Handmade Burnished Ware and the Late Bronze Age of the Balkans

H. Arthur Bankoff, Nathan Meyer, and Mark Stefanovich[1]

Abstract

Handmade Burnished Ware from late Mycenaean contexts has been interpreted variously as a unified ceramic assemblage, a conflation of different indigenous coarse-ware traditions, evidence for intrusive ethnic elements in the Mycenaean world, a symptom of the economic and systemic decline of the palace elite, and the reemergence of the Aegean peasant substrata as the destructions of the Late Bronze Age took their toll. The authors propose that it may represent the ceramic tradition of persons brought into Greece from the Balkans and other areas beyond the Mycenaean periphery, and could be investigated through comparison with models developed in the New World and through the study of the technology of production.[2]

Background

For the past thirty years, Handmade Burnished Ware has been recognized as a characteristic component in LH IIIC (and, more occasionally, LH IIIB) assemblages in Greece (French 1965, French and Rutter 1977). Its first full description and analysis is found in Jeremy Rutter's presentation of material from the site of Korakou near Corinth (Rutter 1975). Rutter also identified similar material from early LH IIIC contexts at sites in the Corinthia, Argolid, Attica, Euoboea, Phocis, and in the VIIb1 and VIIb2 levels of Troy (Rutter 1977, 1990). It has since been also recognized as part of the ceramic assemblage from LBA sites in Crete (Watrous 1992) and Cyprus (Pilides 1991, 1994). This pottery consists of wares clearly distinct in shape, decoration, and production technology from the traditional Mycenaean pottery types found with them (Rutter 1975; Small 1990; Pilides 1991, 1994).

The Balkan Connection

We have long believed that some Handmade Burnished Ware found in Mycenaean sites reflects a central Balkan ethnic component in Late Helladic south Greece (Bankoff and Winter 1984; Stefanovich 1973, 1974). While we originally identified the Late Bronze Age cultures of central and southern Serbia, specifically the Paracin and Mediana groups (cf. Garasanin 1983a), as the nearest to the Handmade Burnished Ware ceramic tradition, more recent information now makes it seem more likely that this ware's antecedents may also be found in the contemporaneous Donja Brnjica - Gornja Strazava group (Garasanin 1983b, with earlier literature; Jevtic 1990; Krstic 1992; Mitrevski 1994), which extends to the east of the Morava valley into southwestern Bulgaria via the adjacent Struma river valley as well. Cemeteries of this group are found over a wide area of southern and eastern Serbia, Kosovo, and as far east as Plovdiv (D. Garasanin, n.d.). This concurs with Rutter's view that " [t]he conclusion is justified that the area of origin for the makers of the handmade burnished pottery of the LH IIIC Korakou, as well as for the makers of similar pottery from contemporary contexts elsewhere in southern Greece, is to be sought in the general region of Thrace or southern Bulgaria." (Rutter 1975:30) and "[o]n the basis of published material, it seems best at the present to suggest Bulgaria as a source for the so far undefined Late Bronze Age culture in which the jars and bowls of Group I, the grooved cups and kantharoi ofGroup II, and the large shouldered closed shapes of Group IV are all at home." (Rutter 1975:31).

The significance of these comments was emphasized as we began the preliminary analysis and interpretation of the site of Kamenska Chuka in southwest Bulgaria, which is currently in its fourth season of excavation (Bankoff and Stefanovich 1996)[3]. We are certainly not proposing that the Mycenaean Handmade Burnished Ware comes from Kamenska Chuka. Indeed, Rutter's pottery groups are represented at many of the Donja Brnjica-Gornja Strazava cemeteries (cf. Mitrevski 1994:Figs. 1-4; 1995:Fig. 2; Jevtic 1990:Figs. 2 and 3). However, Kamenska Chuka is one of the few completely excavated non-funerary sites from the area and the period from which we believe that this ware derives. The site has produced a large, stratigraphically-sealed, well-dated ceramic assemblage which typologically closely resembles Handmade Burnished Ware as originally described from the Argolid. The fine wares at Kamenska Chuka are distinctively north Greek or western Macedonian, and continue in later Bronze and Iron Age shapes widely produced in the Balkans. Thus, Kamenska Chuka may be viewed at least as an example of a significant nexus where the traditions of two different areas (Aegean and central Balkan) meet, interact, and affect the subsequent development of ceramic assemblages on both sides.

Kamenska Chuka is a Late Bronze Age site (carbon dated to the 14-11 c BC) in the Struma river valley of southwest Bulgaria, one of the routes which connect Greece with the central Balkans (Bankoff and Stefanovich 1996). It may very well represent a type of site, hitherto unknown, where the cultures of the Aegean came into contact, directly or indirectly, with those of the barbarian North. Our current interpretation of the site considers it primarily a trading post, perhaps the northernmost Greek or the southern-most central Balkan node of a Macedonian trade network eventually in down-the-line contact with the latest Mycenaean sites of northern Greece (cf. Bankoff and Winter 1989). As such, Kamenska Chuka was one of the most likely entryways for central Balkan pottery shapes and designs, such as those identified by Heurtley in his survey of West Macedonian sites more than fifty years ago (Heurtley 1939) , into the ceramic corpus of the Aegean world.

