

Craft Specialization in the Neolithic of Greece

Catherine Perlès and Karen D. Vitelli

Craft specialization can be, and has been, defined in many ways, and has been documented archaeologically in a wide range of socio-economic situations. Numerous classifications of craft specialization have also been offered, although most of these assume an underlying economic and political motivation, and hence focus on categories such as full-time or part-time, independent or attached specialists. Indeed, craft specialization has for a long time been linked with the emergence of hierarchically organized societies. In the Aegean context, it has been considered a Bronze Age, not a Neolithic phenomenon. Because the approach to specialization has been structurally biased in favour of the so-called complex societies, it becomes almost impossible to fit observed cases of specialized production in the Neolithic into extant typologies of craft specialization.

We prefer to begin our considerations of craft specialization in the Greek Neolithic without prior assumptions about levels of social organization and with the simplest definition of specialization, that is when some people practise skills that others do not, and the products are transferred from the producer to non-dependents (Clark and Parry 1990), or, to use Costin's words, 'Whenever there are fewer producers than consumers of a particular good, we recognize specialized production' (Costin 1991: 43). This definition acknowledges, intentionally, the existence of specialists even within (Palaeolithic) hunter-gatherer societies. Indeed, it is important

to recognize that 'specialists' have always existed. If we are to understand the dynamics of prehistoric societies from the Palaeolithic to the Bronze Age, what matters is precisely to document how specialization evolved, the contexts in which it was practised, the goods that were produced by specialists, how they were distributed, what promoted specialization, and how the presence of specialists of any kind affected the organization of society. In other words, we have to specify, in each context and for each category of goods, the characteristics of the specialization involved.

If a full range of variables is taken into account, to the extent that the data permit (Perlès 1992), it then becomes clear, first, that specialized production existed in Greece in contexts that varied considerably, depending on the specific craft and the chronological phase, and, secondly, that procurement, production, distribution and consumption did (and do) not vary independently, but together form a coherent system within each category of product (Torrence 1986). Some examples of the different circumstances within the Neolithic should make this point clear.

[C.P., K.D.V.]

Lithics

The variables, evidence and arguments pertaining to the procurement, production, distribution and consumption of lithics in Neolithic

Greece have been published elsewhere in considerable detail (e.g. Perlès 1990, 1992), so we summarize them here only briefly.

Early Neolithic (EN) and Middle Neolithic (MN)

- The raw materials exploited are primarily exotic, from localized sources (mainly obsidian, but including honey flints and high-quality jaspers).
- Use of the products is utilitarian.
- Products show no stylistic imprint and striking technical homogeneity all over Greece.
- Products are distributed widely over long distances and the total quantity in circulation at any given time (versus that found at a particular site) is significant.
- Distribution within sites and between sites is even.
- Products are introduced into the sites as partially worked cores or finished products, never as raw material.
- The level of knowledge and skill is markedly different in products made from exotic raw materials and in those made from local raw materials.

Both the methods of procurement at the sources and the production methods for exotic raw materials present all the characteristics of specialized activities (e.g. the skills and knowledge involved in seafaring and/or quarrying, the length of apprenticeship to acquire the skills, the high output per individual, the absence of errors). The evidence strongly points to specialist itinerant knappers who supplied finished products to settlements throughout Greece.

Late Neolithic (LN)

Sharp regional differences emerge during the LN, both in the strategies used to procure raw materials and in the methods of flaking.

- Milian obsidian reaches Western and Central Macedonia, but in small quantities and mostly as finished pieces. Good-quality flint is also imported, but local raw material is extensively exploited as well.
- In Thessaly and Central Greece (including Euboea), imported raw materials remain dominant, and the organization of production remains basically unchanged (although production techniques are modified).
- By contrast, in Southern Greece, the proportion of obsidian increases, but the level of craftsmanship varies greatly.
- In the south, different methods are used concurrently and 'stylistic' provinces emerge.
- Again in the south, obsidian is introduced into the sites in varied states (as raw material, roughed-out blocks, preformed cores, etc.).

