolithic has provided an archaeological record indicative of small-scale populations with a mixed economy. The poor characteristics of the archaeobotanical record from the ENA of Dehesilla make it impossible to know for the moment if, in the earliest phase of the Neolithic process at this site, if there was a predominance or a greater presence of hulled wheat, as is the case at several sites along the Mediterranean coast of the Iberian Peninsula and in the South of France (e.g. De Vareilles et al. 2020).

The most remarkable trend in the different Andalusian sites from the last third of the 6th millennium BC onwards (Fig. 11), including Dehesilla Cave, is the dominance of naked wheat and barley, but with a series of secondary cereals such as hulled barley or different hulled wheats (Rovira I Buendía 2007; Peña-Chocarro et al. 2013, 2018; Pérez-Jordà et al. 2017). This pattern coincides with that observed at contemporaneous sites in the Valencian Country and Catalonia (Antolin 2016). However, it is different from the trends observed in other areas, for instance in the interior of the Iberian peninsula or, even, in the Tingitan peninsula (Morales et al. 2016), where the presence of hulled wheat is more relevant. Moreover, the botanical record of Dehesilla and the sites of the coast of Málaga is different from that of the sites of the interior of the Guadalquivir valley. Flax and poppy, recurrently present in the inland area, do not appear at any of the sites closer to the coast, neither at this time nor in later periods.

In the 5th millennium BC, there was a notable reduction in the taxonomic diversity and a consolidation of two main crops, naked wheat and barley. This pattern has been interpreted as a shift from an intensive to an extensive model (Antolin 2016; Pérez-Jordà et al. 2017), in line with what has been suggested for Thessaly or Central Europe (Halstead 1996; Bogaard 2004). At Dehesilla Cave, this transition is detected more clearly, and even somewhat earlier (in the MNA period), than at other Andalusian sites, such as Los Castillejos de Montefrío and Cueva de Murciélagos de Albuñol. On the other hand, the current evidence suggests the existence of two distinct agricultural traditions in the interior of the Guadalquivir valley and the area closest to the coast. The significant role of hulled wheat and the cultivation of flax and poppies are elements of the inland tradition, which are not present at the coastal sites. At the latter, the available data is poorer, at present, but appears to point towards a different agricultural tradition. In the 5th millennium BC, the MNB period of Dehesilla Cave may have been part of a more or less generalised pattern in which caves were used in relation to livestock, not only in the south of the Iberian peninsula but also on the eastern coast, as indicated by the sites of Cova de les Cendres (Bernabeu and Molina 2009), Cova de l'Or (Badal et al. 2013), Coves de Sta. Maira and L'Abri de la Falguera (Pérez Jordà 2013).

In general, the animal species best represented at Neolithic sites tend to be the two domesticated species of the Caprinae subfamily (sheep and goats), followed by pigs and cows, to a lesser extent (Bernáldez and Bernáldez 2000; Altuna and Maríezkurrena 2009; Halstead 2012; Liesau and Morales 2012; Saña 2013; Morales and Riquelme 2004; Valente and Carvalho 2014; Valente 2016; Bernáldez et al. in press).

More than half of the Neolithic sites in the Iberian Peninsula with faunal studies correspond to caves (cf. Liesau and Morales 2012; Saña 2013). Therefore, caves continue to provide a considerable amount of information for the study of the use of natural resources and this type of agrestic ecosystems. The analysis of the vertebrates from the Neolithic sequences of areas C003 and C006 of Dehesilla Cave contributes new data to the scarce record of archaeozoological studies published for the Andalusian Neolithic (García-Viñas and Bernáldez 2013; García-Viñas et al. 2014).

The main trend of the predominance of sheep and goat herds over pigs and cattle is observed in many other Neolithic sites in the Iberian Peninsula (Castaños 2004; Saña 2011, 2013; Liesau and Morales 2012; Valente 2016), including those located in the south (Fig. 12), as attested by previous work at Dehesilla Cave itself (Boessneck and Driesch 1980), as well as the archaeological records from El Parralejo (Morales and Riquelme 2004), Lebrija (Bernáldez and Bernáldez 2000), Cueva Chica de Santiago (Bernáldez et al. in press), Nerja (Morales and Martín 1995), Los Castillejos (Riquelme 1998), La Molaina and La Carigüela (Morales and Riquelme 2004), Grañena Baja (Conlin et al. 2020), Valdecuevas (Sarrión 1980) and Nacimiento (Alfárez et al. 1981; Asquerino 1984).