So far, about two-thirds of the remains of a large (c. 370 m^2), strongly-constructed building dating to the fourteenth/thirteenth century B.C. have been exposed. A concern for defense is suggested by both the architectural techniques such as massive rubble-filled exterior walls and a gateway with inner and outer doors, and site selection on a secure position atop a steep hill. Within the building itself, several rows of storage pithoi, comprising 15 complete and at least that many fragmentary vessels with capacities of up to 100 liters, were found set into the floor, indicating the means for large-scale storage of agricultural produce. Stratigraphy of the floor zone indicates that the building was in use for only a brief span of time before its eventual destruction by a fierce fire.

Architecturally, Kamenska Chuka is almost unique, not only in the Balkans, but in all of

later prehistoric Europe. Other sites with similar ceramic traditions lack the two-meter wide rubble-
filled stone walls and stone staircase leading to a second story which distinguish this structure. A single mention of Khrysavgi, a site with local Mycenaean pottery and certain Late Bronze Age occupation in the vicinity of Assiros, where construction uncovered a "massive rubble wall over 3 meters high" (Wardle 1983), is the only hint to date of any nearby analogy. The research designenvisions surveying the larger Struma valley area to determine whether this architecture had any other local occurrences (for a fuller treatment of the results of the first three seasons of the Kamenska Chuka excavations, see Bankoff and Stefanovich 1996).

Handmade Burnished Ware: Theoretical perspectives

Discussions of the origin and interpretation of Handmade Burnished Ware may be divided into two classes: Handmade Burnished Ware as an indigenous Mycenaean phenomenon or Handmade Burnished Ware as the material evidence for a fundamentally alien and intrusive phenomenon. The history of this controversy has recently been treated at length by Pilides (1994:1-10, with literature). For the former approach (Walberg 1976; Sandars 1978; Snodgrass 1983; Small 1990), the predominant explanation is that the ware arose as a cultural response to changed circumstances, most often viewed as the breakdown of Mycenaean pottery production systems. Only Small, however, has developed this line of reasoning into a full argument.

According to Small, agricultural surpluses were an unpredictable phenomenon in Late Helladic mainland sites, which implied an environment of economic risk for the peasant population. Household production of crafts is an ethnographically-documented method for managing the risk of agricultural production. The mode of production of Handmade Burnished Ware, namely that it is hand-made and hence (argues Small) household level work, signals its production as an attempt to buffer peasants against the vagaries of agricultural shortfalls. In particular, during LH IIIB/C, he argues that the Mycenaean economic system underwent stress due to massive public expenditure. Excess agricultural surplus was absorbed and diverted from its market role as recompense for elite goods. This, in turn, forced peasants to produce not elite goods, but rather utilitarian goods (i.e. Handmade Burnished ceramics) for their own household and the common market. An additional source of stress was the decline of the elite population at Mycenaean centers, again with similar effects on the peasant household economy.

In a critical rejoinder, Rutter (Rutter 1990) argues that the Greek data do not support Small's argument. For instance, if the pottery is made for exchange, why is there so little of it? Earlier excavations may have not have recorded it (as Walberg and Small argue), but how does this square with more recent investigations where this pottery is a very small fraction of the total sherd count? If peasants were augmenting precarious economics, why did they produce pottery with such a distinctive and yet completely un-Mycenaean style? How would these choices have enhanced the marketability of these pieces? Furthermore, why do stylistically similar wares appear in geographically disparate places, as far away as Cyprus? Rutter also points out that the simplistic equation of handmade wares to household production is contradicted by data from the western Aegean and the mainland, where household wheelmade pottery existed for at least 200 years prior to the first workshops in the early MH period. Ironically, these same MH workshops produced handmade pottery for at least 500 years along very narrow morphological and stylistic norms. While there are several instances where an argument can be made for Handmade Burnished Ware's impact on Mycenaean forms, only at Tiryns can this be argued the other way around. In other words, Handmade Burnished Ware appears to have been an external contributor to the Mycenaean repertoire rather than sharing its aesthetic vision or drawing from it.

Small chose to develop an argument based on the currently available models for Mycenaean economic systems and their collapse at the end of the Late Bronze Age. He specifically identifies what he believes to be an over-reliance on stylistic analysis at the expense of an analysis of the locus and mode of production as one weakness in the arguments of those who favor a diffusionist explanation for the Handmade Burnished Ware (Small 1990:9f). His main criticism is that coarse ware similar in formal attributes can be produced by groups with no temporal or geographical connections. Similar arguments have been advanced by Walberg (Walberg 1976: 186) who held that the shapes and decorative elements of Handmade Burnished Ware could each be found in EB and MB age contexts. Harding (1984:222) likewise argues that the elements believed to define Handmade Burnished Ware are "all widespread and more or less unspecific features which recur time and again in the repertoire of the prehistoric potter" and further that "[p]ottery parallels are in any case notoriously unreliable: potters have demonstrably created identical forms in quite unrelated areas of time and space, for their art is one that is conditioned by considerations of function, of materials, and by the basis of mental preconceptions about the final appearance of a pot that each potter had". Here is evident a regrettable general tendency to view Handmade Burnished Ware as a technologically inferior product, especially when considered alongside the contemporary Mycenaean wares (hence reflecting an impoverished social and technical context of production). However, Rutter has emphasized that the material from Korakou "does not appear to represent the poor attempts by unskilled potters to produce a familiar "Mycenaean" range of shapes and decoration, but rather is indicative of a taste for shapes and decorative treatments" (Rutter 1976:187). Within their genre, these are competent and even, perhaps, sophisticated pieces.