This situation, which is quite different in the south from that which prevailed in the earlier Neolithic, can be explained by increased sea-faring among the Cycladic islands, some of which are now settled, and by the development of a 'direct supply zone' that comes into competition with specialized procurement (Perlès 1990; Torrence 1986). Within this 'direct supply zone', a lesser degree of craftsmanship is often evident and indicates the emergence of some domestic production. The situation thus becomes much more differentiated than in the earlier periods. Paradoxically, however, the trend is not towards more specialization, as is so often assumed, but towards a more complex situation that includes some degree of 'de-specialization'.

Pottery

The circumstances of acquisition of raw materials, production, distribution and consumption of pottery are rather different from those of lithics, although they also show changes over time.

Early Neolithic (EN)

- Pottery is locally produced at all (?) sites, exploiting local materials.
- Potters use simple methods and techniques, but these are labour-intensive.
- Within the Peloponnese, discrete wares, each made with different raw materials, building and firing procedures, and by different hands, are consistently present, but without obvious differences in vessel shape, size, or use that correlate with wares.
- Overall production is low, perhaps as few as 12-13 pots per year total at Franchthi (Vitelli 1993: 210)
- There are more potters than necessary for the scale of production, but too few to represent household production for domestic needs.
- No domestic, 'utilitarian' use can be securely documented: pots are *not* apparently used for cooking, and are too few and too small for storage (Vitelli 1989: 26-27).
- Different wares are uniformly distributed within the site.
- Pots are 'consumed' locally: there is very limited evidence for exchange of ceramics within the region, and even less for long-distance exchange.
- Some regional stylistic variation is evident.

Middle Neolithic (MN)

- Pots are still produced locally from local materials but, at least in the south, a common recipe for the clay body (Urfirnis) is shared among potters at all sites.
- Most potters are skilled manipulators of technology, innovative, and willing to take risks. The level of skill, technical knowledge, practice and experience points to specialist potters.

- The scale of production increases, but, with a total output of less than 100 pots per year at Franchthi, is still small (Vitelli 1993: 210, 211 n. 10). The products are still labour-intensive and each pot is distinctive.
- Ninety percent of production is devoted to 'fine wares', including up to 25% that are elaborately decorated. A few cooking pots are first present late in MN, as are a few potential storage jars.
- Distribution is even within and among sites (with the possible exception of decorated pots: Sesklo—Kotsakis 1983: 95-102; Franchthi—Vitelli 1993: 72 n. 14; Lerna—Vitelli in prep.).
- Technological and stylistic developments are shared throughout each region, but intra- and interregional exchange of the pots themselves appears limited.
- Strong regional stylistic differences are evident.

Late Neolithic (LN)

- Generally, the stylistic regions are smaller and more numerous. The number of 'wares' and decorative styles increases, and most (e.g., Grey on Grey, various polychromes, local 'matt painted' wares) apparently were produced in quite limited areas.
- Some 'wares' (e.g. black burnished and, later, matt painted) have very widespread distributions (essentially, in all regions), but it is still unclear whether these pots are locally produced at each site (and represent a shared style) or derive from a limited source (and represent exchange).
- The level of technical skill varies considerably, both within and among wares.
- Individuality is expressed through general style, rather than through the individual pot: within wares, there is some degree of

standardization. This might imply a greater concern for efficiency.

- In the Peloponnese, the scale of production appears to drop dramatically. In the north, however, scale may increase.
- Interregional long-distance exchange in pots is documented but uneven: in the Peloponnese, even neighbouring sites do not have the same wares represented (Phelps 1975: 186-87).
- Coarse/cooking wares increase to 30-40% of production in both the north and the south, perhaps reflecting increasing use of pottery in the domestic sphere.

While the study of LN ceramics is just beginning to move beyond a concern with chronology, it is already clear that patterns of production, distribution and consumption are quite different from those of the MN. Even procuring raw materials, which up to this point had apparently been done from local sources, may have begun to play a more significant role, for the manganese oxide first used as a pigment on LN ceramics may have been an exotic ingredient, not readily available to all. There are also hints that, as is the case for lithics, ceramic production and consumption in the different regions of Greece followed different trajectories from the LN on. Certainly the overall quantity (and variety) of pottery in Thessaly in the LN stands in striking contrast to the small numbers found in excavations and even in intensively surveyed portions of the Peloponnese. A clearer picture of the differences among the regions must await further study.

