Title
The Shaping of Social Complexity, Networks and Cultural Transmissions: Pottery from the Bronze and Iron Age Communities of Southern Illyria and Northern Epirus (2500-500 B.C.)

Author
Agolli, Esmeralda

Publication Date
2014

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

The Shaping of Social Complexity, Networks and Cultural Transmissions: Pottery from the Bronze and Iron Age Communities of Southern Illyria and Northern Epirus (2500–500 B.C.)

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

in Archaeology

by

Esmeralda Agolli

2014

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The Shaping of Social Complexity, Networks and Cultural Transmissions:

Pottery from the Bronze and Iron Age Communities of

Southern Illyria and Northern Epirus (2500–500 B.C.)

by

Esmeralda Agolli

Doctor of Philosophy in Archaeology

University of California, Los Angeles, 2012

Professor John K. Papadopoulos, Chair

This research takes a full synopsis of pottery analysis in the late prehistoric communities of southern Illyria and northern Epirus (modern state of Albania) covering a span of 2000 years from the Early Bronze to the Developed Iron Age (2500–500 B.C.)

Initially I deal with the current state of the pottery research examining the flaws of the culture-historical approach heavily amalgamated with nationalistic and ethnocentric agendas. The principal scope of this study is to apply to this type of archaeological data a cohesive theoretical and methodological framework that shifts attention on subject matters that pottery has the potential to highlight. In so doing the research focusses on a twofold perspective that considers the synchronic and diachronic dynamics: *first,* it deals with the technological profile of the pottery and to what extent modes of production reflect the socio-economic organization of the pre-urban societies in southern Illyria and northern

Epirus. The analysis of the production step measure, standardization and innovation concludes that pottery production during late prehistory maintains a steady technological profile developed within the domain of the household and likely controlled by women within sedentary, self-subsistent and not highly hierarchical social groups based on a subsistence strategy of farming and herding. Despite its sophistication pottery production is highly conditioned by socio-economic and demographic dynamics and does not transcend the domain of the household. Second, this dissertation presents a systematic analysis of the distribution of the qualitative attributes of the pottery that aims to explore the intensity of regional and intra-regional interactions and what nuances they provide for cultural transmissions. The conceptual and ideational examination of fabric, vessel formation, and decoration indicate that the model of the regional and intra-regional interactions is entirely ruled by geographic proximity and any innovative trait occurring in the pottery is likely the result of the movement of ideas, rather than any type of formal market exchange. I argue that this spontaneous and evidently unintentional dissemination is characterized by a combination of vertical and horizontal model of transmission controlled by artisans/mothers, mothers-in-law and the apprentices/daughters and daughters-in-law who transferred by marriage from the parents' to the husband's house and thus constantly transform and enrich the tradition of pottery making.

The dissertation is provided with three supplementary files:

Appendix # 1 includes site's background followed by individual description and drawings or photos of every vessel. Appendix # 2 includes a combination of graphs, maps, plates and tables. Appendix# 3 includes an integrated version of the key diagrams divided in three main categories for each site.

The dissertation of Esmeralda Agolli is approved.

Cathy Costin

Sarah P. Morris

Charles Stanish

John K. Papadopoulos, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2014

TABLE OF CONTENT

Abstract…… ii
Committee page…… iv
Table of Contents…….. v
Acknowledgment…….. viii
Vita/Bibliography…… xi
Chapter 1: Introduction: Towards an Alternative Epistemological Approach to Pottery Studies in Southern Illyria and Northern Epirus……... 1
1.a. The Cultural-Historical Tradition of Pottery Studies in Albania……2
1.b. Recent Trends in the Studies of late prehistory in Albania…… 12
1.c. Scope of the Present Study……. 13
Chapter 2: The Conceptual Construction of the Research Query: The Ramifications of Processual, Technology and Neo-Evolutionary Theoretical Approaches to Social Organization and Cultural Transmission…… 16
2.a. The Processual Approach and Shift towards the Socio-Economic Profile 17
2.b. The Reconstruction of the Socio-Economic Profile through the Process of Manufacture…… 21
2.c. The Ramifications of Dual Inheritance Theory on Social Organization and Cultural Transmissions……... 24
Chapter 3: Research Strategy: The Measurements of the Technological and Ideational Profiles of the Pottery of the Late Prehistoric Communities of Southern Illyria……. 30
3.a. Background to the Sample Size…….. 31
3.b. A Measurement of the Production Process from Output……... 33
3.c. The Assessment of Dimensional Standardization…….. 36
3.d. The Assessment of Innovation in Pottery Manufacture……. 41
3.e. The Ideational Profile of Pottery Production: Towards a Conceptual Methodological Approach…….. 43
Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Interpretations, I: Technological Profile of Pottery Production in the Late Prehistoric Communities of Southern Illyria and Northern Epirus 2500–500 B.C…… 48
4.a. The Early Bronze Age: 2500–1900/1800 B.C……... 49
4.a.1. The Production Step Measure during the Early Bronze Age…….. 50
4.a.2. The Measurement of the Morphological Standardization during the Early Bronze Age……... 51
4.b. The Middle Bronze Age: 1900/1800–1450 B.C…… 52
4.b.1. The Production Step Measure during the Middle Bronze Age…….. 55
4.b.2. Innovation of pottery Production during the Middle Bronze Age……. 56
4.c. The Late Bronze Age: 1450–1200/1100 B.C…… 58
4.c.1 The Production Step Measure during the Late Bronze Age…… 59
4.c.2. The Measure of Morphological Standardization during the Late Bronze Age…… 62
4.c.3. The Innovation of Pottery Production during the Late Bronze Age……... 65
4.d. The Early Iron Age: 1200–800 B.C……... 68
4.d.1. The Production Step Measure during the Early Iron Age……... 70
4.d.2. The Measure of Morphological Standardization during the Early Iron Age…… 76

4.d.3. The Innovation of Pottery Production during the Early Iron Age……. 80
4.e. The Second Phase of the Iron Age: 800–600 B.C…… 85
4.e.1. The Production Step Measure during the Second Phase of the Iron Age…….. 85
4.e.2. The Measure of Morphological Standardization during the Second Phase of the Iron Age…… 88
4.e.3. The Innovation of Pottery Production during the Second Phase of the Early Iron Age…… 90
4.f. The Third Phase of the Iron Age: 600–500 B.C……... 93
4.f.1. The Production Step Measure during the Third Phase of the Iron Age…… 94
4.f.2. The Measure of Morphological during the Third Phase of Early Iron Age…… 96
4.f.3. The Innovation of Pottery Production during the Third Phase of the Iron Age……... 98
4.g. The Evolution of Pottery Production during the Late Prehistoric Period……... 100
Chapter 5: Data Analysis and Interpretations, II: Cultural Transmissions, Regional and Intraregional Networks in the Late Prehistoric Communities of Southern Illyria and Northern Epirus 2500–500 B.C…….. 109
5.a. The Early Bronze Age: 2500–19/1800 B.C…….. 110
5.a.1. Pottery Fabric during the Early Bronze Age…….. 110
5.a.2. Vessel Formation during the Early Bronze Age…… 111
5.a.3. Decoration during the Early Bronze Age……... 114
5.b. The Middle Bronze Age: 1900/1800–1450 B.C……... 116
5.b.1. Pottery Fabric during the Middle Bronze Age……... 116
5.b.2. Vessel Formation during the Middle Bronze Age…….. 118
5.b.3. Decoration during the Middle Bronze Age…… 119
5.c. The Late Bronze Age: 1450–1200/1100 B.C…… 121
5.c.1. Pottery Fabric during the Late Bronze Age…… 121
5.c.2. Vessel Formation during the Late Bronze Age…….. 125
5.c.3. Decoration during the Late Bronze Age……. 132
5.d. The Early Iron Age: 1200–800 B.C…….. 134
5.d.1. Pottery Fabric during the Early Iron Age……... 135
5.d.2. Vessel Formation during the Early Iron Age……. 138
5.d.3. Decoration during the Early Iron Age……... 154
5.e. The Second Phase of the Iron Age: 800–600 B.C…… 162
5.e.1. Pottery Fabric during the Second Phase of the Iron Age……... 162
5.e.2. Vessel Formation during the Second Phase of the Iron Age……. 164
5.e.3. Decoration during the Second Phase of the Iron Age…… 177
5.f. The Third Phase of the Iron Age: 600–500 B.C…… 184
5.f.1. Pottery Fabric during the Third Phase of the Iron Age……... 184
5.f.2. Vessel Formation during the Third Phase of the Iron Age……. 187
5.f.3. Decoration during the Third Phase of the Iron Age…… 195
5.g. The Shaping of Regional Networks and Cultural Transmissions during Late Prehistory in Southern Illyria……. 197

Chapter 6: Conclusions: The Potential of Pottery Data for an Understanding of the Socio-Economic Profile, Regional Networks and Cultural Transmissions in the Late Prehistoric Communities of Southern Illyria……...209
Appendix 1: Data Catalogs…….. 215
Appendix 2: Graphs, Tables, Maps and Plates…… 543
Appendix 3: Classification of Data …… 626
Bibliography…… 806

Acknowledgments

The years of graduate studies at UCLA have been an invaluable experience and the finalization of these research notes is the successful completion of a long journey that began a decade ago. I owe deep gratitude to my father, the first person who inspired in me an interest of the humanities. The commencement of graduate studies at UCLA made him extremely enthusiastic. I could feel that through me, he envisioned dreams and plans that he was never able to accomplish himself living under the heavy constrains of communist Albania. Regrettably, due to his sudden departure, I am no longer able to convey this achievement directly to him.

I am very grateful to Professor Ylli Cerova, who introduced me to archaeology and during undergraduate studies greatly supported my very first steps in the field. Many thanks to Professor Skënder Aliu for being the first to draw my attention to pottery analysis and put at my disposal data he collected over years in the Kolonjë plateau, published and unpublished.

During my undergraduate studies, I had the great opportunity to participate on several fieldwork projects. At the time, these projects were introducing to Albanian archaeology highly innovative conceptual and methodological agendas. Indeed, this experience became a stepping-stone in any decision that followed in my academic education. I am deeply grateful to Professor Lorenc Bejko for making me an active participant on these projects and for offering unlimited access to pottery data. I am especially grateful for our discussions on my research, which were of immense help toward the conceptual design of this research.

I owe a great deal of gratitude to Professor Dwight Read with whom I have taken two classes at UCLA. His guidance on a methodological framework and especially in the

conceptual understanding of pottery data has had a great impact on my research. Special thanks go to Professor Charles Stanish. The independent studies on the evolutionary theory, economic anthropology and complex societies we took together were immensely beneficial and have served as an invaluable background to my understanding of the organization of pre-urban societies in the western Balkans. I have been very fortunate to have Professor Cathy Costin as the outside member of my dissertation committee, especially since I have greatly admired her various publications over the years. Her work on the technological profile of pottery, especially on standardization and labor investment, inspired a great deal of my own research methodology. Our many discussions during the research process helped a great deal particularly in terms of data analysis. Many thanks are also due to Professor Michael Galaty for showing a great enthusiasm for my topic and an interest to discuss the most recent developments in the Late Prehistoric communities of the Balkans.

I am deeply grateful to the Norris Foundation and especially to Mrs. Tania Norris. Her generous support of me during this endeavor has been instrumental. Many thanks are due to Charlie Steinmetz and the Steinmetz Family Foundation for always responding positively to my requests for travel funding and for his great support of my research and, indeed, for Albanian archaeology more generally.

I have a great appreciation for my UCLA friends and colleagues. I would like to thank in particular Seth Pevnick, Lyssa Stapleton, John (Mac) Martson, Joseph Lehner, Anne Austin, Brett Kaufman, Abhishek Goel and Sonali Gupta for their great company and wonderful collaborations we have enjoyed over these years. I must also thank my Albanian colleagues, Eglantina Serjani and Ardit Miti, for sending with great speed any data and materials I needed from Albanian archives and libraries.

Lastly and most importantly, I owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to my advisers, Professors John Papadopoulos and Sarah Morris, for their mentorship and dedication during my graduate studies at UCLA and beyond. Since our first encounter, in the project of the Lofkënd tumulus in Albania, they have constantly encouraged and supported my aspirations in the field of archaeology. I thank Sarah for receiving, with great enthusiasm, my very initial ideas regarding the plans for my graduate studies and following patiently my progress over these years. I am very grateful to John for trusting me with the first serious responsibility of my career, the pottery from the Lofkënd tumulus. I am also grateful for his guidance and advice through every step I took over these years. I feel very fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with them and have their mentorship even in the most difficult moments. I do not exaggerate when I say that without their immense support this wonderful experience would have not come true.

VITA

EDUCATION

2009	M.A. in Archaeology, University of California Los Angeles Cotsen Institute of Archaeology
2004	B.A. in History and Geography, University Aleksandër Xhuvani, Elbasan, Albania

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2013	Teaching Assistant, UCLA "Ancient Greek Civilization"
2012	Teaching Assistant, European University of Tirana "Anthropology of Socio-Culture Systems"
2010	Teaching Assistant, UCLA "Introduction to Anthropology"
2004 – 2007	Research Assistant, International Center for the Albanian Archaeology (ICAA), Tirana, Albania.
2004 – 2006	Teaching Assistant, University Aleksandër Xhuvani, Elbasan, "Late Antique and Medieval History"

AWARDS AND HONORS

2012 – 2013	Supplementary Grant on Graduate Studies. *SORROS*, Open Society Foundation.
2011 – 2012	Steinmetz Research Travel Funds
2008 – 2010	The Norris Foundation, Support on the Graduate studies
2007 – 2009	*FULBRIGHT* Fellowship, Department of State US and US Embassy in Tirana, Albania.

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

2014 The pottery. In J.K. Papadopoulos, S.P. Morris, and L. Bejko, eds. *Excavations of the Prehistoric Burial Tumulus of Lofkënd in Albania*. Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology.

2006 The distribution of arrowheads in Komani culture burials (6th – 8th centuries), in Bejko, L. and R. Hodges, eds., *New Directions in Albanian Archaeology*. *Studies presented to Muzafer Korkuti.* Tiranë: International Center for Albanian Archaeology Monograph Series No. 1, 287-293.

2005 The Topographical Context of the Burials at c. 4 -8 A.D. in the Provinces of Prevalitanë and Epirus. *The Human Sciences Bulletin of Elbasan University*.

2005 Varreza mesjetare e Rëmbecit: rezultate të vitit 2004, *Candavia* 2: 327–348.

2012 Pottery from the Tumulus of Kamenicë Southeast Albania: Toward a Conceptual and Functional Classification System Paper presented in the 77th Meeting of Society of American Archaeologist. Memphis, USA, 19th April 2012. Session on: Recent Trends in Albanian Archeology: A Decade in Review.

2011 The Evolution of Household Pottery Production in the Iron Age Pottery of the Kamenicë Tumulus in Southeast Albania: Toward New Principles, Theories and Methodologies in Pottery Studies. Paper presented in the Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeology, Oslo Norway – September 2011.

2009 Prehistoric Pottery from Lofkënd, Albania: From Bronze to Iron Age in the Balkans. Poster Presented in the Annual Meeting of the American Institute of Archaeology, Philadelphia. Co-authored with Seth Pevnick. Awarded with the "Best graduate Student Poster".

Chapter 1

Introduction

Towards an Alternative Epistemological Approach to Pottery Studies in Southern Illyria and Northern Epirus

Beyond the Cultural-Historical Agenda

Pottery studies are increasingly an interdisciplinary field informed by theoretical and methodological perspectives drawn from various disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and, increasingly, the natural sciences: sociology, anthropology, geography, chemistry, and statistics, to name a few. Such perspectives have radically changed the way pottery is viewed and studied. On the one hand, scientific analyses have played an important role in offering new ways to understand the production and use of pottery. Anthropological approaches, on the other hand, have contributed greatly in the reconstruction of human behavior from the study of pottery and its attributes, providing cogent avenues in understanding the past. Together, these shifts in method have resulted in new research agendas that go beyond the traditional focus of earlier studies. By utilizing a multi-disciplinary approach, this dissertation explores the salient dimensions of Bronze and Iron Age pottery in Albania over a span of some two thousand years.

In this chapter I deal with the current state of research in Albanian studies by focusing on the limitations of the culture-historical approach and its ramifications for pottery research. I also address the most recent developments in the studies of the late prehistoric period in Albania and to what extent this project aims to integrate and remedy traditional studies by applying an innovative and updated research agenda.

1.a. The Cultural-Historical Tradition of Pottery Studies in Albania

Pottery, together with the analysis of metal objects, has become one of the crucial elements in the study of the late prehistory of Albania, the western Balkans, and southeast Europe more generally. Ceramic research in this area has conventionally followed a culture-historical tradition, which has prioritized issues such as chronology, cultural boundaries, and the comparison of materials and styles across putative regions. Such issues, not least chronology, remain critical aspects of archaeological inquiry. By approaching such issues, however, through a highly deductive agenda, problematic and often ill-defined conclusions have resulted, which lack a systematic strategy in the analysis of the material record.

In the cultural and academic context of Albania in the second half of the 20th century, nationalistic ideology has loomed large, and this has had an enormous and often overlooked influence on a broad array of issues such as cultural continuity, historicity, and ethnogenesis. Indeed, these have become loaded assumptions and have resulted in a particular type of research agenda that continues to determine and define the study of the archaeological record. It is, moreover, a research agenda very much based on a particular way of studying pottery. Such an agenda has turned its back on more anthropological methodologies that focus attention on the social underpinnings of the production, use, and dissemination of pottery.

The process of the formation of the modern Albanian state, and especially the vicissitudes of the Second World War and the establishment of communism, forced a heavily nationalistic agenda on the humanities, which led to approaches that did not naturally spring from a scientific background. Indeed, in archaeology, this inevitable intervention had an immense impact on its conceptual and physical foundations. Any interpretation and work undertaken regarding the so-called ‘reconstruction of the past’ was sharply envisaged within limited conceptual agendas with

exclusive attention given to the glorious ethnogenesis of the Albanian people and their direct continuity with the Illyrians. The question became increasingly popular, to the point that currently it is difficult to come across a publication belonging to the years of the totalitarian regime that does not emphasize as a pivotal issue the question of Albanian ethnogenesis (Aliu 1969; Korkuti 1969; Anamali 1972, 1973, 1979/1980; Stipcevic 1973; Buda 1976; Tirtja 1976; Prendi 1985, 1988, 1989; Spahiu 1986; Bodinaku 1990).

Pottery research undertaken by Albanian scholars has occurred in largely isolated circumstances. A labor of love, it is often pursued without much fanfare, and certainly far from the gaze of international academic centers. Consequently, the bulk of the available data is usually confined to the ritual contexts normally encountered in cemeteries, primarily tumuli burials (Prendi 1956, 1957, 1959; Aliu 1994, 1995, 1996, 2004, 2012; Andrea 1985, 1990, 1997; Korkuti 1981; Bodinaku 1982, 1981, 2001/2002; Budina 1969, 1971; Jubani 1983, 1982, 1995; Ceka 1974; Andrea 2009/2010; Bela 1990; Bela and Përzhita 1990; Kurti 1999; Koka 2012), as well as a few shaft cemeteries (Aliu 1994; Andrea 1981; Braka 1987). However, potential sources of data are also present in other contexts: these include the settlements (e.g., caves or open-air sites) (Prendi 1966; Prendi and Bunguri 2008; Korkuti 1971; Andrea 1996; Ylli 1988; Andrea 1990; Belli and Starova 1983; Prendi, Petrika, and Gilles 1996; Hoxha 1987).

Research in these contexts is at best sporadic, and as such it is far from being representative. Thus, an integration of current analysis of late prehistoric pottery in Albania with new trends of research, anchored in more robust scientific, theoretical, and methodological frameworks, can provide a useful contribution to research in the field.

Quantitatively, the work on pottery is well represented in the publication of numerous articles appearing in the *Archaeological Bulletin* (1968-1975), *Studia Albanica*, with its larger focus on

"Albanological science" (1964), and in the journal *Iliria*, which, since 1971, has become the flagship archaeological journal in the country. Research in *Iliria* is often treated in a type of standardized format: the presentation of research is limited to a few pages that focus, in somewhat uniform fashion, on descriptive commentary of material findings based on a regional comparative framework. Monographs are a more recent phenomenon (Aliu 2012; Andrea 1985; Aliu 2004; Koka 2012; Kurti 1999). While in quantitative terms these are much larger, their content follows the standardized model found in *Iliria*. In both cases, a comprehensive catalogue with detailed information for every single vessel or sherd is simply lacking.

What kinds of theoretical approaches are involved, if any, in this research? In Albanian archaeological studies, theory has rarely if ever been considered an integral part of the research strategy. The discipline was mostly built on the conceptual pillars of culture-history and these have never been challenged or called into question. This has produced a unique situation as far as the research agenda is concerned. Every study had similar predefined queries, and this was often the case even prior to the process of the collection of data. Consequently, results were artificially attached to a research agenda often created at a considerable distance from the data. In most cases, this conceptual strategy yielded predictably similar interpretations, avoiding altogether any type of more focused discussion or controversy.

In the symposium dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the foundation of Albanian archaeology, Lorenc Bejko offered a penetrating overview regarding the general development of Albanian archaeological thought (Bejko 1998, 195-207). Among other remarks, especially those relating to the immense contribution made by the first generation of Albanian archaeology, which largely started from scratch, Bejko in cogent terms pointed out the theoretical frameworks

that were based on historicism, Marxism, nationalism, empiricism and culture history (Bejko 1998, 195-201).

Bejko mentions that perhaps the only debate created within the Albanian community of archaeologists is associated with a few claims of Bep Jubani who, in 1969, suggested notable differences between the northern and southern burial rites of the late prehistoric communities of Albania (southern Illyria) (Jubani 1969; Bejko 1998, 199-200). The statement created a furor within the community of archaeologists and, according to Bejko, it provoked the reaction of Enver Hoxha himself, who, in order to avoid any"discrepancies" arising in the future, accorded the "right" to Albanian archaeologists to call Greek and Roman anything that was not Illyrian (Hoxha 1969, 74-8, 80-1).

This general perspective becomes even more evident in the cases when the focus is limited to a particular subject matter. Specifically for materials like pottery, theoretical considerations are not part of the research agenda. The lack of constructive and coherent theoretical underpinnings is apparent in, for example, the consistent preoccupation with the culture-historical tradition. Pottery is essentially considered a key material component that integrates a chain of potentially crucial issues including ethnogenesis, cultural identity, and continuity. Formulations comprising a given hypothesis are uniformly synthesized and thus rather artificially aligned with the predetermined conclusions of the research. The effects of these very limited "pick-and-choose" and "mine" versus "yours" strategies remain widely applied in this brand of pottery research in late prehistory.

There is a consistent trend of particularism at the center of the research agenda; in other words, a discrete focus on issues of chronology and even particular attributes of a given vessel (mostly decoration). The assumption is that the particularistic focus on these issues and attributes

will potentially explain problems previously formulated in the hypothesis, leaving ethnogenesis, cultural identity, and continuity as the main concepts of reasoning. One common research choice is that of material selection, where in the case of late prehistoric pottery, qualitative research looks at specific elements, i.e., decoration and firing technology, which then go on to form the dominant perspective. Particularistic treatments are commonly undertaken in a fashion that gives preference to the most salient, or most easily observed, attributes. For instance, out of the entire repertoire of Iron Age pottery, the bulk of research and analyses strictly focuses on matt-painted pottery. This is a derivative category of the so-called *Devollian Ware*. Very generally, this fabric is described as light-fine, highly-fired, and usually mixed with very fine particles of sand and micas. Such identification was initially used by Frano Prendi in his study of the long-term settlement in Maliq in southeastern Albania (Prendi 1966, 255-71).

Prendi showed an exceptional enthusiasm for matt-painted pottery. His discussion is somewhat evasive when he argues that the matt-painted repertoire forms the most distinctive group of Iron Age pottery to emerge in southern Albania (in the Devoll Valley). In the case of Maliq, Prendi offers a somewhat simplistic theory related to the painting technique, for which he determines, in fact, two techniques for the painted decoration: those of pre- and post-firing. His distinction is based only on physically touching the vessel surface, and observing whether or not the decoration remains in place. The stratigraphic sequence, or the cultural layers found in an excavation, also serves as the main reference by which both pre- and post-fired categories are situated in time. While chronology here is, and should be, perceived in evolutionary terms, Prendi's determinations focus solely on the firing technique, with little emphasis given to the archaeological sequence. Prendi considers both pre- and post-fired decoration as a qualitative attribute which demonstrates advancement in pottery painting and technology through time.

Thus, the post-fired version, its paint being more easily erased, is somewhat dubiously assigned to an earlier period by Prendi (that of the Late Bronze Age, which correspond to layers IIId2 and d3 at Maliq, dating to the 13th–12th century BC). According to Prendi, the version that dates to the Early Iron Age (11th–8th century BC) is that where the decoration is applied before firing, and this continues through the so-called period of the Developed Iron Age (8th–7th BC) (Prendi 1977/1978, 13).

The same kind of particularistic views are consistently stressed by other scholars in the course of exploration at several Iron Age sites in southern Albania. The Devollian ware and matt-painted pottery continue to comprise a significant part of the pottery assemblage and research agendas (Andrea 1985; Korkuti 1969; Bodinaku 1990, 1989), and related discussions likewise focus on these categories.

Such an agenda, together with particularism, has left a great deal of obscurity on the material and subject matters regarding the pottery dating to the Bronze and Iron Age in southern Illyria and northern Epirus/Albania. Not much attention has been paid to various features that mark abundant presence over the course of the late prehistoric period such as: coarse ware, dark fine ware, incised decoration, the similarities between the incised and matt-painted motifs, the varieties of the plastic applications and vertical and diagonal ribbing, finger impressions, vessel forms, and so on. It is likely that even with the matt-painted decoration most of the above authors have rushed to conclusions without conducting a systematic quantitative and qualitative assessment of the data collected at various sites. Comprehensive accounts of a typology of motifs, regional distribution, and quantitative occurrence, relation to fabric and vessel forms are lacking.

As mentioned earlier, the issues of ethnogenesis (origin) and chronology together indicate more than anything the extent to which political agendas regarding the ideological issues of identity and especially Illyrian continuity still influence studies of pottery and material culture. The entire discourse uniformly determines that matt-painted pottery, as a local tradition, remains deeply rooted in the Devoll Valley. Based on this material, it is claimed that a cultural identity organically arose in this region in the Iron Age—a pots = people argument—which gradually spread over neighboring areas in Macedonia and northwest Greece (Prendi 1974, 121).

These kinds of politically-charged conclusions not only compromise the overall research mentality, but also the possibility of engaging in critical thinking and even incorporating alternative research frameworks. Consequently, the evolution of the culture-historical tradition has hindered research, rather than fostering it.

Moreover, it needs to be stressed that this clear relationship between nationalistic agendas and the culture-historical tradition comes as a response to a similar trajectory dominating research of the southern Balkans more generally. Upon closer inspection, this material, together with the related issue of the so-called "migration waves" on the eve of the Iron Age, are linked in most cases through arguments of emergence and continuity. Decoration especially is understood as an innovative element in the pottery and the main indicator of new movements and/or occupations in the southern Balkans.

Only a few decades before the excavations at the site of Maliq, Walter Heurtley, working in the settlement of Boubousti in north-central Greece (western Thessaly), had come across a similar ware decorated with matt-painted motifs. This ware was dated to the transitional period of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age (1300–900 BC), and Heurtley hastened to link this innovative pattern with the Dorian migrations (Heurtley 1926/1927, 169-79, 91-94).

Since then two different agendas came to the fore: 1) the strong belief in the migration theory. This was led by German scholars, mainly preoccupied to confirm the emergence and the spread of the Aryan race in the areas of the Balkans in the Late Bronze Age (Heurtley 1925/1926; Hochstetter 1982, 1984); and 2) a group that noted the presence of matt-painted pottery in the Middle Helladic period in the areas of Lianokladhi, gradually penetrating to Thessaly and Boiotia (Wace and Maurice 1912; Buck 1964). Ioulia Vokotopoulou subsequently would confirm this observation by admitting that, in the cemetery of Vitsa Zagoriou (northwestern Greece), the matt-painted motifs did not appear until the Late Bronze Age (Vokotopoulou 1986, 364-6). According to her, this was to be considered a material rooted in Greek lands that subsequently spread toward the areas of Epirus, western Macedonia and Albania. The nationalistic tendency related to the leading role of the Greeks in the areas of the southern Balkans was thus promoted, whether intentionally or unintentionally.

The question of origins, however, has only recently been treated in alternative terms. The phenomenon of matt-painted pottery, as Barbara Horejs defines it, rather than being a migration product of people from either Anatolia or southern Greece or central Europe, is the result of long contacts among regions with a south-north direction (Horejs 2007). Even though approached through traditional avenues, her views eschew political and nationalistic agendas. Thomas Tartaron seems to offer so far the most valid account of the presence of matt-painted pottery in western Macedonia and southeastern Albania. Together with Horejs, Tartaron agrees that this category of material was nothing but the result of constant communications among the Late Bronze and Iron Age communities of the greater region. Furthermore, he emphasizes the geographic configuration as a crucially important feature, putting special focus on the routes of the river valleys (Tartaron 2004, 85-7).

The cultural-historians noted above never called into question the migration theory, but the discourse became controversial when the origins and directions of these putative waves of migration and their representations in the material culture (especially matt-painted pottery) were considered.

In every case, however, the important potential offered by research on pottery with regard to social aspects, its role in everyday life, the modes of production, transmission in time and space, and especially its reflection in the economic development, have not been comprehensively considered. In many ways, the issue of matt-painted pottery has become something of a scholarly trap in which one can get easily lost in the various narratives. To this day it remains an approach that perceives archaeological data as an element of ownership developed within sharply delineated boundaries framed within an "ours" versus "yours" mentality.

It is interesting how such scholarly narratives, rather than accomplishing their stated academic mission, revert to traditional concepts, legends and clichés that have been very popular among different ethnic groups living in the Balkans.

While conducting my research in Albania two years ago, I came across a television documentary entitled "*Whose is this Song?*" the production of a Bulgarian director named Adela Peeva (Peeva 2003). The plot was interesting: a well-known folk song that Peeva assumed to be Bulgarian turned out to be equally popular in several countries around the Balkans including Greece, Albania, Serbia, and Bosnia, and even beyond the Balkans, in Turkey. Moreover, in each country, apart from the distinct lyrics, the song had a similar melodic rhythm. Intrigued by this diversity, Peeva undertook a journey in each of the above countries attempting to explore the roots and possibly the identity of the song. I was familiar with the Albanian version of the song and had taken for granted its Albanian origins; after all, the song had always been part of family

celebrations in many parts of the country. In Peeva's exploration of the song, I was expecting the "contest" to favor an Albanian origin. The problem, however, was that others from all over the Balkans had expressed even stronger feelings that the song was "theirs." In her journey through Turkey, Crete, Albania, Serbia, Bosnia, and finally in her native Bulgaria, Peeva came across various versions of the song but also encountered a uniquely similar reaction among different ethnic groups when she asked the question: Whose is this song? To a person, every musician, singer, music expert, composer and local people emphatically claimed the song as belonging to either their country or culture. In the case of two countries—Turkey and Albania—music specialists offered even more elaborative accounts of the authenticity, indeed ethnicity of the song as, in each respective case, Turkish or Albanian. Elsewhere, Peeva even witnessed fighting among the Roma (Gypsy) communities of southern Serbia who claimed the song even more emphatically as theirs. In the end, she returned to Bulgaria empty-handed, unable to give the song an agreed-upon identity. What she uncovered, however, was more important: an "ours" vs. "yours" mentality throughout the various different groups of the Balkans. The documentary serves as a striking example of the lack of cohesiveness and a dualistic attitude toward the "other" among communities that have constantly interacted with one another and, above all, experienced the many centuries under the domain of a central political authority, whether the Roman, Byzantine or Ottoman Empire.

A similar attitude is noted with the interpretation of archaeological data that was rarely considered as a record of the past and one that was not necessarily associated with the present. Moreover, as with the song, the first reaction towards the archaeological record was precisely a similar claim of ownership, one squarely located in the sharply defined ethnic and religious vicissitudes of the Balkans.

1.b. Recent Trends in the Studies of Late Prehistory in Albania

Following the collapse of communism, there was an enormous reaction to the prevailing scholarly agenda. Various scholars focused on the impacts of dictatorship , nationalism (Bowden and Richard 2004; Gilkes 2004), or they addressed the ideological underpinnings of a discipline under heavy influential constrains (Bejko 1998).

More recent developments have shifted the focus toward a mission of the discipline associated with scientific endeavors both theoretically and methodologically, especially in the process of data collection and publication. Numerous projects conducted in recent decades serve as testimony for such activity (Bejko 2006; Damiata et al. 2007/2008; Amore 2010; Galaty et al. 2013; Papadopoulos et al. 2014; Pevnick and Agolli 2014).

The excavations of the burial tumuli in Kamenicë, Lofkënd and Apollonia necropolis have reshaped dramatically several preconceptions regarding the process of data collection by employing highly innovative methods including precise mapping techniques through GIS, TST and 3-D visualization, as well as digital databases, analysis of soil, scientific dating, and conservation of archaeological material, and so on. Above all, two additional aspects that have revolutionized research include the comprehensive physical anthropological assessment of the skeletal remains of the burying groups, and the application of ^{14}C AMS dating.

The study and analysis of the skeletal material has contributed fundamentally to the understanding of demographic profiles, family relations through DNA, diet and health issues in the respective communities of Kamenicë, Lofkënd and Apollonia (Schepartz 2010). Earlier studies only partially considered the skeletal remains, if at all. The few published attempts were mostly focused on an assessment of medieval cemeteries, primarily on morphological features of

the data, with an exclusive interest in the direct derivations among the Illyrians-medieval Arbër-modern Albanians (Dhima 1986a, 1986b, 1987b, 1987a; Dhima and Nemeskeri 1988).

Absolute dating, thus far applied primarily to human bone collagen from the populations at Lofkënd and Apollonia, has shaken dramatically the "Three-Age" system of the conventional dating in late prehistory by pushing absolute dates back, at least by 200-300 years for the Early and Late Bronze Age periods, as well as the Early Iron Age (Damiata et al. 2007/2008).

Systematic regional surveys have contributed extensively to the field during the last two decades (Galaty et al. 2013; Bejko et al. 1998). The regions under survey have offered useful accounts on the diachronic perspective of human occupation together with systematic geological assessments, environmental studies, and ethnographic accounts, including demography, burial rites, marriages, traditions, culinary practices, and so on.

These recent studies, besides adding considerably to the archaeological evidence of the regions in question, have brought to the fore scientific and interdisciplinary agendas. Indeed, they have reconceived how patterns of the past should be perceived.

1.c. Scope of the Present Study

Well beyond the culture-historical agenda we have seen applied to pottery studies in Albania, explorations in the past six decades have yielded an enormous amount of data that can be the subject of further analysis.

The approach adopted in this study is a comprehensive research agenda that tackles two critical issues: First, the potential of pottery data to shed light on the socio-economic profile of the late prehistoric communities in southern Illyria. Pottery is considered a key category of material culture, which, quite apart from its resonance on cultural identity, ethnogenesis, and continuity, displays evidence for choices related to the technological, social, and economic

background of a community. By taking into account this important evidence, I take a closer look at each attribute of a vessel, analyzing to what extent the decision taken over the production process reflects on the socio-economic environment. Equal attention is paid to the qualitative and quantitative parameters that enrich both the functional and aesthetic features, and what these imply in terms of physical effort during the process of production. Using a diachronic perspective, I consider innovation and stability as two parameters directly associated with the qualitative transformation of the pottery data over time, arguing that late prehistoric pottery gains a highly sophisticated profile owing to several qualitative parameters that provide it with the status of a specialized product. This said, the pottery of the period in this region is limited to the domain of household production; that is, it does not develop into another mode of production, and it is never a formal market commodity traded according to its value. This in itself is a strong indicator of the social profile of southern Illyrian communities. Their socio-economic profile maintains gradual change mostly indicated by demographic fluctuations. Those factors that compel radical changes to to the communities of southern Illyria are likely to be associated with external factors, which, after the 6th century B.C., have enduring ramifications on the social and economic topography of southern Illyria.

Second, I consider the qualitative properties of the pottery data as a unique indicator for the shaping of cultural transmission within the late prehistoric communities of southern Illyria. I attempt to bring to the discussion evidence for patterns that measure the degree of communications among various communities and to what extent they shape models of interaction and regional or intraregional networks. In so doing, I consider the conceptual profile of the data and to what extent its properties are associated with shared and individual choices on a given system of values. I argue that a model of cultural transmission, rather than leading to

divisions or boundaries of ideas and choices, represents a compelling factor that conditions the scale of the transformations over time. The most radical changes or developments on the conceptual system, rather than emerging from an internal development of a social context, are conditioned either by the presence or lack of influences or interactions at the regional or intra-regional scale.

In Chapter 2 I discuss the functionalist and evolutionary theoretical approaches that look at pottery production and use/consumption as a reflection of both social organization and social complexity—particularly the role of inter- and intra-regional interactions and cultural transmissions. Chapter 3 focuses on the methodological tools applied to the research. I offer an explanatory model that deals with the nature of the data and the qualitative and quantitative measures applied to the reconstruction of the technological and ideational profiles of the material. Chapters 4 and 5 comprise a synchronic and diachronic analysis of the data. Chapter 4 deals with the technological profile, focusing on three measures: the production step measure, standardization, and innovation. The last section offers extensive interpretations as to the transformation of the technological profile of pottery production over time and its association with the socio-economic profile of the late prehistoric societies of southern Illyria. Chapter 5 also describes the ideational patterns of each repertoire and offers interpretations concerning the shared and individual concepts and to what extent they shape both the regional and intra-regional networks and cultural transmissions.

Chapter 2

The Conceptual Construction of the Research Query: The Ramifications of Processual, Technology and Dual inheritance Theoretical Approaches to Social Organization and Cultural Transmission

As mentioned in Chapter 1, the nationalistic and culture-historical agendas have received a great deal of criticism over the past two decades. In many cases such criticisms have been coupled with alternative theoretical methodologies and accounts. Finely tailored studies that combine research questions with relevant theory and methodology, however sporadic, are becoming an innovative trend in Balkan archaeology, mostly associated with several joint projects with foreign institutions.

Theory is an indispensable tool in any research strategy that contributes to the conceptualization of questions related to the orientation, interpretation, and the derivation of conclusions. The application of relevant theoretical approaches that consider the unique potential of pottery/archaeological data for answering and highlighting issues of the social, economic, and cultural character remains a crucial aspect of this research.

In this chapter I address several theoretical agendas that have had a great impact on the understanding of pottery in the archaeological record. The first section offers a general background on processual approaches and their impact on studies of pottery. The second section focuses on modes of production and especially to what extent technology is associated with the socio-economic profile. The third and last section deals with dual inheritance theory and its critics over the static and unilinear theoretical approaches and the ramifications for understanding of cultural transmission.

2.a. The Processual approach and shift towards the socio-economic profile

In the early 1960s, somewhat ahead of his time, Lewis Binford initiated a coherent critique which called into question the parameters within which archaeological research was being undertaken (Binford 1962). Beyond simplistic historical connotations given to the archaeological data, he addressed the process of cultural change and evolution by imposing special focus on the identification of the so-called technomic, socio-technic, and ideo-technic artifacts (Binford 1962, 218-9). Such claims had a great impact on the theoretical underpinnings of the discipline. On a larger scale, Binford aimed to convert archaeology from a narrative-driven field into a cohesive discipline based on scientific practices. He tackled the core concepts of an archaeological tradition developed around notions of theoretical universalism, historicity, and empiricism. According to him, the key issue in the projection of any idea within the discipline was to be directed by a unified purpose, founded in the scientific method and the proven result. Binford's process-based approach focused on exploring avenues organically related to the immediate social and environmental context. With his critique of the particularistic views endemic in contemporary research attitudes, Binford was arguing for a more static evaluation of the process that included the environment and the complex range of human actions therein. The processual approach espoused by Binford specifically emphasized the aspects of the material and the processes that produce it. Such an approach was not only cutting edge at the time in terms of theory, but Binford's work was unique for tackling the very traditional approach of culture history. Since the 1960s archaeological thinking has developed immensely; nevertheless, some of Binford's basic perceptions easily fit to agendas that today are at the core of the discourse.

Pottery has become the pivotal focus of several theoretical approaches extensively prioritizing several topics of cultural, economic, and social identity, gender, and religious

character. Indeed, this attention has greatly influenced a more comprehensive understanding of this type of material.

The processual approach was followed by several scholars who applied its conceptual framework and especially the functional agenda to various aspects. Among different topics, style has received a great deal of attention (Sackett 1977; Wobst 1977; Hegmon 1992).

Martin Wobst conceptualized the performance of artifacts and especially their stylistic attributes from a functionalist perspective relating the particular elements of folk dress code in the highlands of the central Balkans with a distinctive expression of social identity. The case study takes into consideration the dress codes of three different communities living in adjacent areas. With respect to one another, the Yugoslavians, Bosnians, and Kosovo mountain communities show salient features in their folk customs, features that made their appearance recognizable from a distance. The different model of male hats, for instance, offers a salient element easily distinguished from a distance. Other dress codes were clear representations of gender and age differences within the community. This was an expression related to a behavioral meaning that intended to transmit important components of ethnic and personal identity.

Wobst associated any stylistic feature exclusively with the non-utilitarian attributes, creating a sharp separation with any utilitarian aspect. This conceptual agenda yielded plausible interpretations for his particular case study and to this day continues to serve as an orienting tool for the understanding of the functional role of style. It must be stressed, however, that especially with archaeological case studies, the so-called stylistic features are hardly categorized into such sharp categories. Even if they were, it is the static context of the archaeological record that does not leave much room for the full inspection of both utilitarian and non-utilitarian features (Wobst 1977, 317-42).

In fact, a cogent account of the identification and representation of style in archaeological material is offered by James Sackett. While arguing for the attributes of style in artifacts, he employed a complementary perspective that associated style with every aspect of an artifact, not only to non-utilitarian features. Sackett draws considerable attention to the social milieu in which a particular array of material is perceived. He addresses this more concretely through his critique of the so-called "ceramic sociology" and attempts to reconcile into an inseparable framework both the attributes of a group of artifacts and their social context or ethnic significance (Sackett 1977).

Many years later, Michelle Hegmon addressed style from a comparably diverse perspective. She followed in the footsteps of Wobst and Sackett and especially their views on the functional attributes of style. However, instead of narrowly focusing on the orienting issues of style, she opened up the discussion towards other matters intimately related with stylistic performance, such as technology or the so-called recognition of boundaries. Hegmon argued for a social meaning of style directly perceived during the manufacturing process. Rather than considering its ethnic significance, she considered its dynamic development in a given social environment which she refers to as *habitus* – a term earlier introduced by Pierre Bourdieu (Bourdieu 1977). A focal issue of her agenda is that style is not associated either with information exchange or with cultural interactions, but that it rather represents a social boundary. Hegmon argues for a salient feature of style developed under a given social unit which to a certain extent is not negotiable with other counterparts elsewhere (Hegmon 1992).

Such theoretical approaches have undoubtedly offered a penetrating understanding of the archaeological data. However, as with the processual approach, they also fall in the similar static

perceptions in which the rate of change over time is not considered at all as a dynamic element that greatly transforms the properties of the data.

Beside style, several other theoretical approaches have focused on pottery. Among others, Dean Arnold is to be considered a pioneer who offers a cogent synthesis of the theoretical implications in pottery research (Arnold 1985). His contributions on pottery remain a seminal attempt to unify research approaches, and closely relate those theoretical frameworks that can more effectively contribute to pottery research. The influence of the processual approach on Arnold is apparent insofar as he considers *environment* and *culture* to be the main elements of, and thus closely involved in, any given context. Both parameters, however, are monitored through economic factors and it is these factors that maneuver the nature of any choice regarding environment and culture (Arnold 1985, 18-9). According to Arnold, any choice undertaken in the process of production is to be seen as a direct reflection of the group of actions with economic impact. The choices directly associated with the economic profile are those reflected in the manufacturing process. Parameters such as the scale of production, innovation, or market value greatly impact the technological profile. Arnold views culture as an inexorable economic parameter. The dynamic transformation of the utilitarian or non-utilitarian attributes of production resonates in an important dynamic that change due to the degree of diffusion, exchange, migration, and so on. Such aspects have a great impact as well on the scale of the innovation of production.

Another approach, put forward by Carla Sinopoli focuses hermeneutically on pottery against the backdrop of cultural and social considerations. In contrast to Arnold, she deals with the post-production process, offering insights regarding social organization, economic development, regional interactions, rites, religion, and so on (Sinopoli 1991, 3-7). With a rather

inclusive focus on pottery, she cogently enriches her agenda with several case studies that illustrate a wide range of analyses of pottery (Sinopoli 1991, 119-60). Sinopoli builds a complementing balance between the use of theory and its application to different case studies. Taken together, Arnold and Sinopoli offer two plausible perspectives for dealing with aspects of crucial importance in pottery analyses that have to do with modes of production, as well as other types of approaches related to the qualitative representation of a repertoire.