Those archaeologists who explain Handmade Burnished Ware as the material evidence for a fundamentally alien and intrusive phenomenon, on the other hand, have attempted to identify specific elements of the published examples of Handmade Burnished Ware that have close analogies in areas outside of the Mycenaean/Minoan centers. Possible candidates range from Italy (Kilian 1978:312ff; Hallager 1985), the middle Danube (Deger-Jalkotzy 1977:50), northwest Greece (Kilian 1978:312ff), the Morava valley in Serbia (Bankoff and Winter 1984), and Bulgaria/Thrace (Dimitrov 1969; Stefanovich 1974; Rutter 1975). Such arguments all suffer from some common problems (often cited by the authors themselves). Too little of the Handmade Burnished Ware has been published for any solid analysis (whether a measure of its relative percentage in the overall ceramic assemblage or for systematic comparative studies) to be done. Different

wares may be erroneously classed together as Handmade Burnished Ware (Pilides 1991). The comparanda cited are in no case exact parallels, and often very representative elements in the cited assemblages do not show up in Handmade Burnished Ware. The proliferation of possible sources, none compellingly more likely than others, leaves the question of origins still very much undecided.

The origin and social relevance of Handmade Burnished Ware has thus as yet received no satisfying treatment. Bloedow, surveying the current state of research in 1985, concluded that given the diversity of possible origins for Handmade Burnished Ware, it is now necessary to consider that perhaps the makers of this pottery come from many, if not all, of these regions (Bloedow 1985:190). Bouzek, in a recent review article on Balkan-Greek relations in the Late Bronze Age, reiterates his long-held view that its appearance betokens a foreign invasion (Bouzek1994:69). As it is agreed by most observers that the Handmade Burnished Ware does indeed represent a new (if not alien) pottery type, and that it appears at the end of LH IIIB and the beginning of LH IIIC, that is to say slightly before or during and after the collapse of the Mycenaean centers, its origin and social implications are indeed ".. of outstanding historical importance" (Catling and Catling 1981:81).

As noted above, the arguments of those who favor a diffusionist interpretation of Handmade Burnished Ware often devote their attention primarily to formal similarities. Small advances the discussion by attempting to link mode and locus of production to socio-cultural issues. Such an approach to ceramic interpretation has a long pedigree in archaeological literature outside the Aegean and has been termed "ceramic ecology" by Matson (Matson 1965:203-17; Arnold 1985). It is but a short step from Rutter's emphasis on a specific mental template for how a pot should look, to a broader program of evaluation that focuses on how the pot was made and what are the sorts of functions for which it was suitable (cf. Tournavitou 1992). We may then pose the following questions: can we see similarities in the non-functional technical specifics of two pottery assemblages (for example, Handmade Burnished Ware and Kamenska Chuka ceramics), and were these similarities accomplished despite differing environmental circumstances? Determination of the former (accompanied by the proper controls to eliminate the argument from function, or that all simple handmade burnished wares are the same) will give a wider range of attributes for intra- and inter-assemblage comparison, thus decreasing the probability that the similarities are due to chance. If the latter is true, it could be interpreted as evidence for the conscious creation of a specific type of ceramics by skilled potters working within a different physical environment.

A study of the production technology of indigenous Late Bronze Age handmade burnished ceramics found beyond the northern frontier of the Mycenaean world could attempt to define the physical production parameters such as clay selection and preparation, temper composition and introduction, firing temperature and pyrotechnical control. This could provide a data set of information concerning attributes of pottery production in a ceramic assemblage which has compelling formal similarities to the Handmade Burnished Ware found to the south (cf. Rutter 1975:30). This type of study, which many authors dealing with the Handmade Burnished Ware have recommended, has not yet been accomplished to any great extent (Rutter 1990:32). Analyses undertaken on Handmade Burnished Ware vessels from the Spartan Menelaion, for example, indicate the presence of grog-tempering, a non-Mycenaean manufacturing technique, in this assemblage (Whitbread 1992). On Cyprus, chemical analyses of a few fragments of Handmade Burnished Ware showed that although they were local manufacture, the clay sources which were used differed from those habitually utilized by those potters making the Mycenaean-
like Late Cypriote wares (Jones 1986). Taken along with the typological similarities, analysis of the techniques of ceramic production can give additional insights into the conscious and unconscious patterning of learned behavior, the "culture" of the potters. Such an analysis transcends the comparison of formal and design elements and focusses more exactly on the cultural and behavioral contexts in which ceramics are produced and used.