In the Final Neolithic (FN), coarse/cooking wares continue to increase in frequency, indeed they become the dominant wares—up to 95-100% at some sites. These coarse wares exhibit great variability in composition, shape and the level of skill with which they were produced.

Rare Goods

Few detailed studies have been published of the production and distribution of metal artefacts (but see Zachos 1996a, 1996b) and, more generally, of all 'rare goods': ornaments, stone vessels, marble figurines, *Spondylus* bracelets, etc. The available information fits rather well with what is known elsewhere about the production and distribution of ornaments and rare goods: production centres were limited in number; goods saw wide distribution, but in small quantities; and the goods were distributed unequally within and among sites.

Discussion and Further Thoughts¹

These examples demonstrate significant variation in the production, consumption, and distribution of what can be considered specialized products. We can now return to the various classifications of craft specialization. The most elaborate ones include up to eight different types. How many of our cases would fit the classifications, and into how many types would they fall? Leaving aside the (not trivial) difficulty of actually documenting all the required parameters, one can broadly assume that *all* our Neolithic examples would fit into the 'individual and/or household production' of van der Leuw (1984), the 'household production' of Peacock (1982), and the 'individual and/or community specialization' of Costin (1991), that is, into the simplest type in each system.

Thus the variety of situations that we have just documented is obscured by current typologies of craft specialization. The parameters that underlie these typologies, with their emphasis on social, economic and political variables, are inadequate to document the organization of production in the Neolithic. Not only do they mask the observed variety, but they are often

understood to imply a strict linear evolution from 'simple' to 'complex', an evolution that our data contradict. For instance, although Costin aptly points out that the rationale of the exchange between producer and consumer is one of the important variables in defining craft specialization, she systematically refers to 'payment in money or in kind' or 'economic dependency' (Costin 1991: 3-4) as a necessary prerequisite for craft specialization, thus excluding other rationales as the basis for exchange.

What we actually see in the Neolithic is a far more subtle and complex situation. It is not fashionable, nowadays, to differentiate between economic, social and status-related motives for trade in so-called 'traditional societies'. As Greenfield points out, the 'Kula ring' model is prevalent (Greenfield 1991)! Nevertheless, the Greek data clearly show that the different modes of circulation and distribution of 'exotic' goods also correspond to different systems in the organization of production. The documented variation is not random: on the contrary, it corresponds to coherent systems of production, consumption and distribution of goods (Perlès 1992).

The characteristics of the procurement, production and distribution of obsidian and honey flint blades, especially in the EN and MN,² easily meet the definitions of individual or community specialization. That is:

- (a) The sources are localized and access to them is controlled, not through political means, but through the possession of the specific skills required to exploit them: seafaring to Milos, at a time when the Cycladic islands were still uninhabited, and, presumably, quarrying for the honey flints.
- (b) The choice of flaking methods, in particular pressure flaking, emphasizes productivity per block.
- (c) The standardization of *procedures*: especially in the EN and MN, we see the same

methods and techniques used all over Greece. Given the nature of a lithic reduction sequence, this does not lead to standardization of the products. On the contrary, if one uses the same procedure throughout the process of (pressure) flaking an obsidian core, the products will necessarily be non-standardized. Blades from the edge of the flaking surface ('corner blades') will be morphologically different from blades from the centre of the flaking surface. Blades obtained from the early stages of flaking the core will be longer than the blade(let)s obtained at the end of flaking, and so on. With other crafts, standardized procedures would lead to standardized products. For lithics, however, the importance traditionally given to the standardization of the products for determining specialization is mistaken.

- (d) A long apprenticeship and regular practice are necessary, and these then lead to a high output, well above personal needs.
- (e) Exchange is asymmetrical, in the sense that no local stone tools were exchanged for obsidian or honey flint blades. It can be assumed, therefore, that the specialists indeed supplemented their living by exchange for food or other craft products.