The processual approach pioneered a dynamic discussion for the understanding of social organization through the archaeological record not only in theoretical and conceptual terms. Its agenda, cohesively equipped with cogent methodological strategies, shifted the focus of the discipline towards scientific endeavors introducing highly elaborated analytical actions that measured the qualitative and quantitative parameters of the data aiming to obtain accurate and possibly tested results.

The further implications for studies of style and pottery have effectively applied key concepts synchronically and diachronically. In my research I employ the conceptual agenda of the processual approach to disentangle the extent to which the qualitative properties of the pottery are associated with the socio-economic and ideational profiles of the late prehistoric communities of southern Illyria. Given the considerable amount of the data, the quantitative analysis with statistical inferences will be conducted in a future stage of research.

2.b. The reconstruction of the socio-economic profile through the process of manufacture

Other approaches not exclusively associated with pottery research add to the theoretical approaches innovative and intriguing avenues of inquiry that put particular focus not so much on environment, culture, economy, or society, but rather on the importance of technology. This does

not necessarily exclude or contradict the insights of the contributions already enumerated. Instead it represents a framework centered on technology in which other factors are at play as secondary parts (Leroi-Gourhan 1971). The approach emerged in the 1960s in the work of André Leroi-Gourhan and his study entitled *Le Geste et la parole* (Leroi-Gourhan 1964). The volume represents a social approach to the study of technique, which builds on the earlier work of his mentor, Marcel Mauss, who elaborated a cogent theoretical approach centered on the economic profile of the society. More specifically Mauss dealt with reciprocity as the principal parameter with a significant impact in the shaping of the social, economic, and cultural relations within and outside a community (Mauss 1950).

Valid adaptations of this approach were introduced in pottery studies (van der Leeuw 1976, 1993; Lemonier 1985, 1993). In this approach, technology is viewed as a fundamental signifier related to the social process both of thinking and of making. Lemonier perceives technology to be a cognitive avenue reflecting the material attributes, decisions, and choices made in the pre- and post-production processes. The investigation of these issues, therefore, is meant to be of great potential for exploring a two-part approach that simultaneously reflects modes of production, as well as other parameters accompanying pre- and post-production decisions closely related to material function. This scenario is explained through a conceptual approach, the so-called *"chaîne opératoire."* Both the technological process and everything related to it are explained through a chain of operations starting with the substance/raw material and finishing with the end product, as well as the choices involved in each and every step (Lemonier 1993, 2-27). This involves the examination of thought and production in three primary dimensions: material characteristics, environment, and context. The *chaîne opératoire* comprises an approach neatly structured on theoretical terms. Above all, it focuses on an

inclusive strategy that evaluates the extent to which the properties of the archaeological record reflect on concepts, choices, ideas, physical actions, and the background that yields them. Altogether these aspects complement the theoretical concerns of the technological approach, which give priority to particular elements such as environment, society, or culture.

The advantages of this approach were strongly supported by James Skibo and Michael Schiffer. Their work presents an integrated agenda that takes into account the benefits of a technological approach (Skibo and Schiffer 2008). The so-called "behavioral" approach provides a dynamic theory and methodology that can be used to investigate the myriad backgrounds standing behind material culture. In contrast to the technological approach, behavior becomes the main focus. Behavior is perceived to be the final avenue by which the study of material culture itself is supposed to resonate. The approach stands on five main theoretical pillars: 1) life/history/behavioral chain, 2) activities and interactions, 3) technical choices, 4) performance characteristics, and 5) applications (Skibo and Schiffer 2008, 9-16). The crucial point made clear from such a perspective has to do with a theoretical strategy that no longer leads to heated discussion; instead it creates a cohesive negotiation among varieties of approaches that could beneficially interact together.

In comparative terms, the technological and behavioral approaches comprise complementary agendas; the main discourse does not remain in the core concepts but extends to a mosaic of ideas involving a plurality of theoretical contributions. Pottery research in southern Illyria can benefit immensely from the approaches enumerated above and I suggest that this overview of ideas and concepts leads to a more dynamic theoretical perspective.

This agenda, adapted in the frame of the *"chaîne opératoire,"* involves the transformation of the raw material into an object, a moment associated with two artisanal

instances: first the physical actions undertaken over the production process, the *"doing,"* and, second, the reasoning and the choices leading toward such activity, the *thinking."* Both aspects alter a key moment related to the purposes, choices, and the background of the artisan who through the production activity expresses salient parameters of the social community to which s/he belongs.

Specifically, in this research I attempt to analyze through the properties of the end-product the 'thinking' and the 'making' process. The reconstruction of the technological profile relies on the measures of the production step, standardization, and innovation. The synchronic perspective allows qualitative properties of the data and an investigation of the labor cost and investment of the socio-economic context in which this process is conducted.

2.c. The ramifications of dual inheritance theory on social organization and cultural transmissions

Dual inheritance theory remedies some of the misinterpretations of the Darwinian approach by putting considerable criticism on the unilinear agendas of cultural evolution, especially their equation with genetic and biological evolution (Sahlins and Service 1960; O'Brien, Lee, and Michael 2005; Spencer 1974). The principal concepts of the Darwinian approach, such as adaptation, selection, and equilibrium, are not discarded but rather diffused within an innovative framework that contextualizes a cultural unit on basic terms strictly associated with functional and dynamic parameters. In the most simplistic version, cultural evolution is perceived as the by-product of genetic evolution that takes shape according to the information that people acquire from others by teaching, imitation, and other forms of social learning (Boyd and Richerson 2005, 3-5).

In order for this process to maintain and develop under stable conditions, the involvement of several social mechanisms that operate with cohesion is required. A given social group choses to live according to a social habitus and enters into a continuous process if only motivated by pragmatic needs such as the procurement of goods, competition, protection from outsiders, need for reproduction and so on. It is due to such exigencies that few principal regulations are either formally or informally agreed upon. The efficient operation of a social group and especially the preservation of equilibrium require constant maintenance of its cohesion and solidarity both arranged through constant reciprocal cooperation and via a strategy that punishes the social defectors (Boyd and Richerson 2005, 167-89).

Cooperation, solidarity, and the punishment of defectors are considered crucial for keeping stability within the group; conversely, reciprocity operates as a multidimensional mechanism within and outside its confines. The reciprocal relations mostly develop in terms of social, economic, and political factors among individuals of a given group, entitled entities, and so on. The maintenance of reciprocal balance is a key element that not only enforces the relationship, but also shapes the character of interactions in the future. According to Robert Boyd and Peter Richerson, individuals or groups able to maintain and increase the degree of reciprocity are likely to create promising conditions for internal social stability. In cases when the interaction occurs and continues randomly among various individuals, any projection on the future becomes unpredictable. According to this conceptual formula, the interactions succeed persistently for groups with common reciprocal relations and decrease within groups that rarely intend to reciprocate (Boyd and Richerson 2005, 146-66).

As for culture, the mechanisms of adaptation, cooperation, punishment, and reciprocity serve as crucial parameters that give optimal equilibrium to a group over time. In such

circumstances culture is represented from a repertoire of inherited, newly established, and innovative behaviors and values taking place within and outside groups according to the social context and organization of the group. The model of cultural transmission is shaped according to this model. The dual inheritance theory highly dependent on inherited behavior (vertical transmission) and the absorption of new elements due to immediate circumstances (horizontal transmission). It is this conceptual model that remedies the static perceptions addressed from the processual or behavioral theory, offering the potential to investigate coherently both behavior and culture in a dual order. From a synchronic perspective, horizontal transmission modeled through social learning is treated in three separate sub-levels: 1) *individual transmission*—exclusively related to individual choices and which does not necessarily follow any inherited behavior. Here group influence does not play any role at all; 2) *unbiased transmission*-a learning process that is transmitted from immediate circumstances, sometimes absorbed unconsciously; and 3) *biased transmission*- the imitation of the most common behavior inside the group (Boyd and Richerson 2005; Stark, Bowser, and Horne 2008, 6-7).

These models of cultural transmission have had a great impact especially in pottery studies, both in terms of ethnographic and archaeological data (Stark, Bowser, and Horne 2008). Indeed, the cogent principles of dual inheritance theory offer a compelling framework that invokes detailed and comprehensive treatment and analysis for any type of data.

Compared to the approaches enumerated earlier, the advantages of this agenda rely on three crucial concepts against the cultural-historical and unilinear processualist agendas. First and foremost, Dual inheritance theory considers *change/transformation over time* a pivotal aspect for the understanding of the choices, beliefs, organization, exchange, and other strategies of a social group. However, not much can be offered for any type of grouping if it is not initially

considered from the triple perspective of past-present-future. The processualists succeeded in dealing with various issues of the cultural and socio-economic character; they failed, however, in the dynamic consideration of the rate of change over time by taking for granted the implication of the unilinear agenda of social Darwinism in anthropology.

Secondly, the dual inheritance agenda does not discard the importance of various concepts pinpointed earlier by the processualists, such as the impact of the environment, the pragmatic decisions on the use of economic resources, and the importance of the exchange of goods among various groups. However, in their conceptual framework, these parameters were intermingled into a functional agenda configured by the most crucial needs of a social group for survival, including adaptation, reproduction, exchange, and so on.

Finally, the greatest impact of dual inheritance theory is the perspective on culture. In contrast to the cultural-historians and processualists, culture is perceived as a dynamic mechanism shaped according to inherited values, together with the social strategies and decisions on cooperation, reciprocity, and exchange in a given time context. In fact, it is this viewpoint that has revolutionized the static and "black and white" conceptualization of culture. On the one hand, cultural-historians defined culture as a frozen egocentric parameter delineated by configured borders under the domain of a particular social group. More explixitly, they defined culture as "the information that people acquire from others by teaching, imitation and other forms of social learning*"* (Boyd and Richerson 2005, 3) This perception, instead of building cultural borders, situates culture on dynamic grounds that operate through a multidimensional process of transmission from a diachronic and synchronic perspective within and outside a given social habitus.

I apply the concepts of dual inheritance theory especially to the shaping of the model of cultural transmissions, focusing on two issues. First, I outline to what extent cultural transmission takes shape and changes over time within a site or social group. Second, I evaluate the synchronic and diachronic perspectives by dealing with models of regional and intra-regional networks and how they shape cultural transmissions at sites and regions.

In addition, the theoretical underpinnings of the neo-evolutionist approach are greatly beneficial to the current state of research of the late prehistoric pottery in Albania from a number of different perspectives. Consequently, through a comprehensive consideration of the qualitative and quantitative properties of the late prehistoric pottery studied in Albania in the last 60 years, I adopt a functionalist and evolutionary approach. More concretely, I focus on the association between the manufacturing process and its corresponding social background and to what extent the properties of the end-product reflect the intensity and models of regional and intra-regional networks and to what extent cultural transmission are shaped from both a diachronic and synchronic perspective.

In so doing I address several questions:

To what extent does the profile of step measure of production, standardization, and the degree of innovation reflect on the modes of production of these communities?

To what extent does pottery manufacture reflect on the socio-economic organization in the late prehistoric communities of southern Illyria?

What is the inter- and intra-regional model of interactions and toward what kind of strategy is it developed over time?

To what extent do inter and intra-regional networks play a role in the shaping of cultural transmission? Given the lack of a formal exchange market, to what extent is the model of the regional and intra-regional interactions to be understood?

Chapter 3

Research Strategy:

The Measures of the Technological and Ideational Profiles of the Pottery of the Late Prehistoric Communities of Southern Illyria

The principal parameter of the analysis focuses on the attributes obtained from the endproduct. Indeed, additional examinations of clay composition would yield potentially significant results regarding the provenance of the raw material or the preparation process of the clay. However, given the considerable quantity of data and especially the lack of detailed published accounts, as well as issues of accessibility to the material, a comprehensive analysis of clay composition could not be conducted at this stage.

This research focuses attention on the attributes of the endproduct, addressing two main issues: First, the assessment of the technological profile of the data through the qualitative attributes of the end product. The measures are undertaken on three main dimensions, including the production step measure, standardization, and innovation. In so doing, I attempt to create a cohesive profile of the modes of production and to what extent this reflects the social-economic context of the producers from both a synchronic and diachronic perspective.

Second, I attempt to analyze the ideational profile by taking a detailed look at three primary parameters: fabric, vessel formation, and decoration. Detailed observations of the qualitative attributes of pottery create a more comprehensive understanding of the shared and individual concepts within a well-defined system of choices in the making of pottery. With this in mind, I attempt to analyze to what extent both the shared and individual concepts resonate in terms of inter- and intra-regional networks, together with models of the cultural transmission.

In this chapter I introduce the size of the sample and then I tackle separately each of the issues mentioned above, offering first a general overview of their potential in studies of pottery; I then elaborate on how each of these issues are approached in this particular research.

3.a. Background to the Sample Size

This study attempts to conduct systematic analysis for every site in Albania that has yielded late prehistoric pottery with measurable attributes across southern Illyria and northern Epirus. However, during the process of data collection, this plan was conditioned by two main obstacles:

The first regards the quality of the published data, which as mentioned earlier in the introductory chapter, is very cursorily treated. The individual descriptions of attributes such as fabric, form, decoration, and size are either generally treated or simply lacking. Considering the crucial importance of this kind of information, I have formulated individual descriptions for every vessel. In so doing, an appendix with an updated pottery catalogue that combines the individual vessel description with corresponding illustrations is created (Appendix 1).

The second problem regards the lack of publications. A considerable quantity of material, although included in the analysis, is inadequately known on account of the poor state of publication. This is a widely known problem in studies of the prehistory of Albania. In three cases in particular, however, these problems hinder closer analysis. During the 1960s Frano Prendi undertook, over the course of several seasons, systematic excavations at the well-known prehistoric settlement of Maliq. Unfortunately, to this day only one paper is available, which mostly offers general remarks on the site (Prendi 1966, 623). Prendi used extensively the data of the Maliq settlement in various papers in his discussions of issues relating to the Bronze and Iron

Age, ethnogenesis, continuity, and so on (Prendi 1974, 1977/1978, 1985, 1989). Regrettably, a comprehensive account of the stratigraphy and chronological sequence of the site was never published. Recently, a few more extensive remarks were collected in a volume dealing only with the Early Bronze Age horizon at Maliq. Even in this case, a great deal of the material presented was an overview of information already published elsewhere, and some additional attention was given to the organization of the data in the format of a book (Prendi and Bunguri 2008).

In the late 1970s, Namik Bodinaku excavated the tumuli of Piskovë, Rapckë, and Grabovë in the valley of the Vjosë River. The only published source for these tumuli is a brief preliminary report that primarily deals in a very general way on archaeological research in the area of Përmet (Bodinaku 1981). A similar situation is encountered with the tumuli of Çinamak in the Kukës region. Bep Jubani worked extensively in the 1960s on several tumuli near Kënetë and Krumë (Jubani 1982, 1983). In other publications, Jubani focuses on comparative cultural observations between Kukës and other regions in the south. In so doing, he mentions the evidence yielded from the mounds of Çinamak and he considers them crucial for the identification of cultural features of the Kukës area (Jubani 1969, 1990). Unfortunately, for this research I was only able to assess a limited number of vessels displayed in the Archaeological Museum of Tiranë, so I was only able to prepare a partial catalogue for this site.

Despite these problems, my analysis takes into consideration pottery from no fewer than 49 sites in southern Illyria, including that from 36 burial tumuli, 10 settlements, three shaft cemeteries, as well as one dedication deposit (Graph 1a). The quantitative distribution of the data follows this division: hence, burial tumuli account for 72% of the material, and settlements 22% (Graph 1b); the remaining 6% of the material comprises that from the shaft cemeteries and the deposit already mentioned. I include in the analysis 1,473 complete or nearly complete vessels.

Pottery fragments are only considered in those cases where the sherds offer at least the possibility of one measurable dimension, which mostly coincides with decoration.

Unfortunately the correlation of a particular cemetery or tumulus to a specific settlement has not, to date, been encountered. The data produced from settlements is very poor indeed and thus far only Maliq has yielded data with measurable attributes. During the past two decades extensive excavations have been conducted at the prehistoric settlement of Sovjan. The site is only few kilometers from Maliq, but even here very little has been published (Prendi, Petrika, and Gilles 1996). I am, therefore, unable to include in this study the pottery from Sovjan.

The analyses have not considered a number of sites that offer only fragmentary repertoires without any solid patterning in terms of the required parameters of this research. I have not included any of the late prehistoric sites around the valley of the Black Drin River in the region of Dibër (Bunguri 2010). Several sites, including Topojan IIIa, Cetush IV, Manasdren, and Reç have offered a handful of pottery sherds dating to the Bronze and Early Iron Age, but their qualitative or quantitate attributes were impossible to obtain.

Despite the limitations of the material, the quantity of available data has provided great potential for further assessment and understanding of both the technological and ideational profiles of the pottery during the late prehistoric period in southern Illyria.

3.b. A Measure of the Production Process from Output

In the archaeological record pottery most commonly is encountered as the end product. Thus the “doing” and “thinking” are usually aspects not reviewed from the physical context where they occur, and are instead embodied in the end product. Given these conditions, any attempt of evaluation has to begin in reverse. Gary Feinman and colleagues provide an

interesting pattern in this regard: his approach, known as the "Production Step Measure," is based on two handmade repertoires, one in the Valley of Oaxaca, the other in the Pine Lawn Valley in New Mexico (Feinman, Upham, and Lightfoot 1981, 872-4).

This approach was initially applied to several ethnographic studies with special focus on handmade pottery (Fontana et al. 1962; Foster 1966; Chapman 1970). It operates by taking direct observation of the manufacturing process of pottery production, aiming to highlight to what extent the steps required for a particular vessel designate its use, distribution, level of expertise, labor investment, and so on.

Feinman pioneered this approach to archaeological data by applying to his repertoires a coherent scheme of measures, which he named the "*ordinal index of production*" (Feinman 1980) The index takes into consideration distinctive properties formed during the technological process, including the primary formation of the vessel (i.e., clay composition, form, and size) and the secondary formation (i.e., handles, surface treatment, decoration, and so on) and evaluates two parameters:. 1) the number of steps for a given process; and 2) time expenditure for each step (Feinman, Upham, and Lightfoot 1981, 274). In ethnographic studies, the two kinds of measure of labor investment—namely the number of steps and time expenditure—are proportionally correlated (DeBoer and Lathrap 1979). In the archaeological cases, Feinman and collegues applied only the evaluation of the step measure, and in so doing uncovered patterns in the distribution of pottery and labor investment. According to them, the most finely made and highly decorated vessels – which not surprisingly had the highest production step scores -- were concentrated in the major centers. Other types of vessels, less costly and only equipped with utilitarian features, had a wider distribution and significant frequency in smaller settlements.

The production step measure clearly provides a highly efficient strategy for the measure of labor investment in circumstances where the properties of the endproduct remain the only source of information. Moreover, and particularly for this study, this tool offers two main benefits: 1) it can be easily applied to fragmentary data, and 2) it is highly effective both in terms of the evaluation of the synchronic and diachronic assessment of the technological choices in pottery production during the late prehistoric period.

The production step index is calculated only at those sites that offer a high degree of comparative data within their groups. In this assessment I exclude the material from those assemblages that, no matter the degree or state of preservation, are populated only by a limited variety of attributes leaving no possibility for any comparative analysis within sites. The fragmentary sherds are considered in a few cases mostly in the assemblages from settlements.

Feinman's approach is applied to the selection of vessel parameters together with the corresponding values of cost. In this study, however, several decisions are conditioned by the qualitative and quantitative variability of the data. The scheme of Feinman is maintained for four crucial categories: shaping, fabric, surface, and decoration. The further classification for each category is directly conditioned from the attributes of each repertoire. Feinman's method has been used as a key reference for the designation of the points for each step. The establishment of the values in the shaping process is based on vessel size and form. Both parameters span values from one to six. For fabric and surface I follow similar values to those offered by Feinman and each category varies from one to two points. The decoration, which is the final category, is highly variable and by considering the decoration techniques, sophistication of motifs, and vessel size, the values of the production step established values varying from one to five (Feinman 1980).

By taking into account the focal research query for the reconstruction of the technological profile of the data and the extent to which it reflects the socio-economic profile, particular attention is paid to three main groups of attributes: 1) *functional/utilitarian attributes*. Included here are the most basic steps that only give vessels immediate morphological features, primarily associated with products of kitchenware or storage; 2) *the functional/utilitarian attributes* embodied with elaborated features. In this group are included vessels in which the functional attributes are combined with elaborate features of surface treatment, vessel form or decoration (i.e., burnished surface, the concave disk-foot, strut handle, pillar-like handles, and so on). This category is encountered on small- to medium-sized vessels associated with everyday use or tableware, as well as large-size containers; and 3) *exclusively aesthetic attributes*. Here decoration comprises the main feature in the group. The single or combined techniques are the most frequent especially on small to medium sized vessels.

The analysis of the production step measure attempts to highlight a diachronic and synchronic perspective and to what extent the effort and attention given to each of the categories assigned above reflect on the choices undertaken during the process of production. What is the transformation of the qualitative parameters: functional/utilitarian and aesthetic over time? How does it reflect to the specialization of the product and social background by which it is formed?

3.c. The Assessment of Dimensional Standardization

The study of standardization has emerged recently as an important issue, particularly in ethnographic research or in the archaeological material of contemporary societies (Benco 1986; Arnold 1991; Costin 1991; Costin and Hagstrum 1995; Kvamme, Stark, and Longrace 1996; Eerkens 2000; Eerkens and Bettinger 2001; Arnold 2000). Its application, especially in pottery

research, comprises a key issue that methodologically merges both technological and behavioral approaches.

The amount of variability reflects labor specialization, the number of participants, and issues of economic background, especially those of the scale of production, market, or activity timeline. This is explained in rather explicit terms through the "standardization hypothesis," which claims that *production intensity is reflected through increased product uniformity* (Blackman, Stein, and Vandiver 1993). The degree of variability is measured with the coefficient of variation, calculated as the ratio of the standard deviation and mean multiplied by 100:

CV = Standard Deviation/Mean x 100.

Different properties, such as decoration, vessel form, and size reflect a great deal of information regarding the quality of the production and the expertise of the makers while giving objects a designated function. In more general terms, Costin and Hagstrum (1995) develop standardization in two versions. Firstly, *Intentional Attributes* concern decisions purposely made by the potter. These are related to the technological, morphological, and stylistic parameters. *Mechanical attributes,* on the other hand, relate to immediate decisions taken essentially due to particular circumstances created by the process of production. Such attributes are thought to be more helpful for the assessment of standardization (Costin and Hagstrum 1995, 622). They argue for a proportional correlation between the degree of variability and the number of artisans involved in the manufacture process. According to this scheme, low variability is associated with fewer participants and vice versa (Costin and Hagstrum 1995, 623).

The validity of the standardization of the pottery data and especially the attempt to associate the values of the coefficient of variation with the degree of craft specialization has been a crucial point of discussion. Arnold, by focusing on an ethnographic case study, argues that the

uniformity of the materials does not necessarily reflect large-scale production conducted in workshops. He observes several part-time potters in Veracruz, Mexico, who demonstrate a striking ability for making highly uniform vessels. According to Arnold, the theoretical scheme that derives direct association between the uniformity of the dimensional parameters with the highly standardized and formalized product is to be called into question when individual expertise of the artisan is taken into consideration (Arnold 1991, 664-65). Costin also noted a similar problem with the potential of the standardization, suggesting that the low values of material variation may be the result of various factors not exclusively associated with the organization of production (Costin 1991).

Indeed, the theoretical elaborations on standardization have contributed a great deal to the coherent application of this methodological tool in pottery analysis. The ethnographic case studies especially serve as a referential parameter for a cogent understanding of the degree of variability in the archaeological data.

In order to develop a coherent background for the degree of variability and especially its association with the environment of the production and craft specialization, I have applied a cohesive methodological strategy that considers three main criteria: 1) the potential of the data; 2) the selection of sample; and 3) the interpretation of the results.

The body of data coincides with complete or nearly complete vessels and in most cases the only access to the material is the published reports. As mentioned earlier, the individual description and the measures for each vessel are formulated according to the general descriptions and the illustrations, primarily drawings. By taking into account this difficulty, and the lack of any direct contact with the material, an efficient type of measure with great potential for the assessment of variability includes morphological standardization. The key dimensions taken into

consideration include the vessel height and rim diameter. Both values represent key features for the function of the vessel and especially in groups that share other similar qualitative parameters their variability can clearly reflect coherent results regarding standardization.

The selection of samples was initially based on qualitative and quantitative criteria. According to the qualitative criteria, the measures of the coefficient of variation are only conducted on the groups that share similar attributes for the divisions of fabric and vessel forming. The quantitative criterion is associated with the number of vessels within a group sample. Thus, in order to obtain objective results of the coefficient of variation the measure is undertaken in groups that contain four or more vessels. The groups thus created in the classification process (which will be treated further) are considered key in the process of sample collection. The coefficient of variation is measured in groups that indicate a plausible degree of cohesion through each stage of the classification and typology. This sampling strategy aims to analyze, besides the morphological, qualitative similarities these groups also share in terms of uniform dimensional values. An additional sampling strategy regards the selection of groups that occur in two or more consecutive periods. Special attention here is given to the diachronic overview of the data homogeneity. The coefficient of variation is assessed for groups with similar qualitative attributes that reoccur in the successive period. This measure aims to analyze to what extent the degree of variability of a given group evolves from the diachronic perspective and how that is reflected in either craft specialization or the process of manufacture.

How are the values of the coefficient of variation interpreted? Here I take into consideration the guidelines of Eerkens and Bettinger (Eerkens 2000; Eerkens and Bettinger 2001). They argue that the measure of the coefficient of variation is a coherent tool for the assessment of standardization and offers a functional taxonomic model that includes the values

yielded from the calculation of the coefficient of variation into a referential system varying from the upper baseline (highest degree of standardization) to the lower baseline (no attempt at standardization whatsoever) (Eerkens and Bettinger 2001, 494).

This strategy couples the key concepts of the so-called psychological approach of the Weber Fraction (Weber 1834) with statistical applications. Weber argued that our ability to perceive differences varies depending on the particular sense being utilized and on the size/intensity of the thing being perceived. This means that smaller differences will be more easily detected in smaller items, while in larger items, only proportionally larger differences will be perceived.

Eerkens and Bettinger convert the system of the Weber Fraction to archaeological data and construct a referential scale for artifact variation. This is perceived through the uniform distribution in which every value is equally frequent or probable. Erkens and Bettinger yielded two values, known as the lower and upper base lines are 1.7% and 57%. According to Eerkens and Bettinger, any group of products with a coefficient value lower than 1.7% is mechanically produced and any coefficient value reaching at most 57% is highly non-standardized, indicating either lack of expertise or intentional transformations by various artisans, perhaps expressions of their individual choices on the product (Eerkens and Bettinger 2001, 495-96).

Various archaeological and ethnographic case studies indicate low variability varying from 2–6 % for artifacts made by specialized potters (Longrace 1999). Other cases highlight function and aesthetic features as two crucial elements that have great influence on the variability of a dataset. On the one hand, Eerkens and Bettinger argue that the function of an object is likely to decrease any type of individual choice, thus increasing the degree of homogeneity. On the other hand, the expression of aesthetic elements such as decoration or other elaborated features

on the vessel form give to objects individual increasing characteristics as a consequence of the degree of variability (Eerkens and Bettinger 2001, 499-500).

The interpretation of the CV values in my research uses as referential values the upper and lower baselines of 1.7% and 57% and attempts to provide a synchronic and diachronic evaluation of pottery standardization of the late prehistoric communities in southern Illyria. Indeed either the functional or the aesthetic properties of the data are cohesively considered with the corresponding values of the coefficient of variation.

3.d. The Assessment of Innovation in Pottery Manufacture

In pottery studies innovation is addressed theoretically either in the archaeological data (Nicklin 1971; Hegmon and Kulow 2005; Knappett 1999) or more generally within issues of the social, economic, and political character (van der Leeuw and Torrence 1989; Wengrow 2001; Kaufman 2013; Sørensen 1989). There has been a good deal of discussion on the theoretical underpinnings of innovation in the past few decades.

Van der Leeuw and Torrence deal with crucial theoretical issues arguing against any agenda that predicted change through cultural diffusion. They see innovation as part of a dynamic process that imposes multidimensional changes on the socio-cultural context either as a consequence of inner social developments or from exterior factors. According to them, innovation is more rapidly perceived in the process of manufacture and technology, then gradually may or may not be embodied in cultural traits and behaviors (van der Leeuw and Torrence 1989, 5-15). In the same volume, Sørensen reverses the established "theoretical order" of van der Leeuw and Torrence, arguing that either innovation or change must be stimulated from inner behavior and the choices of the society, despite the influences of external factors. In this way, Sørensen brings to the discussion the "delayed" introduction of iron technology in the

Scandinavia during 800-600 B.C (Sørensen 1989). These societies were highly resistant towards the benefits of iron, avoiding it deliberately until the pre-Roman period (500–300 B.C.) by continuing to elaborate bronze technology for any type of metal object. Considering that iron technology by this time was already popular in central Europe, Sørensen argues that this phenomenon is nothing but a choice imposed from the inner cultural tradition and economic context. Furthermore, she argues that even at a larger scale the adoption of innovation and invention must be perceived as a process accepted from the interior context of a social habitus (Sørensen 1989, 195-6). Nicklin deals more closely with innovation and stability in pottery technology giving economics and cultural factors a primary role in the process. He considers product demand, market, exchange and trade as the principal impulses for improvement, innovation, and dynamic change. While focusing on the cultural significance of pottery technology, however, Nicklin also addressed the importance of cultural traits for pottery manufacture and to what extent they influence the maintenance and continuation of the tradition (Nicklin 1971, 27-30).

The theoretical elaboration for innovation has, to date, not been accompanied by a methodological approach that can contribute to a more coherent understanding of archaeological data. Hegmon and Knapett address innovation in style and wheel-made pottery (Hegmon and Kulow 2005; Knappett 1999). Both scholars, however, base their studies on selected topics mixing theory and archaeological data together without proposing a step by step methodological approach on the assessment of the innovation in the archaeological data.

In this research I attempt to disentangle the properties of the data by comprehensively analyzing inherited, innovated, and extinct features. I seek to evaluate the quantitative presence

of the innovative elements and to what extent they are intertwined with the technological profile, individual decisions, and external influences.

By taking into consideration the wide time span that this research covers, and also the generally good state of preservation of the data, I attempt a quantitative methodology to assess innovation in the late prehistoric pottery in southern Illyria. In so doing, two crucial parameters are evaluated: 1) the diachronic perspective. This parameter focuses on comparative changes between two or three periods. Innovation is measured only at those sites that offer coherent continuity in at least two consecutive periods. Large sites like Maliq due to the poor quality of the published data of either the Middle or Late Bronze Age periods are excluded from the analysis; and 2) the criteria applied to the measure of the data. Salient attributes of vessel forming and decoration are separately numbered for each period and then tabulated within a triple system consisting of inherited, innovative, and extinct features. The quantitative performance of each attribute is measured according to this triple system in each period. Then the cumulative values of numbers and percentage are provided for each feature: inherited, innovative, and extinct.

3.e. The Ideational Profile of Pottery Production: Towards a Conceptual Methodological Approach

In this section I focus on the end product, with a strategy that provides conceptual classification of the material and then measures, through patterns, how these concepts are incorporated either as shared, individual, or individual from a pertinent shared system. Here I attempt to investigate how the input of ideas into the process of production reflects the system of shared values and their corresponding modes of production.

The classification of the archaeological data has been the subject of a controversial discussion concerning the theoretical and methodological framework. The non-linear concepts of evolutionary theory have greatly influenced the conceptual understanding of the methodology of classification of archaeological data. During the 1970s Robert Dunnell adapted to classification methodology a conceptual approach that perceived any attribute in the data only as the manifestation of its pertinent cultural unit (Dunnell 1971, 130-2). Indeed, Dunnell was able to synthesize coherently an approach tailored earlier by several scholars, including Krieger and Rouse (Rouse 1960; Krieger 1944).

Over the past few decades, however, criticism of the inilinear evolutionary approach had a great impact on the reconceptualization of methodical strategies. Particular attention was paid to the study of archaeological data as a dynamic parameter that does not necessarily reflect the cultural context in which it develops. An elaborated methodological framework of this kind was recently suggested by Dwight Read (Read 2007). Through closer consideration of the production process and especially the concepts involved with artifact formation, Read sought to limit the issue in terms of artifact classification and typology. He extensively treated the division of the object, highlighting this as a conceptualization of crucial importance emerging for particular reasons in a given time and place (Read 2007, 25-6). Read attempted to avoid a linear sequence of measure of pottery production by looking at the process through two avenues: conceptual (ideational) and empirical (phenomenological). Four production stages were identified: material selection, form, surface, and decoration are the stages by which clay is transformed from its initial state to a vessel as final product (Read 2007, 97-9). According to Read, this understanding provides a rational avenue not only for the exploration of the physical choices made in the production system, but also considers the kind of ideational character to which the material

belongs. The ideational aspects in the material are expressed by two basic concepts related to a general social system of values, the *shared* and *individual*. Read passes over the terms of culture, focusing rather on the ways artifact classification reflects either common or individual choices of the artisans and how they fit to the general system of social values (Read 2007, 88-9). Indeed, he argues that any further analysis of archaeological data has to rely initially on a robust classification system of the qualitative properties and only then can the research query be quantitatively approached with various statistical applications.

In this research I consider the conceptual approach highly effective for the classification of pottery data. Not only does it offer a relevant framework for the division of data properties, but it also leaves open the possibility for further quantitative analytical examination. Given the considerable quantity of data included in this study, my analysis will be limited to the qualitative profile of pottery. I do not intend to ignore statistical approaches, but rather I apply them at a second stage particularly on patterns of potential quantity.

Unfortunately the available data does not allow comprehensive observations for four stages of the production process: material selection, forming, surface treatment, and decoration. By considering the properties of the end product in the classification process, I include three main attributes: fabric, vessel forming (together with surface treatment), and decoration. Indeed, a better grasp of the data has been obtained by means of vessel formation and decoration. Fabric and surface treatment are treated very briefly in Albanian publications and systematic evidence for both parameters has not been collected.

The classification for vessel formation and decoration begins from the premise of the end product with the aim to analyze the degree to which both parameters are conceptualized in the

material. I construct a classification system organized by a *key diagram* for every site (Appendix 3) that presents all the salient concepts related to vessel-forming and decoration.

The scheme of the key diagram has not yet been applied to the pottery studies. However, in mortuary analysis the technique has offered tangible results regarding the distribution of data properties (Brown 1971; Morris 1987; Papadopoulos 2005).

Brown describes the key diagram as a mechanism to express the partitioning of attribute space by a series of variables coded for independently measured dimensions (Brown 1971, 92). The method also holds great potential for pottery analysis, especially for the separation of concepts. The choices (concepts) made on vessels are divided into five aspects defined either as absolute or relative distinctions. Thus, those decisions clearly distinguished such as handles, number of handles, and their location, the form of the base and techniques of decoration are assigned as absolute distinctions. The categories of the form of neck and vessel size are defined as relative distinctions on account of their fluid variability. In the majority of cases the form of the neck remained an attribute with no salient distinction and thus was relatively established. For every phase, the form of neck is roughly defined as short, cylindrical, conical, or elongated. Vessel size has been classified as small-medium or large. Such distinctions are based on visual observation in which both classes may be clearly separated. This attribute is assigned as a relative distinction (See the table of attributes in the supplementary file 3). Any assumption regarding vessel function was not considered here. Each of the chronological phases of the site is assigned its own group of concepts, according to the degree of variability.

Analysis then shifts toward the identification of group patterning for each conceptual division, which aims to classify the representation of each group of concepts into a given system. I initially define the meaning of "group patterning" as: "*A pattern which includes a given*

number of vessels that evenly share a common number and combination of concepts." The representation of patterns is the key for the qualitative identification of the conceptual system. Here I have identified three main classes of concepts in accordance with their occurrence: 1) *Individual concepts* (including those ideas appearing once and in isolation); 2) *Individual concepts derived from a shared system of concepts* (including particular ideas expressed saliently in a vessel the attributes of which largely belong to a shared conceptual system); and *Shared concepts* (including ideas that together constitute one or more patterns).

The analysis of the data is treated in two separate chapters respectively. In Chapter 4 the measures of production step, standardization, and innovation are addressed, whereas Chapter 5 deals with the classification of the data by way of three main properties: fabric, vessel forming, and decoration.

Chapter 4

Data Analysis and Interpretations, I

Technological Profile of Pottery Production in the Late Prehistoric Communities of Southern Illyria and Northern Epirus 2500–500 B.C.

This chapter deals with the technological profile of the pottery focusing on three types of analysis: 1) the production step measure, 2) assessment of standardization, and 3) innovation. I deal mainly with sites that offer a significant amount of data and attempt to evaluate to what extent the functional and aesthetic properties of the data are associated with craft specialization and its development over time. The qualitative characteristics of the pottery are systematically reviewed as a means to understand the evolution of production. The three measures are addressed for each successive period (the Early, Middle, and Late Bronze Age, as well as the three discerned phases of the Early Iron Age). The results are then comprehensively treated through a diachronic perspective.

I argue that the morphological and aesthetic properties of the household pottery production in southern Illyria and, in part, in northern Epirus maintain a steady profile during the late prehistoric period. The pottery when viewed as a corpus gains numerous sophisticated features especially in the Early Iron Age and this indicates a high level of expertise. However, this development does not increase the qualitative profile in the manufacture process, which is always dependent on the decisions and skills of the artisan. During late prehistory, pottery remains a strictly functional item under the domain of the household environment and does not become a commodity with a defined market value.

4.a. The Early Bronze Age: 2500–1900/1800 B.C.

In Albanian studies, the chronology of the Early Bronze Age has seen two primary methodologies. The first is the conventional chronology that is largely followed by the majority of studies to date. Much of this chronology has been anchored on the sequence provided by the long-term prehistoric settlement at Maliq (Prendi 1966, 1977/1978; Prendi and Bunguri 2008). By relying on the stratigraphic sequence and regional comparanda, Prendi assigned the Early Bronze Age the so-called phases III a and b of Maliq, allotting it the absolute dates of 2100/2000–1800 B.C. (Prendi 1977/1978, 8). Since few other sites have brought to light such a cogent stratigraphic sequence, Maliq came to serve as a cornerstone of the absolute chronology of the Early Bronze Age, a chronology extensively followed by most Albanian scholars (Andrea 1990, 1996, 1985; Bodinaku 1982; Jubani 1995; Korkuti 1971). The second methodology is associated with recent AMS ^{14}C radio-carbon dates (Damiata et al. 2007/2008, 155). As part of a larger study involving primarily samples of human bone collagen from Lofkënd and Apollonia, bone samples from Tomb 60 in Tumulus 10 of the Apollonia necropolis yield two calibrated dates for the Early Bronze Age respectively 2528 ± 53 and 2679 ± 174 (Amore 2010; Damiata et al. 2007/2008, 155). The results, although based on a small sample, revolutionized the dating system of the late prehistoric period by pushing the Early Bronze Age back by almost half a millennium earlier than the conventional system of chronology. On account of the dearth of systematic ^{14}C absolute dates, it remains difficult to assume that the results of the recent AMS dates for a handful of sites can be applied to all sites, so I follow the conventional dating of the relative chronological sequence. Pottery dating to the Early Bronze Age is poorly represented, comprising 154 vessels or 13% of the entire data-set that forms the basis of this study (Graph 1). The sites that have yielded pottery of this period include the settlements of Maliq III a and b

(Prendi and Bunguri 2008), Tren (Korkuti 1981), Nezir (Andrea 1990), deposits underlying the castle of Shkodër (Hoxha 1987), and the tumuli of Shkrel (Jubani 1995), Shtoj (Koka 2012), Bujan (Andrea 1995) and Apollonia (Amore 2010, 12) (see Map 1).

4.a.1. The Production Step Measure during the Early Bronze Age

Sufficient evidence for the calculation of the production step index has been encountered only from the settlements of Maliq, Nezir, Tren and the tumuli of Shtoj. The settlement of Maliq offers comparatively the largest amount of material (see Graph 2). In both of Maliq phases IIIa and b there is a wide range of shapes and sizes. Table 1 shows an evaluation of the production step measures relevant to the attributes of shape, fabric, surface and decoration. In terms of labor investment, a division between fine and coarse ware is clearly noted. The fine ware indicates a higher number of steps ranging from 5 to 6. The coarse ware on the other hand recieves lesser attention, varying from 2-4 steps. The vessels receiving more attention are the short open forms equipped with monochrome decoration respectively (P104-P107). Prendi claims they are a continuation from the Neolithic tradition. Similar attention is given to the one- and two-handled vessels and some miscellaneous small to medium size vessels whose attributes, due to their fragmentary state, cannot be defined clearly (Prendi and Bunguri 2008, 79).

In comparison to Maliq, the settlement of Nezir offers less data. The profile of the step measure indicates some attention only limited to the functional features noting minor differences between fine and coarse ware from 5-4 steps (Table 2).

The burial tumuli of Shtoj have similarly only provided a small quantity of data. In terms of steps of production, however, that material indicates a range that varies from four to seven steps favoring the fine ware (Table 3). The vessels receiving exclusive attention are the two-

handled forms with incised decoration that involve as many as seven steps (P06-P08). Meanwhile, the materials collected from the tumuli of Barç, Bujan and Shkrel do not offer enough comparable properties to be included in the analysis.

What is interesting is that the variability in labor investment is strictly based on the nature of the fabric. The fine ware and its parameters of surface treatment and decoration may be classified as more highly valued products compared to the coarse ware, which have exclusively functional attributes relevant for storage and cooking. Such regularity is repeated in the distribution between the settlement and cemetery data. The limited quantity of the pottery repertoire collected from the tumuli, however, largely coincides with fine small or medium size vessels similar to their settlement counterparts. Coarse ware is rarely encountered among the pottery deposited in graves.

4.a.2. The Measure of the Morphological Standardization during the Early Bronze Age

Given the lack of data from most of the sites, measures of standardization can only be calculated for the settlement of Maliq. Again, the lack of systematic data regarding the fabric or surface treatment limits this measure only to the assessment of morphological standardization.

In the settlement of Maliq there are several primary groups of vessels that belong to a shared conceptual system. No matter their state of preservation, the measures obtained from the drawings are considered accurate.

The coefficient of variation is calculated for two dimensions, namely vessel height and rim diameter on six groups respectively: two groups of vessels with one vertical handle below rim (Table 4), one group of vessels with two vertical handles slightly rising above and below the rim (Table 5), and one group of horizontal handles below rim (Table 6).

The assessment of the morphological standardization with the calculation of the coefficient of variation offers various insights regarding the production profile of the pottery of Maliq IIIa and b. With few exceptions, the values displayed in Graph 3 range between 10% and 20 % which compared to the 1.7% and 57% baseline values somehow indicate an average profile of standardization through each group. The lowest value is 4.4% and coincides with the vessels with two horizontal handles. Even in this case, only one attribute reaches a low CV value, whereas rim diameter within the same group scores 14%.

The lack of systematic evidence during the Early Bronze Age does not provide much potential for extensive analyses on the production profile of pottery. Nevertheless, the calculation of the production step index, together with the assessment of innovation, offers, if anything, an orientation regarding key choices undertaken during the manufacturing process. Obviously immediate attention is given to the functional attributes, while other types of elaborative aspects including decoration are minor. The settlements yield the highest variety containing several groups of forms and fabrics. The material from tumuli is mostly restricted to small or medium size vessels equipped with few more elaborate elements. Standardization maintains an average profile not reflecting any extra implication of qualitative choices during the process of production.

4.b. The Middle Bronze Age: 1900/1800–1450 B.C.

The conventional chronology of the Middle Bronze Age in Illyria is elusive, and it may well be an “invented” phase, one that provides a coherent continuity between the Early and the Late Bronze Age. It is rather difficult to relate any important socioeconomic events to this period, or it may be that pottery alone cannot reveal sufficient data to formulate any significant

changes. Prendi (Prendi 1977/1978, 7-9) described the Middle Bronze Age as a period of distinct prosperity, especially represented by means of highly crafted metal objects and pottery vessels. However, the absolute chronology obtained by means of ^{14}C dating from the prehistoric settlement of Sovjan, a site adjacent to Maliq, associates Prendi's Maliq IIIc horizon with the Early Bronze Age (Lera, Touchais, and Oberweiler 2007/2008, 45). It stressed that Prendi's characterization of the Middle Bronze Age is almost exclusively based on the sequence of Maliq IIIc.

In a recent paper, Bejko has given a systematic overview of the Middle and Late Bronze Age in Illyria, focusing mainly on accounts regarding the nature of the data and contact with the Greek world during this period, but not directly addressing the conventional chronology. In contrast with Prendi, Bejko sees a clear demarcation between the Early, Middle, and Late Bronze Age, and he goes on to refer to population growth during the Middle and Late Bronze Age (Bejko 1994, 105-6). It has to be stressed, however, that sufficient evidence for a chronologically clearly defined Middle Bronze Age simply does not exist at present. From what does survive, however, several innovative parameters are noted but, as will be discussed, it cannot be argued that pottery production shows a higher quality. In the current state of the research, one could argue that a putative Middle Bronze Age as a distinct period in southern Illyria and northern Epirus has been somehow "forced in," in accordance with the logic of the Three Age System (Heizer 1962), despite the fact that there is, as yet, no robust evidence to support such a phase.

