

## TECHNICAL INNOVATION AND PRACTICE IN ENEOLITHIC AND BRONZE AGE ENCRUSTED CERAMICS IN THE CARPATHIAN BASIN, MIDDLE AND LOWER DANUBE

Encrusted ceramics are a visually striking group of objects, found in very large numbers in a wide range of prehistoric cultural units throughout Europe. They are particularly prevalent in Eneolithic and Bronze Age groups within the Carpathian Basin and along the Middle and Lower Danube (Kiss 2013). In this region they form an important, long-standing tradition that transcends individual cultural units, although their production does not appear to have been continuous over time (Kos et al. 2015; Tasić 2003-2004). The apparent



**Fig. 1** Examples of encrusted vessels from a range of cultural units in the Balkans: **A** Kostolac ceramic, Vučedol (Vukovarsko-srijemska županija/HR). – **B** Classic Vučedol vessel, Vučedol (Vukovarsko-srijemska županija/HR). – **C** ceramic from Vatyá context, Százhalombatta (Pest megye/H). – **D** Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery culture, Kaposvár (Somogy megye/H). – **E** Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery culture, Lengyel-Sánc (Tolna megye/H). – **F** Dalj-Bijelo Brdo ceramic, Kozarac-Ciglana (Osječko-baranjska županija/HR). – **G** Gârla Mare vessel, Gârla Mare (jud. Mehedinți/RO). – (Photos J. Sofaer).


similarity between these ceramics, based on their distinctive mode of inlaid decoration, contrasts with the variability in vessel shapes and decorative motifs (fig. 1). This has led to substantial, long-standing discussions regarding the significance of such similarities and differences and how these should be interpreted in terms of relationships between cultural units (Bóna 1975; Dimitrijević 1979; Kiss 2012; Reich 2006; Şandor-Chicideanu 2003; Šimić 2000). Although it has been argued that the Danube may have formed a natural route along which the use of encrusted ceramics developed, the nature of the relationship between different contemporary groups is frequently unclear (see Kiss 2012; Tasić 2003-2004).

The earliest encrusted ceramics in the region are found at Eneolithic Kostolac sites (3300-2700 BC) and their immediate successor, the Vučedol culture (2900-2400 BC) (Balen 2005; Dimitrijević 1977-1978; 1979; Durman 1988). They are less prevalent in the Early Bronze Age but appear in large numbers during the Middle Bronze Age. They are also found in the late Early Bronze Age Kisapostag culture (Črešnar 2010), the precursor to the Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery culture of the Hungarian Middle Bronze Age (2000-1500 BC) named for the prevalence of encrusted vessels. However, elaborately decorated inlaid ceramics feature to a greater or lesser extent in the ceramic assemblages of several other contemporary cultural groups in the Carpathian Basin and along the Middle and Lower Danube. These include the Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group in eastern Croatia, which is frequently understood as the southeast extension of the late phases of the Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery culture (Kiss 2012; 2013; Šimić 2000; Tasić 2003-2004), and the Dubovac-Žuto Brdo and Gârla Mare culture which form a more or less continuous unit in the southeast of the Pannonian Plain in Serbia and Romania (Şandor-Chicideanu 2003). Inlaid ceramics are also found further north along the Danube in Vatya sites in Hungary. In Vatya sites they are less abundant and have frequently been assumed as imports from their Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery neighbours. Recent work has, however, demonstrated a more complex picture with both imports and local production of inlaid ceramics at Vatya sites and in other contemporary cultural units (Sofaer et al. 2013; Bodnár et al. 2014).

In this paper, rather than reiterate classifications and descriptions of motifs we focus on technical innovation in the practice of making the inlays themselves and their link to social identity. In common with many other objects, while typo-chronological studies of encrusted wares have traditionally taken primacy in the identification of culture-specific forms, questions remain regarding the role of practice and the use of materials. There is a risk of building rather simplistic models of cultural identity while ignoring the ways that people engage with materials on practical and imaginative levels in order to make objects. Understanding such potential subtlety in the relationship between objects and identity requires a critical engagement with the concept of typology (Sørensen 2015) alongside contextually sensitive appreciation of creativity in practice, since this underpins innovation in material culture (Sofaer 2015).

Given that the inlays ostensibly look very similar they offer a particular opportunity to explore how people differently addressed the problem of their manufacture. Here we focus on practice by examining choices of materials, the ways these were combined as »recipes« used for the inlays, and the preparation of these materials. In addition, we consider the tools employed to make the beds in which the inlays sat, »techniques of the body« (Mauss 1935 [2006]) used to manipulate the tools, and methods used to fix the inlays to individual ceramic vessels.