However, the balance between wild and domestic species appears to have varied over time. Indeed, Morales and Riquelme (2004) pointed out that the preeminence of domestic animals over wild species at Andalusian sites is less marked in the Early Neolithic than in later periods. Saña (2013) also detected a diachronic decrease in the hunting of ungulates throughout the Neolithic, as well as a shift towards a greater relative importance of pigs and cattle compared to sheep and goats during the period between 4500-3300 BC. This pattern has not been corroborated by the data obtained so far at Dehesilla Cave for the MNB-LN periods, although it has been observed at some sites in the south of the Iberian Peninsula, for example at Papa Uvas (Álvarez and Chaves 1986) and Carigüela (Morales and Riquelme 2004).

The faunal associations between the relative proportions of the different domestic herds documented at Dehesilla for these advanced Neolithic periods is consistent with records from other Andalusian sites such as Papauvas (Morales 1985; Álvarez and Chaves 1986), El Parralejo (Morales and Riquelme 2004), Castillo de Doña Mencía (Martínez-Sánchez and Vera 2017), Los Castillejos (Riquelme 1998), La Carigüela (Morales and Riquelme 2004), Martos (Riquelme et al. 2012) and Cerro de Los López (Riquelme 2003), as well as with what is generally observed for the Iberian Peninsula (Saña 2013), as is the case for the Early Neolithic data.

5. Conclusions

The main results previously obtained for area C003 at Dehesilla Cave, from pollen, carpological and zoological analysis, suggested a general Neolithic scenario essentially of holm oak and wild olive forests together with oscillating farming and herding practices, with a particular predilection for naked wheat and barley crops and sheep and goat herds.

The new data from area C006, with the exception of some specific dissimilarities, broadly converges with this model. Among the remains of cereals, naked wheat and naked barley are predominant. In the zoological record, both areas show similar patterns in terms of the structure of biodiversity and the diachronic dynamics, and are consistent in indicating the higher proportion of sheep and goats over other ungulate species.

The data concerning the ENB period at Dehesilla (second half of the 6th millennium BC) are indicative of small human populations with a mixed cereal and livestock economy. At the Andalusian sites with good stratigraphic and carpological information -which focus mainly in the last third of the 6th millennium BC-, one of the most notable trends observed is precisely the dominance of naked wheat and barley, but with a series of secondary cereals such as hulled barley or different hulled wheats.

It may be postulated that the seed record preserved at Dehesilla Cave is more similar to that of the coastal area of Málaga than to that of the Guadalquivir valley. However, it remains to be

clarified whether this presumed pattern can be explained in geographical terms, in the sense of an evolutionary convergence in the face of a similar physiographic context, or whether it is due to some underlying cultural factor. Such a question, in any case, requires future systematic studies of the material and cultural record as a whole. On a larger, let us say interregional, scale, it seems equally likely that the carpological record of Dehesilla Cave, and by extension that of the southern Iberian Peninsula, shows greater affinity with the Mediterranean regions of Valencia and Catalonia than with the interior regions of the Meseta and even with the Tingitan peninsula (although, of course, these geographical areas display some degree of internal diversity and differences between their archaeological sites). As far as the Iberian geography is concerned, we do not know, at present, if this possible dichotomous pattern may be correlated with the two supposed ceramic cultural traditions, the Mediterranean cardial and the Inland-Atlantic boquique. In any case, the verification of these hypotheses would require further methodologically systematic and specific analyses.

The clear tendency for sheep and goats to dominate over pigs and cattle during this period, and also during the Neolithic sequence as a whole, is also observed at many other Neolithic sites in the Iberian Peninsula. There is, however, some diversity in the Neolithic record in terms of the patterns of dynamics and relative evolutions between domestic herds and wild animal resources, as is suggested by the differences observed between different sites and areas of the Iberian Peninsula.