Wider Implications

In response to Small's attempt to leverage the analysis of Handmade Burnished Ware withsocio-economic considerations, Rutter calls for a more detailed analysis of the contexts and locales in which Mycenaean Handmade Burnished Ware is to be found (Rutter 1990:35-6). Although this falls outside the scope of this work, it might be mentioned that essentially no Handmade Burnished Ware has been found in Mycenaean tombs, and, as far as can be determined, Handmade Burnished Ware is not spatially segregated within individual Mycenaean settlements (Rutter, personal communication). While a successful analysis of Handmade Burnished Ware in Mycenaean contexts will require attention to all of the relevant materials, a model through which to explain the diverse material facts and significance of this ware has still not been satisfactorily adumbrated. For this purpose, we can begin with what we already know about Handmade Burnished Ware:

- it represents a strong departure from Mycenaean ceramic tradition
- it is diverse in formal attributes, with similarities to a variety of cultures on the fringe of the centers of Mycenaean civilization
- it appears in a number of disparate locales within the orbit of the Mycenaean core
- it occurs slightly before, during and after the collapse of the Mycenaean palace-centered society
- it is a small percentage of the overall ceramic assemblage

Even from this meager knowledge base, one can propose a preliminary model. If we agree with Rutter (*contra* Harding and Walberg) that this pottery is not the impoverished work of unskilled artisans, but instead represents a conscious attempt at representing a known type, then we must posit a non-Mycenaean inspiration behind it. If the pottery is created locally, rather than being traded in, we must posit the actual physical presence of a foreign ethnic element resident in Mycenaean society. If we accept that the formal similarities are too diverse to be unequivocally from one cultural grouping, we must posit that this

foreign ethnic element was made up of small populations from different larger groups. If we further attempt to incorporate the physical evidence of "intrusive" wares from disparate locales, we must posit a foreign element or elements with a great deal of mobility. At this point, it is reasonable to speak of "guestworkers" (Kilian1078:311-320), female slaves (E. French), post-Mycenaean northern intruders (Bankoff and Winter 1984:27-29), warlike sea peoples (Schachermeyer 1980), or Italian traders (Hallager 1985), but none of these suggestions, as thus far developed, is sufficient.

Handmade burnished ware, then (although not necessarily Mycenaean Handmade Burnished Ware), occurs in several different contexts. It is the indigenous ceramic tradition of Transalpine Europe, Italy, and the central Balkan area in the Late Bronze Age, where it has a long history of development and use. Wheelmade and painted pottery, such as is typical of Late Helladic Greece, is unknown in these regions. While recognizing that any or all of these may have contributed to the diverse material usually lumped together under the rubric of Handmade Burnished Ware, we shall concentrate on relations with the North, the area with which we have the most familiarity. Further investigation may indicate that our model is equally valid for other areas on the periphery of the Mycenaean world.

In Macedonia, on the northern frontier of the Mycenaean world, we find handmade pottery (Hochstetter 1984), some imported Mycenaean wheelmade wares (Wardle 1980), and localpainted Mycenaean imitations (Wardle 1977). In the Mycenaean core area of southern Greece during the LH IIIB/LH IIIC period, the vast majority of ceramic remains come from wheelmade vessels, with a small inventory of handmade sherds and shapes from about thirty sites (Small 1990:5). Thus, it is quite possible that the scale of analysis appropriate to this problem is *not* solely that of the find context, but must instead look to the complex of interconnections between the Mycenaean world and the hinterland regions from which this pottery arguably emanates. This comes close to the approach known in anthropology as "Mutualism" (Carrithers 1992), which stresses that interaction may occur on a multiplicity of levels, with those among whom one lives as well as with those of whom one is perhaps only dimly aware. Such networks of relationships are characteristic of the modern world (Orser 1996), but they were no less common and important in antiquity. Additionally, we must not only look to the Mycenaean heartland and its interconnections with the hinterland, but we must *also* examine the context of production within the cultural systems of that hinterland. In the case of the Handmade Burnished Ware, an intuitive explanatory model is that the Balkan sites comprise one of the original homelands of the people manufacturing and using this pottery, Macedonia is a zone of intensive contact, the frontier, between the northerners and the Mycenaeans, while at the southern Greek sites these northerners are present only as a small minority population. An alternative explanation, which would interpret the presence of this ware as evidence for trade either in the ceramics themselves or in goods transported in them is untenable (Bankoff and Winter 1984:1; Pilides 1991:143).

Slavery

Our working hypothesis is that at least some of the Handmade Burnished Ware in Mycenaean contexts represents the pottery of slaves (the *do-e-ro-i* of the Linear B tablets [cf. Hiller 1988:53]) brought from the north. We are well aware of the pitfalls of associating ceramic types with ethnic groups (cf. Schuyler 1980; Bartel 1989:171-175; Balint 1989; Shennan 1989). In recent years, however, the archaeological identification of minority sub-strata within dominant populations has made great strides (Baker 1980; Deagan 1983; Praetzellis et al. 1988). This is especially true of the archaeology of slave populations, for example, within the context of American historical archaeology (Otto 1977; Singleton 1985, 1988; Ferguson 1992; Orser 1996). Of course, we are not proposing an American antebellum-type plantation system for the Aegean world. The similarities that enable us to use ideas derived from a New World model here relate primarily to the proposed dependent nature of the northern ethnics, their non-dominant position within the larger society, their lack of further contact with their homeland(s), and their attempt at retaining some distinct cultural identity as evinced by at least part of their archaeologically-
retrievable material culture. These considerations are the same regardless of the slaves' origins; indeed, slaves may have been brought in from a number of places (cf. Bloedow 1985).