An additional issue is Prendi's conventional chronology offered in various publications. In his paper focusing on the Bronze Age in Albania, Prendi attributes a great quantity of the prehistoric material in the tumuli of Vajzë, Vodhinë, and Bajkaj to the Middle Bronze Age (Prendi 1977/1978). In the original reports, however, the dates given to each of the above sites is

not earlier than the Late Bronze or even the Early Iron Age (Prendi 1957). For the purposes of this study, I consider the chronology offered in the original site reports, although this chronological discrepancy will be addressed further in my analysis.

The ramifications of the absolute chronology on the Early, Middle, and Late Bronze Age at Apollonia, Sovjan and Lofkënd cannot be ignored (Damiata et al. 2007/2008; Lera, Touchais, and Oberweiler 2007/2008; Lera, Oberweiler, and Touchais 2008). The establishment of absolute dates in Tumulus 10 of the necropolis of Apollonia defines the end of the Early Bronze Age sometime around 1900 B.C. However, if one considers the absolute dates from Sovjan, where it seems that the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age overlaps with the end of the Early Bronze Age, then the absolute chronology may be pushed at least 100 years earlier. The evidence from Stratum 7 places the beginning of the Middle Bronze Age with the Middle Helladic period in Greece around 2000 B.C. (Lera, Touchais, and Oberweiler 2007/2008, 43). The absolute chronology of the end of the Middle Bronze Age is not yet established. The dates obtained from the Lofkënd tumulus suggest that the beginning of the Late Bronze Age may be assigned to at least 1450 B.C. or earlier (Damiata et al. 2007/2008, 160), though it has to be stressed that this is the date of the earliest burial or feature at the site, and as such, Lofkënd provides no clear evidence for the end of the Middle Bronze Age or for the beginning of the Late Bronze Age. All that can be said on the basis of the current evidence is that the date of 1450 B.C. may serve as something of terminus, albeit a floating one, that helps to bracket the absolute chronology of the end of the Middle Bronze Age.

Whatever the absolute dates, the pottery evidence for a putative Middle Bronze Age phase is represented by only 42 complete or nearly complete vessels, comprising a meager 4% of the entire pottery corpus encountered in the settlements of Maliq phase IIIc (Prendi 1966), in the

so-called dedication deposit in Çukë (Korkuti 1990), and in the tumuli of Piskovë (Bodinaku 1981), Dukat (Ceka 1974; Bodinaku 2001/2002), Pazhok (Bodinaku 1982), Bujan (Andrea 1995), and Kënetë (Hoti 1986; Jubani 1983) (Graph 2, Map 2).

The availability of the data and especially the patterns created in the typology do not offer great potential for any further assessment of morphological standardization. Therefore my analyses solely focus on the production step measure and innovation.

4.b.1. The Production Step Measure during the Middle Bronze Age

The production step measure can be assessed at the sites of Çukë, Maliq IIIc, Nezir, and Dukat. Compared to the Early Bronze Age, there is a significant limitation on vessel forms and decoration that is reflected in the profile of the production step. For instance, in Çukë the index indices range from three to five and are mostly related with vessel shaping and surface treatment (Table 7). Similar results are seen from Maliq IIIc, Nezir, and Dukat. Fine ware is frequent at every site, while coarse ware, although present, is not a significant element. Decoration occurs rarely in rather simplistic forms and with similar techniques at almost every site (Tables 8, 10).

The material published thus far from Maliq for the Middle Bronze Age, or Maliq IIIc as Prendi calls it, is not only fragmentary but not fully published. What can be said is that pottery production goes through a simple production process, yielding relatively low production index scores which focus on crucial attributes primarily related with vessel function (Table 9).

The tumuli of Pazhok yielded two vessels, one hand-made, the other wheel-made (P01 and P02), dating to the Middle Bronze Age. There is no clear evidence for the amount of labor investment, but it is worth mentioning that a cup of Vapheio type (P01) is the earliest imported

wheel-made and Mycenaean product in southern Illyria (Bodinaku 1982; Bejko 1993, 1994). Cups of this type in Greece are normally dated to the 16th century B.C.

4.b.2. Innovation of Pottery Production during the Middle Bronze Age

Apart from the settlements of Maliq and Nezir, where innovation can be compared with the preceding Early Bronze Age, the other sites of Çukë, Pazhok, Dukat, Bujan, Piskovë, and Kënetë are first founded in the Middle Bronze Age with no Early Bronze Age layers. At each of these sites the pottery is handmade without any evidence of wheel-made or imported pottery.

The settlement of Maliq provides a few elements that, although not highly innovative in terms of vessel formation, indicate several differences when compared to the Early Bronze Age. First of all, vessel form appears to be very limited and consists of two-handled vessels with vertical handles rising above the rim and horizontal handles below the rim, and a single one-handled vessel with a spout. An innovative element is the vertical wishbone handle rising above the rim and the body form which opens toward the shoulder without delineating the neck (see supplementary file 3, p.187) (Prendi 1966, 266). Apart from this, the quantitative profile of both inherited and innovative features could not be conducted for Maliq due to the poor state of the publication.

In the settlement of Nezir (phase V), the Middle Bronze Age repertoire appears to be innovative, with few inherited attributes from the Early Bronze Age, mainly related with fabric and surface treatment (Andrea 1990, 5, 9). The vessel formation technique has no parallels in the preceding period. Andrea claims that the changes noted in the vessels have served as a definitive element for the identification of the Middle Bronze Age, despite the fact that the stratigraphic sequence of the Early and Middle Bronze Age does not offer a great deal of variability.

Salient innovative aspects related to the vessel forming are noted in the regional level as well. Thus the repertoire of the so-called dedication deposit of Çukë marks a highly innovative pattern not encountered elsewhere during the Early Bronze Age. The open one-handled form with handles rising above the rim, alternatively known as dippers (P02, P04-P09), as well as the loop handles at the turning point, and the two-handled spherical vessels with a vertical handle above or below rim, are all innovative elements (Korkuti 1990, 75-7).

Despite the lack of homogeneous groupings, innovative attributes are present in the tumuli of Dukat as well. Once more, the lack of data from the previous period does not allow for systematic comparison. Nevertheless, the five vessels encountered at Dukat show slightly concave bases and simple painted decoration (P03), which are both elements not seen anywhere else. As for the tumuli of Piskovë, Kënetë, and Bujan, not much can be said. It is worth mentioning that in Bujan the horn handle (P03) is an emerging element.

Pottery production during the Middle Bronze Age shows a profile that in terms of technological effort and innovation offers two somewhat contradictory results. First the pottery repertoire, especially that of Maliq, sees a significant reduction of vessel forms and decoration during this period. Such can be easily confirmed both from the production step measure and the typology in the key diagram (see supplementary file 2, page 102). This drastic difference may be due to the quality of the publication. However, from what survives, the decrease in the scale of production shows some type of correlation with the decrease shortage of vessel forms.

Second, there are innovative tendencies encountered like the open one-handled vessels in the repertoire of Çukë, the wishbone and horn handles in Maliq, Nezir, and Bujan, or the vessels

with raised concave base in Dukat. They remain, however, qualitative features without any particular weight in the production profile measure.

4.c. The Late Bronze Age: 1450–1200/1100 B.C.

The Late Bronze Age is represented by 145 vessels or 12% of the entire dataset presented in this study, distributed over 18 sites, including tumulus burials and a few settlements (Map 3). The conventional chronology offers several discrepancies that do not clearly define either the beginning or the end of the Late Bronze Age. In most cases the Late Bronze Age is defined by means of metal finds, as well as changes in pottery style with notable attention paid to the continuity between the Middle and Late Bronze Age. Prendi established the Late Bronze Age chronology with reference to the Late Helladic (II and III) period in Greece and the sequence of the settlement of Maliq coinciding with phases IIId1-3 (Prendi 1977/1978, 12). Other Albanian scholars adapted this chronology to their own data and contexts (Andrea 1981, 1985, 1996; Korkuti 1971; Bodinaku 1981; Aliu 1984; Aliu 1996, 2004).

In many studies there is a clear confusion between the Late Bronze Age proper, normally assigned to the period 1450–1200 B.C., and the so-called final phase of the Late Bronze Age, which is conventionally dated between 1200–1100 B.C. At several sites, including Barç, Shtoj, Bajkaj, Burrel, and Krumë, the final phase of the Late Bronze Age and the so-called first phase of the Early Iron Age, conventionally dating to 1200–800 B.C., are taken together, thus blurring the division between the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age. As mentioned above, recent studies focused on southern Illyria and especially the application of absolute chronology at Lofkënd, Apollonia and Sovjan, bring to the discussion cogent results that may remedy especially the absolute dating of the Early Bronze Age and that of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age. On the

basis of the AMS ^{14}C absolute dates from Lofkënd and especially Tomb I [64] (dated to 1373 ± 57 Cal BC), Tomb 91 (1374 ± 58 Cal BC), and Tomb XIII [49] (1299 ± 87 Cal BC), the Late Bronze Age can be pushed back to the 15th–13th century B.C. (Damiata et al. 2007/2008), a date in full accordance with the Late Bronze Age in Greece. The AMS dates from Apollonia and Lofkënd offer invaluable new evidence that shakes the conventional chronological framework of the late prehistoric period in Albania.

What follows only treats that category of material that is dated to the Late Bronze Age, including the settlements of Maliq (Prendi 1966), Tren (Korkuti 1971), Nezir (Andrea 1990), Zagorë (Andrea 1996), the tumuli of Barç (Andrea 1985), Kamenicë (Agolli 2009; Bejko Forthcoming), Shtikë (Aliu 1996), Prodan (Aliu 1984), Luaras (Aliu 2004), Rehovë (Aliu 2012), Dukat (Ceka 1974; Bodinaku 2001/2002), Pazhok (Bodinaku 1982), Patos (Korkuti 1981), Kënetë (Jubani 1983; Hoti 1986), Myç-Has (Bela 1990) and the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj (Andrea 1981).

4.c.1. The Production Step Measure during the Late Bronze Age

In contrast with the Early and Middle Bronze Age, lesser quantity of pottery is collected from the settlements Maliq IIId, Tren, Nezir, and Zagorë. Among theses sites a slightly higher quantity has been recorded in the settlements of Maliq IIId and Tren. Meanwhile in Zagorë and Nezir the few vessels and sherds dating to the Late Bronze Age are poorly preserved.

In Maliq, the Late Bronze Age is been classified in three phases coinciding with IIId1-3. The repertoire is very limited, consisting only of two-handled and short open vessels. The production step measure indicates equal attention between the functional features of vessel forming, surface treatment, and immediate aesthetic features like decoration and pierced

openings. The small open vessels, and the vessels with two horizontal handles, reach 3-4 points dedicated to the shaping and surface treatment, the presence of matt-painted decoration, narrow ribbing or the pierced holes that add an extra step, culminating in 5 points (Table 11).

Limited forms are noted in the settlement of Tren as well. The assemblage is easily divided in three groups: one and two-handled vessels each reaching 3 points, with an additional point for the vessels with plastic decoration (Table 12).

The settlements of Zagorë and Nezir offer both a fragmentary assemblage limited to nearly complete two-handled vessels, which in terms of the technological effort respectively receive three points.

The pottery recorded in the tumuli is better represented especially in Rehovë, Luaras, Shtikë, Kamenicë, Gërmenj, Lofkënd, Pazhok, Patos, and Prodan. Other tumuli, including Barç, Dukat, Cerrujë, Kënetë and Myç-Has, have recorded one to three vessels dated to the Late Bronze Age, which are insufficient for further treatment in terms of labor investment.

The tumulus of Rehovë has the largest number of pots dating to the Late Bronze Age: 32 vessels in all. The majority consists of one- and two-handled vessels, double vessels, and a single imported Mycenaean jar. Within the handmade repertoire, the production steps vary from three to six. The majority of vessels are only equipped with basic functional features. Whenever present, decoration only adds one to two extra points. The highest score was achieved in the group of double vessels, which are only equipped with functional features (Table 13).

The tumulus of Luaras has provided an interesting insight into labor investment. With one exception, the repertoire is comprised by a group of one-handled vessels. As Table 14 shows, the category of one-handled vessels varies from three to six steps, marking equal choices

between the functional and aesthetic features. Notable attention is given to the one-handled basket-like vessel, P08, which uniquely receives nine points, so far the most elaborate vessel of the entire Late Bronze Age repertoire (Table 14).

In the tumulus of Shtikë there are seven vessels where the effort reaches three to five points. Once more, the vessels receiving most attention are those which, beside the functional features which take three to four points, have incised decoration either linear or curvilinear (Table 15).

The Late Bronze Age in the repertoire of Kamenicë is limited to six vessels, which are produced in fewer than three to four steps. Those attributes associated with vessel function receive most of the attention. The decoration comprises an extra step only evaluated at one point (Table 16).

In the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj there are seven vessels that date to the Late Bronze Age, including six two-handled vessels, and a double vase. The majority only receives the most basic steps associated with the functional features reaching up to four points. The highest score is noted in the double vessel, which again is only provided with functional features. The aesthetic features such as the incised motifs are only applied on a two-handled vessel (Table 17).

The tumulus of Lofkënd has yielded an assemblage of five vessels, each with particular features. Despite the basic steps related to both fabric and vessel shape, attention is given to the surface treatment that is evenly burnished on each vessel. Decoration is another aesthetic element that adds two points in the case of the matt-painted vessel (P04) and one to the vessel with wide diagonal ribbing (Table 18).

The tumuli of Pazhok have brought to light a fragmentary repertoire, which despite its salient characteristics, offers an interesting insight into the technological profile. Here, as with Lofkënd, the aesthetic features such as the surface treatment and the decoration when compared to the functional features receive equal attention, reaching five points. Similar results are noted with the open two-handled vessel P06. With this example, however, every step undertaken over the production process is strictly limited to very basic functional features (Table 19).

The tumuli of Prodan and Patos have each yielded four vessels with notable simplicity, being produced in fewer than three to four steps comprising functionrelated attributes.

The labor investment of the Late Bronze Age repertoire largely relies on the most basic attributes associated with vessel shaping. However, with various repertoires, like those of Maliq, Rehovë, Luaras, the equal attention paid to the functional and the aesthetic attributes is sporadically noted.

4.c.2. The Measure of Morphological Standardization during the Late Bronze Age

The data collected in the settlements, given its fragmentary state, does not offer any potential for the assessment of morphological standardization. With respect to the quantity of material, together with the patterns encountered from the classification as displayed in the key diagrams, the measure of morphological standardization is assessed in three groups of vessels from the tumuli of Rehovë, Luaras and the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj. Diachronic comparisons with groups found in an earlier period cannot be conducted at this stage; however, the measure of morphological standardization serves as a unique tool regarding craft specialization especially on cohesive groups within a given repertoire.

In the tumulus of Rehovë, standardization is measured in the homogeneous group of the vessels with vertical loop handles (P02, P03, P08, P10, P14, P15, P21, P24, P33, P34, P35, P36, P37 and P39), which during the four stages of the classification process remains unified, and to an even more heterogeneous group of the two-handled vessels, with vertical handles rising above rim (P04, P05, P12, P13, P17, P18, P22, P23, P28, P29, P30, P44, P48 and P50), which, after the second stage of the classification process, is dissolved in various patterns. In both groups the value of the coefficient of variation is expected to indicate to what extent the degree of morphological homogeneity influences the standardization profile.

The first group includes 14 vessels that share similar attributes qualitatively and quantitatively. There are, of course, slight variations, especially in the form of the neck; however, these are not saliently different features with an impact on the function or the size of the vessel. The coefficient of variation is measured, once more, in two attributes: height and rim diameter for the following vessels: P02, P03, P08, P10, P14, P15, P21, P24, P33, P34, P35, P36, P37 and P39. The coefficient of variation on height and rim offers similar values: respectively 32.55% and 30.46%. Both results are relatively high compared to other CV values of this period indicating the lack of any standardized mode for both attributes (Table 20).

The second group comprises an equal number of vessels, including P04, P05, P12, P13, P17, P18, P22, P23, P28, P29, P30, P44, P48 and P50. As Table 21 shows, the values of the coefficients of variation for height and rim diameter are 11% and 22% respectively. These are lower values in comparison to the first group; they are, however, quite distant from the 1.7% CV that forms the limit of a highly standardized product (Table 21).

The third group is more heterogeneous (P04, P05, P13, P13, P17, P18, P22, P23, P28, P29, P30, P44, P48 and P50). The purpose is to analyze the impact of more variable groups in the standardization profile of the product. The CV values in this group reach exceptionally high levels, respectively 43.9% and 52.5% for height and diameter. Both values are very close to the value of 57% indicating a highly non-standardized product.

The CV values go more in favor of the first two groups that, apart from height and rim diameter, share several other attributes. This is even clearer with the third group, which in its heterogeneity yields a non-standardized profile. The assessment of standardization in the tumulus of Rehovë indicates that the choices applied to the groups are primarily driven by a common decision associated with the specific function of a given group of vessels and these vary once the presence of heterogeneous features increases.

In the tumulus of Luaras, the coefficient of variation is calculated in the group of the looped handled vessels. Six vessels are included here: P01, P06, P07, P11, P13, P14, P15 and P16. Some peculiarities within the group coincide with a few different parameters of decoration and the presence of the spout in the case of three vessels, which do not interfere with the measures of height and rim diameter. As Table 22 shows, the coefficient of variation for both measures of height and rim diameter offers high values, respectively 26.54% and 26.19%, which are not comparable with any type of grouping within the assemblage of the Late Bronze Age.

In the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj, the morphological standardization is assessed for six vessels that are divided in two groups only by one attribute related to the form of the upper body. In order to obtain a complete overview on the vessel dimensions, the CV is calculated in three variables: the maximum height, height to rim, and rim diameter. The vessels included here are

P01–P06. The Table 23 offers low CV results, respectively 12.6%, 17.3% and 11.58%, claiming proportional uniformity within this group but not necessarily a high level of standardization.

Due to the lack of homogeneous groups, the measures of morphological standardization could be cogently carried out for only three cemeteries. Given the lack of data from the previous period for each of the above sites, comparative analyses from a diachronic perspective cannot be undertaken. However, as Graph 6 shows, CV values in the groups at Rehovë, Luaras and Gërmenj are not even close to a high level of standardization. This clearly indicates that even within largely homogeneous groups with similar qualitative attributes, the dimensions of height and rim diameter do not attract particular attention, which reflects the profile of a household production undertaken by non-specialized craftspersons.

4.c.3 The Innovationof Pottery Production during the Late Bronze Age

Maliq and Nezir are the sites at which the innovation of production can be compared but not chronologically integrated with the production dating to the Middle Bronze Age. Prendi claims dramatic changes in pottery production during the Late Bronze Age, referring to fabric, shape, and aesthetic features such as matt-painted decoration (Prendi 1977/1978, 12-3) . From the fragmentary data published, the settlement of Maliq IIId offers a limited repertoire dated to the Late Bronze (Prendi 1966). Few innovative features, such as highly oxidized fine light fabric, matt-painted decoration or the piercing of handles where the handle joins the rim do appear. If the drastic decrease of the quantitative profile pottery production at Maliq is taken into consideration, the prosperity Prendi speaks of is called into question. Similar phenomenon is also noted in the settlement of Nezir. Andrea has published only a few incomplete pieces collected from a limited area and she claims that the Late Bronze Age horizon is barely distinguishable

from that of the Middle Bronze Age (Andrea 1990, 37-8). Also, in the sites of Tren, Nezir, and Zagorë, pottery, both in terms of shapes and quantity, compared to the Early Bronze Age is underrepresented. The fine light ware and the matt-painted decoration appear in Tren, but the pottery is highly fragmentary and further analyses cannot be undertaken. In the settlement of Nezir the few incomplete sherds supposedly dating to the Late Bronze Age do not offer any salient innovative elements. In the settlement of Zagorë, the fragmentary repertoire is only limited to one form, about which little can be said.

The tumuli have yielded a higher quantity of data, which in terms of fabric repeats similar features with the pottery found in settlements, but is also provided with additional innovative features related to both vessels formation and decoration. Handmade production comprises the majority. The wheel-made category is sporadic and limited to two vessels found in the tumuli of Barç (P04) and Rehovë (P32), both imported Mycenaean products.

Fabric has not been assessed systematically by scholars publishing the material and an accurate account of the quantity of each type cannot be obtained. From the general overviews, especially for the sites of Rehovë, Luaras, Kamenicë, Gërmenj, Prodan, Shtikë, Patos, Dukat, Maliq and Tren, the highly oxidized fine light fabric is dominant and must be considered an innovative feature. At other sites, like Nezir, Zagorë, Myç-Has, Kënetë, and Pazhok, the fine dark fabric is frequent. The presence of both fine light and dark ware occurs equally in the tumuli of Lofkënd and Cerujë.

The forms of the vessels and the aesthetic features introduce an interesting framework in which the inherited attributes from previous periods, together with innovative elements, are

cohesively intertwined. Quantitatively, the inherited features are slightly more common in the repertories (Table 24).

Direct cemetery-settlement comparison for each of the above-mentioned tumuli cannot be conducted. Nevertheless, elements found earlier in Maliq IIIc, such as the vessels with two vertical handles and rounded base, continue to be popular in Maliq IIId, as they are in the tumuli of Kamenicë, Barç, Dukat, and the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj. The vessels with spout also become popular, especially in the tumulus of Luaras. The wishbone and horned handles become popular features recorded especially in the Kolonjë plateau with the tumuli of Rehovë, Shtikë, Luaras and Prodan. The relief decoration and especially the wide diagonal and narrow vertical ribbing is also a repetitive feature found in the tumuli of Pazhok, Cërujë, Rehovë and Lofkënd. The pierced rims, as well as plastic projections, are sporadically found in the tumuli of Rehovë, Luaras, as well as continuing in the settlement of Maliq.

The innovative features comprise an important element coinciding mostly with the functional features and somewhat less so with aesthetic aspects. The most popular variable is the loop handle, which is concentrated especially in the tumuli of Rehovë and Luaras. The double vessels and basket forms, although limited, are unique items. Features like cylindrical lugs in Rehovë (P04, P05, P12, P29, P48 and P51), an open handle with raised base in Myç-Has (P01), or the three-spouted vessel in Luaras (P08), are traits that are found only on those sites. An important aesthetic element is the emergence of matt-painted decoration, which although never very frequent, enjoys a wide geographic distribution, including the sites of Maliq, Tren, Barç and Lofkënd. The piercings at the juncture of rim and handle, are also innovative elements found in Maliq and Shtikë.

The technological profile of pottery production in the Late Bronze Age offers a complex picture. On the one hand, the results from the analysis of production step measure and morphological standardization indicate that the process of the production of pottery across different sites proceeds along similar steps, with the focus largely on functional features. Morphological standardization assessed on the groups that share similar attributes does not indicate any drastic change in the CV values. Both measures do not offer any clear evidence for any potential qualitative improvement and changes in the environment of production during the Late Bronze Age. On the other hand, the innovative elements in fabric, vessel forming, together with the aesthetic features, do form a significant aspect within the assemblage of the Late Bronze Age. The inherited and innovative features mark ostensibly similar values, indicating considerable new choices applied to the material that is addressed more fully in Chapter 5.

4.d. The Early Iron Age: 1200–800 B.C.

The Early Iron Age, particularly what is often referred to as the first phase of the period, has yielded the bulk of pottery both in terms of quantity and spatial distribution. A total of 485 vessels, or 39% of the entire late prehistoric pottery has been recovered from 26 sites (Graph 8, 9 and Map 4). In some ways, the relative chronology of the Early Iron Age is better established. Prendi has claimed that the commencement of the Early Iron Age in southern Illyria occurs sometime in the 11th century B.C. and is somehow associated with the decline of Mycenaean civilization, and especially with the introduction of the locally produced iron objects (Prendi 1974, 106-7). A few issues, however, arise with the finalization of the Early Iron Age. Prendi attributes to the so-called first phase of the Early Iron Age a broad span that ends not earlier than 800 B.C. (Prendi 1974, 107). As mentioned above, other scholars do not distinguish between the final phase of the Late Bronze and the beginnings of the Early Iron Age. The date of c. 1200

B.C. has been assigned as the end of one period and the transition into another. This chronology is established at several sites, including Barç (Andrea 1985), Shtoj (Koka 2012) and Krumë (Jubani 1982).

As we have seen, secure dates for the Early Iron Age were only recently established with the application of AMS ^{14}C absolute chronology at the tumulus of Lofkënd (Damiata et al. 2007/2008, 176-7). Even in this case, however, the absolute dating, as with the conventional chronology, extends the last phase of the Early Iron Age towards 800 B.C. Approximately similar conventional dates are assumed for the sites of Luaras (Aliu 2004), Kamenicë (Bejko Forthcoming) and Gajtan (Rebani 1966).

The different dates for the Early Iron Age in both the pottery catalogues and key diagrams are due to the distinction between conventional dates and AMS ^{14}C chronology. Since pottery is not a salient indicator for the establishment of the Iron Age chronology, I have followed, for the purposes of this study, the chronological frameworks provided by the scholars who recovered the data.

The tumuli comprise the vast majority of sites dating to the Early Iron Age. The data from the settlements is largely sporadic and fragmentary, and largely encountered at the sites of Gajtan, Tren (Korkuti 1971), Zagorë (Andrea 1996) and Liqedh. The burial tumuli include Çepunë (Budina 1969), Vodhinë (Prendi 1956), Vajzë (Prendi 1957), Rapckë, Piskovë (Bodinaku 1981), Dukat (Ceka 1974; Bodinaku 2001/2002), Luaras (Aliu 2004), Prodan (Aliu 1984), Rehovë (Aliu 2012), Barç (Andrea 1985), Kamenicë (Agolli 2009), Shuec (Andrea 2009/2010), Pazhok (Bodinaku 1982), Lofkënd (Pevnick and Agolli 2014), Cerujë (Andrea

1997), Apollonia (Amore 2010), Burrel (Kurti 1999), Krumë (Jubani 1982), Myç-Has (Bela 1990) and Shtoj (Koka 2012), as well as the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj (Andrea 1981).

4.d.1. The Production Step Measure during the Early Iron Age

The production step measure is based on the qualitative and quantitative features of a selected group of sites, namely those that offer a particular number of vessels equipped with some degree of variables in terms of vessel formation, decoration and fabric.

Unfortunately, no direct association between a settlement and a cemetery can be established and the analyses can only provide a general overview of the evidence from settlements and tumuli.

The settlements have yielded limited data, but at least two sites can offer a hierarchical profile on the production effort and the extent to which this fits into the functional and aesthetic attributes. The repertoire from the settlement of Gajtan has given a wider range of forms related with functional attributes. No category exceeds four steps, among which only one step with sporadic occurrence is related to the application of an aesthetic feature, mostly decoration (Table 25). The settlement of Zagorë shares a similar profile with that of Gajtan. In comparison to the Late Bronze Age, slight variation is only seen in the decoration technique. The steps range from three to five and reflect particular attention to the functional attributes such as vessel form and size. The aesthetic elements are sporadic, only occurring once and these are associated with decorative traits, like narrow ribbing (Table 26). The settlement of Tren has offered fragmentary data and the systematic assessment regarding the measure of the production step cannot be carried out. A few observations, however, can be made by considering the few sherds available. Tren offers a unique case of an innovative way of production: the wheel-made matt-painted decoration. The preserved fragments are made of very fine light fabric, uniformly fired, neatly

burnished on the exterior surface and decorated with linear or curvilinear geometric motifs. The production step score approximately eight to nine points and it seems that the vessels that receive higher attention are those with curvilinear motifs.

The tumuli yielded a quantity of data that, compared to that from the settlements, provides a different view of the production profile.

In the tumuli of Vodhinë and Bajkaj, the repertoire is limited to small or medium sized vessels, and the functional attributes dominate other more elaborative or aesthetic attributes, scoring four points. Decoration and wheel-made vessels recognized as deriving from a Mycenaean tradition rarely occur. A higher score of ten points is only noted with the wheel-made vessel in Bajkaj (Tables 27, 29).

In the tumulus of Piskovë the repertoire shows a wide variety of choices ranging from three to ten points. Only a few of the vessels are equipped with functional attributes, taking three to four points. In the majority of the assemblage, particular attention is given to the stylistic attributes such as the surface treatment or decoration, and this increases considerably the scores from five to six. Significant differences are noted in the non-local wheel-made pottery, which has a particularly high score, as much as ten points (Table 28).

In the tumulus of Dukat the shaping is the only attribute that receives attention, scoring four to five points at most. The only exception is the double vessel, which, given its morphology, doubles the score for each attribute (Table 30).

The tumuli of Barç have yielded the most variable and elaborate profile for the production step measure for both the hand- and wheel-made category. An exceptional number of shapes and types of decoration are encountered, and within the handmade group the scores reach

from four to 18 points (Table 31). The functional attributes are in a minority within the repertoire. In a few cases, elements such as the strut handle or the raised concave base can play a dual role in terms of both function and aesthetic features. The aesthetics, mainly the decoration, are well represented within the repertoire. Those few vessels that are not decorated either belong to large-size containers or perhaps to external influences. The single or combined techniques of decoration and the surface treatment score usually four to five points and dominate the choices dedicated to basic functional attributes.

Despite the elaboration and the totally different production technique, the wheel-made category at Barç does not exceed ten points. Again here the aesthetic attributes are prevalent with particular attention to the treatment of the exterior surface and the complex motifs. It should be stressed, however, that this category of pottery is Mycenaean, or Mycenaean-derived, and cannot be associated with the local processes of manufacture. The production step measure is applied to this category of material only to compare the qualitative attributes of handmade to those of the wheel-made pottery (Table 32).

The tumulus of Kamenicë had yielded a considerably variable repertoire consisting of one-, two-, and four-handled vessels, both short and tall, as well as double vessels. Within each category there is a simple version made up from strictly functional choices, which scores three to five points. Likewise with Barç, functional attributes like handles and base are embodied with aesthetic elements. For instance the strut handle or the concave raised base gives an addition of two points to the process of vessel shaping. Surface treatment does not get any particular attention in Kamenicë, thus decoration may be considered the only aesthetic attribute. The highest scores here are with the combined decorative techniques, varying from six to eight steps, and the matt-painted double vessel that reaches 11 points (Table 40).

The production step in the tumulus of Rehovë maintains a steady profile, which in comparison to the Late Bronze Age yields only a few slight changes. The functional attributes are the most common, scoring five points at the most. The burnish on the exterior surface is the most common aesthetic feature, while decoration continues to remain sporadic (Table 33).

The repertoire for the tumulus of Luaras offers a more complex profile. Functional attributes embodied with aesthetic features, such as the strut handles, occur frequently. In this case, decoration is rare, scoring only two points at most. On account of their form, the double vessels receive the highest score. With other types of vessels, such as those with one and two handles, both the aesthetic and functional features are equally distributed (Table 34).

The tumuli of Patos and Prodan produce assemblages with an equal focus on both functional and aesthetic attributes. Each shape is either equipped with strictly functional attributes or with functional and aesthetic elements scoring four to six points. The double vessels are again the most elaborated forms and, depending on their decoration, score six to eight points (Tables 35 and 36).

The pottery repertoire in the tumulus of Lofkënd is limited to one- and two-handled vessels only, with a sharp division between fine light and dark fabric, although the variation between each fabric is not great. The one-handled vessels with a strut handle and matt-paintedand plastic decoration have the highest score. The production step with the other vessels reaches four to six points. The surface treatment and decoration versus the vessel forming receive similar attention (Table 37).

The tumulus of Apollonia has produced a limited repertoire and represents a case in which the main attention is given to the functional attributes. The aesthetic elements are very minor, associated only with the single decorative techniques (Table 38).

A similar situation is found in the tumuli of Krumë. The functional elements, and hence attributes, are the main characteristic. Features such as the raised narrow base, a burnished surface, or single decoration techniques, are occasionally found, scoring five points at most (Table 39).

The measure of the production step during the Early Iron Age indicates a number of improvements and elaboration in the labor investment in the technology of pottery. Handmade pottery remains prevalent, comprising 98% of the entire Early Iron Age assemblage. In contrast, wheel-made pottery is exclusively imported, so in this there is no drastic change to modes of production.

What is clear is that the analysis of the production steps has yielded particular differences between settlements and cemeteries. This may be due to the vicissitudes of preservation and discovery, especially since pottery collected from settlement contexts is limited in quantity and quality. However, the measure in the settlements of Zagorë and Gajtan show low scores reaching five points at the most and solely associated with functional attributes. Decoration is very peripheral, characterized by simplistic forms of diagonal ribbing or finger impressions.

What is also clear is that the tumuli offer greater variability, indicating the involvement of more sophisticated choices in the process of production. At several cemeteries, such as those of Barç, Kamenicë, and Lofkënd, the groups of vessels reaching high scores are not always related to the vessels that have aesthetic attributes. Particular attention is given to the elaboration

of the functional attributes such as base or handles. The raised concave base on some vessels, or the strut handles on others, are harmonically embodied in functional attributes, thus sharing functional and aesthetic content.

Decoration in terms of both both techniques and style offers distinctive variation. The matt-painted or the incised techniques are usually coupled with the plastic applications and in these cases the aesthetic features compared to the functional become prevalent. The highly complicated decorated motifs comprise another salient aspect within the Early Iron Age assemblage. The matt-painted motifs at the tumuli of Barç and Kamenicë offer the most sophisticated version of this decorative technique, which requires special skills and reflects improvements in both concept and physical engagement in the process of production.

Moreover, the tumuli offer great variability in terms of vessel forms. This is particularly noted in the tumuli of Rehovë, Barç, Luaras, and Kamenicë. The vessels that reach exceptionally high scores are the double, triple, and large sized painted vessels, which vary from eight to 18 steps.

In addition, the measure of the production steps during the Early Iron Age offers a twofold picture reflecting, on the one hand, continuity in the handmade tradition. It seems that the sporadic occurrence of imported wheel-made pottery does not influence any aspect of the mode of production. The few matt-painted wheel-made sherds encountered at Tren only indicate an idiosyncratic choice that is not popular elsewhere during the period. On the other hand, the local pottery production gains various elaborate elements, thus enriching significantly the qualitative profile of the repertoire.

4.d.2. The Measure of Morphological Standardization during the Early Iron Age

As was the case with material in earlier periods, the Early Iron Age pottery is assessed in terms of morphological standardization. The size and vessel form are observed through the various phases of the classification process and only the groups of vessels that share similar qualitative attributes within these two parameters are selected.

The values of the coefficient of variation are analyzed using a twofold perspective: The first has to do with any association between the elaboration of the vessels forms and the values of the coefficient of variation. The second focuses on diachronic comparisons especially on forms or groups initially introduced during the Late Bronze Age with frequent presence during the Early Iron Age at one or more sites. In this case, variability is analyzed from a diachronic perspective, attempting to evaluate to what extent the variation of the CV values highlights possible improvement in terms of specialization of production.

Among the 26 sites with Early Iron Age pottery, potentially cogent parameters are obtained only in the tumuli of Rehovë, Luaras, Prodan, Barç, Kamenicë, Pazhok, and Patos. The other sites—whether settlements or tumuli—have yielded highly heterogeneous groups or no clear evidence for the measure of morphological standardization.

Among the 54 vessels dating to the Early Iron Age in the tumulus of Rehovë, the variables of height and rim diameter were only assessed in two groups: the vessels with loop handles and those with two handles: a total of 15 vessels. Both types were popular since the Late Bronze Age. The group with loop handles includes eight vessels: P56, P63, P71, P81, P86, P88, P89 and P90. The CV values measured on vessel height and rim diameter are respectively 17.38% and 15.2% (Table 41). For the group of two-handled vessels there are seven vessels:

P57, P62, P65, P67, P72, P84 and P97. The CVs for height are 21.4% and 17.5% for rim diameter (Table 42). The CV values may be considered relatively high if the limited amount of vessels in each group is taken into consideration. In both groups the rim diameter yields a slightly lower CV value; however, this difference is likely to be related with individual choices of the potters and to a particular treatment that would indicate a certain degree of specialization in production.

There are interesting differences noted diachronically. The height and rim diameter of the loop-handled vessels have produced particularly high CV values above 30% (Tables 20 and 21). The CV is even higher within the group of two-handled vessels, although their heterogeneity was much clearer. The CV values of 43.91% for height and 52.54% for rim diameter suggest a significant lack of standardization in both groups. A notable decrease of CV for each variable was encountered within the Early Iron Age repertoire (Graph 8). As Graph 8 shows, the loop-handled and the two-handled vessels have a tendency toward lower CV values, but does this suggest that these groups during the Early Iron Age become more standardized? Before answering this question, two parameters need to be taken into consideration. First, the sample of the Late Bronze Age loop- and two-handled vessels, if compared to that of the Early Iron Age, is twice as large. Second, the Late Bronze Age group of two-handled vessels was chosen with a certain degree of heterogeneity with the purpose of analyzing to what extent the variability of the qualitative attributes influenced the uniformity of the morphological features. Consequently, any claim regarding the improvement of specialization in these groups during the Early Iron Age may be supported to a certain degree only for the loop-handled vessels.

There are 63 vessels of Early Iron Age date from the Luaras tumulus. The measure of the coefficient of variation however is limited to only three groups (22 vessels in all): two-handled

vessels, strut-handled vessels, and double vessels. None of these groups was noted in the Late Bronze Age, thus each CV value will only be treated synchronically. The group of two-handled vessels includes P17, P31, P61, P63, P64, P65, P66 and P67. Each vessel within this group shares at least four to five similar attributes. The CV values for both height and rim diameter are respectively 12.9% and 24.1% (Table 43). There are eight strut-handled vessels: P21, P35, P53, P54, P55, P56, P57 and P58. The CV values here are 20% for the vessel height and 24% for rim diameter (Table 44). The double vessels reach 28.25% for height and 24.07% for rim diameter (Table 45). It is rather hard to draw any comparison among these values. None of the groups, however, indicates evidence for a particular standardization repeating, in whatever degree the values encountered in the tumulus of Rehovë.

The Early Iron Age assemblage of Prodan comprises 27 vessels. On the basis of the classification system, the repertoire breaks down into several groups, each with one to five vessels. The CV was solely measured in the group of the one-handled vessels including P05, P06, P12, P15 and P27. The CV values for height and rim diameter were respectively 14.69% and 13.18% (Table 46). This score indicates a certain degree of standardization in a group that shares equal qualitative attributes. Be that as it may, this group of vessels cannot serve as a representation of the assemblage, which remains highly fragmentary.

In the tumulus of Barç there are 39 vessels dating to the Early Iron Age. Standardization is measured in three groups: loop-handled, and one and two-handled vessels. The group with loop handles includes P03, P04, P05, P08, P09, P59, P61 and P70. The CV values are 31.72% and 16.74% (Table 47). The higher variability of height perhaps reflects the function of the vessels. However, the rim diameter, although lower, cannot be considered a more standardized variable. The group of the one-handled vessels is the largest and includes: P06, P11, P12, P17,

P21, P22, P38, P39, P45, P47, P48, P63, P67, P69, P72 and P77. The CV varies from 18.28% for height to 16.05% for rim diameter. Both values do not indicate a great degree of standardization. The only group that displays significant difference here is that of the two-handled vessels P08, P13, P16, P18, P20, P23, P40 (Table 49), which have low CV values. The height and rim diameter are respectively 8.64% and 3.37% and indicate a lower metric variability likely to be considered as a standardized group.

In the tumulus of Kamenicë morphological standardization among 56 vessels is solely assessed by the two-handled vessels Q531, Q965, Q1497, Q1874, Q1888, Q2134 and Q2137 (Table 50). Height and rim diameter reach 14.96% and 10.42%. Both values do not reflect any particular degree of lower variability.

The tumulus of Pazhok has yielded a limited repertoire with only nine vessels. Among them is a group of two-handled vessels including P07, P08, P10, P11 and P13 that have been selected for the measure of morphological standardization (Table 51). Just by looking at this group, one would expect a high level of uniformity. However, the values of height and rim diameter are respectively 21.67% and 15.85% and they indicate a relatively higher degree of variability not very standardized in terms of dimensional properties.

The tumulus of Patos has yielded 21 vessels and among them only a group of two-handled vessels (including P07, P08, P10, P11 and P13) has been selected as relatively similar according to the qualitative properties (Table 52). Height and rim diameter yield high CV values (23.27% and 33.93%), thus favoring a certain degree of variability within the group.

The standardization of Early Iron Age pottery has been measured for a selected group of vessels at a limited number of tumulus sites. The vessels inspected comprise only 19% of the

entire Early Iron Age assemblage. The morphological standardization indicates relatively high CV values not significantly different from those of the Late Bronze Age. It should be noted, however, that direct comparisons of repetitive groups were only possible in the case of the tumulus at Rehovë. Even in this case, the comparatively lower CV values of the Early Iron Age loop-handled vessels are not any closer to the score of 1.7–5 % considered as highly standardized (Eerkens 2000).

Most of the Early Iron Age groups indicate CV variety ranging from 10% to 30% and this does not indicate any improvement in the dimensional variability either within the vessel groups or at corresponding sites (Graph 10). The only group potentially standardized is that of the two-handled vessels found in the tumulus of Barç. This remains, however, an isolated case not only within the repertoire of the Early Iron Age but within the site of Barç itself.

Improvement in the qualitative profile of the material, especially any elaboration of shape and decoration is not clearly in evidence. Moreover, the groups of vessels sharing equal qualitative attributes do not necessarily share more standardized metric dimensions. However, these two given parameters do not contradict one another. They rather serve as a plausible indication that indicates that pottery production during the Early Iron Age remains under the domain of household production.

4.d.3. The Innovation of Pottery Production during the Early Iron Age

The degree of innovation during the Iron Age is measured at sites in which the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age are integrally related. This assessment, together with the production step measure and standardization, complement the production profile of pottery manufacture. At those sites where there is comparable quantitative and qualitative evidence for both the Early

Iron Age and the Late Bronze Age, three aspects will be systematically inspected, namely the innovative, inherited and extinct features and to what extent they both reflect qualitative improvement of the end product. Subsequently, in Chapter 5, I take a closer look at inherited and innovative features while dealing with the common system of values divided in terms of the individual and shared concepts.

Seven tumuli will be assessed: Rehovë, Luaras, Prodan, Barç, Kamenicë, Pazhok and Lofkënd.

The tumulus of Rehovë maintains a conservative profile, with few innovative parameters during the Early Iron Age. The ratio between the inherited and innovative features largely favors the inherited features, which account for 80% of the total, as opposed to the innovative with only 20%. The only element that disappears is the narrow ribbing decoration that is only used in the Late Bronze Age. The innovative features do not show any particular concentration, although there is a slightly great degree of innovation on vessel form than there is on decoration (Table 81).

The tumulus of Luaras reverses almost completely the picture created during the Late Bronze Age. Several features, such as the vessels with basket form, vessels with spout, loop, wishbone, and horned handles comprise 40% of attributes that are exclusively of the Late Bronze Age, becoming extinct in the Early Iron Age. A small selection of inherited features continues to be used during the Early Iron Age. However, they only comprise 20% of the total. The vast majority consist of innovative features favoring mostly attributes related to vessel form. Decoration and especially the plastic applications become a popular aesthetic innovative element among other types of decorative techniques (Table 53).

The tumulus of Prodan offers an interesting model regarding innovation. The Late Bronze Age repertoire is limited to five vessels; in contrast, the Early Iron Age repertoire forms the majority with 27 complete vessels. Despite this quantitative profile, the inherited features already established during the Late Bronze Age mark significant continuity during the Early Iron Age, with inherited features reaching 70%. Few innovative features are related to new vessels forms. Moreover, attention given to vessel forming and decoration follows similar trends in both periods (Table 54).

In the tumulus of Barç only a solitary handmade vessel dates to the Late Bronze Age. However, its qualitative features become very popular during the Early Iron Age comprising 45% of inherited features. The innovative features nevertheless prevail, but only slightly. This result can be easily justified given the large amount of evidence dating to the Early Iron Age (Table 55).

The tumulus of Kamenicë slightly favors the inherited features, with the innovative elements reaching 42%. There are only two attributes; the horizontal handles below the rim noted in the Late Bronze Age disappear during the Early Iron Age. The innovative features show an even distribution among the attributes of vessel formation and decoration (Table 56).

The tumulus of Lofkënd displays considerable consistency between the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age assemblages. The inherited features are more prevalent than the innovative features. Moreover, the innovative features solely consist of singular salient attributes or new decorative techniques. Vessels with new forms are not introduced during the Early Iron Age (Table 57).

The repertoire of the tumulus of Pazhok closely follows the characteristics of the Late Bronze Age. The innovative features are sporadically associated with a few elements of the form of the handle or base (Table 58).