During the LN and FN, the position of the obsidian and honey flint blade producers changed in southern Greece, and this change was probably more drastic than can be documented archaeologically. With the ready accessibility of Milos, as a result of more widespread knowledge of seafaring, especially from the now-inhabited Cycladic islands, the former monopoly was broken and the specialists found themselves in competition with direct supply and local production.

A situation of competition may also have obtained from the very beginning for the producers of exotic millstones, celts and axes,

since in many sites local production is claimed as well (though not actually demonstrated). Consequently, even among stone tools, different kinds of craft specialization and organization of production can be envisioned. In all cases, however, the rationale behind the production and distribution of the products appears to be primarily of an 'economic' order, in the sense that people were acquiring utilitarian goods, which had no exact local equivalent.

Ceramic production exemplifies very different situations. It is debatable whether the limited EN production of pots can be classified as craft specialization within the traditional economic definitions: too few pots were produced to suppose they were produced mainly for exchange or that pottery production could have supplemented a living. The pattern would fit better with 'sharing' amongst 'dependents', to use the terms of Clark and Parry (1990), or, more broadly, amongst kin. Thus the practice of specialized skills would not imply a shift to an economic status as craft specialist, even part-time. It is important, however, to underline that, contrary to what is generally assumed, pottery making appears from the beginning to have been a restricted practice.

MN potters, on the other hand, certainly share with (some) craft specialists the possession of exceptional skills, and they most certainly produced for non-dependents. The conscious individualization of each pot, however, and the willingness to experiment with new techniques go against any 'standardization of procedures' (and products!). 'Productivity' was not then the point, quite the contrary. The 'profit' made by producing high-quality pots may well have been related more to social position or social power than to economic gain. The exchange of pots of similar craftsmanship and quality between different communities underlines this point: pottery was

not exchanged because there was a 'need' for pots. Social ties between the giver and the receiver must here have been prevalent, as has been observed in several ethnographic contexts (e.g. Balfet 1955; Graves 1991).

The position of the specialists producing elaborate ornaments, stone seals or marble figurines must yet again have been different. They too were producing a small number of highly elaborate and individualized artefacts, but for a limited number of consumers. In addition, down-the-line trade may have obtained for at least some of these goods, so that the producer would not have been in direct contact with the consumer, and would not have gained immediate status, prestige or power from the transaction.

The organization of production and the rationale behind the distribution of each kind of goods may have been different at any given moment. What needs to be emphasized is that very little of it can be accounted for by 'technical constraints', 'technical needs' or 'technical innovations'. Both what craft products were used for and how they were procured must be considered as social and cultural choices. No mechanistic, functional or economic factor by itself can account for the specific organization of production and exchange we have been documenting. On the contrary, they constitute social and cultural choices, and these specific choices are precisely what make Greek Neolithic societies distinctive.

What artefacts were used for, was, as has been noted, a cultural choice. One obvious example is the use of pots: although Neolithic groups in Greece had known (and used) cooking pots from at least the end of the MN, they still chose, in contrast to western European Neolithic groups, for instance, to cook in ovens, pits and complex hearths and to retain pottery as highly invested, valuable goods. Such cultural choices obtain also with stone and bone tools: again, a clear example is given

by the widespread exchange of flint and jasper projectile points in the LN and FN, which no 'technical' or 'functional' consideration can justify.

Likewise, how the goods were procured was also a social choice. Local or regional sources of raw materials for chipped stone tools could have been used. The reliance on exotic raw materials, and thus on 'others' to get one's daily tools, was not a functional necessity, and it may well have been that these exotic raw materials were valued because they were exotic, and because they entailed exchanges. The same obviously holds true for ornaments. Conversely, clay was available to everyone, and every woman, or man for that matter, had she or he wanted to, could have found her or his way into pottery making. Some kind of social mechanism must have been at work to restrict the diffusion of this knowledge and practice in the earlier Neolithic.