Whilst there have been sporadic analyses of the composition of inlays (Kos/Posilivić/Durman 2013; Roberts/Sofaer/Kiss 2007), there has been no detailed synchronic or diachronic study of the practice of making encrusted wares in the region. We present the first comparative analysis of encrusted ceramics from a range of cultural units using X-ray diffraction (XRD) and scanning electron microscopy (SEM) to examine how aspects of practice relate, or not, to established chronological and spatio-typological differences in decoration in Eneolithic and Bronze Age cultural groups.



**Fig. 2** a map indicating the location of Eneolithic sites in this study and approximate extent of the Vučedol culture. – b map indicating the location of Middle Bronze Age sites in this study and approximate extent of the Vatya, Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery, and Gârla Mare cultures. – (Maps I. Kirkpatrick / J. Sofaer).

cultural unit	date (BC)	sites	total number of samples
Kostolac	3300-2700	Vučedol/HR	5
Classic Vučedol	2900-2400	Sarvaš/HR Vučedol/HR	15
Vatya	2000-1400	Százhalombatta/H	14
Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery	2000-1500	Bonyhád/H Ordacsehi/H Kaposvár/H Ménfőcsanak/H Mucsfa/H Lengyel-Sánc/H	14
Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo	1500-1200	Aljmaš Podunavlje/HR Batina-Grovišće/HR Beli Manastir Ciglana/HR Bijelo Brdo/HR Bolman Pijeskovi/HR Klisa Ekonomija/HR Kozarac-Ciglana/HR Lug Lanfurdo/HR Osijek Ciglana/HR Osijek Pristanište/HR Zmajevac-Grovišće/HR Zmajevac-Kishegy/HR	28
Gârla Mare	1900-1400/1200	Balta Verde/RO Cârna/RO Gârla Mare/RO Ostrovul Mare/RO	11
			87

**Tab. 1** Cultural units, sites and number of samples of encrusted ceramics analysed. Absolute dates remain debated although there is widespread agreement on the sequence of cultural units. – (Dating after Balen 2005; Tasić 2003-2004; Kiss 2012; Motzoi-Chicideanu 2011; Vicze/Poroszlai 2000).

## METHODS

A total of 87 inlaid vessels from 25 sites (fig. 2a-b; tab. 1) were collected and analysed including Eneolithic Kostolac samples from the early phases of the tell settlement at Vučedol and Classic Vučedol samples from the eponymous site of Vučedol (Vukovarsko-srijemska županija/HR) and the tell settlement of Sarvaš

(Osječko-baranjska županija/HR) in the Vučedol »heartland«. Bronze Age samples come from sites representing a range of cultural units with encrusted ceramics in the Carpathian Basin and along the Middle and Lower Danube. Our Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery samples come from six sites, including both cemeteries and settlements; this material was previously the subject of a pilot project investigating the composition of inlays (Roberts/Sofaer/Kiss 2007). The Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group sherds come from twelve sites, both cemeteries and settlements. Gârla Mare material comes from four sites, most of which are cemeteries, reflecting a bias towards the greater investigation of these contexts for this cultural unit. Vatya samples come from the large tell settlement of Százhalombatta (Pest megye/H) where there is a rich, well-documented pottery assemblage (Budden/Sofaer 2009). For all the samples discussed here, vessel fabrics correspond well both with other contemporary vessel types from the same site and with the local geology of the site at which they were found, suggesting local production.

Inlay samples were analysed using a LEO1450 variable pressure SEM equipped with a backscattered electron detector and quantitative PGT energy dispersive X-ray microanalysis system. Operating conditions were 20kV and 19mm working distance. XRD data were collected using a Phillips XPert Pro diffractometer equipped with a Cu K $\alpha$  ( $\lambda = 1.54056 \text{ \AA}$ ) radiation tube, run from  $2^\circ$  to  $76^\circ$  ( $2\theta$ ) at a step size of  $0.02^\circ$  ( $2\theta$ ) at  $1.2^\circ$  ( $2\theta$  per min).

## MATERIAL CHOICES AND COMBINATIONS: INLAY COMPOSITION AND RECIPES

The mineralogical composition of the inlays shows distinct chronological and spatial differences in the primary materials used to make the inlays (**tab. 2**). The earliest inlays in the region, those belonging to the Eneolithic Kostolac culture, are predominantly made of calcite, one of lime, and in three samples more than 5% of the inlay is composed of quartz. Under the SEM the quartz grains are angular, consistent with crushing of this material, suggesting it is a deliberate addition to the inlay recipe.