Innovation during the Early Iron Age is thus a crucial element at every site. However, only in a few cases, such as the tumulus at Luaras, are the innovative features prevalent. Despite the limited quantity of the Late Bronze Age repertoires in the other tumuli, the ratio among extinct, inherited, and innovative features mostly favors the inherited features. The innovative features enrich each of the repertoires. If the time span, however, is taken into consideration, which for both periods covers approximately 500 years, a conservative tendency is evident, clearly resistant to innovative features. The presence of wheel-made pottery during the Early Iron Age supports this tendency. No matter its quantity or sporadic distribution, imported wheel-made pottery is present at several sites during the Early Iron Age (Graph 9), and this new trend of manufacturing remains an exclusively non-local type of production. At least during the Early Iron Age none of its parameters are intertwined with the local tradition of pottery production.

On the basis of three different measures–the production step, morphological standardization, and innovation—the production profile of the Early Iron Age pottery does not indicate any particular improvement in technology. The increase of labor investment as measured by the production step, together with an average profile of standardization and innovation, shapes the context associated with the elaboration of the qualitative attributes and the profile of the manufacture process. Pottery production during this phase yields highly elaborative features not necessarily associated with functional attributes that require a high level of expertise. Thus the production of this phase, although still under the domain of the household, indicates sufficient qualitative parameters that separate it from what can be a classic and simple profile of

household production, imbuing it with features produced by very experienced artisans. If this is the case, and Early Iron Age pottery manufacture represents a specialized product, then why do both standardization and innovation maintain a steady profile? There are two issues that need to be taken into account.

The first is market demand. It seems that no matter the elaboration, the technology of pottery is not motivated by any type of market demand beyond the boundaries of the community. It is likely that this production evolves gradually, but does not become a commodity embodied with a particular value and targeted for market.

The second issue regards population growth. Unfortunately, evidence from settlements is very poor and not very representative. However, the quantitative profile of the pottery, together with the general demographic background of the cemeteries, indicates a particularly high population growth during this period compared to the Middle and Late Bronze Age. Detailed accounts are available from the tumulus of Kamenicë, where the Early Iron Age is associated with the expansion phase of the cemetery use, a phenomenon encountered at various tumuli around Kolonjë, Korçë, and Central Albania (Bejko, Fenton, and Foran 2006, 309-22).

Taken together, both parameters are not complementary and hence they do not contribute a great deal to the understanding of the social profile during the Early Iron Age. It seems, however, that, despite population growth, the elaboration of the qualitative features of pottery production, together with lack of settlement evidence, does not indicate radical changes in social organization during this period.

4.e. The Second Phase of the Iron Age: 800–600 B.C.

The date of the "second phase" of the Iron Age is entirely based on the conventional chronology. Prendi associates its commencement with phases IVa, b and c of Glasinac and the phases IIa and b of Trebeniste, thus dating it around 800 B.C. and continuing until about 600 B.C. (Prendi 1974). The AMS absolute dates from the Lofkënd tumulus establishes the latest phase of tumulus use around 800 B.C. The existence of a small quantity of Corinthian sherds in the surface levels of Lofkënd may suggest continued use of some sort shortly after the period of the primary use of the tumulus and thus brings the site in line with chronologies suggested by the finds from other tumuli (cf. Andrea 1985; Aliu 2004, 2012; Hoti 1986; Jubani 1983; Kurti 1999; Braka 1987), but it is very clear that the latest tombs cannot be much later than c. 800 B.C. (Damiata et al. 2007/2008, 178). The second phase of the Early Iron Age is recorded at 16 sites, all cemeteries, including Shtoj (Koka 2012), Burrel and Komsi (Kurti 1999), Kënetë (Hoti 1986), (Jubani 1983), Gërmenj (Andrea 1981), Lofkënd (Pevnick and Agolli 2014), Liqedh (Ylli 1988), Katundas (Braka 1987), Barç and Kuç i Zi (Andrea 1985), Kamenicë (Bejko Forthcoming; Agolli 2009), Shuec (Andrea 2009/2010), Psar (Aliu 1995), Prodan (Aliu 1984), Luaras (Aliu 2004), and Rehovë (Aliu 2012). A total of 223 complete or nearly complete vessels can be dated to this phase, and accounts for 16% of the entire assemblage (Graph 13).

4.e.1 The Production Step Measure during the Second Phase of the Iron Age

The assessment of the production step measure can be applied to the sites of Kamenicë, Rehovë, Luaras, Kuç i Zi, Burrel, Kënetë, and Shtoj.

The tumulus of Kamenicë during this phase offers the largest repertoire ever found within this phase. The step measure is highly variable ranging from three to 18 points, with a

considerable amount of the pottery varying from six to ten steps. The highest score is reached with the triple vessels at 18 points. Decoration is widely applied, and plain vessels are hard to come by in the repertoire. Whatever the vessel size, the surface treatment is mostly burnished. The functional attributes associated with vessel forming and size receive particular attention and, when compared to the aesthetic features, are prevalent. This is most clearly noted with the large sized vessels with tall pillar-like lugs. Unlike smaller vessels where the conical or cylindrical projections are primarily recognized as aesthetic attributes, the size of these large vessels, as well as the pronounced form of the lugs, is exceptional, and such elements can be considered either as a functional attribute, or an alternative type of handle (Table 59).

The tumulus of Kuç i Zi is newly established during this phase of the Iron Age. The measure of the production step identifies not highly elaborated forms, usually reaching three or four points. Decoration is the only aesthetic element of the repertoire, never well represented, and reaches similar scores with the group of the functional attributes. Only two vessels are exceptions to this regularity: the four-handled vessels with neat and heavy matt-painted decoration each scoring 12 points (Table 60).

The tumulus of Rehovë only offers few additional changes during this phase. The extra elements comprise matt-painted decoration and plastic applications, which enrich the aesthetic profile of the repertoire. The highest scores are only associated with the vessels equipped with matt-paint and plastic applications, reaching seven points and the double vessels with plastic applications with ten points (Table 61).

The step measure from the tumulus of Luaras indicates choices restricted to the functional attribute. A few elaborative elements, like the strut handle or the raised concave base,

appear occasionally. Decoration when applied doubles the scores. The most elaborate vessels receiving distinctive attention are the double and triple vessels, which at Luaras during this phase are frequent (Table 62).

The tumuli of Burrel, Kënetë and Shtoj offer a uniquely similar profile of the production step measure highly limited to vessels forms varying from three to five steps (Tables 63-65).

Generally the qualitative profile of the production step measure does not imply any extra effort that could highlight some type of transformation to labor investment. An increase in attention to both functional and aesthetic attributes is especially noted at sites that inherit a consistent tradition throughout the Early Iron Age, such as Kamenicë, Luaras, and Rehovë. At each site the numerical increase of the steps is associated with the elaboration of form, size, or with the aesthetic elements. Kamenicë represents this best. The sites without a well-constructed tradition in previous period are surprisingly limited in terms of both vessel forms and aesthetic features. Burrel, Shtoj, and Kënetë, despite other differences in terms of the production step measure, offer an identical profile.

During this phase there is a greater popularity of sophisticated features at various sites, with a focus either on elaborate elements associated with form, or sophisticated choices implied through aesthetic features. The tumuli of Kamenicë, Luaras, Rehovë, and Kuç i Zi illustrate this best. In any case, this only remains a gradual improvement, and does not indicate radical differences regarding the quality of labor investment.

4.e.2. The Measure of Morphological Standardization during the Second Phase of the Iron Age

As is the case with the preceding phases, standardization is measured at sites that share a similar number of qualitative attributes and show a certain degree of homogeneity. The tumuli that offer such potential include Kamenicë, Luaras, Rehovë, Shuec, Shtoj, and Kënetë.

Two groups were selected at Kamenicë: the tall closed vessels (Q711, Q740, Q803, Q947 and Q1391) and the double vessels (Q452, Q1394, Q1735, Q1749 and Q1922). Height and rim diameter do not reach a highly standardized value in the first group, at 19.93% and 11.1% respectively. Instead both dimensions within the group of the double vessels produce particularly low values of 9.2% and 8%. This is one of the rare cases in which both height and rim diameterreach such low values (Tables 66, 67).

Standardization at the tumulus of Luaras is assessed in two groups: the two-handled vessels (P81, P83, P85, and P86) and the double vessels (P82, P88, P92 and P98). The first group has yielded lower CV values respectively at 12.03% and 12.96%, whereas the second group reaches 15.7% and 25.2% (Tables 68, 69). When compared to the earlier stages of the Early Iron Age, slight changes that favor a higher degree of standardization for the two-handled vessels are noted during this phase. This is not the case, however, for the double vessels. As Graph 14 shows, the CV values between the two phases do not change a great deal.

In the tumulus of Rehovë the CV values were also measured in two common groups: two-handled vessels (P110, P111, P114, P115, and P120) and one-handled vessels (P36, P137, P138, P139, P140, P142) (Tables 70, 71). The CV among the two-handled vessels does not reach relatively high values for both dimensions (rim diameter and height), respectively 25.22% and

17.29%. The diachronic transformation of the two-handled vessels becomes clearer when the CV values are compared with those of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age. Graph 15 shows that the CV values change drastically during the Early Iron Age and maintain similar figures in the second phase of the Iron Age. It must be noted, however, that the group dating to the Late Bronze Age was chosen as a more heterogeneous one. Thus, such differences must be taken with reservations. The one-handled vessels indicate lower CV values at 9.6% and 9.9%. This group has a relatively higher standardization within the entire repertoire of Rehovë.

Only one group has been measured in the tumulus of Shuec: the two-handled vessels, including P10, P14, P16, P17 and P18, do not offer any distinctive degree of standardization reaching 25.51% in terms of height and 19.28% for rim diameter (Table 72).

The tumuli of Shtoj offer a large group of two-handled vessels, including P23, P24, P27, P28, P30, P31, P32, P33, P50, P51, P52, P54, P55, and P56. The CV values of height and rim are respectively 9.15% and 14.58%, indicating a contradictory profile, which in terms of standardization more clearly favors height (Table 74).

Only one group of two-handled vessels was measured at the tumulus of Kënetë. The vessels include P04, P06, P08, P09, P10 and P11 and the CV values for both dimensions are 8.41% and 11.1%. Despite their limited quantity, this group yields a relatively higher degree of standardization (Table 73)

From a general perspective, pottery standardization in the second phase of Early Iron Age is far from the profile of a highly standardized system of production. Moreover, the comparative values at Luaras and Rehovë do not indicate a great degree of differences from a diachronic perspective. However, the cumulative values when compared diachronically show a general

tendency of decreasing CV values (Graphs 14-15). This difference is more evident in the Early Iron Age and the succeeding phase. Where in the Early Iron Age the distribution of CV favors values above 20% in comparison to those below 10% (Graph 11), in the second phase of the Iron Age not only do the highest values not exceed 25%, but all the sites in the study group show a tendency towards values lower than 10% (Graph 16).

This is obviously not the profile of a standardized production industry. The results, however, show an improvement iin the production environment during the second phase of the Iron Age especially when compared to that of the Early Iron Age.

4.e.3. The Innovation of Pottery Production during the Second Phase of the Early Iron Age

There are two criteria for the measure of innovation. The first group of sites includes those that offer consistent and integral continuity with preceding periods, such as Rehovë, Luaras, Prodan, Kamenicë, and Lofkënd. In the second group are included the sites that offer sporadic continuity with the preceding phase and more consistent data either for the current or the consecutive phase, like the tumuli of Burrel, Shtoj, and Këntë.

The tumulus of Rehovë during this phase reinforces the innovation pattern earlier noted in the Early Iron Age with a high degree of extinct features. A selected division of features is inherited in the second phase comprising 95% of the repertoire. However, a group of features that, during the Early Iron Age, comprised 55%, becomes extinct in this phase. The group of the innovative features reaches no more than 5% (Table 52).

A similar situation to that of Rehovë is noted at Luaras. The inherited features here are dominant at 95%, as opposed to the extinct and innovative ones, each with 5%. A particular

distribution of favored traits was not noted, and the innovative aspects only coincide with the introduction of the triple vessels (Table 53).

The tumulus of Prodan offers a better balance among the three measures. The innovative versus the inherited features are respectively 35% and 65%, and a good number of traits, comprising 20% of the entire qualitative attributes during the Early Iron Age, now become extinct. The innovative features focus on new types of vessels and a few other additional attributes of vessel forming and decoration (Table 54).

The tumulus of Kamenicë yields a comparatively interesting picture. The inherited features are dominant here as well at 80%. Innovative aspects are exclusively restricted, however, to new vessel forms. Such a situation does not occur at any other site during this phase. Moreover, the extinct features here only comprise 5% and a balance between the inherited and innovative features is evident. It must be noted, however, that the repertoire of Kamenicë could be considered as highly innovative in terms of vessel forms. This result is affected from measures based on the weight of separate attributes and not on the vessel forms (Table 56).

The inherited features are prevalent in the tumulus of Lofkënd as well, comprising 77% of the repertoire. An interesting parameter is that of the extinct features, which reach 41%. Both results taken together indicate a repertoire that is not highly innovative during this phase (Table 57).

The pottery assemblage at tumuli of Shtoj is enlarged during this phase. Despite its limited quantity, several features of the preceding repertoire reoccur and together with the innovative features, which mostly consist of base form and decoration, reach balanced values of 50% each (Table 75).

The pottery repertoire from the tumuli of Burrel considerably favors the innovative features, which reach 84%. The few inherited attributes remain very peripheral, consisting of a few elements in vessel forming.

An almost similar situation to that of Burrel is noted at Kënetë. The innovative features reach 75%, and this can be explained by the intensity of tumulus use and the significant increase of evidence during this phase (Table 76, 77).

The innovation profile especially in the first group, in which the comparative data is more robust, strongly favors the inherited features (Graph 16). This is not very surprising, and for a handmade product such performance is to be expected. What remains rather striking, however, are the cases in which the innovative versus the extinct features favor the extinct category. Such a phenomenon is noted especially in the tumuli of Rehovë and Lofkënd. It remains unclear whether both features affect one another. From a general perspective is evident that the quantity of extinct attributes is either not replaced or refreshed with innovative elements.

Sporadic innovative features are noted in the tumuli of Prodan and Luaras. Even in this case the inherited features are dominant, with the exception that the extinct versus the innovative attributes are either equal or lower, thus maintaining a conservative profile in terms of repertoires.

The only site showing some potential for innovation is Kamenicë. Despite the fact that innovation is not expressed through separate attributes, the presence of several innovative shapes with considerable quantity offers a completely different picture at this site. The plausible innovation degrees yielded from the tumuli of Burrel, Shtoj, and Kënetë, although spatially distant, enrich the pottery repertoire in this phase.

The modes of production, as seen through the analyses of the production step measure, standardization and innovation, have yielded a complex picture. The handmade pottery remains widely popular at every site. Compared to the Early Iron Age, wheel-made pottery is very poorly represented at Barç, Shtoj, and Këntë. Even in this case they are distinctively different. Moreover, the wheel-made pottery is exclusively related with Greek imports, which do not have any impact on the qualitative profile of the local production.

The production step measure together with the degree of innovation mostly favors the profile of a production with a very gradual transformation towards the elaboration of forms and the unification of dimensions for several groups of vessels. The degree of innovation plays an interesting role as well. The profile of this production indicates stability and maintenance of traditional traits established in the preceding periods. The tumuli of Kamenicë, Luaras, Prodan, Rehovë, and Lofkënd all display this. An innovative profile is noted at sites with increasing quantitative data during the second phase of the Iron Age, such as Shtoj, Burrel and Kënetë. This remains to be analyzed further from a diachronic perspective.

4.f. The Third Phase of the Iron Age: 600–500 B.C.

The Third Phase of the Iron Age sees a lower density of data only encountered in cemeteries. The spatial concentration of sites follows the pattern of the second phase. The sites continuing to be used after the 550 B.C. are very few. Several of them, including Kamenicë, Luaras, Prodan, Psar, and Shtoj, are already, or almost, abandoned during this phase.

A total of 11 tumuli and one shaft cemetery have produced 212 (17%) complete and nearly complete vessels. The wheel-made pottery marks the highest representation ever noticed in a phase dating to the late prehistoric period, comprising 20% of the overall amount of pottery

(Graph 18). The sites that yield evidence for this phase include the tumuli of Barç, Kuç i Zi (Andrea 1985), Rehovë (Aliu 2012), Burrel (Kurti 1999), Kënetë (Jubani 1983; Hoti 1986), Krumë (Jubani 1982), Myç-Has (Bela 1990), Bujan (Andrea 1995), Bardhoc (Hoti 1982), Çinamak (Jubani 1969) and Përbreg (Përzhita and Belaj 1987), and the shaft cemetery of Borovë (Aliu 1994).

4.f.1. The Production Step Measure during the Third Phase of the Iron Age

The production step measure is assessed only for the handmade pottery at sites still in use in this phase, including Kuç i Zi, Rehovë, Burrel, and Kënetë, as well as the shaft cemetery of Borovë, which is newly established at this time. Despite an analysis largely focused on a diachronic development, systematic observations can be made for the presence of wheel-made pottery and to what extent they influence the qualitative properties of the handmade repertoire.

The handmade repertoire in the tumulus of Kuç i Zi consist of four vessels comprising 25% of the entire repertoire. Vessel formation receives particular attention and decoration is simple and not especially popular. The scores vary from three to seven, typical of a production profile where the focus is on functional attributes (Table 71). The contrast is even more evident if the properties of this data are compared to those of the second phase. The repertoire has clearly lost a great deal of attributes especially in terms of elaboration of the forms and the sophistication of motifs. In contrast, the wheel-made repertoire offers a highly sophisticated profile in terms of both form and decoration and this seems to compensate for the poor state of the handmade category. Given the lack of compositional analysis, the provenance of this group of vessels cannot be established with any certainty. Whether locally made or imported, the

skyphoi, cut-away neck jars, kantharoi, and kylikes are clearly associated with Greek imitations or imports intensively used in the community of Kuç i Zi.

At Rehovë the handmade pottery prevails comprising 83% of the total. However, the production step profile is extremely low, varying from three to four steps and exclusively dedicated to vessel formation. The only aesthetic features are the conical projections applied to one-handled vessels (Table 70).

The repertoire from the tumuli of Kënetë is predominantly handmade. A certain variability for different vessel forms is noted; however, the highest score does not go beyond seven points and the only elaborative features are those associated with the application of two decorative techniques on one vessel. The repertoire at the tumulus of Burrel repeats similar parameters to that of Kënetë. Once more, the handmade category is prevalent. However, the vessel forms are very limited and the highest score coincides with the combination of two decorative techniques that reach 7 points (Tables 72 and 73). The wheel-made vessels occur with a similar quantity at both sites, representing non-local forms.

The handmade category in the shaft cemetery of Borovë comprises 32% of the total. The assemblage is extremely simple, displaying only the most basic functional attributes with scores of three and four. The most elaborative features are the conical projections applied not very carefully on a limited number of vessels (Table 74). The wheel-made pottery prevails and, in any case, has similar qualitative features with those noted in the handmade group.

The measure of the production step in virtually each repertoire indicates particular attention given to the functional attributes. The presence of the wheel-made pottery for the first time becomes a crucially important parameter, which has a great impact on the local handmade

production. At the sites where wheel-made pottery is present, the qualitative properties of the handmade pottery show a certain decrease. Such is especially noted in the south at the sites of Kuç i Zi, Barç and Borovë, where wheel-made pottery, although not quantitatively prevalent, clearly influences a great deal the properties of the traditional handmade product. A more traditional situation is only preserverd at Rehovë, where the wheel-made pottery does not appear to interfere with local production, which continues unaffected from the previous phase. A similar situation is also seen in north Albania. The wheel-made pottery never surpasses the quantity of handmade pottery and in terms of the production step both maintain a separate profile.

4.f.2. The Measure of Morphological Standardization during the Third Phase of Early Iron Age

Groups sharing similar qualitative attributes are not especially popular in this phase. However, the process of classification has produced a few groups where the assessment of the coefficient of variation may apply. These include five vessel groups respectively from the tumuli of Rehovë, Kënetë, Myç-Has, and Burrel, and the shaft cemetery of Borove.

The CV measure at the tumulus of Rehovë was applied to the group of the two-handled vessels (P148-P154). The CV values of height and rim were respectively 24.5% and 22.5%. Compared to the groups of two-handled vessels encountered in previous periods, these values do not indicate any difference in the improvement of labor investment. As Graph 15 indicates, the CV values especially between the early and the second and third phases of the Iron Age simply reflect very slight changes, which hardly favor any type of difference on the progress or regression of production modes (Table 75).

The CV was assessed for the group of two-handled vessels in the tumuli of Myç-Has (P13, P15, P26, P29, P33 and P37). The values are respectively 28.94% and 16.85% and such a result is not any closer to optimal standardized values. Moreover, the CV of height is easily associated with a highly non-standardized product (Table 77).

A small group of four vessels with two handles rising above rim (P14, P16, P20 and P21) has been selected from the repertoire of the Kënetë tumulus. The CV values compared with the other sites are slightly lower, reaching 13.08% for height and 17.67% for rim diameter. Such result, however, must be taken with caution if the size of this group is taken into consideration (Table 78).

A group of two-handled vessels was also selected from repertoire of Burrel (P07, P08, P09, P12, P13 and P34). The CV values, respectively 13.8% and 21.3%, only support the general standardization profile aseen in other groups of pottery (Table 79).

Given the fact that a group of wheel-made vessels was selected from the shaft cemetery at Borovë, the expectations for low CV values may have been higher. From this repertoire is chosen a group of six oinochoai sharing similar qualitative attributes, though all six are not well preserved (P17, P20, P22, P23, P24 and P26). The CV was calculated for the variables of height and base diameter, yielding respective values of 18.1% and 10.2% (Table 76). Even in this case, results that may reflect a higher standardized profile for wheel-made pottery was not achieved. The poor state of preservation of this material and the dubious restoration of the draftsman must be taken into consideration

The assessment of standardization highlights two crucial issues. First of all, the limitations of cogent groups with a relevant profile regarding morphology and size that affect the

CV values do not indicate a great deal in terms of improvement of labor investment. Second, the wheel-made pottery, whatever its quantity, very rarely offers meaningful groups with more than two vessels. Even where a given group is quantatively greater, such as that of Borovë, the CV values do not reflect significantly low values that are to be expected with wheel-made production.

In this phase, as with those previously considered, the standardization of the pottery production maintains a conservative profile between 10% and 20%. It has to be stressed that, compared to the cumulative CV values of the previous periods, these are slightly lower. However, even in this case standardization maintains an average profile without highlighting any dramatic decrease that would definitely reflect an important aspect regarding the process of production especially the specialization of labor (Graph 19).

4.f.3. The Innovation of Pottery Production during the Third Phase of the Iron Age

Sufficient comparative data for the assessment of innovation was encountered in the tumuli of Rehovë, Kuç i Zi, Burrel, and Kënetë. Several sites, including Barç, Bujan, Bardhoc, Myç-Has, Krumë, Borovë, Çinamak, and Përbreg were either established during this phase or offer insufficient data for this type of analysis.

Since the foundation of the tumulus of Rehovë to the time of its abandonment, the site maintains a conservative profile of pottery production. Each phase only sees the introduction of a few innovative features that do not exceed the 20% in the overall amount of properties. During this final phase, innovation is even less well represented and is only associated with the presence of wheel-made pottery (Table 52).

The tumuli of Kënetë continue to apply many of the parameters gained during the second phase. The innovation features are associated with wheel-made vessels and a few elaborative features of handle treatment and decoration. The handmade repertoire is prevalent and largely relies on inherited features introduced during the second phase of the Iron Age. Not many elements become extinct. Innovation within the handmade category is poorly represented coinciding with a few elaborative elements of the base, handle and decoration (Table 70).

The tumuli of Burrel produce a balanced profile between the inherited and innovative attributes. The inherited category predominates and is largely a derivation of features established during the second phase of the Iron Age. The innovative features comprise salient elements of vessel forming and the appearance of various wheel-made vessels (Table 76).

The tumuli of Kuç i Zi represent one of the few cases in which the difference between the inherited and innovative features is completely reversed. The constant presence of wheel-made pottery not only weakens the qualitative profile of the handmade assemblage; a phenomenon already noted with the measure of the production step, it also greatly reduces the presence of inherited attributes. Almost 52% of the parameters belonging to the handmade assemblage newly established in the second phase now become extinct. The wheel-made category predominates, comprising 81% of the total (Table 80).

Production innovation during this phase is intimately associated with the presence of wheel-made pottery and the repertoires containing this parameter favor considerably the innovative features. This is best seen in the case of the Borovë cemetery where the wheel-made pottery is prevalent over the handmade. Given the narrow chronological span of the repertoire, a more precise diachronic account of innovation could not be measured at this site. It is clear,

however, that the significant presence of wheel-made pottery influences directly the quantity and quality of the handmade pottery. For the handmade category, the innovative features are only seen in the tumuli of Burrel, where they not only prevail, but also indicate an even distribution throughout the properties of repertoire.

The vicissitudes of the different proportions of inherited and innovative features also indicate a clear regional pattern. As the tables indicate, the repertoires offering robust values of innovation are those located in the south. Despite differences in the quantity of material, the tumuli of Borovë, Kuç i Zi, and Barç clearly favor wheel-made pottery. The only site in the region where this is not the case is Rehovë. In the northeast and northwest the wheel-made category never gains any higher representation than the inherited values.

4.g. The Evolution of Pottery Production during the Late Prehistoric Period

In this section the research queries earlier addressed in the second chapter are combined with the results and the interpretations of the data analysis. The critical question is: To what extent does the profile of step measure of production, standardization, and the degree of innovation reflect on the modes of production of these communities?

The synchronic perspective for the different periods and phases of the three measured dimensions has provided a complex picture with regard to pottery technology. The diachronic perspective provides important insights in terms of the improvement of production over time and the social milieu in which it was conceived. Pottery production during late prehistory goes through a complex evolutionary course characterized by gradual and steady transformations defined in two dimensions.

First of all, the technological profile, that is the making of the vase, does not see any dramatic changes during the late prehistoric period. The most salient choices, according to which standardization and innovation show some sensitivity, are those related to vessel function. Some type of standardization, or perhaps a regularity in the division of different vessel sizes, can be broadly noted. Transformations imply additional morphological features for several groups of vessels that are noted from the Early Bronze Age to the Third Phase of the Iron Age, but the manufacturing process maintains an overriding stability largely relying on the handmade mode of production. Measures of both standardization and innovation strongly favor this outcome throughout late prehistory.

The presence of wheel-made pottery remains an exclusive and restricted trait without any major impact on the quantity or quality of the local production. The first appearance of wheel-made pottery is the Vapheio cup from Pazhok, and wheel-made pottery continues with the Mycenaean products during the Late Bronze and largely Mycenaean-inspired forms in the Early Iron Age, and conclud with the Archaic and Classical Greek products of the third phase of the Iron Age. The handmade and wheel-made pottery of Albania maintains separate traditions that do not overlap in any significant degree. To date, the only clearly locally produced wheel-made pottery is represented by the few matt-painted sherds found in Tren.

Secondly, the conceptual profile, that is, the "*thinking*" behind the making of a vessel, presents a very interesting picture. The lack of standardization and high innovation rates is limited only to the process of the manufacture of the pottery, and does not interfere within the conceptualization underpinning pottery production. The most salient and sophisticated traits are formed at the conceptual level. Given the lack of any dramatic technological changes diachronically, one might perhaps imagine this type of pottery as dull and not very sophisticated.

During the late prehistoric period the conceptual profile of the material sees dramatic changes in two main dimensions: function and aesthetics. The functional dimension is, of course, related to the immediate decisions during the forming process. The function of the vessel plays a primary role in this undertaking, and the choices regarding fabric and size have a great impact on the very first stages in conceiving any vessel. The parameters of fabric and size maintain a clearly distinguished profile throughout late prehistory, with the pottery dividing into the categories of coarse, semi-coarse, and fine ware. The majority of the coarse and semi-coarse category is associated with large size vessels that have functional properties as storage or kitchen ware. This type of pottery is particularly encountered in settlements without any drastic changes over time. The fine ware is exclusively confined to small and medium sized vessels, normally associated with daily purposes, mostly as table ware. This category indicates the most vivid profile of handmade production. It evolves gradually from the Bronze Age to the Iron Age, gaining the most sophisticated profile during the first (early) and second phase of the Iron Age. In the course of the Iron Age, virtually every property of production gains thriving qualitative parameters that are especially noteworthy in the Korçë basin and the Kolonjë plateau. This is especially seen in the case of the fine light matt-painted and the fine dark burnished ware. Both types of pottery, and especially the matt-painted ware, sees a qualitatively high attention paid to the aesthetic profile, such as the elaborate forming, decoration, surface treatment, and even the level of firing. It is here where the aesthetic parameters prevail over the functional. In the Third Phase of the Iron Age we see a gradual decline, with the pottery losing most of the qualitative features gained over the Early Iron Age. At the same time there is no significant interest in imported wheel-made products.

Pottery production during late prehistory maintains a steady technological profile but experiences important qualitative transformations, which indicate a high level of expertise. The elaborated forms like the triple and double vessels, strut handles, the concave disk foot, the three-spouted basket vessels, represent these best examples of this transformation. However, even during the first and second phases of the Iron Age, when the pottery gains its most sophisticated profile, this dimension never becomes very popular and seems to remain an exclusive domain of the artisans' choice and expertise. It does not become a compelling factor that forces drastic transformation in the technological system of pottery production.

Several theoretical approaches draw a direct link between handmade pottery and household production, defining it as small-scale production within individual households and within the domain of a family unit producing its own necessities (van der Leeuw 1977; Arnold 1985; Sinopoli 1991; Peacock 1982). It is likely that, against such a backdrop, the pottery of the late prehistoric communities of southern Illyria, despite the qualitative attributes and elaborated profile, does not gain value in a formal market context, but remains within the exclusive domain of the household.

Complementary and more telling accounts of household pottery production are found in various ethnographic studies. Here again the equation handmade pottery = household production is reinforced. Moreover, the ethnographic approach adds to the discussion an important aspect regarding the division of labor during the manufacture process. It is likely that every ethnographic context identifies the household production of pottery as an activity exclusively associated with women (Hammel et al. 1982; Peacock 1982; Saraswati and Behura 1966; Fontana et al. 1962; Gosselain 2008; Bowser and Patton 2008; Wallart 2008; Herbich and Dietler 2008). Various accounts dealing with the typology of modes of production classify household

production in two categories: household production and household industry (van der Leeuw 1977; Peacock 1982, 12-24; Filipovic 1951). Household production is defined as small-scale, seasonal, accomplishing the basic needs of the household and under the domain of women. In contrast, household industry is associated with more centralized and specialized production, which again is organized within the domain of the household. The scale of the product goes beyond the immediate necessities of the household and is oriented towards an informal and open market. Even in this case, pottery continues to be produced by part-time skilled female potters who, perhaps over time or due to their personal talent, gain a higher level of expertise and renown.

In the context of the late prehistoric period of southern Illyria, the analysis of pottery standardization and innovation easily relate the steady technological profile of the data with that of part-time household production, undertaken by women fulfilling only the immediate needs of the household. However, the elaboration of the qualitative profile, especially in the early and the second phase of the Iron Age at particular sites such as Kamenicë (Agolli 2009), Luaras, Barç, Rehovë, where the highest scores of the production step measure are achieved, may associate this context with a sporadic household industry. In both cases, however, the steady technological profile indicates that pottery never gains the properties of a highly specialized product undertaken by full-time specialists. During late prehistory wheel-made production, even in its heyday, continues to be a non-local and distinctive variety that did not interfere at all with the local household technology of the handmade pottery production.

A further question to be asked is: To what extent does pottery manufacture reflect on the socio-economic organization in the late prehistoric communities of southern Illyria? This

question is perhaps best answered by considering separately the social and economic organization:

First, the reconstruction of the technological profile of pottery production adds an important dimension to recent studies of social organization. Despite the lack of settlement data, there is extensive evidence collected from the tumuli that permits an investigation into social organization. A few years ago, Lorenc Bejko applied a systematic approach to the mortuary data from the burial tumuli of the Korçë basin and Kolonjë plateau (Bejko 1999/2000, 199-55). This approach employed seriation, together with correspondence and cluster analysis, to focus on the extent to which the various parameters of the mortuary evidence highlight social status in the communities of Korçë and Kolonjë. The most distinctive parameter achieved from the statistical inference indicates gender divisions as the most notable social differentiation. Bejko concluded that the mortuary practices in southeast Albania fit into a vertical differentiation in which social status is only shaped by age and gender (Bejko 1999/2000, 151-53). Similar results were achieved from the burial customs at the tumulus of Lofkënd. Again the most significant differences in the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the mortuary practices indicated vertical differentiation shaped by gender (Stapleton 2014).

The analysis of the modes of pottery production and especially the lack of drastic transformation in technology are highly complementary with the results provided by mortuary analysis. It appears that both mortuary practices and pottery production correspond to organized communities that lack a highly distinctive social hierarchy.

Second, the economic profile of the late prehistoric communities of southern Illyria was initially treated by Nicholas Hammond (Hammond 1967; Hammond 1982), from a cultural-historical perspective. Since Hammond was not influenced by an Albanian nationalistic

mentality, his research and many of his interpretations offer interesting accounts of social and economic character. Among other things, Hammond claims that especially during the Early Iron Age the practice of transhumance was very popular among the communities of Illyria and Macedonia. Based on the climatic conditions and the topography of the region, he saw the exploitation of pastures as the only economical resource of the nomadic and semi-nomadic communities. Social organization was based on the exploitation of the environment and settlement patterns were dependent on the potential resources of the environment, which were focused on stock raising, supplemented by fishing in lakes and rivers. According to Hammond, the highest levels of occupation must be attributed to these resources (Hammond 1982, 621-4).

Recent research, especially intensive and extensive surface survey, has yielded little or no records for the presence of settlements adjacent to the tumuli (Bejko et al. 1998; Galaty et al. 2013; Aprile 2014; Martson 2014). There is, however, a good deal of evidence that provides persuasive arguments that the late prehistoric communities of southern Illyria cannot be regarded as pastoral and transhumant groups. Michael Galaty has dealt with this question from the archaeological, historical, and ethnographical data from the Shala valley survey. On the basis of this evidence, he concludes that even in an environment that provides the most ideal conditions for the practice of transhumance over the course of the year, there is, rather, an interest in developing agro-pastoralism that in based on sedentary dwellings in villages; this does not exclude the exploitation of pastures on a seasonal basis (Galaty 2013, 41).

The tumulus of Lofkënd has only yielded scant evidence of animal remains either scattered throughout the fill of the mound or intentionally placed in certain burial contexts. As Marston's study makes clear, Lofkënd cannot contribute a great deal to our understanding of the environmental exploitation in the area around the tumulus. At most, the animal remains offer

complementary data which is largely in keeping with a mixed agro-pastoral economy that has been noted for the Balkan region in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age (Martson 2014).

More robust evidence of settled agricultural activity comes by way of the pollen data from the peat deposits in the settlement of Maliq (Fouache et al. 2001). The study takes a close look at the environmental and geomorphological context of the Korçë basin during the Neolithic and Bronze Age. The analysis of the pollen data offers clear evidence for several cultivated plants including cereals and vegetables during the Bronze Age (4000 uncal. B.P.). Furthermore this activity is accompanied with the planting and cultivation of the secondary woodlands probably used as construction supply for the dwellings of the settlement and heating fuel over the cold season. The authors attribute the abandonment of both Maliq and Sovjan on the eve of the Early Iron Age to the hydrological conditions provided from the rise of the levels of the lake (Fouache et al. 2001, 84-6).

Hammond's model has been challenged cogently in several studies focusing on northwestern Greece and more peripherally on Albania (Halstead 1987; Douzougli and Papadopoulos 2011). Halstead, together with Douzougli and Papadopoulos, argue that the economic profile of the Neolithic and the late prehistoric communities in northwestern Greece, and more specifically the Molossian sites of Vitsa Zagoriou and Liatovouni, as well as the Albanian evidence, applies to sedentary mixed farming that systematically exploited local pastures (Halstead 1987, 78; Douzougli and Papadopoulos 2011, 13).

Indeed, this recent research has added considerably to our understanding of the economic profile of the pre-urban societies of the Balkan region. Taken together, the evidence from both settlements and cemeteries indicate that, beginning in the Neolithic period and continuing to the 5th - 4th century B.C., these communities maintained a steady economic way of life based on

sedentary locations in areas that provided sufficient natural resources for subsistence throughout the course of the year. For centuries these communities were able to maintain a balanced interaction with their environment by exploiting agriculture and animal husbandry. A final question would be: To what extent do the modes of pottery production fit into this scenario? The analysis of the production step measure, standardization, and innovation indicates, if anything, a complementary picture to the economic model discussed above. It is highly likely that the steady and unchanged household production reflects the socio-economic setting of the late prehistoric communities in southern Illyria.

In conclusion, this chapter has attempted to consider the potential of pottery as crucial evidence for understanding not only modes of production, but also the socio-economic organization of the pre-urban communities of southern Illyria and northern Epirus.

Chapter 5

Data Analysis and Interpretations, II

Cultural Transmissions, Regional and Intraregional Networks in the Late Prehistoric Communities of Southern Illyria and Northern Epirus 2500–500 B.C.

In this chapter the attributes of the repertoire are evaluated from a qualitative perspective. Particular attention is given to the distribution of various patterns and attributes in terms of to what extent they relate to the shared, individual-from-shared or individual-conceptual system. The geographical distribution of the attributes within each division of the conceptual system is assessed. The goal is to estimate whether the patterns belonging to the shared conceptual system are exclusive to one or various sites and how both individual-from -shared and individual concepts considered as artisans' choices are associated within a given site repertoire.

This chapter reevaluates the production step measure and especially the innovation profile. By taking into consideration fabric, vessel formation and decoration, I seek to evaluate to what extent the local, regional and intra-regional distribution of attributes is configured and which attributes rule either the exclusively local choices or the regional networks. These two groups are analyzed by means of social learning according to the dual inheritance model of cultural transmission. The bulk of the analysis is based on the patterns yielded from the key diagrams of each site. Special attention is paid to the sites offering solid groupings. Those sites with limited data are addressed mostly in the comparative analysis. As with chapter 4 each issue is treated in diachronic and synchronic order.

I argue that during the late prehistoric period the model of interactions and cultural transmissions is largely conditioned by the socio-economic profile of the pre-urban societies in southern Illyria and northern Epirus. Indeed colorful interactions ruled by sites and regions take place over this period and their intensity changes over time. It remains, however, a small-world regional network ruled mainly by proximity and made possible by favorable geographic features. The cultural transmissions are shaped largely by social interactions and exchange conducted according to formal economic terms is not established. In any case the intensity of the social interactions remains an instrumental factor for the prosperity of these communities.

5.a. The Early Bronze Age: 2500 - 19/1800 B.C.

The geographic distribution of sites dating to this period does not follow any particular order. The settlements of Maliq IIIa and b (Prendi and Bunguri 2008), Tren (Korkuti 1971), Nezir (Andrea 1990), and Shkodër castle (Hoxha 1987), together with the tumuli of Shtoj (Koka 2012), Shkrel (Jubani 1995), Bujan (Andrea 1995), Apollonia (Amore 2010), and Barç (Andrea 1985) are grouped here. Due to the lack of the quantitative data, systematic analyses of fabric, vessel forming or decoration lead to limited evaluations at the site and at the regional or intra-regional level.

5.a.1. Pottery Fabric

Fabric analysis indicates interesting similarities among sites. As aforementioned, the lack of data for individual vessels does not permit a more systematic assessment. However, from the data available a broad evaluation for each site can be achieved. For instance, in the settlements of Maliq IIIa and b, Nezir, and Shkodër, a certain number of attributes such as clay mixture, surface

treatment, and firing temperature mark notable similarities (Plate 2). Hence in each of these sites two broad types of vessels, mainly fine fabric and coarse or semi-coarse ware, share roughly similar features. The fine ware has few inclusions, a smoothed or polished surface, and dark fabric has color varying from black to dark gray or dark brown. Burnished surfaces are rarer. The semi-coarse and coarse ware has abundant inclusions, air pockets and rough surfaces. Such a phenomenon even at a lower scale is repeated in the pottery collected in the tumuli of Shtoj, Shkrel, Apollonia, and Barç (Plate 1). A special feature of the surface treatment is noted at Maliq with a few vessels that are semi-barbotine on the exterior surface (P55, P56, P107 and P108). Prendi considers this a continuation from the Neolithic tradition encountered in the sites of Dunavec and Dërsnik (Prendi and Bunguri 2008, 93-4).

In addition, despite the lack of detailed and systematic data available, the assessment of fabric during the Early Bronze Age represents a significant number of shared choices distributed without defining any type of pattern. In the settlement of Maliq, the groups of semi-barbotine pottery comprise an individual choice exclusive to this site during the Early Bronze Age.

5.a.2. Vessel Formation

The classification of pottery is largely based on various attributes of vessel formation. This remains the most accessible feature in any publication available. However, the quantitative profile of the repertoire dating to the Early Bronze Age greatly influences the patterns at almost every site. The tumuli of Apollonia, Bujan, and Barç have yielded one to three complete vessels each, and among them only Barç and Bujan offer single patterns that shared a similar number of attributes.

The tumuli of Shtoj, despite the higher quantity of vessels across the phases of classification, do not create solid patterns. Only the vessels with two vertical handles below the rim show a certain cohesion across the classification (P07, P08), and as such are considered the most heavily represented group within the repertoire. Also notable is a two-handled vessel with two wide vertical handles below the rim (P06), with salient features that do not seem to match any counterpart. Similar observations are derived from the settlement of Nezir. Here again one can hardly distinguish any type of pattern.

A notable contrast is encountered in the settlement of Maliq, which offers several patterns belonging to the shared system of concepts, including five groups each containing six to seven vessels: one-handled vessels with vertical handles below the rim, two-handled vessels with vertical handles above and below the rim, and two-handled with horizontal handles below the rim. Other groups are fewer and comprise funnels (P91, P92), washtubs pierced on the body (P89, P89), and open short vessels with perforated handles (P76, P77, P78). Significant variability is noted with the one-handled vessels with vertical handles above the rim and with the group of open short vessels. Within each group, the attributes of base and body form largely determine the fragmentation into separate divisions. In any case, they remain well integrated within the larger groups across the first three divisions of attributes.

The individual choices in Maliq are hard to distinguish and if applicable they may be associated with the handle position (P86, P87, P84, P98 and P56) or with the distinctive form of the upper body (P72 and P64).

In the settlement of Tren patterns are hardly defined. The shared system consists of two groups comprised by vessels with two handles slightly above the rim (P01 and P02) and closed

vessels with two vertical handles on the belly (P07 and P08). The group of individual concepts derived from the shared system of concepts is made up of individual vessels each with salient features (P03-P06, P10).

Given the lack of material, however, few parallels can be determined. The three vessels found in the tumulus of Barç are similar to the group of vessels with one vertical handle below the rim in Maliq. Some affinities are encountered between the groups of two-handled vessels in Maliq and Tren. Similar choices of vessel forms are noted at Maliq, Nezir, and Shtoj in three main groups: the one-handled vessels with vertical handles below the rim, two-handled vessels with vertical handles above the rim, open short vessels, and the so-called washtubs. They all share common morphological parameters. The individual choices noted in Maliq do not meet any counterparts at any other site.

In addition to the attributes associated with forming the vessel, due to the limited quantity of each site repertoire, coherent data is only produced by the site of Maliq, which offers comparative insights on the regional environment as well.

The most popular patterns encountered at Maliq even indicate some degree of interaction with Barç and Tren and perhaps a cross-regional distribution in Shtoj, Nezir, and Bujan. Proximity plays a crucial role during this period and is best seen at Maliq, Tren and Barç. At Shtoj and Nezir parallels are only directed at one individual vessel. Any type of cross-regional interaction can be hardly noted given the fact that, beside Maliq and Barç, the repertoires at other sites rely heavily on individual and distinctive vessels that mostly represent local and incidental entities.

5.a.3. Decoration

During the Early Bronze Age five single decorative techniques are noted including incised, punched, painted, plastic, and relief decoration, as well as two combined techniques, those of incised and punched, and punched and plastic decoration. The data collected for each site relies on both decorated complete vessels and sherds found at the sites of Shtoj, Shkrel, Nezir, and Shkodër.

Shtoj, Shkrel, and Shkodër show a clear preference for the incised and plastic decoration, the combined techniques of punched and incised linear decoration on fine fabric, and finger impressions on coarse ware.

The curvilinear technique consists of semi-concentric circles and is solely found in the tumuli of Shkrel. The most popular motifs in Shkrel are the groups with reversed Vs. Other sporadic types include incised and punched pendent rectangles and groups of combined vertical incised and punched lines.

Those few sherds collected at the castle of Shkodër are poorly preserved. Despite their fragmentary state, one can distinguish the incised technique in a group of upright Vs, two miscellaneous motifs, one of them perhaps a pendent triangle hatched with vertical lines. The finger impressions on coarse ware are present as well.

In the tumuli of Shtoj a limited number of motifs have been collected, consisting of three incised upright overlapping rectangles, two incised horizontal lines hatched with double diagonals, and conical projections.