That some form of slavery existed in Mycenaean Greece is amply documented in the Linear B texts (Bennett 1955; Palmer 1963:118; Chadwick 1973:123-124). As in the ancient Near East, it was probably organized along much different lines and generally on a much smaller scale than we find much later in the New World (Deger-Jalkotzy 1972:142; Heltzer 1988:9). In the ancient Near East, most slaves were not private property, but belonged to the king, priests, or temple (Lewis 1990:3). They generally had few or no rights with regard to their owners, and could be sold (Dandamaev 1984:76-8). Most of the people (predominantly women and children) knownfrom the LBA Greek tablets are identified as workers in menial industrial tasks (spinners, carders, headband makers) rather than agricultural workers (Chadwick 1973:155). Like Africans brought to the New World, this Late Bronze Age dependent population may have been composed of people originally from a number of different ethnic groups (Heltzer 1988:9), each with its individual culture and ceramic tradition (Ehret and Posnansky 1982). The Linear B tablets give various ethnic designations for slaves, some of which are apparently Greek, others from undetermined locations/ethnic groups (Chadwick 1973:124). Ethnic designations and names found on the tablets listing the personnel of the *o-ka* troops also hint at the possibility of non-Greek residents of communities within the kingdom of Pylos (Chadwick 1973:430).

With respect to the archaeological visibility of slave populations, a parallel to the Handmade Burnished Ware may be found in the so-called Colono Ware of the late seventeenth through eighteenth centuries AD (cf. Orser 1996:117-123, from which much of the following discussion is summarized). While excavating plantations in the coastal regions of Virginia and South Carolina, as well as in the Caribbean, historical archaeologists have found a type of handmade unglazed fiber-tempered pottery which differs significantly from the usual glazed wares of the period (Singleton 1988; Ferguson 1992; Deetz 1993). First identified as "Colono-Indian Ware", it was thought to be the pottery of the local Native American tribes (Noel Hume 1962). In fact, it does resemble the pottery of the Catawba, a South Carolina group (Baker 1972), although a close study can differentiate these two assemblages (Wheaton and Garrow 1985:248-51). The association of this ware with slave plantations, which had at first led Noel Hume to suggest that the pottery was made by the local Native American groups for sale to slaves, was used by Ferguson to argue for an African origin for this pottery tradition and for its production by African-Americans (Ferguson 1980). As in the case of Handmade Burnished Ware, doubt was cast upon this interpretation by the claim that there was nothing particularly "African" about this ware, but that it represented a "basic non-wheel, unglazed, clamp-fired pottery" which could be found in simple technologies in various parts of the world (Hill 1987:136; cf. Harding 1984:222). Orser, following Ferguson (1991, 1992), sees Colono Ware as part of the process of creolization in North America, in which Europeans, Africans, and Native Americans blended elements of their diverse cultures. To him it is not a "cultural marker", but rather one of the many strategies by which enslaved people all over the world fought against their oppressors (Orser 1996:122).

The Handmade Burnished Ware at Mycenaean sites, like the Colono Ware of the southeastern American Colonial sites, may represent a restricted descendent subset of the ceramic assemblage found in the slaves' homelands (whether central Balkan or Italian), reflecting the reduced non-Mycenaean activities allowed to slaves (Ferguson 1980; Bratton 1992). The fact that the pots found in Mycenaean contexts represent a homogenized and truncated tradition would help to explain why it is difficult to pin down a specific home micro-region. Moreover, like Colono ware, Handmade Burnished Ware may have been one of the mechanisms used by the slaves to maintain an independent cultural identity and resist slavery (cf. Lees 1979; Klingelhofer 1987; Ferguson 1991). Thus, the ware may have had an important cultural as well as a utilitarian function, which helped maintain its existence despite the presence of functional alternatives (cf. Ferguson 1992). We may perhaps use the model of creolization, where elements of diverse cultures are blended form a new native culture, to explain the retention of the later Handmade Burnished Ware into the Cypro-Geometric period or even later (Pilides 1991:143; 1994:45). This model seems to workbest when applied to the sites of the Argolid, especially Tiryns, while it seems less applicable to the Cretan material.

There are further ramifications of this model of interaction, particularly for the Late Bronze Age Balkans. Rather than picturing Greece as the target for military incursions from unruly neighbors (cf. Bouzek 1994), it presupposes a Mycenaean interest, if only indirect, in the people to their north. The economics and social organization of the central Balkan cultures, for example, may have been strongly affected by even indirect slave trade with the south. As in Africa, internecine raiding and warfare may have increased, more centralized authority might have developed, transshipment routes have been established and maintained, and slave trading outlets or emporia might have grown up at the edges of the slave-producing area (cf. Hartwig 1977; Lovejoy 1981, 1983; Manning 1990:126-148). In fact, Chadwick (1973:410) interprets the ethnic designations of the slaves on the Linear B tablets as referring to the trading posts or slave markets from which they were bought. He contrasts this with the use of the term "captives" for others acquired by other means (but see Palmer 1963:114 for the translation of *ra-wi-ja-ja* ["captive"] as an ethnic designation). No direct Mycenaean control over this trade need have been exercised; it could have been indirectly mediated by demand at the exchange route's southern terminus. This may be one interpretation of the increase of fortified sites in the Late Bronze Age of Macedonia (Kokkinidou and Trantalidou 1991:102), of the large grain storage facilities at Late Bronze Age Assiros (for or derived from trade, rather than only the produce of a small agricultural settlement as interpreted in Wardle 1987), and of the existence of northern Macedonian sites such as Kamenska Chuka (cf. Halstead 1994:211 for an alternative trajectory).