Thus craft specialization and exchange in Neolithic Greece must be viewed as social choices, just as 'what products were used for' was culturally determined. Rather than relying on individuals' capacities for self-sufficient production, Greek Neolithic societies chose to rely largely on interaction and exchange. This, needless to say, entailed severe risks, especially in a non-hierarchical society. On the one hand, local groups, or fractions of groups, chose to deprive themselves of some of the basic, necessary skills for their daily equipment. On the other hand, the power relations between producer and consumer had to be constantly renegotiated and must have been a permanent source of tension and change. [C.P.]

Some interesting thoughts about ceramic style, producer-consumer relationships and the dynamics of social organization follow from our analysis of craft specialization in the Greek Neolithic. In thinking about the ceram-

ics from Franchthi and Lerna, I have been stuck for some time on three points—one is a conviction and the other two are puzzles that I have been unable to piece together. These may serve to demonstrate the larger implications of our analysis.

The first—the conviction—is one I have argued elsewhere: that the EN potters were not only specialists, using the simplest definition of that term, but were also some kind of healers or diviners whose major role was in the arena of spiritual or social well-being (e.g. Vitelli 1995: 60-62).³ I arrive at this as follows:

- (a) In the EN, pottery making was the new 'art du feu'. It depended on fire, fire that provides welcome light and heat, but devours flesh, food, wood and bone. Fire that weakens even stone was made by the potters to transform ordinary dry, brittle mud to a permanent stone-like material, in a performance that provided plentiful drama. Pots hissed and exploded, flames leapt and died, pot colours changed before the eyes, pieces emerged with unpredictable markings, with or without their lugs and bases, shattered or intact, but rock-like and permanent. It was, and is, a magic show, with built-in opportunities for divining. It would be surprising if mystery and ritual had not been a crucial part of pottery production when the whole process was very new.
- (b) At Franchthi, the total production in any given year was well within the capability of a single potter working for a few weeks, but some social choice kept five potters active, if rarely (Perlès and Vitelli 1994: 230). That is more than the demand for pots would have required, and fewer than general domestic production should have involved.
- (c) I find, as others have, striking parallels between plant and clay procurement and

processing (Amiran 1965; Crown and Wills 1995: 248). It seems logical to suggest that these parallels exist in large part because the same few individuals were involved in and expert at both. If pots weren't used for food preparation, but were made by individuals expert in plant processing, the 'leap' to using pots for or with medicinal and other ritual potions is not a large one.

EN potters as 'ritual healers', it seems to me, explain our evidence. I think it also makes sense that pottery would first appear among newly sedentary groups if its production constituted a controlled social ritual, for ritual is a useful form of conflict resolution, and new kinds of conflicts calling for new forms of resolution must have been common in the earlier Neolithic (e.g. Johnson 1982; Kuijt 1995).

In the MN at Franchthi, the five earlier wares continue for a while, but they are replaced in importance by a single new ware: the Urfirnis that characterizes the MN throughout southern Greece. Urfirnis seems to have been a new and apparently more potent 'recipe'—one that proved efficacious on more and more frequent ritual and social occasions, to judge from the increases in overall production. The introduction, late in MN, of a few pots specifically designed for cooking may point to a refocus of the rituals from the actual production process to a heavier ceremonial use of the products. Production was, if anything, more labour-intensive than earlier, with a conscious effort by the potter-healers to make each non-cooking pot distinctive. Over the course of the MN we also see rapid innovation in all aspects of production. Innovation in the context of ceramic production puts the entire effort expended on each vessel at risk. The embracing of risk and change conveys a sense of competition among the potters, as though each is trying to outdo the other, by coming up with a new and stronger potion.

I do not suggest that these potters were the only Neolithic individuals with a role in ritual and ceremonial contexts. Indeed, our review of the various kinds of specialists points out that each had some kind of special knowledge and, therefore, potential social power. It is not hard (for me, at any rate) to imagine, for example, socially important events accompanying the arrival of the itinerant knapper with his obsidian cores, with news from other groups, and with spine-chilling tales of the Neolithic equivalent of fire-breathing dragons that he had had to overcome to acquire his shiny black rocks. I suspect that all specialists, or in the case of most of the 'rare goods', the goods themselves, since the consumers probably had little direct contact with the producers, had a role in ritual.