The MNA period of Dehesilla Cave (circa 4800-4500 cal BC) is, undoubtedly, a turning point in the Neolithic sequence. There is a notable decrease in zoological remains and, at the same time, a significant change in the botanical record, indicating an economy based mainly on the cultivation of naked wheat and, to a lesser extent, naked barley. This empirical picture could suggest an agricultural scenario close to monoculture, linked to the shift from intensive to extensive crop systems reported in other Iberian and Mediterranean regions in the 5th millennium BC. At Dehesilla, this probable extensive agricultural system may have caused a pressure on the landscape that would account, from the middle of the 5th millennium BC onwards, for the strong decrease of the forest cover and the creation of thermophile forests, an ecological system that appears to be observed in other Andalusian sites and may be extensible to other peninsular regions.

The MNB and LN periods (second half of the 5th and 4th millennium BC, respectively) present some difficulties in the record currently available at Dehesilla Cave. The livestock herds regain greater importance, but the two excavation areas are markedly different in terms of the carpological record. The areas closest to the cave entrance may have been used for livestock, which would explain the predominance of wild fruit remains, as well as the increase in coprophilous fungi, as observed in C003.

At numerous archaeological sites throughout the south of the Iberian Peninsula, the reduction of botanical taxonomic diversity in favour of the differential replication of naked wheat and barley crops is a consolidated model. The faunal association between the relative proportions of the different livestock herds documented at Dehesilla Cave for these advanced Neolithic periods is also consistent with other Andalusian sites of the same period. However, although the record from Dehesilla is not clear in this regard, there may have been a general decline in the hunting and use of wild ungulates (such as deer), as well as a shift towards a greater relative frequency of cattle and pigs, and a slight decline in sheep and goats around 4500-3300 BC.

These patterns are probably related to many of the changes that are visible in the archaeological record from the 4th millennium cal BC onwards. From its onset, and especially by the middle of this millennium, not only in the south but throughout much of the peninsular geography, a demographic increase took place, along with new territorial patterns of human occupation. There was a differential replication of open-air settlements, in valleys and other open fertile areas, where numerous pit structures have been documented, as well as burial sites and megalithic necropolis. The consolidation of these archaeological features would eventually give rise to a new socio-cultural era, the Copper Age, across the entire southern Iberian Peninsula at the end of the 4th millennium BC.

References

- Acosta, P., and M. Pellicer. 1990. *La Cueva de la Dehesilla (Jerez de la Frontera). Las primeras civilizaciones productoras en Andalucía occidental*. Jerez de la Frontera: CSIC.
- Alfárez, F., G. Molero, V. Bustos, and P. Brea. 1981. "La Cueva del Nacimiento (Pontones): un yacimiento neolítico en la Sierra del Segura. Apéndice II. La fauna de macromamíferos." *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 38: 139-145.
- Altuna, J., and K. Mariezkurrena. 2009. "Tipos de cabañas ganaderas durante el neolítico en el País Vasco." *Archaeofauna* 18: 137-157.
- Álvarez, M. T., and P. Chaves. 1986. "Informe faunístico del yacimiento de Aljaraque (Huelva). Cortes A-7.2 y A-10.4 del sector A." In *Papa Uvas (Aljaraque, Huelva). Campañas de 1981 a 1983*, edited by J. C. Martín de la Cruz, 219-334. Excavaciones Arqueológicas de España 149. Madrid: Ministerio de Cultura.
- Antolín, F. 2016. *Local, intensive and diverse? Early farmers and plant economy in the North-East of the Iberian Peninsula (5500-2300 cal BC)*. Groningen: Barkhuis Publishing.
- Arribas, A., and F. Molina. 1979. *El poblado de "Los Castillejos" en las Peñas de los Gitanos (Montefrío, Granada): campaña de excavaciones de 1971: el corte núm. 1*. Granada: Universidad de Granada.
- Asquerino, M. D. 1984. "Espacio y territorio en el Neolítico del noreste de Jaén." *Arqueología Espacial* 3: 31-40.
- Badal, E., B. Martí, and M. Pérez-Ripoll. 2013. "From agricultural to pastoral use: changes in neolithic landscape at Cova de l'Or (Alicante, Spain)." *Sagvntvm* 13: 75-84.
- Bernabeu, J., and L. Molina. 2009. *La Cova de les Cendres (Moraira-Teulada, Alicante)*. Alicante: MARQ.
- Bernáldez, E., 2009. *Bioestratinomía de macromamíferos terrestres de Doñana. Inferencias ecológicas en los yacimientos arqueológicos del S.O. de Andalucía*. BAR International Series 1978. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Bernáldez, E. 2011. "Biostratinomy applied to the interpretation of scavenger activity in paleoecosystems." *Quaternary International* 243: 161–170.
- Bernáldez, E. and M. Bernáldez. 2000. "La basura orgánica de Lebrija en otros tiempos. Estudio paleobiológico y taxonómico del yacimiento arqueológico de la Calle Alcazaba de Lebrija