The dominant material used in the majority of the Classic Vučedol inlays is aragonite, a carbonate polymorph, typically found in bivalves, corals and mollusc shells. This aragonitic inlay was sometimes mixed with crushed quartz, typically in a ratio of 10:1; aragonite-quartz. Half the samples with aragonite also contain calcite. Three samples of inlay comprise calcite and quartz only, and therefore resemble the earlier Kostolac recipe. There is no substantial difference between the sites in terms of the primary materials used for inlays. It is, however, notable that two samples from Sarvaš are exceptions to the more general use of aragonite, most likely derived from crushed shell. These are made of hydroxyapatite, the mineral fraction of mammal bone and teeth; one sample is composed of hydroxyapatite and quartz, the other of hydroxyapatite, quartz, and calcite.

In contrast to the Eneolithic inlays, Middle Bronze Age inlays in almost all cultural groups in the Carpathian Basin and along the Middle and Lower Danube were composed of hydroxyapatite, indicating mammal bone as the primary material used for the inlays. This change in the mineral composition of the inlay reveals a distinct chronological shift in the practice of making encrusted ceramics that is particularly striking in the Middle Danube (eastern Croatia), where encrusted ceramics were produced in both the Eneolithic and Middle Bronze Age. However, the methods by which the animal bone was combined with other materials, and the degree of variability and consistency in the composition of inlays, show variation in »recipes« within and between cultural units (**tab. 2**).

In the north of the study region just over half the Vatya samples have hydroxyapatite as the primary inlay mineral, with the remainder composed of calcite. This contrasts with the Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery, Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group, and Gârla Mare vessels where hydroxyapatite inlays were the norm. There is no indication of any aragonite in the Vatya samples and the addition of crushed quartz was visible in only

one sherd, where it formed 10-15 % of the composition of the inlay. By comparison, the Gârla Mare material in the south of the study area was extremely homogenous in composition and in the relative proportion of different materials in the inlay mixture: hydroxyapatite was the primary material with the addition of 5-10 % quartz. Only one sample contained calcite in the inlay and this was subordinate to hydroxyapatite.

In the two cultural units sitting between the northern and southern poles of the study area – Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery and Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group – the majority of inlays are primarily composed of hydroxyapatite with occasional use of calcite. They are, however, differentiated by the consistent presence of quartz in the inlay recipe. Whereas only trace amounts of quartz (less than 5 %) are found in some of the Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery samples, in the Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group, 54 % of the inlay samples contain more than 5 %; some are particularly quartz-rich with 10-15 % of the inlay composed of quartz. The quartz grains are angular indicating deliberate crushing and addition to the inlay mixture. Although the Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group in eastern Croatia is traditionally considered as the southern extension of the Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery culture, the addition of quartz and its percentage contribution to the composition of the inlays suggests a greater affinity with practice in making inlays to the south. Overall, the data suggests a north-south divide in terms of the addition of quartz to Middle Bronze Age inlays (**fig. 3**).

The choice of material for Middle Bronze Age inlays appears to be culturally defined and is not primarily related to differences in local availability of materials. Given the location of the Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group and Gârla Mare sites along the Danube, it is likely that the quartz came from readily available quartz float in the river bed. The Vatya site of Százhalombatta is also located on the Danube but here there was very little use of quartz, suggesting that it was not culturally required. There does not seem to be a relationship between the use of calcite and locally available limestone outcrops; the closest limestone deposits to Százhalombatta are approx. 20km to the north in the Buda Hills. The source of the hydroxyapatite has previously been identified as cremated mammal bone although it is difficult to determine whether the bone is from humans or animals (Roberts/Sofaer/Kiss 2007). It has recently been suggested that some inlays in eastern Croatia may include antler (Kos et al. 2015).

## PREPARATION OF INLAY MATERIALS: TEXTURAL VARIATION

In addition to compositional differences, contrasting textures of inlay suggest variation in the preparation of inlays composed of different starting materials, as well between inlays made of the same combination of materials.

Kostolac inlays are fine-grained and compact even when more than one material was used in the inlay recipe, with a well-mixed and homogenous grain size. This may indicate that the materials were ground together rather than separately (**fig. 4a**). In contrast, Vučedol inlays are consistently granular, angular, and coarsely ground and it is relatively straightforward to distinguish their texture from chronologically earlier and later inlays (**fig. 4b**). In this instance, SEM reveals that aragonitic shell fragments are frequently more coarsely ground and larger than quartz grains. As aragonite is relatively easy to crush (Mohs hardness 3.5-4) compared to quartz (Mohs hardness 7) this suggests that the ingredients of the inlay were prepared separately and then brought together. This is supported by the observation that the materials were not always thoroughly mixed, as indicated by occasional clusters of shell or quartz.