The settlement of Nezir offers a wider range of techniques consisting of conical projections, narrow diagonal and short vertical ribbing, incised dots and horizontal lines, punched dots and remnants of pendent triangles hatched with dots. The narrow diagonal ribbing is more frequent and can be considered a local trait. The combinations of incised and dotted techniques display some parallels with motifs found in the tumuli of Shkrel.

In the settlement of Maliq a wider variety of both decoration techniques and motifs is encountered. However, the quantitative profile of the material cannot be assessed. The only element visible is the popularity of the finger impressions not necessarily associated with coarse ware. The local choices are associated with the monochrome painted decoration, the toothed lines, the triple elongated projections, and wide vertical ribbing. A few other traits like the conical projections, pendent triangles hatched with punched dots, pendent reversed Vs and crossed-hatched lozenges occur more rarely.

The decoration during the Early Bronze Age is highly fragmentary and the quantitative profile cannot be assessed. However, the choice of decoration technique and especially the plastic and incised decoration is shared on a regional scale. Individual choices are closely related with special sites associated either with the presence of a completely new technique such as the relief decoration in Nezir or perhaps the continuation from a previous period such as the monochrome painted vessels of Maliq. Robust local patterns are barely defined. A few sites such as Shkrel with the combination of linear and curvilinear motifs, or that of Shtoj with the overlapping rectangles, only offer a glimpse of individual choices.

The data available is insufficient and does not offer much on the shaping of any level of network. The parameters of fabric and surface treatment show impressive similarity at every site.

In any case, the lack of a solid conceptual-shared system at several sites does not lead to consistent relations among them. Few vessel forms have popular attributes with wide spatial distribution. Instead, they mostly consist of immediate functional features without salient comparable parameters. The situation is clearer once the rule of proximity is considered. A certain intensity of networks seems to be taking place among sites at a close distance. The settlements of Maliq and Tren and the tumulus of Barç show signs of likely interaction and due to the data intensity the leading role in such contact may be awarded to Maliq.

5.b. The Middle Bronze Age: 1900/1800–1450 B.C.

The pottery evidence dating to the Middle Bronze Age is obtained from Maliq IIIc, (Prendi 1966), Nezir V (Andrea 1990), Çukë (Korkuti 1990), Piskovë (Bodinaku 1981), Pazhok, (Bodinaku 1982), Kënetë (Jubani 1983; Hoti 1986), and Bujan (Andrea 1995). Once again with this period, especially for the analyses at the site level, the data is not highly represented. Let us now focus more closely on three attributes: pottery fabric, vessel forming, and decoration.

5.b.1. Pottery Fabric

Not much attention has been given to the study of fabric in any of the above publications. According to the general comments, the fabrics are briefly classified in two categories, fine and coarse ware. The fine ware, especially in the sites of Çukë, is merely polished without any trace of burnish. Firing is uneven and the irregular brown spots are visible on the light gray surface. The data collected in the sites of Maliq and Nezir repeats similar features with the repertoire dated to the Early Bronze Age. Although Prendi claims improvement of the surface treatment provided with burnish on exterior surfaces (Prendi 1977/1978, 11-2), quantitative data of such an innovative aspect cannot be provided. The array of the Middle Bronze Age pottery displayed

at the Archaeological Museum of Tiranë shows several vessels with uneven burnish on the exterior surface. However, this cannot be considered an emerging trait exclusive to this period. The fine dark vessels with burnished surface already appear in sporadic use during the Early Bronze Age and this can be best seen in Shtoj (Plate 2).

Several differences break the 'rule' that fine = small – medium size vessels and coarse = large size vessels, as noted in the tumuli of Dukat. Small to medium-sized vessels here are uniformly made of a semi-coarse to coarse ware, not evenly fired and very uneven on the exterior surface without any additional treatment (Bodinaku 2001/2002).

In Bujan and Kënetë the few vessels of the Middle Bronze Age repertoire are fine dark, burnished in surface and with brown to gray color on the exterior. As for the coarse ware not much can be said. Its presence is briefly mentioned especially in the tumuli of Dukat, Bujan, Kënetë and Piskovë; however, given its fragmentary condition, it only consists of a few sherds. It is mostly associated with large-sized vessels with many inclusions and rough surface.

To sum up, fabric during the Middle Bronze Age offers valid insights at both the site and regional scales. In the settlement of Maliq and Nezir, fine ware is perhaps of a better quality when compared to the assemblages of the Early Bronze Age. As for coarse ware, not much is known. Continuity of dark fine fabric is sporadically noted at Kënetë and Bujan. Meanwhile the assemblage collected in Çukë shows different fabric and surface treatment. Every vessel of this repertoire belongs to fine dark, not burnished and only uniformly smoothed. In the tumuli of Dukat this order is completely reversed. The entire repertoire of the tumuli consists of semi-coarse and coarse ware without any treatment of the surface at all.

At a regional scale certain continuity with Early Bronze Age traditions can be claimed and such continuity is shared in the sites of Maliq, Bujan, and Kënetë. The fine and coarse wares enjoy similar characteristics at each of these sites. The sites of Dukat and Çukë are those that each displays an individual pattern with clearly different attributes in both ware and surface treatment.

5.b.2. Vessel Formation

The quantity of the data allows analysis of vessel formation for the sites of Maliq, Nezir, Çukë, and Dukat.

In Maliq the assemblage is strictly limited to two-handled vessels, especially to those with handles rising above the rim. Strong and significant patterns cannot be established here. However, the repertoire shares several attributes such as the rounded base or the spherical and hemispherical body. The individual choices consist solely of wishbone handles slightly raised above the rim that emerge during this period (P136, P137).

In Nezir the two-handled vessels without any solid group dominate the repertoire. The vessel P19 is similar to the group with two vertical handles below the rim in Maliq during the Early Bronze Age. This type of vessel is a popular form in Çukë as well (P13 and P14).

At the site of Çukë there is an impressive number of attributes which, no matter the quantity, indicate solid groupings throughout the process of classification. The open one-handled shapes, alternatively known as dippers (P01-P09), and two-handled vessels (P10-P14), are the most frequent. Those exceptions to this regularity consist of a one-handled vessel with a vertical handle below the rim (P15) and two open vessels (P17, P16).

The tumuli of Dukat do not create a solid pattern. Each vessel shares common attributes that create several combinations, and at the site scale it is hard to distinguish between individual or shared attributes.

On the regional scale the shared concepts clearly show confusion that does not establish any order at all. The most popular shape is the vessel with two vertical handles below the rim, which occurs in both Çukë (P13, P14) and Nezir (P18, P19), and is also noted in Maliq (P11, P12) during the Early Bronze Age. Several others such as the two-handled vessels of Maliq (P132, P134) and Dukat (P02) are similar in terms of the vessel shape. The horizontal perforated handles of Dukat (P04, P05) show clear parallels with the Early Bronze Age vessels found at Maliq IIIa and b (P13, P80). The horn handle found in Bujan is similar to that of Nezir.

The three vessels found in the tumuli of Piskovë and Kënetë do not show any particular affinity to Middle Bronze Age assemblages.

As earlier mentioned in Chapter 4, the Middle Bronze Age remains a controversial period that breaks down a certain type of uniformity created over the Early Bronze Age. The only site that establishes a proper profile and at least two solid patterns is that of Çukë. However, even in this case, salient and popular features that comprise solid groups are to be encountered earlier in Maliq IIIa and b and Nezir. Similar results can be found at the tumuli of Dukat, which again show affinities with a few vessels found earlier in Maliq IIIa and b. These affinities may either be contemporary or perhaps are inherited attributes distributed to other sites from Maliq.

5.b.3. Decoration

Decoration is a rare phenomenon during the Middle Bronze Age. Several techniques are recorded such as the conical projections in Çukë and Nezir, finger impressions in Nezir, wide

parallel ribbing in Maliq, simple painted lines, and punched and incised pendent triangles in Kënetë. Each motif has a sporadic appearance. Likewise the vessel formation with decoration in solid patterns at different sites is not evident.

The open one-handled vessels/dippers of Çukë, the slight changes of the vessels shape in Maliq, and the innovative aspects of fabric at Dukat and Çukë are to be recognized as distinctive elements that indicate a significant concentration of authentic elements at each site.

The Middle Bronze Age still remains vague and any type of interpretation regarding the shaping of interactions is deeply conditioned by the lack of systematic and published evidence, and this is coupled with the discrepancies of the conventional chronology.

However, two groups of gray ware, such as the open one-handled vessels/dippers and the two-handled vessels/kantharoi burnished on the exterior surface, are likely to be the most exclusive and salient traits of this period. Moreover, it seems that both forms also occur in the tumuli of Vodhinë (Prendi 1956), Vajzë (Prendi 1957), and Bajkaj (Budina 1971). Bejko claims that they represent dual influence associated with non-classical Minyan pottery via maritime contact, this being valid for the sites adjacent to the coast, including Vodhinë, Vajzë, Bajkaj, and Çukë, and by contacts with the Thessalian Middle Bronze Age in the mainland, mainly via the Korçë basin and Drinos valley. Bejko pushes the dates of the two-handled vessel/kantharoi of Vajzë even higher to the nineteenth century B.C. (Bejko 1994, 111-2). It should be mentioned that the evaluations of Bejko are not based on the site reports of the tumuli of Vodhinë, Vajzë, and Bajkaj, in which both Prendi and Budina date each of the open one-handled vessels/dippers and the two-handled vessels/kantharoi in the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age.

The presence, however, of both forms clears considerably the confusion regarding the regional networks during the Middle Bronze Age. It remains evident that both shapes, especially in Vodhinë, Vajzë, Bajkaj, and Çukë, are associated with imitations of Minyan pottery coming from the Ionian Sea coast. An additional connection between Maliq and Thessaly, perhaps more sporadic, is occurring inland. The local developments remain hardly defined. A few innovative traits such as the wishbone and horn handles are very scarce. Similar observations can be seen in the limited pottery collection at Dukat.

5.c. The Late Bronze Age: 1450–1200/1100 B.C.

The 17 sites dated to the Late Bronze Age are the settlements of Maliq (Prendi 1966), Tren (Korkuti 1971), Nezir (Andrea 1990), and Zagorë (Andrea 1996), as well as the tumuli of Barç (Andrea 1985), Kamenicë (Agolli 2009), Luaras (Aliu 2004), Rehovë (Aliu 2012), Shtikë (Aliu 1996), Prodan (Aliu 1984), Cërujë (Andrea 1997), Patos (Korkuti 1981), Lofkënd (Pevnick and Agolli 2014), Pazhok (Bodinaku 1982), Dukat (Ceka 1974; Bodinaku 2001/2002), Kënetë (Jubani 1983), and Myç-Has (Bela 1990), and the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj (Andrea 1981). At several sites the parameters of fabric, vessel formation and decoration have salient elements addressed separately.

5.c.1. Pottery Fabric

As mentioned in Chapter 4, the pottery fabric during the Late Bronze Age sees interesting dynamics at regional and site levels. Graph 5 displays an account of the site distribution of the most common types. However, the values may be taken with reservation because individual accounts of nearly complete or complete vessels in terms of the clay composition and treatment are largely missing and the values for each site are only based on narrative information that at

most provides a broad ratio among two to three types. Furthermore, most Albanian scholars (Prendi 1966; Korkuti 1971; Andrea 1985; Aliu 2004, 2012) tend to ignore the importance of the pottery ware and attempt to categorize a given site collection artificially in a broader culturally defined repertoire. According to the current studies, during the Late Bronze Age there are two distinctive ware groups:

The fine light ware, evenly fired in a highly oxidized atmosphere with orange to reddish color, becomes a frequent element distributed particularly in the south at Maliq, Tren, Barç, Kamenicë, Shtikë, Prodan, and Gërmenj, while the fine dark ware burnished on the exterior surface, however poorly represented, is associated with the continuation of the Bronze Age tradition in Nezir, Zagorë, Kënetë, and Myç-Has.

Prendi claims an evolution of the pottery production and appearance of a fine light ware, pink to pale yellow, during phase IIId-1 at Maliq. During phase IIId-2, the pre-fired matt-painted decoration on light ware emerges and develops solidly over the latest phase of the Late Bronze Age, coinciding with what Prendi recognizes as Maliq IIId-3 (Prendi 1966, 13; 1977/1978).

The problems related with the publication of Maliq settlement have been mentioned earlier. However, considering the data available in the publications and especially the examples displayed in the Archaeological Museum of Tirana, it is rather hard to confirm the evaluations of Prendi (Plate 3). The pottery fabric of the Middle and Late Bronze Age, especially the assemblage belonging to Maliq, does not indicate the drastic transformation as described by Prendi. The fine dark ware burnished on the exterior surface continues as a frequent phenomenon during the Late Bronze Age. On the other hand, the fine light ware is in a minority consisting of two plain vessels, pinkish on both interior and exterior surface. The so-called pre-fired matt-

painted decoration has a gray color and is applied on a fine dark burnished vessel. The so-called post-fired matt-painted ware with reddish decoration on fine light surface only appears on a few fragments of this collection.

Similar issues also appear in Nezir. However, Andrea recognizes that the Late Bronze Age is barely distinguished and the few sherds encountered inherit similar features with those noted earlier during the Middle Bronze Age in Nezir V (Andrea 1990, 37). The settlement of Zagorë, as well, offers a limited collection without any distinctive feature regarding the fabric (Andrea 1996, 24).

The light fine fabric becomes a popular element in the tumuli of Luaras (Aliu 2004, 74-5), Rehovë (Aliu 2012, 68), Prodan (Aliu 1984, 40-1), and Shtikë (Aliu 1996, 64). Extensive comments or additional analysis at site level cannot be conducted here. Aliu mentions that the fine dark ware comprises a minority, usually associated with incised and relief decoration. At each site the fine light ware comprises the bulk of the material and may be considered as the earliest and most consistent corpus so far dated to the Late Bronze Age (Plate 3).

The small repertoire of the tumulus of Patos (Korkuti 1981, 22) offers a combination of the fine light and semi-coarse ware. In the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj the repertoire is largely populated by fine light fabric and burnished on the exterior surface. Fine light ware is widely popular in the tumulus of Barç as well. Systematic observations on fabric are obtained only at the tumuli of Kamenicë and Lofkënd. In Kamenicë the fine light ware with abundant fine inclusions and smoothed surface remains the only choice at least among the kterismata. In any case, if classified by more detailed parameters, such as those of clay composition, firing intensity, and surface treatment, each vessel would remain on its own without creating common patterns. In the

tumulus of Lofkënd the fine light and dark and semi-coarse fabrics occur in a repertoire of four vessels. The co-occurrence of fine light and matt-painted decoration, as well as that of the fine dark with the diagonal ribbing, is neatly represented in Lofkënd. The fine light ware has very rare inclusions, and is uniformly fired and burnished on the exterior surface. The fine dark fabric also has few inclusions and uniform burnish on the exterior surface (Plate 4). A similar combination of the fine light and dark fabrics is noted in the tumuli of Pazhok and Cërujë, where fine light versus fine dark marks an equal ratio.

Unfortunately the lack of systematic data on the nature of fabric makes this assessment incomplete. However, with the sites of Maliq, Rehovë, and Luaras, and especially at Kamenicë and Lofkënd, accounts regarding the most popular choices of fabric may be obtained to some degree. In each repertoire, despite the common choices of the two broad ware types, fine light and dark, the presence of individual expressions, especially in the firing intensity and the surface treatment is noteworthy. This may be seen much more clearly in the tumuli of Kamenicë and Lofkënd, where on each vessel one can easily observe individual treatment of the ware, firing intensity, and exterior surface.

The highest concentration of data is obtained from the Kolonjë plateau, Korcë basin, in the river valleys of Shkumbin and Devoll, and in the region of Mallakastër. The data collected from Mat, Shkodër or Kukës is very limited, and does not offer a great deal of information regarding the fabric. The emergence of the fine light ware is of course an innovative parameter of the Late Bronze Age with particular concentration in the Kolonjë plateau, distributed gradually during the latest phase of the Late Bronze Age, occurring to a lesser degree at the sites of Kamenicë, Tren, and Barç. Coexistence between fine light and dark ware is found in the sites of Lofkënd, Pazhok, and Cërujë.

5.c.2. Vessel Formation

Sporadic continuity with the Middle Bronze Age is only noted in the settlements of Maliq and Nezir and in the tumuli of Dukat. At the other sites, the layer dating to the Late Bronze Age coincides with the foundation horizon. In Maliq and Nezir the Late Bronze Age horizon marks the final habitation period.

The Late Bronze Age in the pottery collection of Maliq yields a few sporadic vessels, mostly belonging to individual groups. The key diagram shows a relatively wide variety of forms and sizes. Across the classification process, each category ends up with single vessels, with the exception of a group with two identical vessels (P149 and P150). The shared system of concepts is highly under-represented. Forms such as the horizontal handles below the rim, the vertical handles rising above the rim, and the open vessels indicate some kind of popularity during the Middle Bronze Age that continues to remain stable even during this period. The innovative elements such as the matt-painted decoration and pierced openings at the juncture of the rim coincide with vessels with vertical wishbone handles (P146, P147 and P148), and vessels with vertical handles rising above the rim (P142, P144, P145), both features emerging during Middle Bronze Age. The only innovative shapes, which, however, remain highly isolated, are the vessels with two handles rising above the rim and rounded elongated body (P144 and P145). Perhaps due to the quality of the publication and the discrepancies of the chronology at the settlement of Maliq, a clear difference between the shared and individual concepts of the Middle and Late Bronze Age repertoires cannot be defined. It must be said, however, that, especially during the Late Bronze Age, Maliq is no longer offering a solid system of concepts with shared and individual values. The fact that the site is gradually abandoned during the Early Iron Age is perhaps a complementary argument that explains the lack of the pottery data as well. Not much

can be said for the settlement of Nezir. Its pottery, besides being limited in quantity, is highly fragmentary and repeats elements noted earlier in the Middle Bronze Age.

The Late Bronze Age in Zagorë coincides with the foundation horizon. Pottery is again very limited in quantity and under such conditions no grouping or solid conceptual system can be distinguished. The open two-handled vessels (P02, P04 and P05), however fragmentary, comprise innovative traits so far not encountered elsewhere.

The tumuli offer a greater deal of data in which the conceptual system is better shaped. Continuity with the Middle Bronze Age is incidentally noted in the tumuli of Dukat. The Late Bronze Age repertoire is limited to two open vessels with two vertical handles rising above the rim (P06 and P07), likely to be the derivation of a form occurring sporadically during the Middle Bronze Age.

The majority of pottery data is yielded by the tumuli of Luaras and Rehovë. The shared concepts in the tumulus of Luaras create a solid group with one-loop handled vessels, rounded body and everted rim (P01, P06, P07, P13, P14, P15, and P16). Several features such as the spout or the decoration may be considered individual elements either related with the function of the vessel or with the individual choices of the artisan. Nevertheless, given the cohesion of other shared attributes, these vessels are placed in a single array. Included in the shared system are three small vessels with one horizontal handle (P03, P10, and P12), two vessels with one wishbone handle (P04 and P09), and two vessels with basket form (P05 and P08). The individual concepts mark an isolated occurrence expressed solidly in the three-spouted vessel (P08) and perhaps the horned handles (P02). The tumulus of Luaras certainly offers one solid group with one-loop-handled vessels, highly representative comprising 45% of the entire corpus dated to the

Late Bronze Age. Both the individual-from-shared and the individual concepts mark a sporadic presence in the repertoire.

The tumulus of Rehovë produces the largest pottery assemblage of complete vessels. The bulk consists of one- and two-handled vessels and two double vessels. The shared concepts define solid groups of both one- and two-handled vessels. In the group of one-handled vessels, attributes such as the rounded base and spherical or rounded lower body, with or without a neck that flares to an everted rim, are the most common. The most salient element sharply dividing the repertoire is the location and the form of the handles. The vessels with loop handles comprise the largest group at Rehovë with 20 items (P02, P03, P07, P08, P09, P10, P14, P15, P16, P21, P24, P31, P33, P34, P35, P36, P37, P38, P39 and P45). The only distinction coincides with the angle of the handle attachment in relation to the body. Slight differences on the upper body and rim form are noted, however, they remain isolated, with the exception of one to two vessels. Three groups each with three to four vessels are also included in the category of the shared concepts. Decisions such as the handle form and location are dominant among the other attributes of these groups. Here are included the wishbone handles (P11, P20, P40 and P43); the axe-shape handles (P01, P41 and P42); two-handled vessels with cylindrical lug at turn point (P06 and P25); two vessels with vertical handles rising above the rim (P26 and P47). The group of the individual concepts is barely defined within the Late Bronze Age. They can be related with individual vessels such as P27 and P46 that meet no counterparts anywhere in the repertoire.

The shared concepts are distributed across various groups within the two-handled category. As with the one-handled vessel, here again the handle location and form dominates among other attributes. The group with two vertical handles with a cylindrical lug at is the most popular and comprises five vessels (P04, P05, P29, P48 and P51). Two groups are comprised of

two vessels with wishbone handles that are pointed (P12 and P22) or curved (P28 and P50) at the turn point. An additional group includes the horned handles P18 and P23.

The group of individual concepts derived from the shared system of concepts includes vessels with similar qualitative attributes within the group of two-handled vessels with a single variation that of the handle form. Here are included vessels P30 and P49.

The individual concepts are hard to distinguish; they are, however, clearly separated from the rest of the two-handled category. They have a larger size and horizontal handles (P17 and P44). In this group may be included the vessel with two handles above the rim (P13) as well, which has distinctive attributes in terms of fabric, form, and decoration.

The double vessels P19 and P52 mark a rare occurrence within the Late Bronze Age repertoire. Their frequency, presence and distribution remain to be seen in diachronic perspective at Rehovë and other sites.

The tumulus of Rehovë yields a repertoire with solid values clearly defined by the handle quantity, location, and form. This degree of homogeneity has affected considerably the presence of the individual expression within the solid groups. Some of them in both the one- and two-handled category mark a rare occurrence. For instance the large vessels with two horizontal handles (P17 and P44) may not necessarily be considered non-local elements, rather than a collection of vessels solely equipped with functional attributes, not a highly popular form for a ritual context.

Other vessels, such as the fine dark two-handled vessel with narrow ribbing, definitely indicate a unique form within the two-handled vessel collection, and its occurrence and distribution is further reconsidered in regional and intra-regional scale.

Compared to Luaras and Rehovë, other adjacent sites like Prodan and Shtikë offer a smaller quantity of data. The shared concepts at Shtikë again are strongly represented with the vessels with loop handle, rounded base and spherical body narrowing towards the shoulder and everted rim (P01, P06, P07 and P08). Likewise at Luaras the salient elements here include the spouts. The individual concepts derived from the shared system of concepts coincide on a single vessel with a horizontal handle (P03).

The individual concepts are displayed in the rest of the repertoire consisting of the two-handled vessels P04 and P05, each with different features in handle form and location, and on the small and short vessel P02.

Despite their size, in the tumulus of Shtikë the solid group again consists of loop handles with features similar to those encountered in Rehovë and Luaras. The individual concepts here mark a rare occurrence and derive occasional parallels with the rest of the repertoire in fabric and base form.

The tumulus of Prodan does not yield any group. All four vessels are each classified in separate groups. At least on a regional scale, the vessel with one wishbone handle (P02) and the vessel with two handles with cylindrical lug at turn point (P03) are popular in the tumulus of Rehovë.

The shared concept in the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj is uniquely displayed in a group of two-handled vessels with rounded body flaring out to an everted rim (P01-P06). Attributes such as neck form and height are slightly different, however; despite such variables regarding vessel formation, this group is produced from similar qualitative choices. The individual concept in this collection is solely related to the double vessel P07.

In the tumulus of Pazhok the shared concepts are not highly represented, consisting of two-handled vessels (P04-P05). The individual concepts are comprised of two vessels P03 and P06, each saliently different within the assemblage.

In the tumuli of Kamenicë, Barç, Lofkënd, Patos, and Cerujë, the number of vessels dating to the Late Bronze Age varies from six to two. However, in the classification process they are easily distinguished and do not create any pattern.

In the regional perspective, vessel formation yields several morphological features that indicate wide distribution beyond the areas of their initial occurrence. Here I bring to attention again Table 24 and its content in terms of innovation. It seems, therefore, that inherited features such as the vessels with rounded base and vertical, wishbone, horizontal and horned handles become salient elements at emerging sites during the Late Bronze Age, including at Rehovë, Luaras, and Gërmenj. The vessels with one or two vertical handles rising above the rim are common, especially in the cemeteries of Gërmenj, Lofkënd, Kamenicë, and Cerujë, largely dominating each repertoire. The horizontal handles occurring at Luaras, Shtikë and Rehovë tumuli are also inherited concepts from the Early and Middle Bronze Age; however, they are uniformly adapted to small size vessels. The wishbone handles, claimed to be a frequent attribute during the Middle Bronze Age, become a sporadic element in Luaras but are also popular in Rehovë on both one and two-handled vessels. The horned handles so far recognized as an element at Nezir and Bujan occur sporadically in Rehovë and Luaras. Continuity with the Early or Middle Bronze Age is noted in the sites of Maliq, Nezir, and Dukat, and the wishbone, horned or vertical handles rising above the rim seem to occur often despite the fragmentary state of their repertoires.

Given the fact that inherited features appear at both emerging and abandoned sites, some sporadic influence of the Middle Bronze Age traits on new sites is to be considered likely. However, at the sites with a solid shared conceptual system, such as Rehovë, Luaras, and less so at Shtikë, the inherited features are no longer frequent and popular traits.

In contrast, innovative features occur intensively in the newly established sites and some of them rule solidly among other features within the repertoire, becoming crucial elements of the shared system of concepts. For instance, the vessels with one loop handle indicate a strong presence at Luaras, Rehovë, and Shtikë. It is rather hard to associate this type of vessel exclusively with a single site. By considering, however, other parameters such as variability and quantity within the group, the tumulus of Rehovë gains dominance versus Luaras and Shtikë. The two-handled vessels with cylindrical lug at turn point in Rehovë hold a dual identity as innovative parameters. They mark a notable presence among the group of the two-handled vessels grouped within the shared system of concepts and also represent a unique and exclusive choice in the tumulus of Rehovë. Outside Rehovë this vessel type occurs only once in Prodan. The unique basketform vessels in Luaras also mark site exclusivity as well; however, they do not create a meaningful group even within the shared system of concepts at site level.

In contrast with the previous periods, during the Late Bronze Age a pattern of networks in a core region is clearly defined. The tumuli around the Kolonjë plateau are greatly influenced by Rehovë that offers plausible quantitative and qualitative evidence. Every neighboring site adjacent to Rehovë, such as Luaras, Shtikë, and Prodan, yields in lesser quantity one or two groups similar to those encountered in abundance at Rehovë. Greater intensity of interactions occurs between Rehovë and Luaras. Both loop and wishbone handles at Luaras display great affinities with the most popular patterns of Rehovë. However, this remains a unilateral

interaction ruled by one contributor. Luaras, Shtikë or Prodan seem to be influenced especially by the innovative parameters emerging at Rehovë but are not able to play a reciprocal role in such interaction.

5.c.3. Decoration

Quantitatively decoration remains sporadic and at site level; no pattern can be distinguished. The decoration technique, however, follows a certain order.

Inherited decorative features such as the incised technique are encountered in the sites of Rehovë, Luaras, Shtikë and in the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj. No patterns can be established at any site. However, the linear geometric motifs with the combination of zigzags and horizontal lines are frequent. The cross-hatched pendent triangles, inscribed upright triangles, and the curvilinear motifs of two concentric circles occur once. The wide diagonal ribbing is found among the tumuli of Lofkënd, Pazhok, and Cërujë which, compared to other Late Bronze Age sites, are relatively close to each other. The narrow vertical ribbing marks a rare occurrence at Maliq and Rehovë. The plastic applications are distinctive in Prodan and Pazhok.

The most popular innovative technique appearing during the Late Bronze Age is the matt-painted decoration. The matt-painted motifs mark a rare occurrence at Barç, Tren, Maliq, and Lofkënd. Each site offers unique motifs such as the inscribed upright triangles with spirals at Barç, the hatched and crossed-hatched pendent triangles at Maliq, the lattice band with hatched zigzag at Lofkënd, or the cross-hatched rhomboids combined with wavy lines and the pendent triangles with elongated apex at Tren.

The pierced openings at the rim juncture usually accompanied by wishbone handles occur in Maliq, Rehovë, and Luaras. In Kamenicë two innovative plastic techniques are encountered: the elongated projections and the plastic applications that resemble tear drops.

On a regional scale the three areas with at least one popular technique can be distinguished. Thus in the sites around the Kolonjë plateau the incised technique is the most frequent. The narrow ribbing occurring on the fine dark vessel P13 has already been defined as an incidental and perhaps non-local choice in Rehovë. In the sites around the Korçë basin, such as those of Maliq, Barç and Tren, matt-painted decoration is the most frequent. Some degree of regional distribution is noted with the wide diagonal ribbing that again occurs at sites near one another like Lofkënd, Pazhok, and Cërujë.

The decorative techniques offer innovative parameters that lack considerably any type of representation at site level. Evaluations for any interaction model within a region cannot be conducted either. It is worth mentioning, however, that the decoration techniques are the only trait offering not only the most extensive distribution but also clearly confined regional patterns whose development remains to be considered subsequently.

During the Late Bronze Age the fabric, vessel formation and decoration introduce several parameters that contribute a great deal to the understanding of both the regional networks and individual entities. It is clear that fabric is an attribute that defines a broad conceptual interaction. The inherited fine dark and the innovative fine light do show a geographic pattern or clearly defined concentration. Therefore, the fine dark is still an important element at sites that elaborated traditional pottery technology during the Early and Middle Bronze Age. In the settlements of Maliq, Nezir, and in the tumuli of Pazhok this tradition is continued. The fine light

appears more solidly in those tumuli newly established in the Late Bronze Age such as Rehovë, Luaras, Shtikë, Prodan, Kamenicë, and Barç. Combination of both types is noted in the tumuli of Lofkënd and Cërujë, both relatively adjacent to Pazhok.

Vessel formation is a crucial parameter that reinforces the patterns already established from fabric, offering additional insights into the regional interaction. The inherited features of vessel formation during the Late Bronze Age indicate wide geographic distribution and are differently adapted at various sites, becoming an important trait only at the site of Gërmenj. The innovative features, in contrast, especially in the Kolonjë plateau, indicate a solid presence as local and regional entities. In any case, during the Late Bronze Age these features cannot be observed crossing the constraints of the Kolonjë plateau.

5.d. The Early Iron Age: 1200–800 B.C.

The Early Iron Age yields a notable increase in pottery, spatially distributed at 26 sites including the settlements of Tren (Korkuti 1971), Gajtan (Rebani 1966), Zagorë (Andrea 1996), and Liqeth (Ylli 1988), and the tumuli of Çepunë (Budina 1969), Bajkaj (Budina 1971), Vodhinë (Prendi 1956), Vajzë (Prendi 1957), Piskovë, Rapckë (Bodinaku 1981), Pazhok (Bodinaku 1982), Dukat (Ceka 1974), (Bodinaku 2001/2002), Luaras (Aliu 2004), Shtikë (Aliu 1996), Prodan (Aliu 1984), Rehovë (Aliu 2012), Barç (Andrea 1996), Kamenicë (Agolli 2009), Shuec (Andrea 2009/2010), Lofkënd (Papadopoulos, Bejko, and Morris 2007; Pevnick and Agolli 2014), Gërmenj (Andrea 1981), Cërujë (Andrea 1997), Apollonia (Amore 2010), Burrel (Kurti 1999), Krumë (Jubani 1982), Myç-Has (Bela 1990). and Shtoj (Koka 2012).

5.d.1. Pottery Fabric

Fabric becomes a salient parameter during the Early Iron Age. Particular trends especially in the firing intensity and surface treatment favor different areas. Unfortunately due to insufficient evidence, systematic analysis of individual vessels cannot be conducted. As mentioned earlier, for most sites, both in settlements and tumuli, the characteristics of the pottery fabric are only briefly considered in a broader perspective offering general narratives on the clay composition, firing intensity, surface treatment or the color of the exterior surface. Prendi mentions the foundation of a few regional trends during the Early Iron Age such as the fine light ware that is highly oxidized, evenly fired with reddish to orange color on the exterior surface, usually accompanied with matt-painted decoration, around Korçë basin and Kolonjë plateau, as well as the fine dark to semi-coarse ware, not evenly fired with gray to brown color, distributed in Pazhok, Gajtan and the tumuli of Burrel (Prendi 1974, 108).

From a closer inspection of the available data, however, pottery ware gains individual features at every site and if systematically collected and treated it would have a great potential for the understanding of the common or individual choices on pottery. Graph 12 only displays an approximate distribution of three main pottery wares, confirming somewhat the trends established earlier by Prendi. Regrettably, more comprehensive data can only be collected from the tumuli of Barç, Kamenicë, Shuec, Apollonia, Lofkënd and to a certain extent at Dukat and Pazhok. The analyses at these sites could contribute to a better grasp of the composition and treatment of fabric at a local level and to what extent various parameters, like the composition of clay, firing intensity, and surface treatment are to be perceived in terms of regional interactions.

The tumulus of Barç has been recognized as the motherland of the so-called "Devollian ware" during the Early Iron Age (Andrea 1985; Prendi 1974). According to Andrea the fine light ware, with rare inclusions, evenly fired, orange to red in color, usually finished with matt-painted decoration, is the most popular choice (Andrea 1985). At least from the material displayed in the Archaeological Museum of Tirana, this uniformity may be called into question. Plates 5 and 7 only offer a glimpse of the assemblage. However, even within this small collection a greater variability can be noted which clearly challenges the claims of either Andrea or Prendi. Within the category of the fine ware at least four different groups can easily be distinguished: 1) fine light, highly oxidized, evenly fired, reddish color, polished or burnished on the exterior surface with matt-painted or incised decoration; 2) fine dark, black color, evenly burnished on the surface accompanied with relief decoration; 3) fine dark, gray color burnished or smoothed on the exterior surface, plain or with plastic decoration and 4) dark fine ware, dark gray in color, smoothed on the surface and decorated with matt-painted decoration. An additional category is that of the semi-coarse ware consistently associated with large-sized vessels.

The pottery ware in the tumulus of Kamenicë is impressively uniform, characterized by light fine ware, highly oxidized and evenly fired with reddish, orange to pale yellow color, smoothed or polished on surface. The fine dark ware is incidental, appearing very rarely in one or two vessels (Bejko Forthcoming). In the tumulus of Shuec both fine light and dark are equally represented. The fine light ware is evenly fired, reddish to orange color and polished on surface. The fine dark ware is evenly fired, dark gray color and burnished on surface accompanied with relief decoration (Andrea 2009/2010, 240). Tumulus 10 in Apollonia offers a uniform repertoire characterized by fine dark ware, not evenly fired, gray to black in color, smoothed on the surface and usually accompanied by incised decoration (Amore 2010, 597). The repertoire at the tumulus

of Lofkënd is sharply divided into two groups: 1) fine light ware evenly fired, highly oxidized yellow to orange in color, accompanied by matt-painted and plastic decoration and 2) fine dark evenly fired, dark gray to black in color, burnished on the surface with relief decoration (Pevnick and Agolli 2014). In the tumuli of Dukat pottery is uniformly made of a semi-coarse ware with abundant inclusions, fired at a low temperature, without any treatment of the surface. The tumuli of Pazhok have a uniform repertoire as well, largely consisting of fine dark ware, gray in color, burnished on the surface and finished with wide vertical ribbing (Bodinaku 1982, 70).

Significant uniformity with frequent light fine ware is present at the tumuli of Rehovë, Luaras, Prodan, Shtikë, and Kamenicë. The coexistence of fine light and dark is notable in the tumuli of Barç, Shuec, Rapckë, Piskovë, and Lofkënd. The fine dark ware is prevalent in the tumuli of Pazhok and to a much lesser degree in the cemeteries of Gërmenj, Shtoj, Krumë, Myç-Has, and Kënetë and the settlements of Gajtan and Zagorë. Some type of coexistence between the light fine and semi-coarse ware is noted in the tumuli of Vodhinë, Patos, and Çepunë. Salient choices not clearly associated with any of the above traits are observed in the tumuli of Apollonia and Dukat.

It must be said, however, that individual choices applied at each site dominate against the regional traits or models. The area of influence of the fine light fabric or the so-called "Devollian Ware" can be solidly established among Kolonjë plateau, Korçë basin and Vjosë valley. Accurate ratios between the inherited and innovative choices cannot be determined, although at a broader scale, a certain continuation of the Bronze Age fine dark tradition can be claimed, especially in Barç and Shuec.

During the Early Iron Age the fine dark ware gains extensive popularity in Pazhok. Some sporadic presence is also noticed in the north with a particular concentration in Shtoj. The exclusive choices solely associated with local treats appear in the tumuli of Dukat and perhaps Apollonia. Even in these cases, a few non-local traits are present.

5.d.2. Vessel Formation

Settlements yield fragmentary evidence mostly consisting of nearly complete vessels or sherds. Sporadic continuity with the Late Bronze Age is encountered in Zagorë and Tren. Other sites like Gajtan, Liqeth, and Katundas emerge during the Early Iron Age. Each site is characterized by considerable variability and groups with particular attributes belonging to a particular system of values are barely defined. The settlement of Zagorë offers remnants of various forms varying from small closed to large open vessels. In Liqeth as well the only group is that of two-handled vessels. Greater quantity of data is encountered in the settlement of Gajtan. However, the key diagram dissolves into various groups each represented by one to four small to large size vessels without defining salient features either on a local or regional perspective.

The tumuli offer a greater quantity of data, reflecting at best site traditions and regional interactions. Taking into consideration the spatial distribution, the data occurrence at a significantly higher concentration is noted among the river valleys of Shkumbin, Vjosë and Drinos, Korçë basin and Kolonjë plateau. In the north the data from the tumuli is increasingly sporadic. The tumuli of Kënetë, Shtoj and Burrel have one to two vessels that date to the Early Iron Age. A few more vessels are found in the tumuli of Krumë. Even in this case, however, the size of the repertoires does not define any clear tendency or pattern.

There are numerous sites that not only produce a considerable quantity of pottery but also offer a particular concentration of parameters highlighting individual and shared values. A corpusof 15 tumuli is selected here. Initially I deal with the tumuli that have yielded a greater amount of evidence such as those of Rehovë, Luaras, Prodan, Barç, Kamenicë, and Patos. Following these, the tumuli with smaller quantities of pottery where salient groups can be defined are considered. Included here are the tumuli of Pazhok, Patos, Lofkënd, Dukat, Apollonia, Shuec, Vodhinë, Piskovë, Rapckë, and the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj.

The shared system of concepts in the tumulus of Rehovë displays clear continuity with the Late Bronze Age tradition. The vessels with loop handles become increasingly popular either by maintaining the features noted during the Late Bronze Age (as in P56, P63, P71, P81, P88, P89 and P90) or adapted to other types of vessel forms creating smaller and fragmentary groups. Included here are P55, P58, P70, P83, P93, P95 and P96. The groups with wishbone handles or cylindrical lugs at turn point continue with similar frequency during the Early Iron Age (P66, P68, P87 and P78, P82). The vessels with vertical handles rising above the rim are again popular indicating some type of variability and divide themselves into four groups, ranging from one to four vessels: P91; P108; P80, P94; P60, P75, P92 and P109. The vessels with horizontal handles as well are easily divided into three groups P77; P85; P102. Continuity with the Late Bronze Age is also noted within the group of the two-handled vessels. The vessels with wishbone handles (P57, P62, P65, P67, P72, P84 and P97) and those with cylindrical lug at turn point (P64, P73 and P79) are the most popular within this category. The two-handled vessels with handles rising above the rim (P69, P74 and P98) are equally popular in both periods. The double vessels, however, inherited from the Late Bronze Age, show a high degree of diversity and are broken down into four groups either by handle location or base form: P99; P101; P103; P105.

The individual properties are rarely associated either with a given group, such as that of the vessels with two vertical handles below rim (P76, P100, P104 and P106), or that of strut handles P54 and P107, or with unique categories such as that of the small vessel with two horizontal pierced handles (P59).

The properties belonging to the shared system of values can be easily defined as local developments of Rehovë, although the diversity relies heavily on a tradition founded since the Late Bronze Age. The significant rate of the inherited values during the Early Iron Age solidifies the shared system of concepts (Table 52).

The individual properties are largely associated with the innovative features (Table 52). Some of them seem to belong to individual local expressions that do not become popular. In this group are included the vessels with two vertical handles below the rim (P76, P100, P104 and P106). The individual properties that remain largely isolated are the strut handles P54 and P107 and the small vessel with two horizontal handles P59.

The tumulus of Luaras offers an impressively innovative repertoire. The shared system of concepts is solidly represented by several groups of vessels. The one-handled vessels are configured in two categories: the strut handles (P21, P23, P29, P32, P35, P52, P53, P54, P55, P56 and P58) and the vertical handles rising above the rim (P19, P20, P22, P26, P28, P48, P49, P50 and P51). Variability in base and body form distinguishes both groups. However, two attributes such as the handle quantity and location become salient and unifying features. The group with two vertical handles rising above the rim is the most stable within the Early Iron Age repertoire and indicates variability solely in the base form (P17, P30, P31, P59, P61, P62, P63, P64, P65, P66, P67, P68, P70 and P71). The double vessels form a consistent group within the

shared system (P24, P36, P38, P39, P73, P74, P75, P76, P77 and P78). Attributes such as the handle location, base, body and neck form interfere with the unity of this group. However, as with the strut handles, key variables such as vessel form and handle quantity serve as unifying features. Lesser variety is noted with the vessels with vertical handles below the rim which, beside the similar attributes in handle quantity and location, are easily divided into groups with one (P25, P40 and P47, P44 and P45) or two vessels (P27 and P37).

The individual concepts derived from the shared system of concepts can be easily associated with several individual choices applied within groups that belong to the shared system of concepts. However, within this category are included a few vessels, although the similar qualitative attributes of the vessel form are too weak to create any group (P18, P41, P42).

The individual concepts represent a minority solely associated with the vessel with two vertical handles below the rim (P34), two vessels with horizontal handles but of different size (P60 and P72), the vessel with two small pierced handles on shoulder and pointy base (P33) and the tall vessel with raised concave base (P43).

The high degree of innovation at Luaras is exclusively related with the shared system of concepts. The features inherited from the Late Bronze Age are cohesively intertwined within the shared system (Table 53). On the other hand the individual concepts are easily grouped among the innovative features and their rare presence will be discussed when the regional interactions are treated.

The shared system of concepts in the tumulus of Prodan consists of three groups without any particular internal solidarity. The loop-handled vessels (P18, P19, P22, P24, P25 and P26), vessels with vertical handles rising above the rim (P05, P06, P12, P15, P27) and vessels with two

vertical handles rising above the rim (P11, P14, P16, P17, P20 and P21). Attributes such as base and body form are more salient and easily divide each group into smaller categories comprised by one, two, three or four vessels.

Few individual concepts derived from the shared system such as the loop-handled vessel with raised base (P22), the open vessel with two handles rising above the rim (P07), the vessels with wishbone handle (P20), and the vessel with spout (P29) are easily distinguished.

The individual concepts coincide with single vessels that in the key diagram either dissolve from the very first stage of classification, such as the four-handled vessel (P10), open short vessel (P28), the so-called pottery spoon (P17), the double vessel (P23), or show highly diverse attributes within a certain group, such as the open one-handled vessel with raised base (P09).

The inherited versus innovative features are prevalent in Prodan (Table 54). However, despite the significant increase in quantity and the continuation of preceding traditions during the Early Iron Age, within the cohesive groups associated with the shared system of concepts at least 12 vessels may be included (P18, P19, P26; P05, P12, P15; P14, P16 and P11, P17, P20, P21).

The shared system of concepts in the tumulus of Barç coincides with several groups introduced during the Early Iron Age. The vessels with loop handles (P03, P04, P05, P08, P09, P59 and P61) show a great degree of cohesiveness when divided solely by size or the handle treatment. For instance P03 offers the combination of the loop and wishbone handle. The vessels with handles rising above the rim form a large group (P06, P11, P12, P17, P21, P22, P38, P39, P45, P47, P48, P63, P67, P69, P72 and P77) that through further classification by base and body form is fragmented into six categories each with one to six vessels. The group of vessels with

two vertical handles rising above the rim is the largest group of the repertoire. According to the handle location this group is divided into three categories: handles simply rising above the rim (P06, P08, P13, P16, P20, P23, P25 and P40), wishbone handles (P31, P44, P74, P75 and P76), and handles with rectangular lug at turn point (P62 and P68). The large-sized two-handled vessels create groups of one or two vessels (P32, P43; P30, P52; P37, P71; P11). Minor and diverse groups containing two to three vessels are the large four-handled vessels (P09 and P27) and the double vessels (P10, P15 and P51).

The individual concepts derived from the shared system coincide with a group of vessels with one vertical handle below the rim (P33, P35, P36, P54 and P55). They belong to a shared system of concept but contain salient attributes easily dissolved into five to six groups. The triple vessel P46 is considered to be a derivative version of the double vessels. The short and tall closed vessels (P14 and P52) and the vessel with strut handle (P07) are also included here.