While I could see and explain the innovation and individualizing of pots with this model of specialists competing for power, the MN evidence poses two additional questions. First, the individualizing of Urfirnis vessels was always done within the rather limiting rules of the regional style; if distinctiveness was the goal, why did the potter not simply shape or paint something really different? Secondly, if all this innovation and risk taking points to competition among potters, how do I explain the fact that the innovations appear, in essentially the same sequence, throughout the Urfirnis style region? The individual potter's new tricks, many of which are of the sort that had to be demonstrated, were obviously shared, and widely, which would seem to dilute the inventor's 'power'.

After our examination of craft specialization in the Neolithic, however, I think I can rationalize these apparent contradictions, and at the same time explain my third puzzle, which is, What happened to the long and distinguished MN Urfirnis ceramic tradition that is suddenly replaced in the LN by a profusion of local styles in both northern and southern Greece?

My new picture looks like this. The EN potter-healers performed their occasional rituals for the resolution of inevitable conflicts among their immediate neighbours. In the MN, potter-healers with more powerful recipes performed more frequently, probably in more and more varied contexts. The best of them developed reputations that spread throughout the region. Individuals thus acquired prominent and powerful social positions. But in an essentially egalitarian society, counter-forces exist to balance the individual's prominence. The rules of broad regional styles—rules that, probably unconsciously, kept potters from moving beyond them—are, I suggest, one manifestation of such a counter-force.

The requisite sharing of new knowledge among potters would have been another leveling mechanism. The contradictions I saw are, in fact, examples of the dynamic tensions and continuous negotiation and balancing between the social power of the individual and that of the larger social group. The dramatic rate of innovation in MN ceramics reflects the escalation of these basic tensions. The tensions must have affected all aspects of life and apparently stretched regional alliances to their limit, until finally they snapped. In the last round of the individual versus the large regional group, the allegiance to the large group lost.

Thus LN begins as a reorganization of social groups, of ceramic styles (Demoule and Perlès 1993: 387), and a renegotiation of relationships of all sorts. In the Peloponnese, sites are abandoned by some or all of the MN occupants (a variation on hunter-gatherer fissioning to resolve conflict) and we see more and smaller settlements, of individuals with greater freedom of identity (Halstead 1995: 16-17). Each group's potters are free to develop their own styles, but without the previous network of shared specialist information, their knowledge and skills vary substantially. The

increase in coarse/cooking wares contributes to, and reflects, the decreasing 'mystique' and ritual power of pottery making, as former rituals become less relevant and knowledge of the processes more widely known.

The entire social system, of course, is affected. In the south, either the smaller groups can no longer rely on the safe passage and arrival of the itinerant obsidian knapper, or they are no longer socially restrained from exploring his marvellous places themselves. Either way, their new, direct access to the obsidian sources de-mystifies and de-specializes obsidian production, as Perlès has pointed out. Something similar probably transpired with the social role of most 'rare goods', as the new explorers came into their first direct contact with the producers of these goods, making the objects themselves less 'mystical', but the special knowledge of the producers more apparent.

Small disc beads of shell, which almost certainly would have been used together in large numbers, may present a different pattern than other, one-piece ornaments. Miller has recently described the production process of these small shell disc beads in the EN at Franchthi (Miller 1996: 17-20). She points out that, while the production requires little skill, it was, in the EN, labour-intensive, taking about an hour to produce each of the hundreds of beads necessary for even a small necklace (1996: 28). In the context of the scenario I have been describing, we might consider whether production of ceremonial necklaces or beaded costumes in the EN might have been a collective undertaking by some portion of the Franchthi community for use in a collectively significant occasion. A single individual would obviously have worn the costume for the event, but the power accrued by the individual might have been perceived as transitory, the 'benefit' communal.