(Sevilla)." *Boletín Instituto Andaluz Patrimonio Histórico* 32: 134–150.

Bernáldez, E., and E. García-Viñas. in press. "Modelos tafonómicos neolíticos: historia de dos enclaves. In *Actas del VII Congreso sobre el Neolítico en la península ibérica*, edited by D. García-Rivero, (eds). Spal Monografías. Sevilla: Universidad de Sevilla.

Boessneck, J. 1980. "Diferencias osteológicas entre la oveja (*Ovis aries* linné) y la cabra (*Capra hircus* linné)." In *Ciencia en arqueología*, edited by D. Brothwell, and E. Higgs, 338-366. Madrid: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Bogaard, A. 2004. *Neolithic farming in central Europe: an archaeobotanical study of crop husbandry practices*. London: Routledge.

Bosch Gimpera, P. 1920. "La arqueología prerromana hispánica." In *Hispania*, edited by A. Schulten, 133–205. Barcelona: Tipografía de la Academia.

Castaños, P. 2004. "Estudio arqueozoológico de los macromamíferos del neolítico de la Cueva de Chaves (Huesca)." *Saldivie* 4: 125-171.

Castroviejo, S., coord. 1986-2012. *Flora ibérica*, Vols. 1-8, 10-15, 17-18, 21. Madrid: Real Jardín Botánico, CSIC.

Conlin, E., R. M. Martínez, and A. Morgado. 2020. "Hacia una nueva definición del Neolítico Medio en el sur de la península ibérica: Grañena Baja, Jaén." *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 77: 30-47.

De Vareilles, A., L. Bouby, A. Jesus, L. Martin, M. Rottoli, M. Vander Linden, and F. Antolín. 2020. "One sea but many routes to sail. The early maritime dispersal of Neolithic crops from the Aegean to the western Mediterranean." *Journal of Archaeological Science. Reports* 29: 102-140.

Fernández-Jalvo, Y., and P. Andrews. 2016. *Atlas of the taphonomic identifications. 1001+images of fossil and recent mammal bone modification*. Dordrecht: Springer.

García-Rivero, D. 2004. "Prehistoria y evolución: reflexiones sobre la secuencia ecológico-cultural holocénica en el mediodía ibérico." *Spal* 13: 9–34.

García-Rivero, D., M. Barrera-Cruz, M. J. Díaz-Rodríguez, J. C. Vera-Rodríguez, and R. Taylor. 2022. "Cueva de la Dehesilla: nuevos datos estratigráficos, materiales y radiocarbónicos (corte C006) y revisión de su secuencia neolítica." *Spal* 31.1: 57-91.

García-Rivero, D., G. Pérez-Jordà, E. García-Viñas, J. A. López-Sáez, R. Taylor, L. Peña-Chocarro, E. Bernáldez-Sánchez, and S. Pérez-Díaz. 2019. "Ecological patterns and use of natural resources during the neolithic of the south of the Iberian Peninsula: An update from the 6th to 4th millennia cal BC sequence of Dehesilla Cave." *Quaternary Science Reviews* 219: 218–235.

García-Rivero, D., R. Taylor, C. Umbelino, M. Cubas, M. Barrera-Cruz, and M. Díaz-Rodríguez. 2021. "Early Neolithic ritual funerary behaviours in the Westernmost regions of the Mediterranean: new insights from Dehesilla Cave (southern Iberian Peninsula)." *Documenta Praehistorica* 48: 2-31.