Within the repertoire a high number of individual concepts is noted, expressed in different vessels with salient attributes including the open vessel with one handle and disc base (P64), the vessel with horizontal handle (P78), the tripod (P61), and the two-handled vessel (P10).

The innovative and inherited features show nearly equal values (Table 55). However, the Early Iron Age repertoire at the Barç tumulus offers a repertoire that relies heavily on the shared system of concepts. The number of the individual choices derived from the shared concept, despite their diversity, maintains key traits that closely associate them with the shared system. The very particular choices excluded from the other two groups are grouped with the individual concepts that need to be treated further in the regional perspective.

The shared system in the tumulus of Kamenicë is crystallized in five groups. The vessels with a vertical strut handle (Q509, Q510, Q523, Q550, Q551, Q1699, Q1534, Q2096, Q2097 and Q2119) indicate a certain degree of variability, especially with the base treatment and the strut handle. However, this may be considered a classic group in which shared and individual choices are harmoniously combined. The vessels with one handle rising above the rim (Q001, Q171, Q469, Q508, Q524, Q801, Q1495, Q1715, Q1898, Q1971, Q2116, Q2117, Q2144, Q2179, Q2155, Q2156 and Q2307) comprise the largest group which, based on base and body form, is subdivided into various groups. Among the individual choices may be grouped the open one-handled and spouted vessel (P803 and P1495). The vessels with two vertical handles rising above the rim (Q531, Q965, Q1874, Q1888, Q2130, Q2134 and Q2137) display a plausible degree of cohesion with certain variability of base and body form. The four-handled vessels (Q462, Q472, Q527 and Q1893) own common attributes. The neck form and size break it down into four groups. The double vessels (Q1876, Q2149, Q2173 and Q2174) indicate handle location as an attribute that divides the group into two categories.

The individual concepts derived from the shared system are associated with seven vessels which have attributes noted in the shared system, combined with salient parameters not creating any group with their close counterparts (Q1645, Q1737; Q540, Q1891, Q1899, Q1050, Q2094). The individual concepts can be related solely with a restored two-handled vessel (P541).

The inherited features in the tumulus of Kamenicë are prevalent and this weakens the degree of innovation. In any case, however, the attributes of the repertoire become crucial elements within the shared system of concepts. The individual concepts derived from the shared system indicate a degree of variability though conceptually they remain integrated with the shared systems. As seen already the individual concepts can barely be defined.

The shared system of concepts in the tumulus of Patos is distinctively expressed in three groups: vessels with one vertical handle rising above the rim (P13, P15, P16 and P18), the vessels with two vertical handles rising above the rim (P10, P11, P19, P21, P23 and P25) and the double vessels (P05, P07, P09 and P17). The one-handled and double vessels have distinctive attributes on base, body or neck form, thus are easily divided into smaller groups with one or two vessels at most. The two-handled vessels show a greater degree of homogeneity divided only by base form in two categories of two and four vessels. The individual concepts derived from the shared system are hardly defined. Perhaps the vessel P12 with a vertical handle above the rim and raised concave base may be included here. Its attributes if taken separately are easily encountered in other vessels within the repertoire. In the group of the individual concepts are included the vessels that mark a rare occurrence at Patos whereas at other sites they are particularly frequent. Included here are vessels with strut handles (P06 and P08) and the loop handle (P14). Also included in this group is the open vessel with one horizontal handle (P20), which represents distinctive features hardly encountered anywhere else.

There are a number of tumuli that despite their limited quantity yield one or two cohesive groups. The tumuli of Pazhok, Lofkënd, Vodhinë, Shuec, Piskovë and the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj are included here. The shared system of concepts in the tumulus of Pazhok coincides with a single group coinciding of 5 vessels with two vertical handles rising above the rim (P07, P08, P10, P11 and P13). Each vessel included here has a similar number of qualitative attributes sharply distinctive from the rest of the repertoire.

The individual concepts derived from the shared system consist of two vessels, P09 and P12, that are separated from the main group based on the handle quantity or the base form.

Within the individual concepts is included the vessel with two horned handles P15 and a large sized vessel with two horizontal handles P14. Each of them has salient features not combined with the rest of the repertoire.

The inherited values in the tumulus of Patos are increasingly significant and the shared concepts are integrally rooted in the tradition of the Late Bronze Age (Table 58). The few individual choices are regarded as innovative features and their sporadic appearance will be further analyzed in the regional perspective.

The shaft cemetery of Gërmenj, despite the limited quantity, offers a group of three vessels with identical traits regarding the vessel forming (P08, P09, and P10).

The shared system of concepts in the tumulus of Lofkënd is expressed in two distinctive small groups: vessels with one vertical handle rising above the rim (P06, P10, P12, and P14) and vessels with two handles rising above the rim (P08 and P09). The base form divides the first group in two categories with one and three vessels respectively.

The individual concepts derived from the shared system are associated with two strut-handled vessels (P13 and P15) that do not either belong to or create any group on their own. However, they both represent a neat combination between popular features of the repertoire such as base, body and neck form with salient parameters such as the strut handle that for Lofkënd constitutes a rare element.

The individual concepts are encountered in three distinctive forms that within the repertoire have no counterparts: a vessel with one horizontal handle above the rim (P11), a vessel with two-horned vertical handle rising above the rim (P07), and the large vessel P16.

The tumulus of Lofkënd during the Early Iron Age yields patterns that rely heavily on the preceding tradition of the Late Bronze Age (Table 57). The newly established parameters only become peripheral elements related with individual choices either associated with isolated expressions at the site or perhaps influences from outsiders.

There is a chronological discrepancy with the tumulus of Vodhinë. Bejko in a recent study dates the so-called dippers P04, P09 and P10 to the Middle to Late Bronze Age (Bejko 1994, 111-13). Given these circumstances, what can be attributed to the Early Iron Age narrows to seven vessels. The shared system of concepts coincides in three groups each containing two or three vessels: open two-handled vessels with vertical handles below the rim (P03 and P05), and two-handled vessels with vertical handles above the rim (P01, P02 and P07).

The shared system in the tumulus of Shuec is limited to one group with vessels with one vertical handle above the rim (P01, P02, P04, P05 and P06). Base and body form break it down into four categories. The individual concepts are easily distinguished with the strut-handled vessel (P03).

The shared values in the tumulus of Piskovë include three groups with two vessels each: vessels with vertical handles below rim (P11 and P12), one-handled cut-away neck vessels (P13 and P15) and short closed vessels (P07 and P08). The individual concepts include four vessels (P06, P09, P10 and P14).

The tumuli of Dukat offer a single group with similar properties and a considerable number of vessels belonging to the individual concept derive from the shared system. The shared system of concepts consists of three open vessels with horizontal handle (P13, P21 and P22). Even in this case the variability of base form divides the group into two categories. Within the

group of the individual concepts derived from the shared system are included several vessels, each of which shows a combination of salient attributes in handle quantity and location, base and body form without creating any group (P08, P09, P12, P15, P14, P17, P18, P19 and P20). In the individual concepts only the double vessel (P16) is included.

Several tumuli such as Apollonia, Bajkaj, Rapckë, Shtikë, Shtoj, Vajzë, and Çepunë do not even create a group of shared concepts. However, several attributes give interesting insights regarding the configuration of the regional interactions.

An analysis of vessel formation offers great potential regarding the configuration of the regional and intra-regional interactions. I deal separately with each division within the conceptual system, attempting to define spatial distribution of the shared concepts, individual derived from shared system, and the individual concepts and analyze to what extent they shape the regional and intra-regional interactions during the Early Iron Age. In so doing four different groups of concepts that gain particular meaning within a site or regional perspective are treated.

The group of *shared concepts exclusively associated with one site* includes those groups of vessels that belong to the shared system of concepts and mark a unique appearance only at one site. This dimension is noted in the tumuli of Rehovë, Barç, Dukat, Piskovë, and Lofkënd, occupying a small proportion within each repertoire. In the tumulus of Rehovë this coincides with three groups: those with wishbone handles, and handles with cylindrical lug at turn point, occurring on one and two-handled vessels. Each group is inherited from the Late Bronze Age. It is rather hard to distinguish any group from the tumulus of Barç; however, it seems that two vessels with two vertical handles and rectangular lug at turn point and the large four-handled vessels do not occur anywhere else in the Early Iron Age repertoire. The only group attributed to

the shared system of concepts in Dukat tumulus belongs to this category. The vessels with raised narrow base and horizontal handle above rim do not meet any counterpart during the Early Iron Age. In the tumulus of Piskovë as well both groups associated with the shared system, the vessels with cut-away neck and those with vertical handles below the rim, remain a salient feature to this site. Two vessels with vertical handles above the rim at Lofkënd tumulus show distinctive features not encountered anywhere.

The *group of shared concepts distributed in more than one site* includes groups of vessels that belong to the shared conceptual system and are encountered in two or more sites. Te group of vessels with one vertical handle above the rim is frequent at several tumuli including Kamenicë, Barç, Prodan, Luaras, Rehovë, Shuec, Patos, and Lofkënd. It must be said that at each site this group gains salient local attributes in base, body, neck form and size. However, conceptually this continues to represent the output of similar qualitative choices produced by many artisans The group of vessels with two vertical handles above the rim is equally frequent if not more popular and encountered in the tumuli of Barç, Kamenicë, Luaras, Rehovë, Prodan, Pazhok, Gërmenj, and Vodhinë. A certain degree of variability is noted within this group as well. The salient attributes coincide with local traits and choices gained at various sites. In any case, this variability does not compromise the conceptual unity of the group.

In addition, limited distribution is noted of four types of vessels: those with loop handles, strut handles, vessels with two wishbone handles, and double vessels. The loop handles continue to be a popular phenomenon in the tumulus of Rehovë, appear for the first time in the tumulus of Barç, and create a fragmentary group in the tumulus of Prodan. The strut handles are very frequent in both Kamenicë and Luaras. The double vessels also become popular in Luaras but are less frequent at Rehovë, Kamenicë, Barç and Patos.

This group indicates two traits regarding the intraregional and regional interaction. The first regards a broad regional interaction based on general attributes of vessel formation. Particular trends among different sites cannot be pinpointed here. However, it is likely that the shared system of concepts on popular vessel forms is widely distributed among numerous sites without favoring a particular type of interaction.

The second trait favors reciprocal interactions between two sites and in this case three trends are clear. The presence of the strut-handled vessels at both Luaras and Kamenicë indicates an interaction between them. The almost equal intensity of the data and the contemporaneous appearance of the strut handle at both sites do not make it possible to identify either Luaras or Kamenicë as the primary site for this type. However, this represents the first case of a closer and dual reciprocal intra-regional interaction. The presence of the loop handles in Rehovë and Barç comprises another dual interaction. In this case, however, the leader can easily be pointed out. The loop handles comprise a popular choice at the tumulus of Rehovë since the Late Bronze Age. However, in the tumulus of Barç they do not appear earlier than the Early Iron Age. Given the chronology, this dual interaction gives a leading position to Rehovë. It should be noted, however, that the repertoire of the loop handles at the Barç tumulus gains a few salient and perhaps local attributes not encountered so far at any other site. Present here are large-sized loop-handled vessels and also in one case a unique wishbone loop-handled vessel, a rare phenomenon within the Early Iron Age assemblage. The Rehovë and Barç interaction continues with the vessels with two wishbone handles, a group that is hardly popular during the Early Iron Age. In this case, however, even taking into account the earlier appearance in the Rehovë tumulus, it cannot be given the leading role on account of the quantitative profile. The wishbone handles comprise a popular phenomenon in the Middle and Late Bronze Age repertoire in the settlement

of Maliq, which is impressively close to the tumulus of Barç. Thus an earlier influence from Maliq to Barç may be considered as well.

The double vessels show a wider distribution that is, however, confined to Luaras, Rehovë, Barç, Kamenicë, and Patos. The tumulus of Luaras offers the largest group of the double vessels. Lesser intensity is noted at Kamenicë and Barç; at both sites, however, the double vessels show distinctive elaborated features like the handle treatment or the base form. Only by considering the intensity can Luaras be considered as a core site that greatly influences the others. The double vessel, however, cannot be considered an exclusive form of the Early Iron Age. During the Late Bronze Age it marks sporadic occurrences at the tumulus of Rehovë. It seems, however, that in Early Iron Age at Rehovë the attributes of the double vessels are completely renovated and at least two of the vessels are very similar to those of Luaras, which plays an important role in this multi-site interaction. However, the local choices in various aspects of the vessel forming are equally strong and the double vessels represent a case in which intra-regional interactions combined with individual local expression coexist integrally.

The *shared concepts of one or several sites become individual concepts at other sites* includes the vessels that belong to consistent groupings at one or more sites but mark occasional appearance at other sites. The strut handles create solid groups in Luaras and Kamenicë but are widely distributed with limited quantity at many sites like Rehovë, Barç, Prodan, Shuec, Patos, Lofkënd, Vodhinë, and Vajzë. The double vessels are even more popular, creating clear groups in the tumuli of Luaras, Rehovë, Kamenicë, Barç, and Patos. Their sporadic appearance is noted at various sites, mainly in the south at Prodan, Piskovë, Dukat, Çepunë, and Vajzë. The vessels with two vertical handles above the rim at Pazhok are less frequent in the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj and at the tumuli of Çepunë, Shtoj, and Kënetë. This model indicates intraregional

interaction that refers to a core area based either in the Korcë basin or the Kolonjë plateau following a radial direction. In both cases, however, the highly innovative elements appearing during the Early Iron Age in the Korçë and Kolonjë areas have a crucial impact on the intra-regional interactions. The tumulus of Pazhok as well indicates some type of influence at adjacent sites such as that of Gërmenj and other sites in the north and south.

The *group of the individual concepts derived from the shared system* includes variables that are widely distributed in many repertoires. They are mostly associated with individual choices that enrich or elaborate particular vessels without creating any type of groups or patterns. This is better noted within the repertoires of Gajtan, Zagorë, Krumë, Burrel, Apollonia, Dukat, Piskovë, Rapckë, and Bajkaj. The pottery assemblages are comprised of numerous vessels. In any case, however, through the classification system they dissolve immediately without creating any groupings. Moreover at some sites such as those of Apollonia, Dukat, and Bajkaj the individual concepts comprise salient parameters hardly found anywhere else.

Several sites that have yielded solid groups such as those at Rehovë, Luaras, Barç, and Kamenicë indicate various individual traits within a pattern. In this case the degree of variability within a group is associated with exterior influences, individual decisions of an artisan, old-fashioned parameters or innovative elements that perhaps become popular in a later phase.

Due to its heterogeneity this type of traits can hardly highlight any type of interactions. However, several groups such as those with the strut handles at Patos, Rehovë and Lofkënd represent a neat combination between the applications of the new traits into a local system of concepts that is complementary to the interaction model yielded from the previous group.

The *group of the individual concepts* is associated with a small group of vessels. They have highly unique parameters that usually do not meet any counterpart. Few vessels encountered exclusively in tumuli are part of this group. They are characterized by highly elaborative features, and it is rather difficult to explain their presence. However, perhaps they can be associated with forms not necessarily a target of ritual purposes or individual choices of highly skilled artisans.

To sum up, the Early Iron Age offers an impressive amount of data that in terms of the regional and intra-regional interactions yields a threefold picture.

First and foremost in the regional perspective, the rule of proximity between two sites no longer is the exclusive model of interactions. Moreover, the order established between Rehovë and Luaras during the Late Bronze Age is no longer valid. The innovation rates at both sites largely reflect this as well. The high innovation rate at Luaras versus high rate of inherited values at Rehovë confirms the foundation of a local profile at Luaras not related at all to that of Rehovë. In addition the difference in preferences between Luaras and Kamenicë and those of Rehovë and Barç indicate selective choices not conditioned by proximity. The only case where proximity seems to play a relative role is that between Pazhok and Gërmenj.

Second, the intra-regional interactions indicate unidirectional routes. The Korçë basin and Kolonjë plateau play a crucial role in this. It is very clear that the vessels highly popular in Korçë and Kolonjë become less frequent at any other site in the north, west or south. At any rate, these traits indicate a neat combination of exterior influences and local traits. The tumulus of Pazhok pioneers another type of intraregional interactions sporadically distributed from north to south.

With both cases, however, an interesting phenomenon is the establishment of distinctive patterns that influence the repertoires of sites in the surrounding regions.

Third is that several sites, such as Dukat and Apollonia, remain unaffected by any type of interaction during the Early Iron Age. No solid groups are created. However, each site is resistant towards the non-local influence. The few influences are sharply divided from the features that belong to the local repertoire. This self-isolation is perhaps conditioned by the low demographic profile of these communities rather than by a deliberate choice tending to create a socio-cultural boundary.

5.d.3. Decoration

Decoration becomes a common phenomenon at several sites, indicating in some cases a preference for a given technique or decorative style. Considerable data is collected from the repertoires of Luaras, Barç, and Kamenicë. Other sites such as Rehovë, Patos, Lofkënd, Pazhok, Tren, Prodan, Piskovë, Rapckë, and Zagorë offer less evidence. Sporadic presence of decoration techniques is noted at sites with limited number of vessels.

The tumulus of Luaras can easily be considered as the motherland of plastic decoration during the Early Iron Age. The plastic applications occur with several forms of projections including conical, short, semi-arched, diagonal and elongated. The conical projections are the most popular, occurring in 16 vessels. The others mark a rarer occurrence. Incised decoration is sporadically applied to a few one-handled vessels, mostly consisting of zigzags appearing as interrupted or continuous, short diagonals and hatched pendent triangles. The matt-painted decoration coincides with a group of intersected zigzags, lozenge and triple horizontal lines entirely applied on a two-handled vessel.

The tumulus of Barç yields a distinctively variable repertoire developing every type of decorative technique encountered in the Early Iron Age. The matt-paint is dominant among other types of techniques including incised, plastic, relief, punched decoration. Not only in terms of quantity, the matt-painted decoration at Barç yields as well highly sophisticated motifs. The most popular are the pendent triangles on the body, either hatched with diagonals or solid, and the wavy bands around neck. Numerous motifs such as the cross-hatched rhomboids, checkerboard design and horizontal lines hatched with diagonals, zigzags, and lozenges occur much more rarely. The incised decoration is only applied on a few vessels. It either displays new motifs such as the horizontal lines hatched with zigzags, upright and pendent inscribed triangles, or repeats a version noted as well with the matt-painted decoration such as the zigzags. Plastic decoration is also common. The conical projections are the most frequent, appearing as a unique element or coexisting with the incised and matt-painted techniques on a few vessels. Other types of decoration like the wide wavy and vertical ribbing, elongated projections and punched dots only appear once.

In the tumulus of Kamenicë plastic decoration expressed mainly with conical projections is prevalent. Other types such as the elongated or circular projections occur once. The matt-painted decoration gains exceptional popularity in Kamenicë. The pendent triangles hatched with diagonals are more frequent against the crossed-hatched and narrow triangles with elongated apex or those hatched with vertical lines. A newly established array of motifs consisting of wheat-ear motif, lattice band, solid lozenge with dots at center, horizontal rows hatched with diagonals, cross-hatched lozenges and double guiles mark exclusive occurrences. The incised technique is less frequent. Zigzags and short pendent triangles hatched with diagonals occur on three vessels.

Lesser variability and quantity in noted at other sites. In the tumulus of Rehovë the sporadic presence of three techniques is noted. The matt-painted decoration occurs in a combination of horizontal and toothed lines with strokes applied on a vessel with two vertical handles. The incised decoration is encountered in two cases as zigzags or twisted zigzags. Finger impressions are applied on a large vessel.

The decoration at the tumulus of Lofkënd is based on three main techniques: matt-painted, plastic application and relief. The matt-painted decoration is increasingly popular but restricted to pendent triangles hatched with diagonals on the body and horizontal lines on the neck. In every case it appears accompanied with conical projections. The narrow diagonal or vertical ribbing is very finely made, occurring on three vessels.

Several decorative techniques occur in the tumulus of Patos including incised, plastic, matt-painted, punched and relief. The incised technique yields several versions of zigzag: interrupted, intersected at apex and so on. The conical and oval projections, punched dots, wide diagonal ribbing upright and pendent triangles are occasional.

The tumulus of Pazhok introduces one decorative technique coinciding with the wide diagonal ribbing.

In the settlement of Tren a few sherds with matt-painted decoration were collected. Given their fragmentary state, not much can be said about the motifs. However, glimpses of pendent triangles hatched with diagonals, concentric circles or horizontal rows are visible on numerous fragments.

The tumulus of Prodan offers a limited repertoire of motifs that occur once or twice. The conical projections, matt-painted horizontal lines, short diagonals and incised dots are those that occur most frequently.

The matt-painted decoration is an exclusive decorative trait in the tumuli of Piskovë and Rapckë. Due to the fragmentary state of publication the remnants of several decorative motifs such as the hatched upright and cross-hatched pendent triangles, lattice, lozenges and horizontal lines are those occurring most frequently.

The incised decoration is the most frequent technique in tumulus 10 at Apollonia. The groups of zigzags are placed around the neck or along the body. The spectacle motif and the wide cross-hatched row around the neck are highly unique. The wide diagonal ribbing is encountered on one vessel.

The settlement of Zagorë offers an array of various fragments with finger impressions, diagonal and vertical ribbing, conical projections and fewer incised motifs.

Decoration is casual at a number of sites with limited pottery repertoires. The incised zigzags and diagonal ribbing are recorded in the tumulus of Dukat. The diagonal ribbing and punched dots are found in Shtoj. The diagonal ribbing is also occasional in the tumuli of Krumë, Kënetë and Çepunë and in the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj. Short and vertical ribbing and conical projections are noted in the tumulus of Shuec. The conical projections appear once in the tumuli of Vodhinë. Matt-painted decoration is sporadic in the tumuli of Vodhinë and in the settlement of Liqeth.

Decoration becomes a crucial aspect in the pottery of the Early Iron Age. Particular parameters such as the selection of clay, application of motifs, and firing intensity are carefully

treated and in several cases decoration versus the other types of functional attributes either receives equal or a greater deal of attention.

The distribution and qualitative features of the decorative motifs and techniques underlines several traits regarding the regional and intra-regional networks.

The first includes a group of sites that produces consistent shared concepts and fewer individual features. Luaras, Barç, and Kamenicë are included here. The decoration technique at Luaras involves the plastic applications creating various versions of several forms of projections. The unique features relate to incised or matt-painted motifs appearing once. The tumulus of Barç offers a different profile largely characterized by matt-painted motifs, more often the pendent triangles and conical, elongated and circular projections. The individual features relate to highly sophisticated matt-painted and incised motifs, occasional diagonal and vertical ribbing and punched dots. The most frequent type in Kamenicë is the plastic decoration usually accompanied with matt-painted motifs. The individual assets consist of several sophisticated matt-painted motifs that occur once. The incised decoration either imitates matt-painted motifs or represents a few simple features like the zigzags.

The reduction in number of sites with consistent quantity of decoration indicates a trait that remains an alternative element chosen only by a selection of sites in Korçë and Kolonjë. Regarding the regional interaction, these three sites offer a two-fold picture. They all develop a similar shared system of concepts regarding the decorative techniques but create a single preference, not necessarily exclusive. Luaras favors the plastic applications whereas Kamenicë or Barç include more matt-painted motifs and plastic applications. Some types of difference that cannot be sharply divided associates with the presence of the individual traits that are either old-

fashioned elements, such as the incised decoration that is largely similar at every site, or strictly individual local features.

The rule of proximity shapes to some degree the nature of interactions. Therefore Barç and Kamenicë can be barely divided from one another in terms of the decorativetechniques and the shared system they develop. Luaras is active as well in this group;' however, perhaps by choice it only develops a shared system based on a particular trait popular as well at Barç and Kamenicë.

In the second group are included sites that develop a solid shared system such as Lofkënd and Pazhok. Both tumuli maintain a clear background referring to one or two types of decorative traits. Lofkënd yields two different techniques: the matt-painted consistently combined with the plastic applications, and the narrow vertical or diagonal ribbing. Pazhok instead produces solely the wide diagonal ribbing. Lofkënd follows a dual interaction between the matt-painted tradition of Kamenicë and narrow ribbing with uncertain provenance. Perhaps this development at Lofkënd is the local version springing from ribbing influence of Pazhok. In the settlement of Zagorë only few traits with narrow ribbing are encountered. Some type of influence from the north, considering its presence at Nezir during the Early Bronze Age, may be considered as well.

The third group involves sites that offer sporadic samples of one or a few techniques that do not create any grouping; however, they indicate some type of intra-regional interactions. The most impressive is the distribution of the wide diagonal ribbing found occasionally at several sites including Shtoj, Kënetë, Krumë, Gërmenj, Apollonia, Patos, Dukat, and Çepunë. This decorative trait appears sporadically during the Late Bronze Age in the tumuli of Pazhok, increasing its popularity during the Early Iron Age. Thus some provenance from Pazhok needs to

be considered. Its wide distribution may be attributed to the central location of Pazhok and to a chain influence at other sites in the north and south.

The matt-painted motifs and the plastic applications occur sporadically in the settlement of Liqeth and the tumuli of Shuec, Vajzë, and Vodhinë. Provenance in this case may be persuasively attributed to the Korçë basin.

Several sites develop only a few decorative traits that hardly meet any counterpart. The matt-painted decoration of Piskovë and Rapckë can be occasionally associated with that of Barç or Kamenicë. Pazhok also develops more similarities with the Korcë basin. Prodan and Rehovë develop particular matt-painted motifs hardly to be associated with those in Korçë basin. Apollonia only offers an old fashioned trend of the incised decoration, not highlighting any type of interaction.

In addition, the decoration during the Early Iron Age is a crucial tool for building bridges of connection. The interactions in the regional sphere follow the criteria of proximity. Intensive connections take place among Kamenicë, Barç, and Tren. In contrast, the Kolonjë plateau does not create a solid regional profile. Moreover, despite their proximity to each other, sites like Rehovë or Prodan do not take a leading role in any type of interaction. Luaras is the only site actively showing an interest towards Kamenicë and Barç, and also able to shape its own unique profile. Pazhok affects to a greater degree adjacent sites such as Gërmenj.

The intra-regional sphere takes a multidirectional pathway in which both Korçë and Pazhok have a great impact. The popular decorative traits in the Korçë basin become popular traits at other sites not necessarily adjacent to it, such as at Lofkënd. Some radial influence from the matt-painted and plastic decoration is also noted as an exclusive trait at several sites around

the south. In this case, however, the interaction remains very sporadic. Pazhok seems to affect both north and south. The wide diagonal ribbing as compared to any other type of decorative trait has the most extensive distribution during the Early Iron Age.

Extensive quantitative analysis dealing with the particular combination of attributes of vessels form and decoration at different sites would contribute a great deal to an understanding of the shaping of local identities formed due to the regional and intra-regional interactions. This aspect remains to be developed through the application of statistical analysis in a future stage of research.

The fabric, vessel formation, and decoration during the Early Iron Age accordingly indicate the establishment of regional tendencies equipped only with several salient features at site level that do gain distinctive popularity. Fabric alone indicates a broad division of tendencies strongly reinforced by the evidence of vessel formation and decoration. Both parameters highlight the presence of three core regions that build up three models of interaction: 1) Korçë, Kolonjë, and perhaps Përmet choose to interact by following an order that does not compromise their local tradition. This interaction is developed on a reciprocal mode without favoring any site; 2) Korçë and Kolonje versus Pazhok choose to stay distant from one another. Such communication is even more obvious with their influence on third parties. Korçë influences largely Lofkënd and to a lesser degree Patos. On the other hand Pazhok shows sporadic connections with Apollonia and Patos. Such 'antagonism' becomes even more evident with the influence of Pazhok in the north and that of Korçë in the south. Few decorative traits together with the fine dark burnished ware similar to that developed on Pazhok are encountered in the tumulus of Barç. Even in this case, however, they only comprise a sporadic presence shaped by local choices. Meanwhile at Pazhok any type of affinity with the southeast is simply lacking.

Definitely more than any type of interaction this context highlights two different spheres which either by choice or lack of pragmatic interest does not decide to build any type of interaction; 3) the unilateral influence of Korçë, Kolonjë, and Pazhkok follows some type of preference in the intra-regional interactions. The influence of Korçë, and to a lesser degree that of Kolonjë, is widely encountered in the south. Pazhok, however, shows a greater influence in the north and considerably less in the south. In any case, beside Lofkënd, interventions of both regions at other sites remain very sporadic and the receiver perhaps due to their inner social developments is increasingly passive. The progress of this interaction will be addressed further with the analysis of the Second Phase of the Iron Age.

5.e. The Second Phase of the Iron Age: 800–600 B.C.

The sites aforementioned in Chapter 4 are subjected to the analysis of fabric, vessels forming and decoration. The evidence from settlements is drastically sporadic and the analysis focuses largely on the pottery data collected in the burial context including the tumuli of Kamenicë (Bejko Forthcoming; Agolli 2009), Luaras (Aliu 2004), Rehovë (Aliu 2012), Prodan (Aliu 1984), Psar (Aliu 1995), Kuç i Zi (Andrea 1985), Shuec (Andrea 2009/2010), Katundas (Braka 1987), Lofkënd (Pevnick and Agolli 2014), Burrel (Kurti 1999), Kenetë (Jubani 1983; Hoti 1986), and Shtoj (Koka 2012), the shaft cemeteries of Gërmenj (Andrea 1981) and Katundas (Braka 1987) and the settlement of Liqeth (Ylli 1988).

5.e.1. Pottery Fabric

Fabric remains a salient parameter during this phase and a regional division between south and north is more evident than ever. Systematic data from individual sites could only be collected at Kamencë and Lofkënd, as with the other sites the evaluations are based on accounts

that rely on brief published descriptions in the site reports and some personal observations on the pottery displays of the Archaeological Museum in Tiranë.

Fabric at Kamenicë maintains a great stability; any difference between the Early Iron Age and this phase can barely be identified. Whatever the vessel size, fabric is fine light with rare to moderate inclusions, highly oxidized, evenly fired and uniformly with orange color. The surface is either smoothed or burnished. Encrustation is noticed on a few vessels and the burnished surface is damaged at many cases.

At Lofkënd during this phase the light fine ware remains the only type. No traces of the fine dark ware are encountered. The four vessels included in the repertoire are made of very fine fabric with almost no inclusions, evenly fired, burnished on exterior surface on orange to pale yellow color. Compared to the fine light ware of the Early Iron Age this one is more carefully treated and the semi-coarse ware is no longer applied to small to medium sized vessels.

Similar features of the fine light ware are noticed in Kuç i Zi, Shuec, Rehovë, Luaras, Prodan, Psar, and Katundas (Plate 8). At least at Kuç i Zi and Shuec, differences are noticed with the color and surface treatment. The surface color takes reddish nuances and the surface itself is simply smoothed. At least with the vessels displayed in the museum, burnish is not visible.

At the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj a unique version of the light fine fabric with moderate inclusions, dark brown color and smoothed surface, is encountered.

In the tumuli of Burrel, Kënetë and Shtoj an entirely different type of fabric can be observed. Around these areas the fine dark ware is very popular. The ware contains moderate inclusions, is evenly fired, weakly oxidized, and burnished on the surface with dark brown, gray to black color.

Definitely there is a degree of individuality among sites that cannot be systematically assessed. However, at least in Kamenicë and Lofkënd, Kuç-i Zi and Shuec several local traits associated with the preparation and clay, color, firing intensity and surface treatment are to be noted. Unfortunately the lack of systematic assessment for the other sites makes the analysis and evaluations of fabric incomplete, and permits similar conclusions to those claimed earlier by Prendi, who suggested a neatly defined division into two main areas in the south and north (Prendi 1974, 117-8). However, the systematic observations at Kamenicë and Lofkënd of salient features in terms of inclusions, color and surface treatment yield considerable evidence highlighting unique choices in the pottery production at every site.

5.e.2. Vessel Formation

The only settlement associated with the second phase of the Iron Age is that of Liqeth. The data collected consists of a few sherds that belong to open vessels. A complete profile of the vessel forms used over this period can only be obtained from the material collected in the tumuli. Some of them including Kamenicë, Rehovë, Luaras, Psar, Kuç i Zi, Shuec, Prodan, Burrel, Shtoj, and Kënetë have yielded considerable evidence. Limited amount of data is produced from the shaft cemeteries of Gërmenj and Katundas.

At the tumulus of Kamenicë the second phase of the Iron Age is divided in two consecutive sub-phases: the first 800–700 B.C. and the second 700–550 B.C. The repertoire is consistently cohesive and the presence of any type of individuality is hardly noted.

The shared system of concepts appears in four inherited groups entirely dating to the first sub-phase, two groups not highly represented during the Early Iron Age but frequent in this phase, and six newly established groups dating to the second sub-phase. The one-handled vessels

are only limited in one group with solid parameters (Q548, O459, Q1069, Q1076, Q1174, and Q1924). The features that are not part the group are found on one vessel with strut handle (Q487) and another with raised concave base (Q1190). Both vessels are clearly remnants from the Early Iron Age tradition that is no longer fashionable during this phase. The two-handled vessels create several groups with various elements in size and body form (Q354, Q387, Q513, Q1336, Q1038, Q1063, Q1109, Q1353, and Q1882). Also the group with two-handled vessels derived from the Early Iron Age is more heterogeneous and according to size and body form is divided into three groups with three to two vessels each. Double vessels are more heavily represented during this phase (Q452, Q556, Q1394, Q1735, Q1749, and Q2095). Handle and base form are the only attributes that divide this group in two. A few other differences involve the neck form; they represent, however, individual expressions that do not compromise the group cohesion. The four-handled vessels (Q141 and Q1382) are equipped with elaborated features on base and body form but occur with similar intensity during this phase.

There are two versions of closed small to medium, tall and short vessels that appear during the Early Iron Age but become particularly popular in this phase. The group of the tall closed vessels equipped with four projections is the most popular within the entire repertoire (Q711, Q740, Q803, Q804, Q826, Q849, Q860, Q948, Q1108, Q1116, Q1373, Q1391, Q1295, and Q1727). The base form is the only notable feature that divides this in two solid groups. The group of the short closed vessels (Q371, Q465, Q466, Q758, Q1077, and Q1261) compared to the first group is not as cohesive. The body form and size dissolve this group easily creating two groups each with two to three vessels.

The newly established groups not only are quantitatively represented but also able to create a cohesive category within the repertoire. The first group includes three large-sized vessels

with two horizontal handles (Q409, Q918 and Q929). The body form is a salient feature that divides the group in two. The second group comprises vessels with two vertical handles below the rim (Q697, Q710, Q1113, Q1384, and Q1392). Size and base form are the main distinctive features and divide it into three groups with three, two and one vessels. The third group includes large-sized vessels with pillar-like lugs (Q735, Q763, Q788, Q998, Q1049, Q1228, Q1353, Q1385, Q2120, and Q2121). Only a few aspects like the number of the pillar-like lugs which varies from two to four, or the body form, divide the group in two categories with seven and two vessels respectively. In the fifth group are included the small to medium sized vessels (Q817, Q828, Q935, Q942, Q954, and Q1223). The base form divides this group in two subgroups with three vessels each.

The individual concepts derived from the shared system are hardly distinguished in this phase. In this group are included only three vessels. Among them two seem to represent old-fashioned items that during the Early Iron Age enjoyed considerable popularity, such as the strut-handled vessel (Q487), the vessel with raised concave base (Q1190) and the vessel (Q935) introduced during this period without creating any grouping.

The second phase of the Iron Age in the tumulus of Rehovë is divided in two consecutive sub-phases: 800–700 B.C. and 700–600 B.C. The shared system of concepts in the first sub-phase includes a large group of vessels with two vertical handles raised above the rim (P110, P111, P113, P114, P115, P117, P119, P120, P123, P125, P126, P127, P129, and P128). The most distinctive feature within the group is the body form that divides it in four categories, each comprised of nine, four, two and one vessel(s). The other two groups dated in this phase are the vessels with one handle raised above the rim (P112, P122 and P132) and the double vessels

(P130 and P131). Each group shows a great degree of cohesion without undergoing any type of division.

The individual system of concepts is clearly distinctive and either associates with a sporadic remnant from the Early Iron Age such as the loop handled vessel P124 or a completely unusual form that does not fit conceptually anywhere within the repertoire. Included here is the closed vessel with two vertical handles below rim (P121).

The second sub-phase is only populated by two groups both belonging to the shared system of concepts: the one-handled vessels (P133, P135, P136, P137, P138, P139, P140 and P141) and the two-handled vessels (P141 and P134). The base and neck form divide the first group into two categories each including three vessels. Instead, the two-handled vessels have similar attributes and beside the handle quantity do not meet other processes of division.

Similar chronology to that of Rehovë is also applied in the tumulus of Psar. The shared system of concepts in the first sub-phase is represented by two groups with two vessels each: the vessels with two horizontal handles below the rim with size as the only distinctive parameter (P02 and P05), and the double vessels with (P03 and P04). A vessel with four vertical handles below the rim occurs as a unique exemplar (P01) and can hardly be grouped anywhere within the conceptual system. During the second sub-phase the vessels with one vertical handle above the rim become a dominant group in the repertoire (P07, P08, P09, P10, P13, P14, P15 and P16). Neck and rim form divide it in two groups each with five and two vessels. The vessels with two vertical handles rising above rim (P06, P12 and P17) are rarer but comprise a cohesive group with similar qualitative and quantitative attributes. The individual concepts only consist of a one-handled vessel with cut-away neck (P11).

The shared system of concepts in the tumulus of Luaras is clearly divided into four groups among which three were already established in the Early Iron Age. The one-handled vessels in this phase no longer comprise a solid group. They consist of strut handles (P91, P93, and P106) and vessels with vertical handles rising above the rim (P95, P100, and P104). Base and body form divide each vessel in its own group. The vessels with two vertical handles rising above the rim (P80, P81, P83, P85, P84, P86, P94, and P101) create a cohesive group. The classification process excludes from the main group two vessels based on the attributes of base and body form. The double vessels occur with similar intensity during this phase (P82, P88, P89, P92, P97, P98, P99, P102, P103, P107, P110, P111, and P105). The handle location and neck form to some degree split the group, creating two main categories each containing three and six vessels respectively. The triple vessels are the only newly established group that is highly solidified with similar attributes (P87, P96, and P112).

The individual concepts from the shared system consist of vessels with two vertical handles below the rim (P090 and P109). They comprise a rare phenomenon and even during the Early Iron Age can barely be associated with any treat within the shared system of concepts.

Within the group of the individual concepts is included a single large-size vessel with raised concave base (P108). The form of the vessel and especially the base form have been continuously associated with salient unique choices.

The tumuli of Kuç i Zi are newly established during this phase. Three groups are integrated in the shared system of concepts: two-handled vessels with vertical handles rising above the rim (P08, P09, P10, P17, P18, P19, P22, P27, and P28); four-handled vessels with vertical handles below the rim (upper body) (P02, P05, P11, P23, and P27); short closed vessels

(P04, P07, P13, P21 and P25) and the large vessels with two horizontal handles on the upper body (P06 and P15). The group of the two-handled vessels shows some degree of variability coinciding with the base and body form and size. The largest group includes four vessels. The four-handled vessels are greatly cohesive. Attributes like the body form and size may exclude two vessels from this group. One of them is even provided with a lid (P02 and P03). The short closed vessels are highly homogeneous. The only attribute manifesting variability is the height of each vessel. The large sized vessels with two horizontal handles indicate a similar number of attributes cohesively combined with one another. A singular trait that is slightly different is the location of the attachments/foot on the lower body. They are either placed as simple additions (P15) or as functional parameters (P06).

In the individual concepts derived from the shared system are included a few salient characteristics associated with extra additions on the handle at turn point (P01 and P08) in the group of the two-handled vessels and a large-size vessel with two horizontal handles (P12). The handle location and number is the only property to divide this vessel from the group of the four-handled vessels.

Within the group of the individual concepts are included three vessels that mark a highly unique appearance within the repertoire. The one-handled vessel (P16), the open sized vessel (P24) and the large sized vessel (P14) are included here.

The time span covering the Second Phase of the Iron Age at the tumulus of Shuec is divided in two periods: the second phase of the Iron Age (800–700 B.C.) and the "urban period" (700–500 B.C.) The shared system of concepts is associated with three groups: the first group includes vessels with two vertical handles rising above the rim (P07, P09, P10, P11, P13, P14,

P16, P17, and P18)]. The group shares a similar number of attributes. A few particularities on base, neck and body form dissolve it into four groups each containing one to five vessels; the second group is less frequently populated with closed short vessels (P08, P12 and P15). The differences in base and body form locate each vessel in a separate group, and the third group dates to the so-called urban period and includes tall vessels with concave disk-foot (P20-P22). The body form splits the group in two, each with one and two vessels.

The individual concepts are associated with a small size vessel with two vertical handles below the rim and a large sized vessel with two vertical handles below the rim and cylindrical lugs (P19 and P23).

The pottery corpus collected from the shaft cemetery of Katundas offers a limited repertoire that at least in one group indicates a high degree of cohesion. The shared system of concepts includes one group of vessels with vertical handles above the rim (P04, P05, P06 and P07). The base form is the only attribute splitting the group in two. A vessel with two vertical handles above the rim occurs once and can be hardly given any location within the conceptual system.

The Second Phase of the Iron Age in the tumuli of Shtoj consists of two sub-phases: 800–700 B.C. and 700–600 B.C. The handmade repertoire dating to the first sub-phase is comprised of exceptionally similar attributes coinciding in vessels with two vertical handles rising above rim and slightly raised base (P13-P18). The same group continues with higher frequency over the second sub-phase (P19, P20, P21, P22, P23, P24, P26, P25, P28, P29, P31, P32, P33, P34, P36, P37, P39, P40, P41, P42, P44, P45, P47, P49, P50, P51, P52, P54, P55, P56, P58 and P60). The size and base form, to a certain degree, may create two categories within the group. However,

either the one or the other may form smaller groups that do not compromise the cohesion of the repertoire. In the individual system of concepts is included one vessel with cut-away neck and vertical handle above the rim (P57).

The tumuli of Kënetë yield a quantitatively small repertoire. The shared system of concepts strictly relies on vessels with two handles rising above the rim and a narrow base (P04, P06, P08, P09, P10, and P11). The individual concepts derived from the shared system or the individual concepts are hardly represented. In any case some evaluations can be conducted only by considering the differences and similarities against the traits of the shared system. Thus the vessel with two vertical handles rising above the rim and wide base is considered as a derivation from the shared system of concepts. Two vessels (P05 and P07) due to their unique form are grouped with the individual system of concepts.

The Second Phase of the Iron Age in the tumulus of Barç coincides with the final use period of the site. The repertoire drastically declines quantitatively and qualitatively. Some type of group cohesion is preserved. However, from the large assemblage of the Early Iron Age in this phase only the vessels with two vertical handles (P12, P79 and P80) and the short closed vessels (P81 and P82) are inherited types. Both groups belong to the shared system of concepts.

Several sites including Prodan, Lofkënd, Gërmenj, Komsi, and Burrel offer very limited and heterogeneous repertoires. The largest groups here are comprised of two vessels. The groups with distinctive similarity involve the vessels with two vertical handles and narrow base in the tumuli of Burrel (P03 and P04) and the vessels with cut-away neck in the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj (P12 and P13).

Vessel formation during the second phase of the Iron Age is an insightful parameter regarding the shaping of the individual developments at separate sites as well as the regional or intraregional networks. Compared to the Early Iron Age, the shared system of concepts is more strongly represented and this seems to impact directly the individual expressions and choices.

The group of *shared concepts exclusively associated with one site* as a category is not well represented. Each group, however, is solely related with innovative features and encountered at Kamenicë, Kuç i Zi, Psar, and Gërmenj. In Kamenicë two newly established groups, including the large-sized tall vessels with pillar-like lugs and the short open vessels are popular. The tumuli of Kuç i Zi have one group of large-sized vessels with rounded base and rectangular lugs serving as feet or attachments on the lower body. Two vessels with horizontal handles on the upper body comprise a unique group at Psar not encountered elsewhere. The shaft cemetery of Gërmenj yields two cut-away neck vessels with pointed base.

The *group of shared concepts distributed in more than one site* is the most frequent group, associated mainly with traits inherited from the Early Iron Age. The vessels with two vertical handles rising above the rim are the most popular, creating solid groups at Kamenicë, Rehovë, Luaras, Shuec, Kuç i Zi and, to a lesser degree, in Barç, Lofkënd, and Psar. The two-handled vessels with narrow base appear in the tumuli of Kënetë and Burrel. The one-handled vessels continue to be popular in the tumuli of Kamenicë, Luaras, Rehovë and appear with some intensity in the tumuli of Psar and Prodan and in the shaft cemetery of Gërmenj. The large-sized four-handled vessels remain common at Kamenicë and are newly encountered in Kuç i Zi. The tall vessels with concave disk foot are frequent in Kamenicë and Shuec. The double vessels continue to create solid groups especially at Luaras, Kamenicë and sporadically in Rehovë and

Psar. The short closed vessels with flat base continue to be common at Kamenicë and Barç and also occur in Kuç i Zi and Shuec.