All Middle Bronze Age inlays are fine and powdery (**fig. 4c**). However, detailed SEM analysis reveals textual variation within and between cultural units, suggesting a range of different practices in the preparation of inlays (**fig. 5**). The greatest variation is found in the Vatya inlays. Although data presented here comes from a single site (Százhalombatta), there is a wider range of textures at this site than elsewhere. Bone-based


cultural unit/site	XRD inlay						
	hydroxyapatite (bone)	quartz	calcite	aragonite (shell)	lime	albite	dolomite
<i>Kostolac</i>							
Vučedol 4-p		■	●			▷	
Vučedol 9		■	●				
Vučedol 15		■	●				
Vučedol 10			●				
Vučedol IIG1					◐		
<i>Classic Vučedol</i>							
Sarvaš 8	◆	■	●				
Sarvaš 9				▲			
Sarvaš 10				▲			
Sarvaš 11		■	●	▲			
Sarvaš 12				▲			
Sarvaš 13	◆	■					
Vučedol 1				▲			
Vučedol 2				▲			
Vučedol 3				▲			
Vučedol 5		■	●				
Vučedol 6		■	●				
Vučedol 7		■	●	▲			
Vučedol 8			●	▲			
Vučedol 16			●	▲			
Vučedol 17		■	●	▲			
<i>Vatya</i>							
Százhalombatta 1294	◆						
Százhalombatta 1794	◆						
Százhalombatta 3540	◆						
Százhalombatta 1795	◆	■ ■					
Százhalombatta 1288			●				
Százhalombatta 1333	◆						
Százhalombatta 1670			●				
Százhalombatta 4806	◆						
Százhalombatta 4703			●				
Százhalombatta 8013	◆						
Százhalombatta 4933	◆						
Százhalombatta 4867			●				
Százhalombatta 4729			●				
Százhalombatta 4482			●				
<i>Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery</i>							
Bonyhád	◆	□					
Ordacsehi	◆						
Kaposvár 61 98.101.397.33	◆	□					
Kaposvár 61 98.101.397.25	◆	□					
Kaposvár 61 98.101.378.58	◆			○			
Kaposvár 61 98.101.397.607	◆						
Kaposvár 61 98.101.322.18	◆	□					
Kaposvár 61 98.101.397.395	◆						
Ménfőcsanak			●				▼
Mucsfa A	◆	□					
Mucsfa B	◆						
Lengyel-Sánc 3	◆			○			

**Tab. 2** Inlay composition of the samples. Solid boxes represent a strong affirmative XRD response. Unshaded boxes correspond to a weak potential XRD response.

cultural unit/site	XRD inlay						
	hydroxyapatite (bone)	quartz	calcite	aragonite (shell)	lime	albite	dolomite
Lengyel-Sánc 8		□	●				▽
Lengyel-Sánc 6	◆	□					
<i>Szeremle / Dalj-Bijelo Brdo</i>							
Beli Manastir Ciglana 6531a	◆						
Beli Manastir Ciglana 6524a	◆	□					
Bolman Pijeskovi P-763	◆	■					
Beli Manastir Ciglana 6531b	◆						
Beli Manastir Ciglana 6524b	◆	■					
Beli Manastir Ciglana 6535a	◆	■ ■					
Beli Manastir Ciglana 6463	◆	■					
Lug Lanfurdo P-844	◆	■					
Lug Lanfurdo P-830	◆						
Lug Lanfurdo P-828	◆	■ ■					
Lug Lanfurdo P-834	◆	■					
Bijelo Brdo 4322	◆	■ ■					
Batina-Grovišće 180786	◆	■ ■					
Batina-Grovišće 180784	◆	■ ■					
Batina-Grovišće 180787	◆	□					
Batina-Grovišće 180785		■	●				
Aljmaš Podunavlje 12732	◆	□					
Aljmaš Podunavlje P807	◆	□					
Osijek Pristanište	◆		●				
Kozarac-Ciglana 6228a	◆	□					
Kozarac-Ciglana 6227d	◆						
Kozarac-Ciglana 1955	◆						
Kozarac-Ciglana 7078c	◆	■	●				
Klisa Ekonomija	◆	□					
Zmajevac-Grovišće 2008 4a	◆	■					
Zmajevac-Grovišće 2008 4b	◆	■					
Osijek Ciglana i.Z.P.35J-118	◆	■					
Zmajevac-Kishegy Fole 1 2010	◆						
<i>Gârla Mare</i>							
Gârla Mare 2010 SI C6	◆	■					
Ostrovul Mare 1936	◆	■					
Gârla Mare 2009 SI C5	◆						
Gârla Mare 2009 SI C4	◆	■					
Gârla Mare 2009 G.2	◆	■	●				
Cârna G.30	◆	■					
Cârna G.32	◆	■					
Cârna G.65	◆	■					
Balta Verde 6569	◆	■					
Balta Verde 4311	◆	■					
Balta Verde GP Sett 2	◆	■					