García-Rivero, D., R. Taylor, C. Umbelino, T. D. Price, E. García-Viñas, E. Bernáldez-Sánchez, G. Pérez-Jordà, L. Peña-Chocarro, M. Barrera-Cruz, J. F. Gibaja-Bao, M. J. Díaz-Rodríguez, P. Monteiro, J. C. Vera-Rodríguez, and J. Pérez-González. 2020. "The exceptional finding of Locus

- 2 at Dehesilla Cave and the Middle Neolithic ritual funerary practices of the Iberian Peninsula." *PloS One* 15(8): e0236961.
- García-Rivero, D., J. C. Vera-Rodríguez, M. J. Díaz-Rodríguez, M. Barrera-Cruz, R. Taylor, L. G. Pérez-Aguilar, and C. Umbelino. 2018. "La Cueva de la Dehesilla (Sierra de Cádiz): vuelta a un sitio clave para el neolítico del sur de la península ibérica." *Munibe* 69: 123–144.
- García-Viñas, E., and E. Bernáldez-Sánchez. 2013. "Paleobiología en Andalucía: una primera aproximación a los estudios arqueozoológicos realizados para la Prehistoria Reciente." In *VI Encuentro de Arqueología del Suroeste Peninsular*, edited by J. Jiménez, M. Bustamante, and M. García, coords., 897–926. Villafranca de los Barros: Ayuntamiento de Villafranca de los Barros.
- García-Viñas, E., A. Ocaña, M. Gamero, and E. Bernáldez-Sánchez. 2014. "Diecinueve años de investigación sobre el patrimonio paleobiológico de la Prehistoria Reciente andaluza." *Boletín Instituto Andaluz Patrimonio Histórico* 86: 88–100.
- González-Urquijo, J. E., J. J. Ibáñez-Estévez, L. Peña-Chocarro, B. Gavilán-Ceballos, and J. C. Vera-Rodríguez. 2000. "El aprovechamiento de recursos vegetales en los niveles neolíticos del yacimiento de los Murciélagos (Zuheros, Córdoba)." *Complutum* 11: 171–189.
- Halstead, P. 1996. "Pastoralism or household herding? Problems of scale and specialization in early Greek animal husbandry." *World Archaeology* 28 (1): 20–42.
- Halstead, P. 2012. "Las transformaciones económicas del Neolítico en Europa." In *El Neolítico en la Península Ibérica y su contexto europeo*, edited by M. Rojo, R. Garrido, and I. García, 27–39. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Jordá-Pardo, J. F., ed. 1986. *La Prehistoria de la Cueva de Nerja. Trabajos de la Cueva de Nerja 1*. Málaga: Patronato de la Cueva de Nerja.
- Liesau, C., and A. Morales. 2012. "Las transformaciones económicas del Neolítico en la Península Ibérica: la ganadería." In *El Neolítico en la Península Ibérica y su contexto europeo*, edited by M. Rojo, R. Garrido, and I. García, 107–128. Madrid: Cátedra.
- López-García, P. 1980. "Estudio de la cerámica, industria ósea y lítica de la Cueva de los Murciélagos de Albuñol (Granada)." *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 37: 163–180.
- López-García, P. 1986. "Estudio palinológico del Holoceno Español a través del análisis de yacimientos arqueológicos." *Trabajos de Prehistoria* 43: 143–158.
- Lyman, R. L. 1994. *Vertebrate taphonomy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Martín-Socas, D., M. D. Cámalich, J. L. Caro, and F. J. Rodríguez-Santos. 2018. "The beginning of the Neolithic in Andalusia." *Quaternary International* 470: 451–471.
- Martínez-Sánchez, R. M., and J. C. Vera. 2017. *El enclave neolítico al aire libre del castillo de Doña Mencía (Córdoba). Una mirada a los primeros agricultores y ganaderos de las campiñas del Guadalquivir Medio. Onoba Monografías 1*. Huelva: Universidad de Huelva.
- McClure, S. B., and M. H. Welker. 2017. "Farming with animals: Domesticated animals and taxonomic diversity in the cardial Neolithic of the Western Mediterranean." In *Times of Neolithic Transition along the Western Mediterranean*, edited by O. García-Puchol, and D. C. García-Salazar, 221–250. Cham: Springer.