The *group of shared concepts of one or several sites that become individual concepts at other sites* is a group that is not well represented, and is associated either with inherited or innovative traits. The common features mostly highlight bilateral interactions between sites. The tumuli of Kamenicë and Luaras have a great impact. The triple handles at Luaras although not common comprise a solid group of three vessels. Outside Luaras this type only occurs at Kamenicë. Similar observations can be made for the vessels with strut handles. During this phase they lose their popularity considerably. However, in Luaras a few remnants at least create a group. At Kamenicë the strut-handled vessel disappears almost completely, dropping into the category of the individual concepts. The group of the large-sized vessels with two horizontal handles of Kamenicë is found at Kuç i Zi. The four-handled vessels that comprise solid groups at Kamenicë and Kuç i Zi occur once in Psar. Parallels are derived between the vessels with two vertical handles below the rim at Kamenicë and similar but unique vessels at Kuç i Zi, Rehovë Shuec, and Prodan. Sporadic contacts are noted between the group of the two-handled vessels at Shtoj and one vessel at Komsi. The one-handled vessels at Kamenicë or Luaras are rare at the tumulus of Kuç i Zi. The vessels with two vertical handles above the rim, widely distributed in Korçë and Kolonjë, note a sporadic presence in the shaft cemetery of Katundas and at Prodan.

The *group of the individual concepts* during this phase is highly sporadic and in many cases is barely distinguished from the individual concepts derived from the shared system. The vessels coincide with unique shapes introduced during this phase which do not gain any type of popularity, such as the vessel with stem goblet in the tumulus of Lofkënd, the vessel with cut-away neck at Psar, the large-sized vessel with raised concave base at Luaras, the large- sized

vessels at Prodan, the vessels with two vertical handles below the rim at Shuec, the short open vessel at Burrel and the vessel with the cut-away neck Këneté. A limited category of vessels is associated with forms with significant frequency in the Early Iron Age but no longer popular during this phase. Included here are the vessels with raised base at Kamenicë and the vessel with one loop handle at Rehovë.

Vessel formation in the later Iron Age offers a clearer insight into multiple interactions. Given the intensity and the qualitative features of the data, the interaction between Kamenicë and Luaras develops against a different background. This is especially noted with the features inherited from the Early Iron Age such as the one-handled vessels and the double vessels. It is rather hard to pinpoint the giver and receiver in such a context; however, certain influence from Luaras to Kamenicë is clearer particularly with the double vessels. In any case, however, the presence of inherited features at both sites perhaps reflects an interaction that took place during the Early Iron Age that does not necessarily continue during this phase. Furthermore at each site innovative aspects, such as the raised concave base at Kamenicë or the T-shaped handle at Luaras, remain exclusive features that do not cross the boundaries of the site.

The innovative groups indicate sporadic contacts only, with the triple vessels perhaps moving from Luaras to Kamenicë together with the raised concave base, a typical feature of Kamenicë, that becomes an individual parameter at Luaras. Even with this case the affinities may not be directly interpreted as reciprocal interactions. The triple vessels mark an earlier occurrence in the tumulus of Barç and despite the similarities between the vessels of Luaras and Kamenicë during this phase, some attention is to be given to the very fact that this type of vessel was found earlier in a site very close to Kamenicë, such as the tumulus of Barç. A striking element indicating at best the lack of reciprocal interaction between the two is that no parallels

occur in Luaras from the group of innovative features that are frequent in Kamenicë and vice versa. This is also due to the fact that these vessels are associated with the second sub-phase which at Kamenicë continues vividly until 550 B.C. Meanwhile Luaras dates its latest event no later than 600 B.C.

Impressive affinities are also noted between the vessels with two vertical handles at Kënetë and those found in Burrel. By considering the intensity a certain priority may be given to Kënetë in this case.

Some type of sporadic interaction is perhaps occurring between Shtoj and Komsi. However, given the lack of the data from Komsi the only two-handled vessel that derives similarities with Shtoj is insufficient for any type of claim associated with reciprocal interaction.

Kamenicë derives affinities within the sites around the Korçë basin such as Shuec, Kuç i Zi and Barç. The most common group shared is that of the short closed vessels which occur at each site in almost similar intensity. Again with this group a given site can hardly be identified as the primary one. However, by considering the variability and elaboration of forms yielded at Kamenicë, a prior influence of this site on the others is to be claimed.

Luaras extends sporadic influence on the other tumuli in the Kolonjë plateau. The double vessels noticed at both Rehovë and Psar can be associated with the large group of vessels encountered at Luaras. In any case, however, at least at Rehovë such interaction may be related to that of the Early Iron Age.

Both the Korçë basin and the Kolonjë plateau continue to develop interaction with sites in the west such as Katundas and Lofkënd. The exclusive presence of the one and two vertical handles at these sites illustrates such type of communications at some scale.

In addition, vessel formation clearly defines three types of interactions: 1) *The dominant intra-regional interactions* are associated with popular and widely distributed forms, including two groups of vessels with one and two vertical handles above the rim encountered in Kamenicë, Kuç i Zi, Barç, Shuec, Luaras, Rehovë, Psar, Katundas, and Lofkënd. Not many details or preferences are derived in this case. Nevertheless, it seems that the influence of Korçë and Kolonjë, despite the lesser quantity of material compared to the Early Iron Age, is once more extended towards the west. If some priority is to be given between the two regions, the Korçë basin and especially Kamenicë and Kuç i Zi to a lesser degree would clearly be defined as the favorite. Few types of vessels such as the four-handled vessels, and the vessels with two vertical handles below the rim comprise frequent traits at Kamenicë and Kuç i Zi, but note their rare occurrence at Prodan, Rehovë, and Psar. The intraregional interactions are developed between Kënetë and Shtoj deriving sporadic affinities, respectively, with Burrel and Komsi.

2) *The reciprocal interactions* indicate the development of a pattern not necessarily ruled by geographical proximity. Moreover, more preferable here are the sites not necessarily adjacent. Kamenicë and Luaras indicate at best the development of intra-regional interactions that at a regional level are not established with similar intensity. Especially in the south both Kamenicë and Luaras even at a lesser scale continue an exclusive interaction. Intensive contacts are noted between Kamenicë and Shuec after 700 B.C. The tall vessels with concave disk foot and the vessel with two handles below the rim dating to the so-called urban period at Shuec are easily associated with those of Kamenicë. The tumuli of Kënetë and Burrel, as well as those of Shtoj and Komsi, indicate a similar pattern developed to a lesser intensity; and 3) *The regional interactions* are especially developed in the Korçë Basin and Kolonjë plateau. Sites like Kamenicë, Barç, Kuç i Zi, and Shuec interact rather intensively during this phase. A great deal of

this communication relies on inherited vessel groups; however, by considering their respective intensity at each site, priority must be given to Kamenicë. Several types such as the short closed vessels and vessels with onevertical handle rising above the rim, if sporadic at other sites, are highly frequent at Kamenicë. In the Kolonjë plateau the site of Luaras leads sporadic interactions with Rehovë and Psar.

The second phase of the Iron Age sees another interesting dimension regarding the exclusive developments at separate sites. There are several innovative features that remain under the dominance of one site and do not gain any type of popularity elsewhere. Several forms at Kamenicë do not appear at any other site and similar claims can be made for Shtoj and Gërmenj. So far this type of individual and non-diffusive parameters has not been encountered. For instance Kamenicë is thriving during a time at which other sites in the adjacent area experience dramatic decline, decreasing radically their use. Shtoj does not meet any counterpart at a closer distance and such isolation seems to affect greatly the unique dimensions of its repertoire. Regarding Gërmenj not much can be claimed. Both vessels from this site, even though unique, due to the lack of quantity do not highlight the analysis a great deal.

5.e.3. Decoration

The decorative techniques and motifs are more limited during this phase and a striking division between South and North is noticed. The matt-painted decoration and especially the plastic applications remain the only decorative traits around the south.

At Kamenicë the matt-painted motifs are restricted to the six versions of pendent triangles with elongated apex, hatched or crossed-hatched with diagonals or parallel line and placed on upper body. The hatched pendent triangle continues to be the most frequent. The

motifs on the neck are more variable and consist of horizontal lines, lattice, combination of pendent and upright triangle, toothed line, hatched rhomboids and so on. The plastic decoration is prevalent and is applied either as a single trait or accompanied by the matt-painted decoration. The conical projections continue to be frequent. However, the sporadic presence of cylindrical and rectangular projections is noticed as well. The pillar-like lugs comprise an innovative parameter and are given the dual status of both handles and decorative traits.

The matt-painted decoration is prevalent in the tumuli of Kuç i Zi. The pendent triangles are the only choice on the lower body whereas the neck on a few vessels receives particular attention offering highly sophisticated motifs. The horizontal lines, lozenges, horizontal lines hatched with diagonals and the latticed bands all appear once. Plastic decoration is less popular, only limited to conical projections and restricted only to a vessel form. The vertical narrow ribbing occurring in one vessel comprises a unique no longer popular during this phase.

The tumuli of Barç follow a trend similar to that of Kuç i Zi. The matt-painted decoration is more popular but restricted only to the combination of the pendent triangles hatched with diagonal lines on the body and the horizontal lines on the neck. The plastic decoration only consists of conical projections occurring in one vessel.

Plastic decoration is the only trait in the repertoire of Shuec. The conical projections with different size are prevalent. This regularity excludes a vessel with two cylindrical projections.

Plastic decoration consisting solely of conical projections is the most popular trait in Luaras as well. Other techniques are rare and include the matt-painted motif of pendent triangles hatched with vertical lines and incised decoration consisting of short diagonals.

The repertoire of the tumulus of Rehovë offers a neat combination between the matt-painted and plastic decoration. The conical projections are again the most popular trait. The matt-painted decoration even in limited quantity offers unique motifs usually accompanied with plastic applications. Both the linear and curvilinear motifs are present at Rehovë. The short pendent triangles with elongated apex and those with thick vertices are the most common among the linear motifs. The curvilinear motifs consist of semi-arches and combination of wavy and horizontal lines.

Plastic decoration, exclusively represented by conical projections, is the only trait in the tumuli of Psar, Prodan, and Katundas. At the tumulus of Lofkënd the combination of the hatched pendent triangles with the wavy lines on the neck is only applied on one vessel. Gërmenj yields a repertoire with three decorative techniques each appearing once. The short detached diagonal ribbing, the horizontal ridges and the punched dots are separately applied on three vessels.

The incised and punched techniques with pendent triangles hatched with diagonals are the most popular in the tumulus of Shtoj. Other motifs appear once and include inscribed pendent triangles, lozenges, vertical lines hatched with diagonals, and combination of horizontal lines and punched dots. The incised lines and punched dots together with the narrow vertical ribbing are noted at Komsi. The similar combination of incised lines with punched dots and pendent triangles is frequent at Burrel. The incised technique solely consisting of simple vertical lines interrupted by reversed V's together with the narrow vertical ribbing occur on several vessels at Shtoj.

The decoration is highly limited in both techniques and motifs during this phase. Each site has a salient pattern rooted in a shared system of decorative techniques. The matt-painted

decoration continues in Kamenicë, Barç, Kuç i Zi, and Rehovë, offering more restricted motif designs. The pendent triangles are especially frequent in the tumuli of Kamenicë, Kuç i Zi, and Barç. At any site, however, they gain or inherit a few local characteristics not encountered beyond the site. The elongated apex is no longer applied in Barç but becomes a unique feature in Kuç i Zi and Kamenicë. Moreover the filling of the triangles especially at Kamenicë offers several designs. Other types of motifs like the solid lozenges, toothed lines, combination of pendent and upright triangles or the hatched rhomboids emphasize higher diversity especially between Kamenicë and Kuç i Zi. At Rehovë the matt-painted motifs are particularly different from anything encountered in the Korçë basin. The pendent triangles with thick vertices, the horizontal bands on the neck, the semi-arches and so on comprise highly unique features. It must be stressed that for Rehovë such innovation can be hardly attributed to a site choice. Decoration in Rehovë especially during the Early Iron Age is not by traditional choice. Most of the pottery dating to this period is plain with a few aesthetic traits that are easily associated with sites adjacent to Rehovë such as Luaras or Prodan. The exceptional thriving of the matt-painted decoration especially during 700–600 B.C., a time in which the matt-painted technique is hardly applied even around the Korçë basin, is somehow somewhat surprising and cannot be related to any type of influence from the neighboring region of Korçë or its own area, the plateau of Kolonjë. The counterparts of this motif designs are to be found to the southeast and more precisely in the cemeteries of Liatovouni and Vitsa in Epirus. The nature and intensity of these interactions remains to be seen, however; so far it is obvious that Rehovë serves as a buffer area between Kolonjë plateau and the valley of Konitsa (Vokotopoulou 1986; Douzougli and Papadopoulos 2011, 44, 6).

Plastic decoration is a popular trait distributed at Kamenicë, Luaras, Shuec, Kuç i Zi, Barç, Psar, Rehovë, and Katundas. Furthermore, at sites like Shuec, Psar, and Katundas it remains the only aesthetic technique. The definition of any type of interaction pattern among the sites cannot be easily established in this case. At the sites of Kamenicë, Luaras, Barç and Rehovë, the conical projections represent inherited features, thus their presence during this period cannot be strictly attributed to regional or intra-regional interactions. Patterns of interactions can be derived especially with the sites newly established during this period. The conical projections of Kamenicë can be especially associated with those of Shuec where they represent innovative features. Uncertain parallels can be made between Kamenicë and Kuç i Zi. The conical projections at Kuç i Zi only appear in the short closed vessels that are a very popular form at Kamenicë. Similar projections occur at lesser frequency at Barç. Given the circumstances it is difficult to pinpoint whether Kamenicë or Barç is interacting more with Kuç i Zi. However, several contacts with Kamenicë have already been noted with the vessel formation. Also considering the intensity of this decorative trait at Kamenicë, dual interaction between Kuç i Zi and Kamenicë is likely preferable. Luaras derives a dual interaction with Psar where the conical projections comprise an exclusive decorative technique. The relationship between Luaras and Rehovë is hardly defined. The conical projections at Rehovë, despite their popularity, comprise inherited features from the Early Iron Age. Thus a dual interaction between the two sites during this phase cannot be claimed.

In the intraregional perspective the influence of both Korçë and Kolonjë continues to a lesser degree towards the west. The presence of the conical projections at the Katundas cemetery definitely claims an interaction following an east to west direction.

The incised and punched techniques together with the narrow ribbing comprise frequent techniques in the north. The hatched pendent triangles together with the combination of the incised and punched lines occur with similar frequency at Shtoj, Burrel and Komsi. Other types of motifs such as the vertical and horizontal lozenges and the inscribed triangles are only found at Shtoj. It is rather difficult to prioritize any of the sites in terms of interactions. However, this seems to be the case in which shared values influence each site equally, giving more priority to the individual local choices developed at site level. Similar claims can be made for the cemetery of Kënetë. Despite the prevalence of the incised technique, the decorative motifs do not show any type of affinity with those of Burrel or Shtoj.

The decoration clearly defines a division between south and north that represents two non-interfering spheres that establish diverse models of interaction.

In the south, intense interactions are noticed in the regional scale. The rule of proximity follows a similar model as with the vessel formation. However, some importance is given to several individual choices that do not gain any popularity outside the site. Reciprocal interactions are very rare and the influence of one site towards a few others is better defined at both Korçë and Kolonjë. The intraregional interactions are weak. However, a vague influence towards the west, especially with the relationship between Korçë and Kolonje and Katundas, is somehow emphasized.

The model of interactions in the north is completely different. The tumuli of Shtoj, Burrel, and Kënetë do not find an adjacent counterpart. Thus the intra-regional interactions are those playing a great role in such a context. These sites define an interacting model that relies on two parameters: first, each develops a shared system of concepts defined by the similar

decorative techniques, and second, they create an individual non-interfering profile by choosing salient individual design motifs.

In addition the three parameters of fabric, vessel forming and decoration offer a complementary background regarding the nature of contact and interactions during the Second Phase of the Iron Age.

The intraregional interactions are clearly configured between south and northwest and northeast. Both Korçë and Kolonjë in the south, even though at lesser frequency, are still able to influence other sites westward. This is a unilateral interaction in which the giver and receiver are clearly defined, whereas in the northwest and northeast sporadic parallels in fabric, vessel form and decoration techniques are easily derived. However, a considerable number of individual traits, especially at Shtoj and Kënetë, suggest a reciprocal interacting model that does not favor any site or region. The tumulus of Rehovë represents a unique case regarding intra-regional interactions. During this period this site is intensively involved to the east, decreasing considerably its contacts with adjacent sites around the Kolonjë plateau. In fact, during this phase the other sites are almost abandoned, with the exception of Luaras.

The regional contacts between Korçë and Kolonjë are more intense. The rule of proximity has a great impact on the regional contacts and this is particularly seen with the sites of Kamenicë, Kuç i Zi, Barç and Shuec in Korçë and Luaras, Psar and less so at Rehovë in Kolonjë. However, the development of several dual interactions is noticed as well. Kamenicë and Luaras continue their interaction, although to a lesser degree.

5.f. The Third Phase of the Iron Age: 600 –500 B.C.

As mentioned earlier, the data belonging to this phase are not highly represented. In any case, the sites still in use and those newly established during this phase have yielded a consistent amount of data with great potential regarding the regional and inter- and intra-regional networks coinciding with the final phase of the long-lasting era of late prehistory in southern Illyria. Unfortunately no data from any settlement has been recovered during this phase. I must stress that the analysis for this phase has only been focused on that category of data yielded from the sites with considerable activity integrated with late prehistory. The foundation of the first two Greek colonies of Apollonia and Epidamnos during 700–600 B.C. on the west coast of southern Illyria had a great impact on the urbanization of several centers on the coast and further inland. However, the complex process of urbanization and the appearance of the new centers as an aftermath of Greek colonization is beyond the scope of this study (Papadopoulos et al. 2014)

The analysis of fabric, vessel formation and decoration are addressed in the tumuli of Barç, Kuç i Zi (Andrea 1985), Rehovë (Aliu 2012), Burrel (Kurti 1999), Kënetë (Jubani 1983; Hoti 1986), Krumë (Jubani 1982), Myç-Has (Bela 1990), Bujan (Andrea 1995), Bardhoc (Hoti 1982), Çinamak (Jubani 1969), and Përbreg (Përzhita and Belaj 1987), as well as the shaft cemetery of Borovë (Aliu 1994).

5.f.1. Pottery Fabric

Fabric offers salient transformations during this phase. Of course the lack of systematic accounts of individual vessels has made possible only partial evaluations of the data and this is shown on Graph 21. Nevertheless, based on the narrative data and the assessment of what is

displayed in the Archaeological Museum of Tiranë, a few general remarks are underlined (Plates 9 and 10).

The fine light ware that is highly oxidized, orange to reddish in color, neatly treated on the exterior surface and accompanied by matt-painted decoration, is poorly represented. The tumulus of Rehovë seems to rely much longer on such a tradition while at sites such as Barç and Kuç i Zi this trait disappears suddenly. The new version of fine light ware coincides with two wheel-made vessels produced by very fine fabric, very evenly fired and painted on the exterior.

The fine dark ware is widely distributed and applied to both hand- and wheel-made vessels. Several sites in the north including Kënetë, Bujan, Krumë, Burrel, Çinamak, Bardhoc, and Burrel continue to use the fine dark ware, in a gray to black color either smoothed or burnished on the exterior surface. The wheel-made ware is carefully treated in the composition of clay, shape and surface elaboration. However, regarding the fabric both wares sharply maintain their own profile.

Drastic transformation of the handmade dark ware is noted in the south especially in Borovë, Barç and Kuç i Zi. At each site the ware contains abundant inclusions and very little attention is given to the exterior surface; such attributes easily group it within the semi-coarse category. The wheel-made pottery represents a fine product characterized by light, gray to dark gray color, evenly fired and burnished on the surface. Aliu claims that the wheel-made production of this phase at Borovë, although associated with Greek forms, displays poorer quality in terms of the clay composition and surface treatment and largely lacks any type of decoration. According to him this repertoire definitely represents a local version of the Greek imports (Aliu 1994, 25-9). Moreover Aliu draws parallels between these products and those

encountered in tumuli around the region of Kukës. Due to the lack of compositional analysis it is rather hard to pinpoint their provenance. According to Aliu, however, they definitely do not represent products imported from Greece. On the other hand they coexist with local handmade pottery at every site but are not yet to be considered a dominant category within a repertoire. Perhaps they represent an imitation of the Greek shapes produced in the Greek colonies around the west coast, moving in an eastern direction towards the mainland of Illyria (see, for example, the discussion in Douzougli and Papadopoulos 2010, 53-59).

The properties of fabric highlight two important dimensions neatly configured in the regional perspective. In the south the disappearance of fine light ware as the most elaborate handmade product of the Bronze and Iron Age is due to the appearance of wheel-made imported ware, which becomes considerably popular in Kuç i Zi, Barç, and Borovë. The appearance of wheel-made pottery greatly influenced the trajectory of the traditional handmade category. Consequently, these products either preserve a rudimentary profile without gaining any additional property, as is the case with the repertoire of Rehovë, or they offer an intermediate version of the handmade and the wheel-made tradition resulting in a low quality product as seen with the handmade repertoire of Borovë.

In the north the tradition of the fine dark ware continues consistently. The imported wheel-made product is present in this part of Illyria as well. However, at least in terms of fabric, a sharp division between traditional and imported products can be easily discerned. The poor quality of the wheel-made pottery in the mainland may indicate a westward influence from the Greek colonies along the coast. The lack of compositional analysis does not allow extensive interpretations regarding the nature of contacts between the coast and inland areas. However,

considering the intensity of wheel-made pottery production in the mainland, the provenance of this innovative product may point to the west coast.

5.f.2. Vessel Formation

The limited quantity of data directly reflects on the properties of the groups. Consistent groups containing more than two vessels are found in Rehovë, Borovë, Kuç i Zi, Barç, Kënetë, Burrel, Myç-Has, Bardhoc, Çinamak, and Bujan.

The shared system of concepts at Rehovë is associated with two groups of vessels, both inherited from the second phase of the Iron Age: vessels with one vertical handle above the rim (P145 and P146) and those with two vertical handles above the rim (P148-P154). The first group is easily separated by the attributes of base, body and neck form. The second group, perhaps given its quantity, is slightly more robust. However, body form creates three groups with three, two and one vessel(s) respectively. The group of the individual concepts derived from the shared system includes a vessel with one loop handle (P147). The individual system of concepts includes two wheel-made vessels, a kylix (P143) and a kantharos (P144). The attributes of each vessel are very distinctive and separated from the rest of the repertoire.

Several groups belonging to the shared system of concepts are produced from both the handmade and wheel-made repertoires in Borovë. The handmade vessels form three distinctive divisions: 1) vessels with one vertical handle slightly rising above the rim (P01, P03, P04, P09, and P11). Base form and size split this group in two; 2) vessels with cut-away neck (P05-P08) have greater homogeneity and the only salient attribute grouping one vessel with another is rim form; and 3) vessels with two vertical handles rising slightly above the rim (P02, P10, and P12). The body form divides this group into two. Within the wheel-made category the largest group is

that of the oinochoai (P13, P14, P17, and P20-P32). The salient attributes within the group include base and rim form which break the unity of the group, excluding from the main cluster two divisions of three and one vessel(s). Other wheel-made vessels, such as the skyphoi and kylikes, are either individual examples (P18 and P16) or included in a group of two (P15 and P19).

It is rather hard to define within the group the individual concepts, as both categories, no matter their variability, display a high degree of cohesion. A single kylix is the only vessel not meeting any counterpart within the wheel-made repertoire. Considering its conspicuous provenance and the very fact that such a form is widely popular in the Greek world, it cannot be attributed to an individual choice by a local artisan. This type, as is the rest of the wheel-made group, represents an imitation of Greek vessels either produced locally or brought from the south Illyrian coast.

The identification of the shared and individual system concepts of the tumuli of Kuç i Zi is poorly defined. The wheel-made category produces four relatively standardized and cohesive groups each with two and three vessels including: three skyphoi (P10, P13 and P16), two cut-away neck jars (P07 and P14), two kantharoi (P04 and P08) and two kylikes (P02 and P09). The vessels found as isolated types include a small cup (P01), a kothon (P11) and a short open vessel (P03). The handmade category is a highly heterogeneous group comprised by a combination of various inherited and innovative features (P05, P06, P12, and P15).

A similar situation to that of Kuç i Zi is repeated to a lesser degree in Barç. The wheel-made pottery is prevalent consisting of a homogeneous group of kantharoi (P83, P85, and P86).

In the handmade category is grouped one small closed vessel (P84), a remnant from the second phase of Iron Age.

The shared system of concepts in Kënetë consists of four cohesive groups of handmade vessels. Among them the largest is that of the vessels with one vertical handle rising above the rim (P13, P14, P16, P17, P18, P19, P20, P21, P22, P23, P26, ad P32). The cut-away neck vessels comprise a key trait within the group, with the exception of two vessels (P18 and P32). Other parameters such as base and body form are less saliently expressed, dividing this assemblage further into groups of four, two and one vessel(s) respectively. The group with two vertical handles rising above the rim includes three vessels (P15, P28, and P30). Attributes such as size, base, body and neck form separate each vessel. Two open vessels with spout create a separate group individually treated as to the spout location and base form (P24, P27). The last group is that of the short open vessels (P29, P34 and P35). Even in this case, size, base and rim form greatly contribute to the separation of each vessel. The individual concepts are mostly associated with the wheel-made repertoire. The handmade category only includes one vessel with horn handle (P32). The wheel-made repertoire is populated by two distinctive forms, one four-handled (P31) vessel and one kylix (P36).

Burrel yields a consistent shared system of concepts within the handmade repertoire consisting solely of one- and two-handled vessels. The group with one vertical handle is smaller and consists of four items with size as the only saliently distinctive attribute (P11, P14, P16, and P24). The vessels with two vertical handles rising above the rim are the largest handmade group (P07-P09, P12, P13, P17, P18, P20-P23, P25, P26, P31, and P34). Salient attributes, such as base, and especially body and neck form, separate it into three smaller groups, each with four, -five and six vessels. The individual concepts in the handmade category are associated with two

vessels with one and two vertical handles below the rim (P27, P28). Each represents distinctive forms not encountered anywhere else during this phase. The wheel-made repertoire is easily distinguished, made up of two large-sized vessels: one with cut-away neck (P35) and a jar (P15) and two groups of kylix (P30, P33) and skyphoi (P29 and P32).

The shared system of concepts in Myç-Has relies especially on the vessels with two vertical handles above the rim (P09-P13, P15, P17-P20, P22, P23, P26, P27, P29-P33, P34, P37-P40, and P44-P47). The group has a high number of attributes that define its cohesiveness. Thus attributes such as base, body and neck form form eight sub-groups containing ten, six, two and one vessels. A similar degree of heterogeneity is noted with two other groups, the short open vessels (P21, P24, P36, and P48) and the vessels with one handle and cut-way neck (P16 and P28). The individual concepts coincide with a small-sized vessel with two vertical handles below the rim (P35). The wheel-made products consist of two kylikes (P25 and P41) and one skyphos (P49).

The shared system at the tumuli of Çinamak is populated by groups of one- and two-handled vessels with vertical handles above the rim. The one-handled vessels, beside the handle location, also show also a similar cut-away neck (P03, P04, and P12). Base form may be the only trait that removes a vessel out of the group. The group with two-handled vessels displays a similar degree of variability (P01, P02, P05, P06, P08, and P09). Base form indicates a salient attribute dividing the group in two. Within the group of the individual concepts derived from the shared system are included three open vessels with flat or raised base that do not yield any group (P07, P08, and P11). The wheel-made category is restricted to a group of skyphoi (P13 and P14) and one kylix (P15).

The repertoires of Bardhoc, Krumë, Bujan, and Përbreg offer very little. The groups of the two-handled vessels at Krumë (P10-P12), the open vessels (P03-P06), and the one-handled vessels at Bardhoc, may be considered to some degree as solid groups. In any case, each form produces considerable diversity indicating very little regarding the shared system of concepts.

The parameters of vessel formation yield an insightful situation enriched with several interacting multidirectional models. The significant presence of wheel-made pottery greatly affects the qualitative attributes of the handmade assemblage. Above all, this innovative production technique interferes considerably with the representation of the shared system of concepts that relies largely on two parameters: the reproduction and reconfiguration of the inherited features from the second phase of the Iron Age, and the imitation of the most fashionable and popular Greek products. Both parameters influence extensively the conformity of production, reducing considerably the individual expressions. It remains to map out the distribution of the system concepts, including both hand- and wheel- made groups, and to what extent they shape the patterns of interactions.

The *shared concepts exclusively associated with one site* as a division is very limited, consisting only of the handmade repertoires of Rehovë, Borovë, Bujan, and Kënetë. These assemblages are associated with old-fashioned traits inherited from previous phases, including the one- and two-handled vessels at Rehovë, Bujan, and Borovë. In other cases they represent handmade imitations of Greek products or vessels embedded with strictly functional attributes. These patterns are noted in the group of the vessels with cut-away neck/oinochoe at Borovë and the spouted vessels at Kënetë.

The *group of shared concepts distributed in more than one site* represents the largest collection of data. The handmade groups are only encountered in the north, consisting of vessels with cut-away neck and two vertical handles above the rim. Both groups are frequent in Kënetë, Burrel, and Çinamak. The short open vessels create solid groups at Myç-Has and Kënetë. However, this group is less popular and equipped with salient simplicity that barely produces any type of potentially comparative trait. The groups of wheel-made pottery are less frequent but widely distributed. Among them the skyphoi and kylix are the most popular. They create small groups of two or three vessels at Kuç i Zi, Burrel, Myç-Has, Kënetë, and Çinamak. Other wheel-made forms like the kantharoi are only used in Kuç i Zi and Barç.

The groups of shared concepts of one or several sites become individual concepts at other sites only include the handmade vessels easily associated with local production. The vessels with cut-away neck best represent this group. Their abundant presence at Kënetë and Burrel has already been noted. However, other sites such as Myç-Has, Përbreg, and Krumë have yielded limited repertoires and a small quantity of this distinctive form.

The individual concepts occur at several sites associated as usual with unique shapes, such as the wheel-made trefoil vessel at Borovë, the wheel-made four-handled vessel at Kënetë, the handmade raised cup at Bardhoc, and the three-handled vessel and the oinochoe at Kuç i Zi. A few others, such the short closed vessel of Barç and the two-handled matt-painted vessel at Kuç i Zi, are derivations from the previous phase.

The pattern of interaction during this phase clearly experienced dramatic transformations. The shared system of concepts among the handmade products indicates sharply divided regional patterns. In the south the sites of Barç, Kuç i Zi, Rehovë, and Borovë develop an individual and

antiquated system of concepts that no longer serves as an interacting parameter. The limited local handmade repertoires of each site are a great proof for such occurrence. In contrast, in the north a completely different situation is encountered. During this phase several sites achieve intensive interactions within the regional compound. The tumuli of Kënetë, Burrel, and Çinamak play a leading role not only by offering cohesive groups but also in the degree of exchange they are able to undertake with one another. It is rather hard to prioritize any of the above sites. However, the distribution of the two-handled vessels favors much more a dual interaction between Burrel and Çinamak. In contrast, the vessels with one vertical handle and cut-away neck in particular are more frequent at Kënetë and Çinamak. Myç-Has, despite its distance from both Kënetë and Çinamak, offers a distinctive form of vessel with two vertical handles above the rim, not indicating any affinity with any of the above sites. The only comparable trait here is that of the vessels with one vertical handle and cut-away neck. The given vessel form occurs to a lesser degree in Bardhoc, Përbreg, and Krumë. Such presence perhaps is attributed to some radial influence of both Kënetë and Çinamak. The only site not participating in any type of interaction is Bujan, and perhaps this is due to its remote location in the mountains.

The handmade pottery production in the north indicates two clear models of interaction: 1) intensive regional interactions ruled by proximity across the region of Kukës. The sites of Kënetë and Çinamak maintain a leading position in such communication. Other sites such as those of Bardhoc, Përbreg, and Krumë rely heavily on borrowed parameters that occur with abundance at Kënetë and Çinamak. The only site showing very little interest in such interaction is Myç-Has, which develops a large and distinctive repertoire of vessels with two vertical handles above the rim. The lack of proximity with the area of Kukës clearly influences the tumulus of Bujan, which during this phase develops a limited repertoire largely equipped with

old-fashioned traits; 2) intensive dual intraregional interactions between Kënetë, Çinamak, and Burrel. Kënetë and Çinamak not only play a leading role around the Kukës region, but they are also constantly interacting with Burrel. The intensity and the qualitative features of the repertoire at both sides only indicate a reciprocal interaction.

The continued emergence of wheel-made production adds an additional feature to the model of interaction. The Greek products are encountered at almost every site during this phase, resulting in interference in two aspects. First, the presence of the wheel-made vessels is restricted to the skyphos and kylix. Both forms are widely distributed in north and south. The uncertain provenance of these products does not contribute a great deal regarding their status as local or imported products. A few attempts at local wheel-made production in the south are perhaps associated with the oinochoai at Borovë or the kantharoi at Barç and Kuç i Zi. In any case, if one considers the shortage of the kantharoi at both sites, such assumptions can be called into question. The status of the wheel-made products can be better defined in the north. The abundance of the handmade products together with the restricted number of wheel-made products in two basic forms give the wheel-made vessels a non-local identity. Perhaps such innovation should be sought around the Greek colonies along the coast, entering gradually into the mainland. Second, the wheel-made vessels have a great impact on the properties of the local product. Several attempts in the production of the Greek forms with handmade technology are noted at Borovë, Kuç i Zi, and Myç-Has. Such efforts at imitation mainly represent a gradual transition between hand- and wheel-made production.

5.f.3. Decoration

Decoration does not comprise an important trait during this phase. In the south the decorative techniques show a sharp division between the hand- and wheel- made products. No innovative features are encountered within the handmade category. Moreover, the traits transmitted from the second phase only consist of poorly made conical projections that, in some cases, are made at a notable disproportion with the vessel size. They are found especially in Borovë, Rehovë, and to a lesser degree at Barç and Kuç i Zi. The matt-painted technique is almost completely abandoned, consisting of short pendent triangles applied on a two-handled vessel. The wheel-made products are not highly decorated in this part of Illyria. A few emerging traits are associated with the use of narrow horizontal ridges at Kuç i Zi, Borovë, and Barç. The painted decoration is less popular mostly limited to horizontal linear bands such as those found mostly in Kuç i Zi and less so at Rehovë or Borovë.

The decoration techniques in the north offer a different pattern. Special attention is given to the handmade repertoires at several sites. In Burrel the incised technique still transmits the motifs of the second phase, consisting of hatched pendent triangles, and innovative features are strictly limited to the narrow vertical ribbing on body and handles. The partial ribbing on the cut-away neck vessels comprises a distinctive aspect at this site. In Çinamak several techniques are encountered that do not yield a specific pattern. The incised motifs mostly consist of hatched pendent or upright triangles. The narrow ribbing on the handles, combination of vertical incised and punched lines, wavy incised lines and the wide diagonal ribbing are utterly individual. The narrow ribbing is the most popular trait at Kënetë combined in a few cases with incised decoration, either pendent triangles or groups of zigzags. Decoration is very rarely applied at Myç-Has. A few individual traits including the vertical narrow ribbing, incised lines above the

handles or punched lines are poorly displayed on some vessels. The combination of the incised and punched techniques appears sporadically in Përbreg and Krumë. The wheel-made products are rarely decorated. In a few cases, however, a limited number of sophisticated designs on the skyphos at Përbreg and Çinamak occur. The horizontal ridges are somewhat popular in the wheel-made groups of Burrel and Kënetë.

Decoration does not contribute a great deal to the shaping of the network models. However, it does serve as a complementary parameter that confirms the regional patterns created by the analysis of vessel formation. The lack of any solid decoration technique in the south, and the transmission of old-fashioned techniques in the north highlight a twofold division between south and north. In the south, the lack of any inheritance from the second phase of the Iron Age, and of any solid emerging decorative pattern, indicates dramatic conditions and there is no evidence for any type of interaction. The situation is a little clearer in the north. However, even here, the profile of the decoration relies heavily on inherited traits and the interactions are only determined by proximity. The wheel-made production offers very little in this regard and cannot be considered a solid and potential pattern containing promising values for any development towards the future.

The networks gain highly diverse dimensions in the third phase of the Iron Age. The distinction between northeast, northwest, and south is sharply defined. Moreover, the interior regional networks highlight two entirely different models: 1) the regions of Korçë and Kolonjë, which during late prehistory maintained and developed the most intense and influential networks, offer a highly isolated and non-interactive profile during this phase. With the exception of Borovë, every other site, especially after the second half of the 6th century B.C., indicates sporadic developments largely relying on badly produced antiquated handmade traits

and a high reluctance for any type of innovation; 2) the northeast and northwest are very interactive and able to construct a reciprocal model of contacts between a few key sites. However, even here the handmade production does not indicate an impressive profile of innovation. Most of the sites still operate with inherited features, which through this phase only gain a slight degree of elaboration.

The presence of wheel-made pottery in both regions hardly plays any role in the local production. Several imitative attempts are noted, especially at Borovë, Burrel, and Barç; however, they are never significantly represented and the distinction between the local and imported products is obvious. All the sites dating to this period merge in a single parameter. Consistently, and perhaps with a similar intensity, they are interacting with the urban centers along the coast. The wheel-made pottery found inland is nothing but a Greek by-product already popular around the colonies of the Adriatic and Ionian coasts. From this only Borovë appears be excluded, although there may be influences or interaction with northwestern Greece. Again the provenance of the wheel-made products remains uncertain. They may either be imports or imitations from the Greek mainland.

5.g. The Shaping of Regional Networks and Cultural Transmissions during Late Prehistory in Southern Illyria

The discussion of cultural contacts is only cursorily addressed by cultural historians. Narratives focus generally on regional comparanda, and overviews of the diachronic and synchronic development of the intensity of regional and intra-regional interactions by means of cultural transmissions are simply lacking.

It must be noted that the late prehistoric phase in Illyria and in northern Epirus offers clear evidence regarding the regional networks. Numerous patterns, characterized mainly by regional, intra-regional and dual networks, are shaped over different periods and, to a lesser degree and under particular circumstances, several sites are noted that are within their core area without conducting or being influenced by any clear form of contact.

Several questions need to be addressed in order to discuss the regional networks and the cultural transmissions against the backdrop of the ideational profile of the pottery data. The first question is: What is the inter- and intra-regional model(s) of interactions and toward what kind of strategy is it developed over time?

The regional networks occur more frequently in southern Illyria and northern Epirus. They develop among two to three sites in a neatly configured geographical unit. Such patterns are sporadically noted as early as the Early Bronze Age at Maliq and Barç in the Korçë basin, with the dark fine ware on vessels with one vertical handle below the rim. Subsequently, during the Late Bronze and especially the Early Iron Age, various regions in southern Illyria form solid and cohesive interactions. This is initially encountered in the Kolonjë plateau, coinciding with the leading position of Rehovë versus Luaras, Prodan, and Shtikë. The vessels with loop handles and two-handled vessels with cylindrical lug at turn point or wishbone handles are salient regional features at Kolonjë plateau over the Late Bronze Age. During the Early Iron Age cohesive regional patterns emerge in the Korçë basin. The matt-painted decoration on fine light fabric together with the vessels with one and two vertical handles above the rim comprise the bulk of the pottery evidence in this region, distributed mainly at Barç, Kamenicë, Tren, and less so at Kuç i Zi. The Kolonjë plateau reinforces its regional agenda, mainly by repeating features acquired during the Late Bronze Age. Similar effects may be claimed for the sites around the

valley of Shkumbin. Indeed the tumuli of Pazhok play a leading role here. However, the fine dark ware together with the diagonal ribbing resonates slightly in Gërmenj and Lofkënd. Glimpses of salient regional developments are captured in the Drinos valley in the tumuli of Piskovë and Rapckë. The poor state of publication, however, does not leave any hope for further evaluations. During the second phase of the Iron Age constant and intensive interactions take place in the area of Kukës around the confluence of the Drin Rivers (Black and White). The fine dark ware, burnished on the exterior and associated with two-handled vessels and incised or narrow ribbing, defines the most salient parameters in the region, present at Kënetë, Çinamak, Krumë, Përbreg, and at other sites.

The regional context has an immense impact on the conceptual development of the pottery at various sites in this period. The function of the vessels greatly conditions the conceptual profile on a regional scale, ruling three crucial dimensions such as fabric, form and size. However, individualities and local preferences constantly interfere at various sites. This is mostly seen with salient attributes such as the handle form and location, base or decoration, indicating either site individualities or other kinds of interactions with counterparts outside the region.

The system of concepts at a regional scale indicates an impressively balanced combination between the shared regional and the individual site concepts. This is likely to be an intertwined model neatly shaped especially at sites with a certain quantitative profile. The data for further quantitative analysis is insufficient. However, further treatment of the concentration and possible significance of attributes at different sites remains to be considered.

Given the available data, however, the pattern of regional interactions is likely to offer the most intense and cohesive network of interaction model during the late prehistoric period. This develops in an environment conditioned by common choices on economic and cultural premises. Under such circumstances, pottery becomes a crucial mediator. By considering, however, its technological environment (elaborated in Chapter 4), any formal distribution following a particular order of exchange among the sites of a given region can hardly be claimed. The model of interaction in a given region either develops as a reciprocal model between two or more sites or by referring to a leading site with other possible "subordinates" in the adjacent region. In any case, the routes of communication do not follow a predictable and organized route.

The intra-regional networks take various routes developing under various models, including interactions between two adjacent and distant regions and radial influences of a core region versus several sites located in other geographic units. Compared to the regional networks, the interaction between two adjacent regions occurs at a lesser intensity. It is shaped between two sites based on mutual reciprocity. This occurs especially over the Early Iron Age at three pairs of sites, Kamenicë and Luaras, Barç and Rehovë, and Kënetë and Burrel. The cases are notable due to the particular presence of salient attributes such as the double vessels and vessels with strut handles at Kamenicë and Luaras, the loop handles at Rehovë and Barç, or the two-handled vessels with narrow base at Kënetë and Burrel. Proximity does not play any role in this type of interaction. What is likely to have a great impact is the solid conceptual system that occurs at each site. This is the case especially between the first two pairs and may be due to the development of particular routes that somehow underplay and weaken the influence of neighboring sites in their respective regional cluster. It mostly relies on salient attributes not associated with immediate functional parameters. Given the technological profile any type of

formal exchange is not likely to occur. Moreover, it seems that this interaction perhaps represents the most consistent and solid route between two regions that afterward becomes more widely distributed. For instance, such development is clearly noted between Luaras and Kamenicë. They both share a similar intensity in strut-handled and double vessels. The same types of vessels at other sites like Barç and Rehovë are highly sporadic.

The radial influences are mostly related to a sporadic distribution of popular traits into other regions. Again this type of network occurs to a lesser degree taking a dual direction. The earliest is noted in the Middle Bronze Age associated with local imitations of Minyan products on the southwest coast, including Çukë, Bajkaj, Vodhinë, and Vajzë. Sporadic influence from Thessaly is also noted at Maliq. In both cases, however, this only remains a unilateral and sporadic influence. Several efforts at imitating foreign products are obvious. The Mycenaean products encountered in Pazhok, Barç, Bajkaj, Piskovë, and Rehovë occur in a wider range, and as Bejko suggests are seemingly secondary products associated with sporadic contacts at an intermediate location between southern Illyria and the Mycenaean world (Bejko 1993, 115).

During the Early Iron Age the radial influences rely completely on the local handmade products. The Korçë basin and Kolonjë plateau are the most influential regions. Typical traits such as the matt-painted products, double vessels and strut handles occur to a lesser degree at several sites towards the west and southwest, including Lofkënd, Vajzë, Çepunë, Katudas, and Patos. In particular, Lofkënd, Çepunë, Katundas, and Patos develop a unique relationship with the core region, intertwining harmonically the popular traits named above with their local products, which in some cases are underrepresented. An entirely different model of radial interactions develops during the Third Phase of the Iron Age. The handmade production no longer plays a commanding role with regard to any potential interactions and is strictly

associated with the Greek wheel-made products around the Korçë basin, Kolonjë plateau, Kukës, and Burrel. Whether or not they are locally made, they clearly represent influences from the Greek world emerging in two directions, from the Greek colonies along the western coast and via inland routes.

Few sites remain increasingly indifferent to the sphere of any interaction during late prehistory. This is particularly noted with Dukat, Apollonia, and Bujan. Not only do they offer quantitatively limited repertoires, they also display distinctive traits that remain insensitive to any kind of influence. With Bujan this can be attributed to the highly remote geographic location. As for Apollonia and Dukat this phenomenon is likely to correspond to a low demographic profile especially in the Early Iron Age when the radial interactions occur at their highest intensity around these sites.

The models noted above indicate a pattern that is largely ruled by geographic proximity. The clearest patterns with intensive interactions in which both the givers and receivers are very visible occur within a region and between two neighboring or adjacent regions. The radial interactions are more dispersed and, at most, indicate glimpses of interactions without establishing a clear model. This pattern highlights also the complete lack of interactions between Korçë and Kolonjë with the sites of Kukës, Burrel and Shkodër.