Conclusion

Current suggestions for the appearance of Handmade Burnished Ware suffer from a lack of a clear hypothesis and a means for testing this hypothesis in the archaeological record. We believe that any science advances by proposing theoretical models which extend knowledge beyond the present state of observed behavior (Wylie 1982). In this case, "the data can only be explained in the context of theoretical models, which give order to the data by accounting for factors assumed to have been instrumental in generating them" (Patton 1993:15). The one sustained argument offered on the basis of an economic model for Late Bronze Age Greece (Small 1990), does not sufficiently address the diversity and particulars of the Mycenean context, to which more detailed attention must be paid (Rutter 1990).

It must be stressed that Handmade Burnished Ware is not a monolithic assemblage, but rather a description of technical production features found on a number of shapes. Although we believe we are justified in continuing the historical tradition of lumping together the Handmade Burnished Ware of the Argolid, other "strains" of Handmade Burnished Ware, such as those at Kommos (Watrous 1992), certainly are differently derived (J. Rutter, personal

communication). The present authors further suggest that the appropriate model should not *only* address the Mycenaean context. Instead, the model should also extend the scale of analysis to include the complex interconnections between people in the Mycenaean heartland and the possible hinterland sources for this intrusive pottery. Study of such a source would seek to produce a contextual understanding of the social and technological environment within which the pottery wasproduced, and seek to analyze the impact that a slave trade might have had on this local context.

By analogy to the impact of the 18th and 19th century slave trade on local cultural systems in central Africa, it seems that diachronic regional research in an area such as southwestern Bulgaria could provide evidence to support or refute a hypothesis that a Bronze Age "slave trade" existed at a magnitude to produce similar structural changes in the area of slave extraction. Such a regional research project would analyze changes in settlement patterns, material forms such as architecture, regional exchange patterns as evidenced by material remains, resource exploitation and technologies. *If* a slave trade existed, we might expect to find that it affected the local culture in ways that would be recognizable in the archaeological record.

Sources

Arnold, D.
1985 *Ceramic Theory and Cultural Process*. Cambridge.

Baker, S.
1972 Colono-Indian Pottery from Cambridge, South Carolina with Comments on the Historic Catawba Pottery Trade, *Notebook* (South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology) 4(1):3-30.

Baker, V.G.
1980Archaeological Visibility of Afro-American Culture: An Example from Black Lucy's Garden, Andover, Massachusetts, in R. Schuyler (ed,), *Archaeological Perspectives on Ethnicity in America: Afro-American and Asian American Culture History*. New York.

Balint, C.
1989 Some Ethnospecific Features in Central and Eastern European Archaeology During the Early Middle Ages: The Case of Avar and Hungarians, in S.J. Shennan (ed.), *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*. London.

Bankoff, H.A. & F.A. Winter
1984 Northern Intruders in LH IIIC Greece: A View from the North, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 12(1984)1-30.

1989 Diffusion and Cultural Evolution in Iron Age Serbia, in T. C. Champion (ed.), *Centre and Periphery*. London.

Bankoff, H. A. & M. Stefanovich
1996 Kamenska Chuka, 1993-95: Preliminary Report, in M. Stefanovich, H. Todorova and H. Hauptmann , (eds.) *In Memorium James Harvey Gaul. (In the Steps of James Harvey Gaul*, vol. 1) Sofia, pps. 247-317.

Bartel, B.
1989 Acculturation and Ethnicity in Roman Moesia Superior, in T. Champion (ed.), *Centreand Periphery*. London.

Bennett, E. L.
1955 *The Pylos Tablets: Texts of the Inscriptions Found 1939-1954*. Princeton.

Bloedow, E. F.
1985 Handmade Burnished Ware or 'Barbarian' Pottery and Troy VIIB, *Parola del Passato* 222(1985)161-199.

Bouzek, J.
1994 Late Bronze Age Greece and the Balkans: A Review of the Present Picture, *Annual of the British School of Classical Studies in Athens* 89:217-234.

Bratton, J.
1992 Yabba Ware and the African Presence at Port Royal. Paper presented at 1992 Society for Historical Archaeology Conference, Kingston, Jamaica.

Carrithers, M.
1992 *Why Humans Have Cultures:Explaining Anthropology and Social Diversity*. Oxford.

Catling, H.W. and E.A. Catling
1981 'Barbarian' Pottery from the Mycenaean Settlement at the Menelaion, Sparta, *BSA* 76(1981)71-82.

Chadwick, J.
1973 *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*. Second edition (of Ventris and Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek)*. Cambridge.

Dandamaev, M.
1984 *Slavery in Babylonia*. Carbondale, Ill.

Deagan, K.

1983*Spanish Saint Augustine: The Archaeology of a Colonial Creole Community*. New York.

Deetz, J.
1993 *Flowerdew Hundreds*. Virginia.

Deger-Jalkotzy, S.
1972The Women of PY An607, *Minos* 13:137-160.