Tab. 2 Continuation.

inlays alone have at least four different textures. These are distinguishable by the relative length of the largest hydroxyapatite grains and their consistency in size and appearance: fine (blocky grains up to 50 µm in length), medium (blocky grains up to 100 µm in length), fine + medium, and vitrified. Variably sized pieces sitting within a fine matrix (fine + medium) suggest that the animal bone was not always evenly ground. In




**Fig. 3** Data showing a north-south divide in the addition of quartz to Middle Bronze Age inlays. – (Illustration J. Sofaer).


contrast, Vatyá calcite inlays are generally fine and consistent, although there are a few samples with a range of grain sizes.

Variability in Vatyá inlays contrasts with notable homogeneity in the visual appearance of Gârla Mare inlays. Under the SEM the bone fragments have a blocky appearance and are coarsely ground (up to 150µm in length), set within a finer matrix containing bone and crushed quartz. As bone is softer than quartz, again this suggests that the different materials were ground separately and then brought together. The materials appear to be evenly mixed, suggesting attention to this aspect of preparation.

Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery and Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group inlays show a range of textural variation that lies between the heterogeneity of Vatyá and the homogeneity of Gârla Mare samples. Although each sample looks slightly different under the SEM, the bone-based Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group inlays have blocky fragments of hydroxyapatite up to 100µm long set in a fine matrix of bone, or bone and crushed quartz; some of the inlays are composed of a mixture of hydroxyapatite grain sizes, while others tend to have relatively larger grains set within the matrix. The Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery inlays fall into three main categories: randomly orientated angular grains of hydroxyapatite up to 70µm in length showing a flake-like appearance and set in a finer grained groundmass of hydroxyapatite <1µm in length; coarse hydroxyapatite grains with a blocky appearance up to 100µm long with a less well-developed matrix composed primarily of hydroxyapatite; angular fragments of calcite up to 60µm in length, although the norm is closer to 15µm, set in a matrix of finer calcite fragments (Roberts/Sofaer/Kiss 2007). The contrasting textures of the bone-based inlays (flakes vs. blocks) suggest that although they are of similar chemical composition, there was some variation in manner of preparation of the inlay material. Experimental work in progress aims to explore whether different techniques of crushing and grinding bone result in different textures.



**Fig. 4** Inlay textures: **a** Kostolac ceramic, Vučedol 15 (Vukovarsko-srijemska županija/HR; mag.  $\times 35$ ). – **b** Classic Vučedol ceramic, Sarvaš 6 (Osječko-baranjska županija/HR; mag.  $\times 50$ ). – **c** Middle Bronze Age ceramic, Bijelo Brdo 4222 (Osječko-baranjska županija/HR; mag.  $\times 50$ ). – (Photos J. Sofaer).



**Fig. 5** Examples of inlay textures under the SEM. – (Photos S. Roberts / J. Sofaer).

While differences in inlay preparation may to some extent be explained in terms of communities of practice (cf. Lave/Wenger 1991), the resulting textures observed under the SEM also create visual effects that are perceptible to the naked eye. These may give a clue as to reasons for choices in materials, including the deliberate addition of small amounts of quartz or calcite to the inlay recipe, as well as to the fineness or coarseness of their preparation.

The majority of inlays are white. The calcitic inlays give a strong matt appearance resulting in a »flat« visual effect. In contrast, the addition of crushed quartz to a shell or bone mixture, even in relatively small proportions, results in a more reflective, glistening, sparkly appearance. Angular, blocky grains (whether of quartz, shell, or bone), as well as varied grain size in an inlay, result in a texture that more efficiently reflects light. Consequently, the coarse textures of some of the Middle Bronze Age bone inlays may have been specifically prepared with this desired optical effect in mind. Likewise, the relatively large grains and angularity of the Classic Vučedol inlays add to their reflectance. Differences in preparation of inlays may therefore have been linked to aesthetic choices and a desire for particular visual effects.

## TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES OF THE BODY

Although some cultural units shared forms of tools, there are clear chronological and spatial differences in the choice of implements used to make the beds into which the inlays were applied. Inspection of Kostolac vessels reveals that the impressed decoration has a distinctive shallow but sharp W-shaped profile and lines


**Fig. 6** **a** Classic Vučedol deep inlay bed made with a pointed T-shaped tool, Vučedol 6 (Vukovarsko-srijemska županija/HR; mag. x50). – **b** Middle Bronze Age shallow inlay bed made with a rounded tool, Osijek Ciglana i.Z.P.35J-118 (Osječko-baranjska županija/HR; mag. x50). – (Photos J. Sofaer).



were made with a series of short dashes (cf. Balen 2011, 89). Vučedol inlay beds were usually made with a pointed T-shaped tool, resulting in a deep incision (usually 1.5-2.0 mm) with a wide surface; the width of the incision can be up to 11 mm. This allowed potters to apply thick, coarse inlays that covered large areas of the vessel (**fig. 6a**).

Inlay beds on Middle Bronze Age vessels are generally much shallower than those of the Classic Vučedol (**fig. 6b**). They frequently have an U-shaped profile following the use of tools with rounded ends. However, the range and width of tools varies according to cultural group. The greatest range of tools was employed in the north of the study region in the Vatyá culture, echoing the diversity of motifs, materials, and inlay textures found there. The ceramics from Százhalombatta reveal the use of a range of rounded tools and also V-shaped tools of different widths, as well as rouletting using a tool akin to a »pastry-cutter«; several different tools may be used to decorate the same vessel. In the Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery culture the inlay beds are usually shallow (frequently 0.5 mm or less) with only occasional deeper incisions. The width of the incisions is highly variable and is related to motif, but they are most frequently rounded in profile; a triangular tool with a flat end was sometimes used to create a zigzag effect. Rouletting and so-called rolled stick impressions were also used (see Kiss 2012). Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group inlay beds are similarly shallow but are frequently narrow and made with both rounded and V-shaped tools. The choice and dimensions of tools are most consistent in the Gârla Mare ceramics. Although the motifs on these vessels are extremely complex and elaborate, and each vessel is decoratively distinct in terms of the particular combination of decorative ele-





**Fig. 7** Vučedol 16 (Vukovarsko-srijemska županija/HR). Vučedol vessel painted over the inlay, image under polarised light (mag. x50). – (Photo J. Sofaer).

ments, the tools used to make them were very similar and restricted. Our observations suggest that most frequently only a single tool (occasionally two tools) was used to decorate an entire vessel.

The choice and range of tools reflects temporal and spatial differences in techniques of the body and rhythms of practice (de Beaune 2013). For example, Kostolac inlay beds were made by stabbing, impressing, and stamping the tool into the clay in a repeated staccato manner. By contrast, Classic Vučedol vessels were incised using continuous flowing actions to create long smooth lines, appropriate to the use of a pointed »carving« tool. Sometimes Vučedol inlays were over-painted using ochre to give a red colour on the white. It is apparent that on occasion the pigment spilled over the line of inlay onto the vessel body (fig. 7).

The body actions used in most of the Middle Bronze Age groups were a mixture of staccato impressions or dashes where the tool was lifted off the vessel, and continuous flowing actions where it was drawn across the surface. Gârla Mare vessels, however, show a much greater tendency to the use of staccato actions than other contemporary groups; SEM images reveal that lines or motifs that appear contin-


uous to the naked eye, such as the so-called garland were actually made using a repeated series of small gestures in which the tool was removed from the surface of the clay (fig. 8). This contrast is analogous to the difference between separated and joined up writing. It reflects learnt embodied practice from which there was very little deviation. In all the cultural units discussed, the margins of the inlay beds are very clean, suggesting that attention was paid to the timing of decoration at the leather hard stage.

## METHODS OF APPLICATION

Following incision of the inlay bed the inlay was applied to the vessel. On-going experimental work suggests that organic binding agents such as egg albumin, animal glue, or resins may have been effective ways of holding inlay mixtures together (Anne Kelcey pers. comm. 2013) but decomposition of organic materials means that definitive identification of these is difficult. However, an observable range of mechanical methods were also used for ensuring that the inlay remained fixed to the vessel, as well as geochemical indicators relating to the application of inlays.

As most of the Kostolac inlays contain calcite (with a single sample with an inlay made of lime), and as calcite converts to lime at temperatures above 500 °C (McTigue/Wenk 1985), this suggests that the inlays were not present on firing. In addition, the calcite inlays, including the sherd with the lime inlay, do not display any shrinkage gap between the margin of the inlay and the vessel as might be expected following


**Fig. 8** Gârla Mare G2 (jud. Mehedinți/RO). The »garland« motif made using a repeated series of small gestures on a Gârla Mare vessel. – (Photos S. Roberts / J. Sofaer).



firing. The presence of lime may therefore indicate heat treatment of inlay prior to application to the vessel. All in all, our observations suggest that Kostolac inlays were applied after firing.