Here the discussion addressed in chapter 4 regarding the socio-economic profile of the late prehistoric communities in the southern Illyria is very much to the point. The simple organization with a social hierarchy based on age and gender divisions and founded on a mixed economy of farming and herding explains the pattern of small-world interactions developed

within a region or between two neighboring regions. This is a phenomenon developed in subsistence communities that lack the political will to expand beyond the borders of their unit.

Systematic studies of the demographic profile would be greatly beneficial to an understanding of the socio-economic profile of this context. To this day, such an assessment remains far from reach. Nevertheless, by considering the quantitative profile of the skeletal data from two burial tumuli assessed with physical anthropological analysis, a few general remarks can be made. Thus far, the most populous human occupation in late prehistory dates in the second phase of the Iron Age in the tumulus of Kamenicë. Approximately 250 individuals are assigned to this phase. With the completion of excavations of the site this figure may double (Bejko, Fenton, and Foran 2006). In any case, whether 250 or 500 individuals, this number hardly reaches the size of the current population in the modern village of Kamenicë. In contrast, the population of the tumulus at Lofkënd is considerably lower: in over five centuries of use only 132+ individuals were interred (Schepartz 2014; Stapleton 2014). At Lofkënd we are dealing with data that indicates low population size growing very gradually over time. Valid insights that correlate the fluctuations of the demographic profile with the economic profile of a social unit are offered by Malthus (Malthus 1982). He sees the population size only as a quantitative feature and considers it a crucial factor that rules the social organization of a group by means of choices of an economic nature. Population growth and successful subsistence maintain equilibrium, secure resources and thus provide continuation and survival.

Taken together, the socio-economic profile, the model of small-world networks, and the demographic profile, however fragmentary or poorly understood, indicate that these communities during late prehistory, and especially in the Late Bronze and Iron Age, achieve a successful social and economic equilibrium by procuring any immediate needs in resources within the

region and by means of a subsistence economy. The model of their social network represents an interaction exclusively motivated by their social needs. It is due to this that the geographical proximity becomes a dominant factor in all interactions. Moreover, the geographic proximity also determines and defines the lack of interactions. It seems that the communities of southern and northern Albania intentionally do not interact because there was no pragmatic need and motivation to do so. This is the most crucial factor that delineates cultural transmission, its expansion, and the unintentional cultural borders.

A further question is: To what extent do inter- and intra-regional networks play a role in the shaping of cultural transmission?

The inter- and intra-regional networks play a crucial role on the shaping of the cultural transmission. As earlier discussed in Chapter 4, the technological profile of the pottery in late prehistory maintains the profile of household production, at most manufactured by skilled artisans, but never reaching the status of a commodity with assigned value in a formal market. Against this backdrop, a crucial question regarding the nature of contacts and interaction of the late prehistoric communities in southern Illyria arises: with a lack of a formal exchange market, to what extent is the model of regional and intra-regional interactions discussed above to be understood?

A great deal of ethnographic and archaeological research conducted on the modes of cultural transmission brings to the fore a plethora of case studies that draw cogent parallels between the socio-cultural profile and the ideational profile for this corpus of data (Stark, Bowser, and Horne 2008; Bowser and Patton 2008; Gosselain 2008; Herbich and Dietler 2008 ; Papadopoulos 1997).

Despite a broad focus on various parts of the world and the variability in individual cases, these studies find common ground in discussions of the organization of household pottery production and its impact on the shaping of the models of social learning and interactions. Household pottery production is generally considered a seasonal activity under the exclusive domain of women. Direct observations and analysis of ethnographic case studies recognize, in particular, an internal hierarchy based on age and expertize. The manufacture process is monitored and directed by highly qualified potters, likely mothers or mothers-in-law, and assisted by the younger trainees, the daughters or the daughters- in-law within the household. Beyond the immediate purpose of the production of a needed quantity of vessels, an intensive inter-generational learning process between the artisan/mother and the trainee, apprentice/daughter takes place simultaneously.

Several theories regarding this process seek to give to the household environment of production a critical role in understanding models of cultural transmissions. This is elaborated in a conceptual scheme that defines vertical, oblique and horizontal models of cultural transmission exclusively shaped by social learning. Vertical transmission is defined as cultural knowledge passed from parents to offspring within a household; oblique transmission involves two generations likely to be in a teacher-student interaction and, finally, horizontal transmission takes place between one group belonging and a different social group that is not necessarily related (Cavalli-Sforza et al. 1982; Cavalli-Sforza, Luca, and Feldman 1981, 54; Guglielmino et al. 1995, 75-85; Hewlett, De Silvestri, and Guglielmino 2002, 314-20; Stark, Bowser, and Horne 2008, 2-20).

A similar understanding of social learning and cultural transmission is offered by archaeological data of Tracey Cullen and K.D. Vitelli, in dealing with the Urfirnis pottery of the

Middle Neolithic period at Lerna and Franchthi Cave in the Argolid, in southern Greece, interpreted the similarities and differences of the style, as the result of the movement of potters in clearly defined social circumstances (Cullen 1985, 77-100; Vitelli 1993). Cultural transmission in this case involved young women who were trained as household potters by their mothers, and who subsequently moved, after marriage, to the village of their husband, and continued the tradition of household pottery production in their new home .

It seems likely that the regional and the intra-regional interactions serve as the primary avenue for the maintenance of social and economic stability within these communities. Hence, only those communities that succeed in long term inter- and intra-regional networks experience some degree of prosperity in their internal organization. The regions of the Kolonjë plateau and Korçë basin demonstrate this most clearly, as opposed to the communities of Kukës, Burrel, and Shkodër that are active to a lesser extent. Other sites, particularly Apollonia, Dukat, and Bujan, among others, participate very little, or not at all, in any type of interaction and thereby appear as having a rudimentary and insignificant data profile. The three parameters of fabric, vessel formation, and decoration indicate a solid shared system of concepts in which individual choices, especially those of vessel formation, are attributed to influences from other sites and, to a lesser extent, to the individual choices and decisions of local artisans. Indeed, the lack of a formal market economy, more than anything else, leaves exchange strategies entirely dependent upon the decisions of a social-cultural character. It is likely that the interactive model was determined by the movement of people and ideas—and in the context of pottery production most probably by the movement of young females—instead of the movement of objects.

By considering the ratio of the shared and individual concepts in particular in the regions that offer clear evidence of interaction, including Korçë, Kolonjë, Kukës, and Burrel, two

features may be highlighted: first of all, the majority of qualitative features within the shared system of concepts (including fabric, vessel formation, and decoration) indicate, at best, an intertwined model between local and interactive shared concepts and attributes. By considering only the qualitative parameters, however, the interactive features gain priority in the majority of the sites. The statistical analysis at the site and regional level would disentangle quantitatively and quantitatively the ratio between local decisions and external influences. However, given the considerable quantity of data in this research, such an analysis can only be dealt with in the future. Secondly, the unique choices that appear as unique expressions at several sites also involve interactivity at the regional and intra-regional level and are usually noted by means of their insignificant presence within the repertoire.

The profile of the extant data appears to favor the model of horizontal transmission. It seems likely that social interaction, and more particularly inter-marriage between communities, is likely the most crucial mediator in shaping the qualitative profile of the pottery. A great deal of change and innovation of pottery is entirely predicated on the taste, learning, experience, and skill of the women and to their dual influence on the households of their parents and husbands.

The regional and intra-regional networks serve as an instrumental element that not only shapes the models of interaction but also influences the qualitative properties of the data. The key diagrams clearly show a proportional relation between the degree of interaction and the enrichment of the qualitative properties of the conceptual system. Those sites able to build consistent regional and intra-regional interactions with others adapt easily to other traits and as a consequence achieve products of higher quality.

In addition, the late prehistoric communities of southern Illyria pragmatically developed an interactive model very much based and conditioned upon the internal socio-economic organization. Cultural transmission is shaped in social terms mostly at a horizontal level and almost exclusively by women, who are the progenitors of cultural transformation. The intensity and expansion of this transmission remains by and large an instrumental and influential factor in the prosperity and the maintenance of social equilibrium of these communities.

Chapter 6

Conclusions

The Potential of Pottery Data for an Understanding of the Socio-Economic Profile, Regional Networks and Cultural Transmissions in the Late Prehistoric Communities of Southern Illyria

Two crucial aspects have largely inspired this research: the current state of pottery research in Albanian studies and the immense potential that recent multidisciplinary theoretical and methodological approaches have on the material.

For over six decades archaeological explorations have yielded a considerable quantity of data throughout southern Illyria. Several issues, however, particularly the lack or poor quality of publication, and above all interpretations heavily loaded with nationalistic agendas, have hampered progress in the field and have not permitted the full potential of the extant pottery data to come to the fore.

Despite the limited conceptual framework and the linear interpretations of the cultural-historical approach, there have been important contributions to the discipline, especially the meticulous work of scholars such as Gordon Childe, Walter Heurtley, Nicholas Hammond, and Kenneth Wardle, among others. Their research to this day serves as an invaluable reference, with significant achievements in terms of the collection and synthesis of data, and for their construction of historical frameworks that have determined and defined the field.

I cannot stress enough that among the countries of the Balkans this approach was not only embraced but heavily combined with nationalistic agendas in such a way that it became difficult to differentiate pure archaeological research from exterior political agendas. This was particularly the case with pottery studies, where ceramics became intertwined with issues of ethnogenesis, as well as "ethnic" continuity. At a very early stage of my research into this topic, and during discussions with Albanian archaeologists, it was clear that the "origin" of matt-painted pottery was the most important subject for the late prehistoric period of southern Illyria.

In Chapter 1 I have argued that the attention paid to matt-painted pottery has been overemphasized to the neglect of potentially more interesting concerns. Moreover, nationalistic agendas in pottery research have only contributed to an elaboration of and ethnocentric perspective inquiry that has vigorously competed with similar perspectives among the various countries of the region. Looking beyond such ethnocentric viewpoints, and by stripping away current political borders in the Balkans, I have collected a considerable quantity of data covering a span of some 2000 years, interrogating the material from a theoretically and methodologically rigorous perspective.

The Chapter 2 focused on the theoretical underpinnings of my approach. As an end product manufactured at a particular time and for a given purpose, pottery has the potential to shed considerable light on various issues of socio-economic organization, regional networks, and cultural transmissions. Particularly and strictly by considering the potential of the data and beyond any external and subjective interference especially I evaluated the crucial impact of the anthropological theoretical agenda in the formation of the research query and the interpretation of the results yielded by a systematic methodology of research. My research was designed employing a conceptual scheme in which pottery data was contextualized both synchronically

and diachronically to address various questions pertaining to the social units that produced the pottery. This methodological approach was especially focused on the qualitative properties of the pottery, and permitted a number of important interpretations (Chapter 3).

I focused in Chapter 4 on the *technological profile* of the pottery data and to what extent the manufacture process can shed light on the modes of production and the socio-economic profile of the late prehistoric communities of southern Illyria. My three-part analysis of the production step, measurement, standardization, and innovation, indicated a steady technological profile gradually transformed over time. Despite several innovative features gained over time, pottery throughout the late prehistoric period of southern Illyria was always handmade, manufactured within the household under the domain of women, who produced it on a seasonal basis in order to fulfil the internal needs of the household. Pottery in this context was never a commodity with a targeted value in a formal market. Against such a socio-economic backdrop, pottery in the late prehistoric of southern Illyria was developed within simple organized social groups without highly complex social hierarchies and always in a subsistence economy based on farming and herding in largely sedentary habitation sites.

Notable transformations of the qualitative profile of the pottery occur especially during the Early and Second Phases of the Iron Age. In these particular periods, the aesthetic features are clearly prevalent over the strictly functional attributes. This development is, however, highly conditioned by the socio-economic context in which there is little interest to foster formally an overall improvement and sophistication of the pottery style, leaving this type of transformation to the taste and talent of individual artisans.

In Chapter 5, I covered the *ideational profile* of the pottery attempting to understand a model of the regional networks and to what extent they shaped cultural transmissions: the chapter gave rise to four primary conclusions: first of all, the interactions developed during the late prehistoric period in southern Illyria were largely ruled by geographic proximity, which is to say that the nearest is highly interactive, the distant is less interactive or not at all. Secondly, it appears that the communities of prehistoric Albania only participate in certain types of social interactions. There is no evidence from the qualitative profile of the data for any type of formal exchange. Rather, the circulation of several traits in the pottery among these communities is to be attributed to the movement of potters and their ideas and habits, a process mainly brought about by marriage of young women and their dislocation from the parents' to the husband's house. It is due to this form of transmission, alternatively known as '*horizontal transmission*,' that most of the changes in the qualitative profile of the data occurs. Moreover, it seems that the lack of strong and distinctive local patterns is perhaps conditioned by the continuous intertwinement of various traditions of pottery making. Third, the model of interaction conditions the properties of the data, which becomes in turn an indicator of the prosperity of these communities. The sites that are able to build intense and long-term interactions also develop an enriched qualitative profile of the pottery data. And finally, the interactions ruled by geographic proximity do not go through drastic transformations over time. What is clear, moreover, is that transformations occur within two main regions, the north and the south, which do not interact at all, thus creating an unintentional cultural border of sorts. As I have already argued, the socio-economic character of the late prehistoric communities of southern Illyria did not promote or encourage long-distance interactions.

The conceptual framework of this research largely relied on a neo-evolutionary model in which social equilibrium was maintained by the increase of cohesion and solidarity, and the punishment of defectors. The late prehistoric communities of southern Illyria and northern Epirus succeed in building a balanced socio-economic equilibrium which was never challenged by any internal or external factors until the appearance of Greek colonization in the Ionian and Adriatic coast. Drastic transformations of the social, economic, and cultural sphere occur in the aftermath of the arrival of the newcomers and this is gradually reflected in the inland communities of southern Illyria. The introduction of wheel-made Greek pottery greatly influences local production, which was hitherto exclusively handmade, and leads to the beginning of a new era, one that needs to be carefully studied in the future.

In this study I have attempted to remedy the current state of pottery research in southern Illyria and northern Epirus by employing an integrated approach that only evaluated the potential of pottery data in understanding socio-economic profiles, social interactions, and cultural transmissions in southern Illyria. What I have not undertaken in this study is a comprehensive compositional analysis of the clay, which would greatly contribute to a better grasp of the technological profile of the material, as would the application of statistical analyses dealing with various combinations of attributes at different sites which would highlight particular local patterns and preferences. I hope to undertake such analyses in the near future.

Bibliography

Agolli, Esmeralda 2009. The Evolution of Household Pottery Production in the Iron Age Pottery of the Kamenicë Tumulus in Southeast Albania:Toward New Principles, Theories and Methodologies in Pottery Studies, MA Thesis, Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, University of California Los Angeles

Aliu, Skënder. 1969. Një qytezë e re ilire në Shqipërinë juglindore/rrethi i Kolonjës. In *Konferenca e dytë e Studimeve Albanologjike*.
———. 1994. Varreza e Borovës. *Iliria* 24 (1-2):5-57.
———. 1995. Tuma e Psarit. *Iliria* 25 (1-2):119-48.
———. 1996. Tuma e Shtikës. *Iliria* 26 (1-2):57-78.
———. 2004. *Tuma e Luarasit*. Tiranë: Akademia e Shkencave
———. 2012. *Tuma e Rehovës*. Korçë: Akademia e Shkencave e Shqipërisë.
Aliu, Skënder 1984. Tuma e Prodanit. *Iliria* 24:27-67.

Amore, Maria Grazia. 2010. *The Complex of Tumuli 9, 10 and 11 in the Necropolis of Apollonia (Albania)*. 2 vols: BAR International Series 2059 (I).

Anamali, Skënder. 1972. Zbulime të reja arkeologjike për marrëdhëniet e shqiptarëve me Bizantin në mesjetën e hershme. *Studime Historike* (1):157-63.
———. 1973. Nga ilirët tek arbërit. *Studime Historike* (3):121-40.
———. 1979/1980. Antikiteti i vonë dhe mesjeta e hershme në kërkimet shqiptare. *Iliria* (9-10):5-21.

Andrea, Zhaneta. 1981. Një varrezë e dystë në fshatin Gërmenj. *Iliria* 11 (1):219-26.
———. 1985. *Kultura Ilire e Tumave në Pellgun e Korçës*. Tiranë: Akademia e Shkencave e RPSSH.
———. 1990. Venbanimi shpellor i Nezirit. *Iliria* 21 (2):5-64.
———. 1995. Varreza tumulare e Bujanit *Iliria* 25 (1-2):91-114.
———. 1996. Vendbanimi i Zagorës. *Iliria* 26 (1-2):21-56.
———. 1997. Tuma e Cerujës. *Iliria* 27 (1-2):85-94.
Andrea, Zhaneta 2009/2010. Tuma 1 e Shuecit (Rrethi i Korçës). Rezultatet e fushatës së parë të gërmimeve *Iliria* 34:223-79.

Aprile, Jamie. 2014. An intensive, systematic archaeological survey of the landscape around the Lofkënd tumulus In *Excavations of the Prehistoric Burial Tumulus of Lofkënd in Albania*, edited by J. Papadopoulos, S. P. Morris, L. Bejko and L. A. Schepartz. Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology.

Arnold, Dean A. 1985. *Ceramic Theory and Cultural Process*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arnold, Dean E. 2000. Does the Standardization of Ceramic Pastes Really Mean Specialization? *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 7 (4):333-75.

Arnold, III, Philip J. 1991. Dimensional standardization and production scale in Mesoamerican ceramics. *Latin American Antiquity* 2 (4):363-70.

Bejko, Lorenc. 1993. Mbi praninë e qeramikës mikene në Shqipërinë Jugore dhe probleme lidhur me të. *Iliria* 23 (1-2):100-22.

———. 1994. Some problems of the Middle and Late Bronze Age in Southern Albania. *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology UC London*:105-26.

———. 1998. Vështrim mbi mendimin arkeologjik shqiptar dhe kontekstin e tij social *Iliria* 28 (1-2):195-207.

———. 1999/2000. Zakone mortore të bronzit të vonë në Shqipërinë Juglindore. *Iliria* 1-2:129-81.

———. Forthcoming. *The Tumulus of Kamenicë*.

Bejko, Lorenc and Richard Hodges, ed. 2006. *New Directions in Albanian Archaeology: Studies Presented to Muzafer Korkuti*. Tirana: International Centre for Albanian Archaeology.

Bejko, Lorenc, Todd Fenton, and David Foran. 2006. Recent advances in Albanian mortuary archaeology, human osteology, and ancient DNA. In *New Directions in Albanian Archaeology: Studies presented to Muzafer Korkuti*, edited by L. Bejko and R. Hodges. Tirana: International Center for Albanian Archaeology:309-322

Bejko, Lorenc, Korkuti Muzafer, Jack I. Davis, Michael L. Galaty, Skënder Muçaj, and Sharon R. Stocker. 1998. The Mallakastra Regional Archaeological Project: First Season, 1998. *Iliria* 1-2:253-74.

Bela, Muhamet. 1990. Tumat e Myç-Hasit. *Iliria* 21 (2):97-136.

Bela, Muhamet, and Luan Përzhita. 1990. Harta arkeologjike e zonës së Hasit (rrethi i Kukësit). *Iliria* 21 (2):227-48.

Belli, Petrit, and Sami Starova. 1983. Vendbanimi shpellor i Katundasit. *Iliria* 13 (1):79-84.

Benco, Nancy L. 1986. Morphological Standardization: An Approach to the Study of Craft Specialization. In *A Pot For All Reasons: Ceramic Ecology Revisited*, edited by C. C. Kolb and L. L. Louana. Philadelphia: Temple University: 57-72.

Binford, Lewis R. 1962. Archaeology as Anthropology. *American Antiquity* 28 (2):217-25.

Blackman, James M., Gil J. Stein, and Pamela B. Vandiver. 1993. The Standardization Hypothesis and Ceramics Mass Production: Technological, Compositional, and Metric Indexes of Craft Specialization at Tell Leilan, Syria. *American Antiquity* 58 (1):60-80.

Bodinaku, Namik. 1981. Kërkime Arkeologjike në Rrethin e Përmetit *Iliria* 2:243-62.
———. 1982. Varreza tumulare e Pazhokut. *Iliria* 1:49-101.
———. 1989. Rreth kronologjisë së qeramikës së pikturuar mat të kohës së vonë të Bronzit dhe të Hekurit. *Iliria* 19 (1):53-63.
———. 1990. Rreth origjinës dhe bartësve të qeramikës së pikturuar mat të kohës së vonë të Bronzit dhe asaj të Hekurit *Iliria* 21 (2):65-96.
———. 2001/2002. Varreza tumulare e Dukatit në rrethin e Vlorës *Iliria* 1-2:9-96.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *An Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bowden, William, and Hodges Richard. 2004. Ghosts. Nationalism and the question of rural continuity in Albania. In *Landscapes of change. Rural Evolution in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, edited by N. Christie: Ashgate Publishing Company: 195-222

Bowser, Brenda J., and John Patton, Q. 2008. Learning and Transmission of Pottery Style: Women's Life Histories and Communities of Practice in Ecuadorian Amazon. In *Cultural Transmission and Material Cutlure: Breaking Down Bondaries* edited by M. T. Stark, B. J. Bowser and L. Horne. Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press:105-129.

Boyd, Robert, and Peter J. Richerson. 2005. *The Origin and Evolution of Cultures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Braka, Kujtim 1987. Një varrezë e periudhës së Hekurit në fshatin Katundas të rrethit të Beratit *Iliria* 17 (2):37-48.

Brown, James J. , ed. 1971. *The Dimensions of Status in the Burials at Spiro*. Edited by J. Brown. Vol. 36, *Approaches to the Social Dimensions of Mortuary Practices*. Memoirs of the Society for American Archaeology

Buck, Robert J. 1964. Middle Helladic Mattpainted Pottery. *Hesperia* 33:231-314.

Buda, Aleks. 1976. Ilirët e jugut si problem i historiografisë. *Iliria* (6):39-53.

Budina, Dhimosten. 1969. Tumat e Çepunës. *Buletini Arkeologjik*:49-56.
———. 1971. Gërmimet arkeologjike në varrezën tumulare të Bajkajt. *Buletini Arkeologjik* 3:57-66.

Bunguri, Adem. 2010. *Prehistoria e Dibrës*. Tiranë: Qendra e Studimeve Albanologjike

Cavalli-Sforza, L. L., M. W. Feldman, K. H. Chen, and S. M. Dornbusch. 1982. Theory and Observation in Cultural Transmission. *Science* 218 (4567):19-27.

Cavalli-Sforza, L. L., Luigi Luca, and Marcus Feldman, W. 1981. *Cultural Transmission and Evolution: A Quantitative Approach*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Ceka, Neritan. 1974. Gërmimi i një tume në Dukat. *Iliria* 3:139-61.

Chapman, Kenneth 1970. The pottery of San Ildefonso pueblo In *Cibola Whiteware Conference* University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.

Costin, Cathy L., and Melissa B. Hagstrum. 1995. Standardization, Labor Investment, Skill, and the Organization of Ceramic Production in Late Prehispanic Highland Peru. *American Antiquity* 60 (4):619-39.

Costin, Cathy Lynne. 1991. Craft Specialization: Issues in Defining, Documenting, and Explaining the Organization of Production. *Archaeological Method and Theory* 3:1-56.

Cullen, Tracey. 1985. Social Implications of Ceramics Style in the Neolithic Peleponnese. In *Ceramics and Civilization: Ancient Technology to Modern Science*, edited by W. D. Kingery. Colombus, Ohio: The American Ceramic Society.

Damiata, Brian, N., K. Papadopoulos John, Grazia Amore Maria, P. Morris Sarah, Bejko Lorenc, M. Martson John, and Southon John. 2007/2008. Të dhëna mbi kronologjinë absolute të arkeologjisë shqiptare: datime radiokarboni AMS nga Apollonia dhe Lofkëndi. *Iliria* 33:135-84.

DeBoer, Warren, and Donald Lathrap. 1979. The making and breaking of Shipibo-Conibo ceramics In *Ethnoarchaeology: implications of ethnograhy for archaeology* edited by C. Kramer. New York: Columbia University Press:102-138.

Dhima, Aleksandër. 1986a. Gërmimet arkeologjike të vitit 1986 - Lënda eshtrore nga Proseku. *Iliria* 2:272-3.
———. 1986b. Kafka të periudhës antike të vonë nga Bylisi. *Iliria* 2:171-82.
———. 1987a. Studim antropologjik i gjetjeve eshtrore nga varreza e Rapckës. *Iliria* 2:123-51.
———. 1987b. Gërmimet arkeologjike të vitit 1987 - Brar/Tiranë *Iliria* 2:265.

Dhima, Aleksandër, and Janos Nemeskeri. 1988. Sprovë për rindërtimin paleobiologjik të popullsisë apoloniate të shek. I-III të e.sonë. *Iliria* 1:119-48.

Douzougli, Angelika, and John K. Papadopoulos. 2011. Liatovouni: A Molossian Cemetery and Settlement in Epirus. *Jahrbuch des Deutchen Archaologischen Instituts* 125 (4):1-87.

Dunnell, Robert C. 1971. *Systematics in Prehistory*. New York Free Press.

Eerkens, Jelmer W 2000. Practice Makes Within 5% of Perfect: Visual Perception, Motor Skills, and Memory in Artifact Variation. *Current Anthropology* 41 (4):663-8.

Eerkens, Jelmer W., and Robert L. Bettinger. 2001. Techniques for Assessing Standardization in Artifact Assemblages: Can We Scale Material Variability? *American Antiquity* 66 (3):493-504.

Feinman, Gary M. 1980. The relationship between administrative organization and ceramic production in the valley of Oaxaca Department of Anthropology, Ph.D Dissertation, City University of New York

Feinman, Gary M. , Steadman Upham, and Kent G. Lightfoot. 1981. The Production Step Measure: An Ordinal Index of Labor Input in Ceramic Manufacture. *American Antiquity* 46 (4):871-84.

Filipovic, Milenko S. 1951. Primitive Ceramics Made by Women among the Balkan Peoples. *Monographs Tome* CLXXXI (2):157-70.

Fontana, Bernard L. , Robinson William, Cormak Charles, and Leavitt Jr. Ernest. 1962. *Papago Indian pottery*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Foster, George M. 1966. The sociology of pottery: questions, hypothesis arising from contemporary Mexican work. In *Ceramics and Man* edited by M. Frederick, R. London Methuen and Co LTD:43-61.

Fouache, Eric, Jean-Jacques Dufaure, Michelle Denèfle, Anne-Marie Lézine, Pétrika Léra, Frano Prendi, and Gilles Touchais. 2001. Man and environment around lake Maliq (southern Albania) during the Late Holocene. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 10 (2):79-86.

Galaty, Michael. 2013. The Enviromental Context. In *Light and Shadow: Isolation and Interaction in the Shala Valley of Northern Albania* edited by M. Galaty, O. Lafe, W. E. Lee and Z. Tafilica. Los Angeles Costen Institute of Archaeology: 29-43.

Galaty, Michael L., Ols Lafe, Wayne E. Lee, and Zamir Tafilica, eds. 2013. *Light and Shadow: Isolation and Interaction in the Shala Valley of Northern Albania* Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology.

Gilkes, Oliver. 2004 The Trojans in Epirus: Archaeology, Myth and Indentity in Inter-War Albania. In *Archaeology under Dictatorship*, edited by M. L. Galaty and C. Watkinson. New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London Moscow: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers: 33-54.

Gosselain, Oliver P. 2008. Mother Bella Was Not a Bella: Inherited and Transformed Traditions in Southwestern Niger. In *Cultural Transmission and Material Culture: Breaking Down* edited by M. T. Stark, B. J. Bowser and L. Horne. Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press: 150-177.

Guglielmino, C. R., C. Viganotti, B. Hewlett, and L. L. Cavalli-Sforza. 1995. Cultural Variation in Africa: Role of Mechanisms of Transmission and Adaptation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 92 (16):7585-9.

Halstead, Paul. 1987. Traditional and Ancient Rural Economy in Mediterranean Europe: Plus ça Change? *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 107:77-87.

Hammel, E. A., S. Ehrich Robert, Radmila Fabijanić-Filipović, M. Halpern Joel, and B. Lord Albert, eds. 1982. *Among the People: Selected Writings of Milenko S. Filipović*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Hammond, Nicholas G. L. 1967. *Epirus: The geography, the ancient remains, the history and the topography of Epirus and adjacent areas*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

Hammond, Nicholas G. L. 1982. Illyris, Epirus and Macedonia in the Early Iron Age. In *The Cambridge Ancient History: The Prehistory of the Balkans and the Middle East and the Aegean world tenth to eigth centuries B.C.*, edited by J. Boardman, I. E. S. Edwards, N. G. L. Hammond and E. Sollberger. Cambridge Cambridge University Press.

Hegmon, Michelle. 1992. Archaeological Research on Style. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21 (ArticleType: research-article / Full publication date: 1992 / Copyright © 1992 Annual Reviews):517-36.

Hegmon, Michelle, and Stephanie Kulow. 2005. Painting as Agency, Style as Structure: Innovations in Mimbres Pottery Designs from Southwest New Mexico. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 12 (4):313-34.

Heizer, Robert F. 1962. The Background of Thomsen's Three-Age System. *Technology and Culture* 3 (3):259-66.

Herbich, Ingrid, and Michael Dietler. 2008 The Long Arm of the Mother-in-Law: Learning, Postmarital Resocialization of Women, and Material Culture Style. In *Cultural Transmission and Material Culture: Breaking Down Boundaries*, edited by M. T. Stark, B. J. Bowser and L. Horne. Tucson: University of Arizona Press:223-244.

Heurtley, Walter A. 1925/1926. Report on Excavations at the Toumba and the Tables of Vardaroftsa, Macedonia. *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 27:1-66.

———. 1926/1927. A Prehistoric Site in Western Macedonia and the Dorian Invasion. *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 28:158-94.

Hewlett, Barry S. , Annalisa De Silvestri, and Rosalba C. Guglielmino. 2002. Semes and Genes in Africa. *Current Anthropology* 43 (2):313-21.

Hochstetter, Alex. 1982. Die mattbemalte Keramik in Nordgriechenland, Ihre Herkunft und lokale Ausprägung. *Praehistorische Zeitschrift* 57:211-97.

———. 1984. Kastanas. Ausgrabungen in einem Siedlungshügel der Bronze – und Eisenzeit Makedoniens 1975 – 1979. Die handgemachte Keramik, Schichten 19 bis 1. In *Prähistorische Archäologie in Südosteuropa 3*. Berlin: Verlag Volker Spiess.

Horejs, Barbara. *The Phenomenon of Matt-painted Pottery in the Northern Aegean: Introduction, Overview and Theories", http://www.aegeobalkanprehistory.net/article.php?id_art=8*. 2007.

Hoti, Afrim. 1982. Varreza tumulare e Bardhocit në rrethin e Kukësit. *Iliria* 1:15-45.
———. 1986. Tumat V e VI të Kënetës. *Iliria* 16 (2):41-70.

Hoxha, Enver 1969. Nga diskutimi në mbledhjen e Byrosë Politike të KQ të PPSH. In *Vepra*. Tiranë.

Hoxha, Gëzim. 1987. Gjurmë të periudhës së bronzit të hershëm në kalanë e Shkodrës. *Iliria* 1:71-81.

Jubani, Bep. 1969. Tipare të përbashkëta në ritin e varrimit tek ilirët e trevës së Shqipërisë In *Iliret dhe Gjeneza e Shqiptarëve* Tiranë.
———. 1969. Varreza tumulare e Çinamakut. *Buletini Arkeologjik*:37-51.
———. 1982. Tumat e Krumës (Rrethi i Kukësit). *Iliria* 12 (2):147-96.
———. 1983. Tumat ilire të Kënetës. *Iliria* 13 (2):77-134.
———. 1990. Qeramika e zbukuruar me motiv vijash paralele *Iliria* 20 (1):243-52.
———. 1995. Kultura e Bronzit të Hershëm në Tumat e Shkrelit. *Iliria* 1-2:53-73.
———. 1995. Kultura e bronzit të hershëm në tumat e Shkrelit. *Iliria* 25 (1-2):53-90.

Kaufman, Brett. 2013. Theory in Archaeometry. *The Crucible: Historical Metallurgy Society News* Summer (83):17-8.

Knappett, Carl. 1999. Tradition and Innovation in Pottery Forming Technology: Wheel-Throwing at Middle Minoan Knossos. *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 94:101-29.

Koka, Aristotel. 2012. *Kultura Ilire e Tumave të Shtojit Shkodër*. Tiranë: Qendra e Studimeve Albanologjike. Departamenti i Arkeologjisë.

Korkuti, Muzafer. 1969. Qeramika e pikturuar e kohës së vonë të bronzit dhe e kohës së hershme të hekurit dhe karakteri Ilir i bartësve të saj. *Studime Historike* 3:159-74.
———. 1971. Vendbanimi prehistorik i Trenit. *Iliria* 1:31-48.
———. 1981. Tuma e Patosit. *Iliria* 1:7-55.
———. 1990. Një kushtim i epokës së Bronzit në Çukë (Sarandë). *Iliria* 1:75-83.

Krieger, Alex D. 1944. The Typological Concept. *American Antiquity* 9 (3):271-88.

Kurti, Dilaver. 1999. *Trashëgime iliro-arbërore*. Tiranë: Hylli i Dritës.

Kvamme, Kenneth L. , Miriam T. Stark, and William A. Longrace. 1996. Alternative Procedures for Assessing Standardization in Ceramic Assemblages. *American Antiquity* 61 (1):116-26.

Lemonier, Pierre. 1985. The Study of Material Culture Today: Toward an Anthropology of Technical Systems. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 5:147-86.
———, ed. 1993. *Technological Choices: Transformation in material cultures since the Neolithic*. London and New York: Routledge.

Lera, Petrika, Cécile Oberweiler, and Gilles Touchais. 2008. Le passage du Bronze Récent au fer ancien sur le site de Sovjan (basin de Korçë, Albanie): Nouvelles données chronologiques. In *L'Illyrie Meridionale et L'Epire dans L'Antiquite-V*, edited by J.-L. Lamboley and M. P. Castiglioni. Grenoble: Diffusion par le BOCCARD, 1:41-52.

Lera, Petrika, Gilles Touchais, and Cécile Oberweiler. 2007/2008. Ndihmesa e gërmimeve të Sovjanit për kronologjinë absolute në prehistorinë shqiptare. *Iliria* 33:39-50.

Leroi-Gourhan, Adreu. 1964. *Le Geste et la Parole Tome 1: Technique et Langage*. Biblothèque Albin Michel Sciences Paris.

Leroi-Gourhan, Andreu. 1971. *L'Homme et la matière*. Vol. 1, *Collections Sciences - Sciences Humaines*. Paris: Center National Du Livre.

Longrace, William A. 1999. Standardization and Specialization: What is the link? In *Pottery and People*, edited by J. M. S. a. G. M. Feinman. University of Utah Press: Salt Lake City:44-58.

Malthus, Thomas R. 1982. *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. London: Penguin Classics.

Martson, John M. 2014. Environmental archaeology at Lofkënd. In *Excavations of the Prehistoric Burial Tumulus of Lofkënd in Albania*, edited by J. K. Papadopoulos, S. P. Morris, L. Bejko and L. A. Schepartz. Los Angeles: Cosen Institute of Archaeology.

Mauss, Marcel. 1950. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Society*. Routledge: W.W. Norton.

Morris, Ian. 1987. *Burial and ancient society: The rise of the Greek city-state.* . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nicklin, Keith. 1971. Stability and Innovation in Pottery Manufacture. *World Archaeology* 3 (1):13-48.

O'Brien, Michael J. , R. Lyman Lee, and Brian Schiffer Michael. 2005. *Archaeology as Process: Processualism and its Progeny* University of Utah Press.

Papadopoulos, John K. 1997. Innovations, Imitations and Ceramic Style: Modes of Production and Modes of Dissemination. In *TEXNH Craftsmen, Craftswomen and Craftsmanship in the Aegean Bronze Age: Proceeding of the 6th International Aegean Conference/6e Recontre égéenne internationale Philadelphia, Temple University, 18-21 April 1996*, edited by R. Laffineur and P. P. Betancourt. Austin: Université de Liége, University of Texas:449-463.

Papadopoulos, John K. 2005. *The Early Iron Age Cemetery at Torone*. Los Angeles Cotsen Institute of Archaeology at UCLA.

Papadopoulos, John K. , Sarah P. Morris, Lorenc Bejko, and Lynne A. Schepartz. 2014. *Excavations of the Prehistoric Burial Tumulus of Lofkënd in Albania Cotsen Institute of Archaeology*. Los Angeles.

Papadopoulos, John K., Lorenc Bejko, and Sarah P. Morris. 2007. Excavations at the Prehistoric Burial Tumulus of Lofkënd in Albania: A Preliminary Report for the 2004-2005 Seasons. *American Journal of Archaeology* 111 (1):105-47.

Papadopoulos, John K., Sarah P. Morris, Lorenc Bejko, and Lynne A. Schepartz. 2014. Lofkënd: the site and archaeological objectives In *Excavations of the Prehistoric Burial Tumulus of Lofkënd in Albania*, edited by J. Papadopoulos, S. P. Morris, B. Lorenc and L. A. Schepartz. Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology.

Peacock, David. 1982. *Pottery in the Roman World: an ethnoarchaeological approach*. London and New York: Longman.

Peeva, Adela. 2003. Whose Is This Song?, TV Documentary. USA.

Përzhita, Luan, and Muhamet Belaj. 1987. Objekte nga tumat e Përbregut (Kukës). *Iliria* 1:223-5.

Pevnick, Seth, and Esmeralda Agolli. 2014. The pottery from the tombs and tumulus fill. In *Excavations of the Prehistoric Burial Tumulus of Lofkënd in Albania*, edited by K. P. John, P. M. Sarah, B. Lorenc and L. A. Schepartz. Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology.

Prendi, Frano. 1956. Mbi rezultatet e gërmimeve në fshatin Vodhinë të rrethit të Gjirokastrës. *Buletin për Shkencat Shoqërore* 1:180-8.
———. 1957. Tumat në fushën e fshatit Vajzë /Vlorë. *Buletin për Shkencat Shoqërore* 2:76-110.
———. 1959. Tumat në fshatrat Kakavi dhe Bodrishtë të rrethit të Gjirokastrës. *Buletin për shkencat shoqërore*:190-211.
———. 1966. La civilisation préhistorique de Maliq. *Studia Albanica* 1:255-80.
———. 1974. Vështrim mbi kulturën e periudhës së parë të epokës së hekurit në Shqipëri. *Iliria* 3:103-30.
———. 1977/1978. Epoka e Bronzit në Shqipëri. *Iliria* 7-8:5-58.
———. 1985. Mbi formimin e kulturës dhe të etnosit ilir në territorin e Shqipërisë gjatë epokës së bronzit dhe fillimit të asaj të hekurit. . *Iliria* (2):83-117.
———. 1988. Kërkimet arkeologjike në fushën e kulturës Pre dhe Protohistorike Ilire në Shqipëri. *Iliria* (1):5-32.
———. 1989. La continuité ethno-culturelle illyro-albanaise et la formation du peuple albanais. Paper read at Südosteuropa-Studie 48. Internationales Symposion, at Bonn:11-17.

Prendi, Frano, and Adem Bunguri. 2008. *Bronzi i Hershëm në Shqipëri* Prishtinë: ARK-KOS.

Prendi, Frano, Lera Petrika, and Touchais Gilles. 1996. Gërmime arkeologjike të vitit 1995: Sovjan. *Iliria* 1-2:225-53.

Read, Dwight W. 2007. *Artifact Classification: A Conceptual and Methodological Approach*. Walnut Creek, California: Left Coast Press.

Rebani, Bep. 1966. Keramika Ilire e qytezës së Gajtanit *Studime Historike* 1:42-70.

Rouse, Irving. 1960. The Classification of Artifacts in Archaeology. *American Antiquity* 25 (3):313-23.

Sackett, James R. 1977. The Meaning of Style in Archaeology: A General Model. *American Antiquity* 42 (3):369-80.

Sahlins, Marshall D., and Elman R. Service. 1960. *Evolution and Culture*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Saraswati, Baidyanath, and Kishore Behura. 1966. *Pottery Techniques in Peasant India*. Calcutta: Anthropological Survey of India.

Schepartz, Lynne A. 2010. Bioarchaeology of Apollonia: Tumuli 9, 10, 11 and Appendixes 1, 2 and 3. In *The Complex of Tumuli 9, 10 and 11 in the Necropolis of Apollonia (Albania)*, edited by M. G. Amore: BAR International Series 2059 (I).

———. 2014. Bioarchaeology of the Lofkënd tumulus In *Excavations of the Prehistoric Burial Tumulus of Lofkënd in Albania*, edited by J. K. Papadopoulos, S. P. Morris and L. Bejko. Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology.

Sinopoli, Carla M. 1991. *Approaches to Archaeological Ceramics*. New York and London:: Plenum Press.

Skibo, James M., and Michael B. Schiffer. 2008. *People and Things: A Behavioral Approach to Material Culture*. New York: Springer.

Sørensen, Mari Louise S. 1989. Ignoring Innovation - denying change: the role of iron and impact of external influences on the transformation of Scandinavian societies 800-500 B.C. In *What's New? A Closer Look at the Process of Innovation* edited by S. E. Van der Leeuw, Robin Torrence. London: Unwin Hyman: 182-199.

Spahiu, Hëna 1986. Elemente të traditës antike në kulturën e varrezave të mesjetës së hershme shqiptare. *Iliria* (1):263-9.

Spencer, Herbert 1974. *The Evolution of Society; Selections from Herbert Spencer's Principles of Sociology*. Midway reprint: The University of Chicago Press.

Stapleton, Lyssa C. 2014. The prehistoric burial customs In *Excavations of the Prehistoric Burial Tumulus of Lofkënd in Albania*, edited by J. Papadopoulos, S. P. Morris, L. Bejko and L. A. Schepartz. Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology.

Stark, Miriam T. , Brenda Bowser, J., and Lee Horne, eds. 2008. *Cultural Transmission and Material Culture: Breaking Down Boundaries*. Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press

Stipcevic, Aleksandar. 1973. Simbolizëm ilir e simbolizëm shqiptar. *Studime Historike* (2):129-34.

Tartaron, Thomas F. 2004. *Bronze Age Landscape and Society in Southern Epirus, Greece*, *BAR International Series 1290*. Oxford: Archaeopress Publishers of British Archaeological Reports.

Tirtja, Mark. 1976. Elemente të kulteve ilire te shqiptarët. *Iliria* (5):241-60.

van der Leeuw, Sander E. 1976. Studies in the Technology of Ancient Pottery: Archaeological theories and artifact research. The pottery of a medieval Syrian village on the Euphrates river Neolithic Beakers from the Netherlands: the potter's point of view, PhD Dissertation, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

———. 1977. Toward a study of the economics of pottery making In *Ex Horreo*, edited by B. L. V. Beek, R. W. Brant and W. G.-v. Waateringe. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam:68-76.

———. 1993. Technological Choices: Transformation in material cultures since the Neolithic. In *Technological Choices: Transformation in material cultures since the Neolithic*, edited by P. Lemonier. London and New York: Routledge:238-288.

van der Leeuw, Sander E., and Robin Torrence, eds. 1989. *What's New? A Closer Look at the Process of Innovation* London: Unwin Hyman.

Vitelli, Karen D. 1993. Power to the Potters. *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* 6:247-57.

Vokotopoulou, Ioulia. 1986. *Βίτσα: Τα νεκροταφεια μιαδ μιας μολοσσικηδ μολοσσικης κώμηδκώμης*, *ΕΚΔΟΣΗ ΤΟΥ ΤΑΜΕΙΟΥ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΔΟΓΙΚΩΝ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΩΝ ΠΟΡΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΠΑΔΔΟΤΡΙΩΣΕΩΝ ΑΠΑΛΛΟΤΡΙΩΣΕΩΝ*. ΑΘΗΝΑ.

Wace, Alan J. B., and S. Thompson Maurice. 1912. *Prehistoric Thessaly: Being Some Account of Recent Excavations and Explorations in North-Eastern Greece from Lake Kopais to the Borders of Macedonia.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallart, Hélène. 2008. The Way of Potters Mother: Apprenticeship Strategies among Dii Potters Cameroon, West Africa. In *Cultural Transmission and Material Cutlure* edited by M. T. Stark, B. J. Bowser and L. Horne. Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press:178-198.

Weber, Ernst Heinrich. 1834. *De Pulen, Resorptione, Auditu et Tactu: Annotationes Anatomicae et Physiologicae*. Leipzig, Germany: Kohler.

Wengrow, David. 2001. The Evolution of Simplicity: Aesthetic Labour and Social Change in the Neolithic Near East. *World Archaeology* 33 (2):168-88.

Wobst, Martin H. 1977. Stylistic behavior and information exchange. In *For the Director: Research Analysis in Honor of James B. Griffin*, edited by C. E. Cleland. Ann Arbor: Univeristy of Michigan: 317-342.

Ylli, Luftim. 1988. Vendbanimi prehistorik i Liqethit. *Iliria* 18 (2):93-103.