In the LN, when Miller suggests that unfinished beads were strung, ground and polished

together (1996: 25), it became possible for a single producer to create a complete necklace in far less time. What had been a collective project directed at the collective welfare could become an individual undertaking, more readily transferred to an individual consumer, with a consequent change in the value and meaning of the beads. The status assigned to the producer of any craft is a part of this whole dynamic, and would have been affected by the relationship between producer and consumer. When the producer was not directly known to the ultimate consumer, then whatever status was associated with the product need not have been extended to the producer.

We may see this changing status of producer and product in the case of ceramics as well: whereas in EN and MN the 'power' of the pot was intimately linked to the producer and the process of production, in the LN, long-distance travellers carried more different styles of pots to distant places. The connection between potter and pot was lost, and the pots could take on new meanings and roles as independent objects, while the potters lost more of their former social importance. The symbolic meaning of pottery seems not to have been totally lost, for pots remain the grave good of choice well into historic times, but in the Final Neolithic, the role of pottery is quite dominantly in the ordinary domestic sphere. Pottery, in fact, loses its primary symbolic role just as metal objects become progressively more abundant. One must wonder whether pottery, the first 'art du feu', was not replaced in its symbolic role by the even more powerful 'art du feu', metallurgy.

I can, in fact, go on and on with this exercise, explaining the varied evidence of Neolithic Greece in terms of the renegotiation of social roles and values. The process leads (but not in the same way everywhere) to a variety of emerging hierarchies, not to mention economically motivated craft specialists,

in the Aegean Bronze Age. I hope, however, that I've said enough to show that our identification of Neolithic specialists, even though defined so broadly that Costin and others have dismissed the definition as 'useless', is actually quite useful when combined with an examination of the different characteristics of production, distribution, and consumption, and when we do not insist that all specialists must be driven by purely economic motives. Indeed, if we forget that *we* have created the various classifications related to social organization to serve as analytical tools - whether of degrees and kinds of craft specialization or of social hierarchies - and force all the evidence to fit into rigid categories, then we have predetermined the range of possibility, rather than provided a means to explore the richness of it. [K.D.V.]

Notes

1. The jointly authored introduction is followed by separate 'discussions'. Authorship is identified by initials at the end of each relevant section.
2. Macedonia, where a different production system prevails, is not considered in the following analyses.
3. I call the EN potters 'specialists' because they practised skills that others in their community did not, and, judging from the uniform distribution of all wares, produced goods for the community as a whole. C.P. rejects the term for the EN potters (above) largely because she considers that the small scale of production could correspond to simple sharing amongst dependents. We are both inclined to agree with Miller that, at this point, the label itself is less critical than the recognition of different patterns of production and the exploration of their implications (Miller 1996: 32).

C.P. and I have also debated at some length my choice of the term 'healer', which she considers too specific. I retain the term 'healer', however, as less specific and loaded than 'shaman', but still suggestive of a role that may have involved potions, magic, divination, arbi-

tration, trance and other performance arts, played out in a socially significant context.

Our lively and often fruitful debates over terminology reflect in part the poverty of knowledge about EN social organization and of current conceptual models of craft specialization, indeed, of social organization generally. We need to recognize and explore more variations, rather than insist on fitting all examples into neat and familiar categories.