- Morales, A., and J. M. Martín. 1995. "Los mamíferos de la Cueva de Nerja (análisis de las cuadrículas NM-80A, NM-80B y NT-82)." In *Fauna de la Cueva de Nerja I. Salas de la Mina y de la Torca, campañas 1980-82*, edited by M. Pellicer, and A. Morales, 57-159. Nerja: Patronato de la Cueva de Nerja.
- Morales, A., and J. A. Riquelme. 2004. "Faunas de mamíferos del Neolítico andaluz: tendencias diacrónicas fiables." In *II-III Simposios de Prehistoria Cueva de Nerja*, edited by M. Pellicer, and A. Arribas, 41-51. Nerja: Fundación Cueva de Nerja.
- Morales, J., G. Pérez-Jordà, L. Peña-Chocarro, Y. Bokbot, J. C. Vera, R. M. Martínez, and J. Linstädter. 2016. "The introduction of South-Western Asian domesticated plants in North-Western Africa: An archaeobotanical contribution from Neolithic Morocco." *Quaternary International* 412: 96-109.
- Pellicer, M. 1963. *Estratigrafía prehistórica de la Cueva de Nerja. Primera campaña, 1959. Excavaciones Arqueológicas en España* 16. Málaga: Ministerio de Educación Nacional and Patronato de la Cueva de Nerja.
- Pellicer, M. 1964. *El Neolítico y el Bronce de la Cueva de la Carigüela de Piñar (Granada). Trabajos de Prehistoria* 15. Madrid: Seminario de Historia Primitiva del Hombre.
- Pellicer, M., and P. Acosta. 1997. *El Neolítico y Calcolítico de la Cueva de Nerja en el contexto andaluz. Trabajos de la Cueva de Nerja* 6. Málaga: Patronato de la Cueva de Nerja.
- Peña-Chocarro, L., G. Pérez-Jordà, and J. Morales. 2018. "Crops of the first farming communities in the Iberian Peninsula." *Quaternary International* 470B: 369–382.
- Peña-Chocarro, L., G. Pérez-Jordà, J. Morales, and J. C. Vera. 2013. "... Y llegaron los agricultores: agricultura y recolección en el occidente del Mediterráneo." *Menga* 4: 15–34.
- Pérez Jordà, G. 2013. *La agricultura en el País Valenciano entre el VI y el I milenio a.C.* València: Universitat de València.
- Pérez-Jordà, G., L. Peña-Chocarro, J. Morales, and L. Zapata. 2017. "Evidence for early crop management practices in the Western Mediterranean: Latest data, new developments and future perspectives." In *Times of Neolithic Transition along the Western Mediterranean*, edited by O. García-Puchol, and D. C. Salazar-García, 171–197. Cham: Springer.
- Ramos, J. 2006. "Embarcadero del río Palmones (Algeciras). Síntesis socioeconómica y perspectivas de investigación." *Almoraima* 33: 95–106.
- Ramos, J., and M. Lazarich. 2002. *El asentamiento de "El Retamar" (Puerto Real, Cádiz). Contribución al estudio de la formación social tribal a los inicios de la economía de producción en la Bahía de Cádiz*. Cádiz: Universidad de Cádiz.
- Riquelme, J. A. 1998. "Contribución al estudio arqueofaunístico durante el Neolítico y la Edad del Cobre en las Cordilleras Béticas: el yacimiento arqueológico de Los Castillejos en Las Peñas de los Gitanos, Montefrío (Granada)." Ph.D. diss., Universidad de Granada, Granada.
- Riquelme, J. A. 2003. "II Fase del proyecto Aportaciones de los estudios arqueozoológicos al conocimiento de las relaciones hombre-fauna durante la prehistoria y la historia antigua en Andalucía." *Anuario Arqueológico de Andalucía* 2003(2): 322-327.