Similarly, the identification of aragonite in Classic Vučedol inlays also suggests application after firing. Aragonite converts to calcite at temperatures above 400 °C (McTigue/Wenk 1985) and the presence of illite, calcite, and lack of calc silicates or spinels in the pot fabric is consistent with vessel firing temperatures of between 600 and 825 °C (Maritan et al. 2006). Thus the presence of aragonite (and lack of aragonite to calcite conversion) in the inlays points to their post-firing application in most cases. Where calcite is the predominant inlay material this may either result from use of naturally occurring calcite or heat treatment of aragonite; it is not, so far, possible to distinguish between these as their chemical signatures are the same. The widest variety of mechanical methods for ensuring the adherence of the inlay is found in the Vatya samples from Százhalombatta. SEM analysis of sections across the inlay bed shows that in some cases a thin layer of clay was applied to the bed prior to application of the inlay, presumably with the aim of helping it to adhere to the vessel (**fig. 9A**). In another case, hydroxyapatite in the inlay is vitrified with a shrinkage gap between the inlay and the vessel wall (**fig. 9B**). This particular sherd shows no evidence of reburning or vitrification of the vessel itself suggesting that in this example the inlay had been heated at high temperature and inserted prior to firing. Making the inlay bed with a rouletting tool may also be a further means of ensuring the adherence of inlay as it increases the surface area of the bed through the creation of undulations.

Of these methods seen in the Vatya material, so far only the use of rouletting has been observed elsewhere, in some of the Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery sherds (see also Kiss 2012). For the majority of Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery, Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group and Gârla Mare samples, there is relatively little variation in the methods developed to ensure appropriate adherence of the inlays to the vessel. In section they are tight up against the vessel wall and there is no shrinkage gap or vitrification of the inlay itself (**fig. 9C**). The particles in the inlays are random in orientation suggesting that the inlay was pushed



**Fig. 9** SEM images showing different methods of fixing inlay to the vessel: **A** a thin layer of clay applied to the vessel bed presumably in order to help the inlay adhere to the vessel, Százhalombatta 1795 (Pest megye/H). – **B** vitrified inlay with a shrinkage gap between the inlay and the vessel wall, Százhalombatta 1294 (Pest megye/H). – **C** inlay tight against the vessel wall, Bijelo Brdo 4322 (Osječko-baranjska županija/HR). – (Photos S. Roberts / J. Sofaer).

in, rather than stroked or smoothed in some way. There is, however, a single sherd in our data set, from the Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group, which may have up to three horizons within the inlay. This could suggest reapplication but it is difficult to know whether this took place as part of the manufacturing process or as repairs.

## CONCLUSION

The widespread use of white inlay as a chosen means of decorating ceramics and of highlighting motifs suggests a shared aesthetic between cultural groups in the Carpathian Basin and along the Middle and Lower Danube. There were, however, several different primary materials and combinations of these used to make encrusted ceramics. Inlays were also prepared in different ways, resulting in different textures and light-reflecting qualities. Additional differences can be observed in the tools and techniques of the body used to make the inlay beds, as well as methods of affixing inlay to vessels. These differences reveal contrasting practices and ways of engaging with materials that go beyond what might be expected in terms of variation between the production of individual batches of inlay (**tab. 3**). Nor are they related to associations with different kinds of contexts (settlements or cemeteries).

Our data show a clear shift over time away from the use of calcite in the Kostolac, to shell in the Classic Vučedol, and to the widespread use of cremated bone in the Middle Bronze Age. These represent different traditions in the practice of making encrusted ceramics. However, despite these clear temporal trends, practice in the making of inlays reveals a more complex picture than a simple one-to-one association with cultural units. Regional patterns in the combination of materials used for inlay recipes in the Middle Bronze Age show a north-south divide in the use of quartz as a deliberate addition. This is at a level above local stylistic differences, perhaps suggesting a shared desire for inlays with more reflective qualities. Notably, although motifs on Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group encrusted vessels are usually considered to be typologically influenced by those to the north-west, in composition they are more similar to those further south. However, not all of the Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group inlays contain quartz and in terms of inlay preparation, tools, and techniques of the body they are less homogeneous than the Gârla Mare samples. This suggests that there