Bibliography

- Amiran, R.
1965 The beginnings of pottery-making in the Near East. In F.R. Matson (ed.), *Ceramics and Man*, 240-47. Chicago: Aldine.
- Balfet, H.
1955 La poterie des Ait Smail du Dhurdjura. Éléments d'étude esthétique. *Revue Africaine* 99: 289-340.
- Clark, J. and W.J. Parry
1990 Craft specialization and cultural complexity. *Research in Economic Anthropology* 12: 289-346.
- Costin, C.L.
1991 Craft specialization: issues in defining, documenting, and explaining the organization of production. In M.B. Schiffer (ed.), *Archaeological Method and Theory* 3, 1-56. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Crown, P.L. and W.H. Wills
1995 Economic intensification and the origins of ceramic containers in the American Southwest. In W.K. Barnett and J.W. Hoopes (eds.), *The Emergence of Pottery: Technology and Innovation in Ancient Societies*, 241-54. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Demoule, J.-P. and C. Perlès
1993 The Greek Neolithic: a new review. *Journal of World Prehistory* 7: 355-416.
- Graves, M.W.
1991 Pottery production and distribution among the Kalinga: a study of household and regional organization and differentiation. In W.A. Longacre (ed.), *Ceramic Ethnoarchaeology*, 112-43. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Greenfield, H.J.
1991 A Kula ring in prehistoric Europe? A consideration of local and interregional exchange during the Late Neolithic of the central Balkans. In S.A. Gregg (ed.), *Between Bands and States* (Center for Archaeological Investigations Occasional Paper No. 9), 287-308. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University at Carbondale.
- Halstead, P.
1995 From sharing to hoarding: the neolithic foundations of Aegean bronze age society? In R. Lafineur and W.-D. Niemeier (eds.), *Politeia: Society and State in the Aegean Bronze Age* (Aegaeum 12), 11-16. Liège: Université de Liège.
- Johnson, G.A.
1982 Organizational structure and scalar stress. In A.C. Renfrew, M.J. Rowlands and B. Seagraves (eds.), *Theory and Explanation in Archaeology*, 389-421. London: Academic Press.
- Kotsakis, K.
1983 *Keramiki Technologia kai Keramiki Diaphoropoliisi: Problimata tis Graptis Keramikis tis Mesis Neolithikis Epochis tou Sesklou*. PhD dissertation, University of Thessaloniki.
- Kuijt, I.
1995 The emergence of social complexity in the Levantine Neolithic: community identity, ritual practices, and village planning in Jericho. Paper presented at the Society for American Archaeology Meetings, May 1995, Minneapolis, MN.
- Leeuw, S.E. van der
1984 Dust to dust: a transformational view of the ceramic cycle. In S.E. van der Leeuw and A.C. Pritchard (eds.), *The Many Dimensions of Pottery: Ceramics in Archaeology and Anthropology*, 707-73. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Miller, M.
1996 The manufacture of cockle shell beads at early neolithic Franchthi Cave, Greece: a case of craft specialization? *JMA* 9: 7-37.
- Peacock, D.P.S.
1982 *Pottery in the Roman World: An Ethnoarchaeological Approach*. London: Longman.
- Perlès, C.
1990 L'outillage de pierre taillée néolithique en Grèce: approvisionnement et exploitation des matières premières. *BCH* 114: 1-42.
1992 Systems of exchange and organization of production in Neolithic Greece. *JMA* 5: 115-64.
- Perlès, C. and K.D. Vitelli
1994 Technologie et fonction des premières productions céramiques de Grèce. In *Terre cuite et société. La céramique, document technique, économique, culturel, XIVe Rencontres internationales d'archéologie et d'histoire d'Antibes*, 225-42. Juan-les-Pins: Editions APCDA.

- Phelps, W.W.
 1975 *The Neolithic Pottery Sequence in Southern Greece*.
 PhD dissertation, Institute of Archaeology,
 University of London.
- Torrence, R.
 1986 *Production and Exchange of Stone Tools: Prehistoric
 Obsidian in the Aegean*. Cambridge: Cambridge
 University Press.
- Vitelli, K.D.
 1989 Were pots first made for foods? Doubts from
 Franchthi. *World Archaeology* 21: 17-29.
 1993 *Franchthi Neolithic Pottery, 1: Classification and
 Ceramic Phases 1 and 2* (Excavations at Franchthi
 Cave, Fascicle 8). Bloomington: Indiana Uni-
 versity Press.
- 1995 Pots, potters, and the shaping of Greek neolithic
 society. In W.K. Barnett and J.W. Hoopes (eds.),
*The Emergence of Pottery: Technology and Innova-
 tion in Ancient Societies*, 55-63. Washington:
 Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Zachos, K.L.
 1996a Metallurgy. In G.A. Papathanassopoulos (ed.),
Neolithic Culture in Greece, 140-43. Athens:
 Goulandris Foundation.
 1996b Metal jewellery. In G.A. Papathanassopoulos
 (ed.), *Neolithic Culture in Greece*, 166-67. Athens:
 Goulandris Foundation.