1977 *Fremde Zuwanderer im spatmykenischen Griechenland*. Vienna.

Dimitrov, D.
1969Troja VIIb2 I balkanskite trakijski I mizijski plemena, *Arheologija* 10/4(1968)1-14.

Ehret, C. & M. Posnansky
1982*The Archaeological and Linguistic Reconstruction of African History*. Berkeley.

Ferguson, L.
1980Looking for the "Afro" in Colono-Indian Pottery, in R. Schuyler (ed.), *Archaeological Perspectives on Ethnicity in America: Afro-American and Asian American Culture History*. New York.

1991Struggling with Pots in Colonial South Carolina, in R. McGuire and R. Paynter (eds.), *The Archaeology of Inequality*. Oxford.

1992*Uncommon Ground: Archaeology and Early African America*. Washington, D.C.

French, E.
1969The First Phase of LHIIIC, *AA* 84(1969)136.

French E. & J. Rutter
1977The Handmade Burnished Ware of the Late Helladic IIIC Period: Its Modern Historical Context, *AJA* 81(1977)111-112.

Garasanin, M.
1983aCentralbalkanska grupa, in A. Benac, (ed), *Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja, vol. 4 (Bronzano doba)*. Sarajevo.

1983bGrupa Donja Brnjica - Gornja Strazava, in A. Benac, (ed), *Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja, vol. 4 (Bronzano doba)*. Sarajevo.

Halstead, P.
1994The North-South Divide: Regional Paths to Complexity in Prehsitoric Greece, in C. Mathers and S. Stoddart, (eds.), *Development and Decline in the Mediterranean Bronze Age*. Sheffield.

Hallager, B.P.
1985 Crete and Italy in the Late Bronze Age III Period, *AJA* 89(1985)293-05.

Harding, A.F.
1984 *The Mycenaeans and Europe*. London.

Hartwig, G.
1977Changing Forms of Servitude among the Kerebe of Tanzania, in S. Miers and I. Kopytoff (eds.), *Slavery in Africa: Historical and Anthropological Perspectives*. Madison, WI.

Heltzer, M.
1988The Late Bronze Age Service System and its Decline, in M. Heltzer and E. Lipinsky,(eds.), *Society and Economy in the Eastern Mediterranean (c. 1500-1000 B.C.)*. Leuven.

Heurtley, W.A.
1939 *Prehistoric Macedonia*. Cambridge.

Hill, M.
1987Ethnicity Lost? Ethnicity Gained? Information Functions of "African Ceramics" in West Africa and North America, in R. Augur, M. Glass, S. MacEachern, and P. McCartney (eds.), *Ethnicity and Culture*. Calgary.

Hiller, S.
1988Dependent Personnel in Mycenaean Texts, in M. Heltzer and E. Lipinsky, (eds.), *Society and Economy in the Eastern Mediterranean (c. 1500-1000 B.C.)*. Leuven.

Hochstetter, A.
1984*Kastanas: Ausgrabungen in einem Siedlungshugel der Bronze- und Eisenzeit Makadoniens 1975-1979. III: Die handgemachte Keramik:Schichten 19 bis 1*. Berlin.

Jevtic, M.
1990Praistorijska nekropola u Pirotu -- Prilog poznavanju Brnjicke grupe. *Glasnik SAD* 6:92-102.

Jones, R.
1986Chemical Analysis of "Barbarian Ware," in V. Karageorghis (ed.), *Acts of the International Symposium "Cyprus Between the Occident and the*

Orient''. Nicosia.

Kilian, K.
1978Nordwestgriechische Keramik aus der Argolis und ihre Entsprechungen in der Subappeninfacies, *Atti della XX riunione scientifica dell'Istituto italiano di prehistoria e protostoria in Basilicata*. 1976:311-320.

Kilian, K., C. Podzuweit, & H-J Weisshaar
1981 Ausgrabungen in Tiryns 1978, 1979, *AA*(1981)149-256.

Klingelhofer, E.
1987Aspects of Early Afro-American Material Culture: Artifacts from the Slave Quarters at Garrison Planatation, Maryland, *Historic Archaeology* 21(1987)112-119.

Kokkindou, D. And K. Trantalidou
1991Neolithic and Bronze Age Settlement in Western Macedonia, *Annual of the British School of Classical Studies in Athens* 86:93-106.

Krstic, D.
1992Praistorijske nekropole u Gornjoj Strazavi, *Zbornik Narodnog Muzeja* 14-1:231-243.

Lees, W.B.
1979The Function of Colono-Indian Ceramics: Insights from Limericak Plantation, South Carolina, *Historical Archaeology* 13(1979)1-13.

Lewis, B.
1990*Race and Slavery in the Middle East*. Oxford.

Lovejoy, P.E.
1981*The Ideology of Slavery in Africa*. Beverly Hills

1983*Transformations in Slavery*. Cambridge.

Manning,
1990*Slavery and African Life*. Cambridge.

Matson, F.R.
1965Ceramic Ecology: an approach to the study of early cultures of the Near East, in F.R. Matson (ed.) *Ceramics and Man*. Chicago.

Mitrevski, D.
1994A Brnjica Type Necropolis near Skopje, *Starinar* 43-44:115-124.