- Riquelme, J. A., R. Lizcano, C. Pérez, R. Sánchez, and J. A. Cámara. 2012. "Una introducción al análisis de los restos faunísticos de la zona arqueológica del polideportivo de Martos." *Cuadernos de Prehistoria y Arqueología de Granada* 22: 199-230.
- Rodríguez-Ariza, M. O. 1996. "Análisis antracológicos de yacimientos neolíticos de Andalucía." *Rubricatum* 1: 73-83.
- Rodríguez-Rodríguez, A. C., J. F. Gibaja, U. Perales, and I. Clemente. 2013. "Comunidades campesinas, pastoras y artesanas. Traceología de los procesos de trabajo durante el Neolítico andaluz." *Menga* 4: 35-52.
- Rovira I Buendía, N. 2007. "Agricultura y gestión de los recursos vegetales en el sureste de la Península Ibérica durante la prehistoria reciente." Ph.D. diss., Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona.
- Saña, M. 2011. "La gestió dels recursos animals." In *El poblat lacustre del neolític antic de la Draga. Excavacions 2000-2005*, edited by A. Bosch, J. Chinchilla, and J. Tarrús, 177-212. Monografies del Centre d'Arqueologia Subaquàtica de Catalunya 9. Girona.
- Saña, M. 2013. "Domestication of animals in the Iberian Peninsula." In *The origins and spread of domestic animals in southwest Asia and Europe*, edited by S. Colledge, J. Conolly, K. Dobney, K. Manning, and S. Shennan, 195-220. London: Institute of Archaeology Publications.
- Sarrión, I. 1980. "Valdecuevas. Estación Meso-Neolítica en la Sierra de Cazorla (Jaén)." *Sagvntvm* 15: 23-56.
- Stevenson, A. C., and R. J. Harrison. 1992. "Ancient Forests in Spain: A Model for Land-use and Dry Forest Management in South-west Spain from 4000 BC to 1900 AD." *Proceeding of the Prehistoric Society* 58: 227-247.
- Valente, M. J. 2016. "Zooarqueología do Neolítico do Sul de Portugal: passado, presente e futuros." In *O Neolítico em Portugal antes do Horizonte 2020: Perspectivas em debate*, edited by M. Diniz, C. Neves, and A. Martins, 87-108. Monografias de Associação dos Arqueólogos Portugueses 2, Lisboa.
- Valente, M.J., and A. F. Carvalho. 2014. "Zooarchaeology in the Neolithic and Chalcolithic of Southern Portugal." *Environmental Archaeology* 19: 226-240.
- Vicent, A. M., and A. M. Muñoz. 1973. *Segunda campaña de excavaciones en la Cueva de los Murciélagos, Zuheros (Córdoba), 1969. Excavaciones Arqueológicas en España* 77. Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia.
- Zohary, D. M. Hopf, and E. Weiss. 2012. *Domestication of Plants in the Old World: The Origin and Spread of Domesticated Plants in Southwest Asia, Europe, and the Mediterranean Basin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Figure captions:

Fig. 1 Location of Dehesilla Cave in the southern region of the Iberian Peninsula

Fig. 2 Section and 3D plan of the cave with the location of all of the archaeological excavation areas.

Fig. 3 Graph of the relative percentages of cereals, legumes and wild plants from area C006.

Fig. 4 Density chart (x10 l.) of the carpological remains in the samples of each period in area C006

Fig. 5 Cumulative bar chart with the relative percentages of each type of cereal from C006 in each period

Fig. 6 Graph of the Fragmentation Index (IF) of the zoological remains of areas C003 and C006 by period

Fig. 7 Relative percentages of the seed groups by area and period

Fig. 8 Comparative plots of ungulate densities (individuals, DI and number of identified specimens, DNISP) by area and period.

Fig. 9 Comparative graphs with the percentages of MNI of the different ungulate species by area and period.


Fig. 10 Sites with archaeobotanical and archaeozoological data used in the Discussion (Red circles: caves; Green circles: open-air sites): 1) Dehesilla, 2) El Parralejo, 3) Lebrija, 4) Papauvas, 5) Chica de Santiago, 6) Toro, 7) Doña Mencía, 8) Murciélagos de Zuheros, 9) Los Mármoles, 10) Los Castillejos, 11) Nerja, 12) Polideportivo de Martos, 13) Grañena Baja, 14) La Molaina, 15) Carigüela, 16) Murciélagos de Albuñol, 17) Valdecuevas, 18) Nacimiento, 19) Cerro de los López, 20) Falguera, 21) L'Or, 22) Sta. Maira, and 23) Cendres


Fig. 11 Relative frequencies/percentages of cereal species in the different Neolithic periods of Dehesilla, Los Castillejos (open-air) and Murciélagos de Zuheros (cave)


Fig. 12 Proportion of NISP of *Bos taurus*, *Cervus elaphus*, *Sus srofa*/*Sus s. domesticus* and *Ovis aries*/*Capra hircus* at Neolithic archaeological sites in Andalusia


Author biography


García Rivero has always been aware of the importance of the Philosophy of Science in the Humanities. This has led him to seek out a wide range of training opportunities and stays with professors from different universities and countries (Southampton, 2003; London, 2008, 2010, 2011; Columbia, USA, 2012; Buenos Aires, 2013; Faro, 2014; Köln, 2021). In the last decade, he has been successful in consolidating the archaeological understanding of the theory of evolution and the principles of cultural transmission both at the theoretical level (e.g. Complutum 2012; Editorial Universidad Sevilla 2010, 2013; Springer 2016), with contributions aimed at generating critical knowledge not only among specialists, but also among students and the wider public, and the methodological level (e.g. Plos One 2014, 2021; Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences 2016; Journal of Archaeological Science 2017; JAS, Reports 2019), with relevant contributions in the development of sequencing techniques and phylogenetic methods in the cultural arena. In recognition, he has received invitations to teach seminars and give lectures at universities in different countries (e.g. Cuernavaca, Mexico 2014; Mexico DF 2015; Barcelona 2016; Coimbra 2017; Algarve 2017; Valencia 2018; Köln, scheduled for April 2022) and to form part of several scientific committees of international specialised events (e.g. Arizona 2015; Faro 2017; Cancún 2017). In addition, García Rivero has excavated and contributed to the knowledge of diverse periods and phenomena, especially in Late Prehistory: the Mesolithic-Neolithic transition in Central Portugal (Quaternary International 2017; European Journal of Archaeology 2020); the origin of farming and herding populations in Southern Iberia (Munibe 2018; Quaternary Science Reviews 2019, Plos One 2020; Spal 2022) and their dispersal across Western Mediterranean (JAS, Reports 2019; Documenta Praehistorica 2021; Plos One 2021); the evolution of symbolic mobiliary representations in the Late Neolithic and Copper Age in SW Iberia (Plos One 2014, Estudos Arqueologicos de Oeiras 2015; Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences 2016); the Bell Beaker in the Guadiana Basin (British Archaeological Reports 2008, Journal of Archaeological Sciences 2016); the Copper-Bronze Age transition in SW Iberia (Zephyrus 2015); etc. In addition to his permanent position at the University of Seville, García Rivero is an Associated Researcher in two international research centres: International Centre for Archaeology and Evolution of Human Behaviour and Research Centre for Anthropology and Health, and maintains close collaborations with several universities in the UK, USA, Argentina, Mexico, Germany and Portugal. In recent years, García Rivero has taken on a relevant role in terms of scientific responsibilities, including membership in international (2) and national (2) research projects; international scientific committees (3); organisation of international (2) and national (4) congresses; editorial and journal committees (4); juries for academic awards (1); academic commissions through elected officials (1); editions of conference proceedings (2); and, of course, numerous evaluations of academic work (undergraduate, master and doctoral theses) at the University of Seville and other universities, research articles for various scientific journals, applications for research projects for the State Research Agency, etc. His leadership role has increased through his position as PI in the General Research Project Cueva de la Dehesilla, of the Junta de Andalucía (2015-present); in a R+D+i of the Call for Excellence 2018; in the implementation of the FACTUS Project (2017-present), a solid teaching commitment of the Vice-Rectorate for Teaching and the Faculty of Geography and History of the University of Seville; in projects of private entities, such as the PALARQ Foundation; as well as in collaboration contracts for junior staff, research initiation and research management (Ministry of Education, University of Seville, Regional Government of Andalusia/ERDF, respectively). The funding received, added to other internal grants from the University of Seville, as well as from other sources (e.g. University of Coimbra), exceeds 150,000 euros. All these activities generate a substantial contribution to society and to the training of young researchers, an essential commitment of Dr. García Rivero as a lecturer and an active researcher.


















Figure08

[Click here to access/download;Non-color figure;Fig08.jpg](#)









Figure10

[Click here to access/download;Color figure;Fig10.jpg](#)









Click here to access/download
Supplementary material
Table01.docx



Click here to access/download
Supplementary material
Table02.docx



Click here to access/download
Supplementary material
Table03.docx