1995Prvite etni ki zaednici vo Makedonija: spored na inot na pogrebuvanje I pogrebnite obi ai, *Civilizacii na po vata na Makedonija*, 2. Skopje.

Noel Hume, I.
1962An Indian Ware of the Colonial Period, *Quarterly Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Virginia* 17:2-14.

Orser, C. E., Jr.
1996*A Historical Archaeology of the Modern World*. New York.

Otto, J.S.
1977Artifacts and Status Differences - A Comparison of Ceramics from Planter, Overseer, and Slave Sites on an Antebellum Plantation, in S. South (ed.), *Research Strategies in Historical Archeology*. New York.

Palmer, L.
1963*The Interpretation of Mycenaean Greek Texts*. Oxford.

Patton, M.
1993*Statements in Stone: Monuments and society in neolithic Brittany*. London.

Pilides, D.
1991Handmade Burnished Wares of the Late Bronze Age:Toward a Clearer ClassificationSystem, in J.A. Barlow, D.L. Bolger, and B Kling (eds.), *Cypriot Ceramics:Reading the Prehistoric Record*. Philadelphia.

1994*Handmade Burnished Wares of the Late Bronze Age in Cyprus*. Jonsered.

Praetzillis, M., A. Praetzillis, and Marley R. Brown III
1988What Happened to the Silent Majority? Research Strategies for Studying Dominant Group Material Culture in Late Nineteenth Century California, in M. C. Beaudry (ed.), *Documentary Archaeology in the New World*. Cambridge.

Rutter, J.
1975Ceramic Evidence for Northern Intruders in Southern Greece at the Beginning of the Late Helladic IIIC Period. *AJA* 79(1975)17-32.

1990Some comments on interpreting the Dark-surface Handmade Burnished Pottery of the 13th and 12 century B.C. Aegean. *JMA* 3(1990)29-49.

Sandars, N.
1978*The Sea Peoples*. London

Schachermeyer, F.
1980*Die Agaische Fruhzeit IV: Griechenland im Zeitalter der Wanderungen*

vom Ende der Mykenischen Ära bis auf die Dorier. Vienna.

Schuyler, R.(ed.)
1980*Archaeological Perspectives on Ethnicity in America: Afro-American and Asian American Culture History*. New York.

Shennan S.J. (ed.)
1989*Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*. London.

Singleton, T.
1985*The Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life*. New York

1988An archaeological framework for slavery and emancipation, 1740-1880, in M. Leone and P. Potter (eds.), *The Recovery of Meaning*. Washington, D.C.

Small, D.B.
1990'Barbarian Ware' and Prehistoric Aegean Economics: an Argument for Indigenous Appearance, *JMA* 3(1990)3-25.

Snodgrass, A.M.
1983 The Greek Early Iron Age: a reappraisal. *Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne* 9:73-86.

Stefanovich, M.
1973Some Balkan elements in the Aegean migrations. *Actes du VIIIe Congres International des Sciences Prehistoriques*, 3:148-160

1974The possible origins of the Knobbed Ware of Troy VIIb2. Primus Congressus Studiorum Thraciorum, *Thracia* 3:101-106

Tournavitou, I.
1992Practical Use and Social Function: A Neglected Aspect of Mycenaean Pottery, *Annual of the British School of Classical Studies in Athens* 87:181-210.

Wardle, K.
1977Cultural Groups of the Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age in Northwest Greece. *Godisnjak* (Sarajevo) 15(1977)153-199.

1980Excavations at Assiros, 1975-79. *Annual of the British School of Classical Studies in Athens* 75:229-267.

1983Assiros: A Macedonian Settlement of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age. *Ancient Macedonia* 3(1):291-305.

1987Excavations at Assiros Toumba, 1986: A Preliminery Report, *Annual of the British School of Classical Studies in Athens* 82:313-329.

Watrous, L. V.
1992*Kommos III: The Late Bronze Age Pottery*. Princeton.

Wheaton, T. And P. Garrow
1985Acculturation and the Archaeological Record in the Carolina Lowcountry, in T. Singleton (ed.), *The Archaeology of Slavery and Plantation Life*. Orlando, FL.

Whitbread, I.
1992Petrographic Analyses of Barbarian Ware from the Menelaion, Sparta, in J. Sanders (ed.), *Philolakon: Lakonian Studies in Honour of Hector Catling*. London.

Wylie, M.
1982Epistemological issues raised by a structuralist archaeology, in I. Hodder (ed.), *Symbolic and Structural Archaeology*. Cambridge.

Notes

[1] The author's names are in alphabetical order: H. Arthur Bankoff, Professor, Department of Anthropology, Brooklyn College CUNY; Nathan Meyer, Department of Anthropology, UC Berkeley; Mark Stefanovich, Associate Professor, Southeast European Studies, American University in Bulgaria. Correspondence should be addressed to H. Arthur Bankoff.

[2] The authors would like to thank Frederick A. Winter and Jeremy B. Rutter for many suggestions and constructive criticism of earlier drafts of this article.

[3] The excavations at Kamenska Chuka were partially supported by funds granted by the PSC-
CUNY Faculty Research Awards Program, the Institute for Aegean Prehistory, the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, the American University in Bulgaria, Brooklyn College CUNY, and private donors.