	Eneolithic		Bronze Age			
	Kostolac (eastern Croatia)	Vučedol (eastern Croatia)	Vatya (Százhalombatta, Hungary)	Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery (Hungary)	Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo (eastern Croatia)	Gârla Mare (Romania)
<i>material</i>	predominantly calcite (also quartz and lime)	predominantly shell (also quartz)	bone or calcite	predominantly bone (also calcite)	predominantly bone and quartz (also calcite)	predominantly bone and quartz
<i>texture</i>	fine	coarse (granular)	fine, medium, vitrified	fine	fine, medium	fine, medium
<i>reflectivity</i>	low	high	low	low	low/medium	low/medium
<i>fixing</i>	some heat treatment of inlay prior to application to vessel	possible low heat treatment of some inlay prior to application to vessel	wide range of methods including pre- and post-firing of vessels	no visible attempts at fixing (organic binding agent?)	no visible attempts at fixing (organic binding agent?)	no visible attempts at fixing (organic binding agent?)
<i>tools</i>	shallow W-shaped impressions; shallow notches	sharp deep grooves; pointed often T-shaped tools	shallow blunt and sharp grooves; rounded and V-shaped tools; roulette	shallow and deep blunt grooves; rounded tools; roulette	blunt shallow grooves; rounded and V-shaped tools	blunt shallow grooves; rounded tools; »nib«-shaped tools
<i>techniques of the body</i>	staccato actions	continuous »flowing« actions	continuous »flowing« and staccato actions	continuous »flowing« and staccato actions	continuous »flowing« and staccato actions	staccato actions
<i>painted</i>	no	yes	no	no	no	no

**Tab. 3** Summary of temporal and spatial differences in uses of materials and practice in the making of inlays for encrusted pottery in the Carpathian Basin, Middle and Lower Danube.

are contrasts between cultural units that are a matter of ranges of variation and willingness to innovate, rather than absolute differences. Likewise, there is no one-to-one relationship between cultural unit and the use of calcite inlays in the Middle Bronze Age but there is a tendency for greater use of calcite as a material in the north of the study area, particularly in the Vatya culture.

The most striking differences in the Middle Bronze Age inlays are between the two geographical poles of the study region in terms of the variability notable in Vatya inlays in the north, and the standardization and homogeneity of Gârla Mare inlays in the south. In the former there is a sense of experimentation, creative playing with materials and innovation in practice with potters working within rather loose rules, as seen for example in the different ways to fix inlay to the vessel. By contrast, there is a conservatism in the latter that is evident in all aspects of inlay making which contrasts with the flamboyant use of motifs in the decoration of the vessels. Here the impression is of a »right way to do things« and of a more technically conservative community that creates itself through these shared routine practices. The Transdanubian Encrusted Pottery culture and Szeremle/Dalj-Bijelo Brdo group sit between these two in terms of the degree of variability within our samples, hinting at a north-south gradient in the extent to which potters were able to exercise innovation in the making of inlays.

Our data do not offer easy answers to long-standing debates regarding the relationships between cultural units in the Carpathian Basin and along the Middle and Lower Danube. They do, however, add another layer to these discussions, showing that material choices were complex and sophisticated, with both a degree of independent innovation and, in the Middle Bronze Age, shared practices between some groups at a scale between the region as a whole and local decorative forms. In the particular case of the Vatya inlays, it is apparent that freedom in practice in making encrusted wares contrasts strongly with otherwise highly rule-

bound typological aspects of the ceramic assemblage (Budden/Sofaer 2009; Sofaer/Bender Jørgensen/Choyke 2013). At Százhalombatta, as with other Vatyá sites, inlaid ceramics are much less abundant than in the other cultural groups discussed in this study. It may be that encrusted ceramics were not part of the Vatyá »canon« and could therefore be safely experimented with. Vatyá encrusted ceramics are not direct copies of those to the south on any level: the range and use of motifs, materials, preparation, tools, or methods of fixing the inlay to the vessel. Rather, they reveal creativity and innovation in playing with the encrusted ceramics genre, and an awareness and connection to the material culture of others that ran alongside a deep sense of self.

Technical innovation in material culture is bound up with how people engaged creatively in practice and with materials. This means that assumptions regarding the existence of homogenous cultural »packages«, while they may sometimes exist, need not always hold true. Our study of encrusted ceramics shows that making practices that may result in variability can be important to cultural identity, as may those that lead to absolute similarity. In other words, the nature of identity in prehistory is not just about making things the same in order to be the same. It is rather about the balance between similarity and difference through the ways that people directed attitudes to innovation in the practice of making things.

## Acknowledgements

A version of this paper was first presented in 2014 at the »Balkan Dialogues« Conference at the Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg. We would like to thank the conference organisers and participants for stimulating discussion throughout the event. – We would also like to thank the following colleagues and institutions for providing us with samples: Jaqueline Balen, Arheološki Muzej u Zagrebu; Gabriel Crăciunescu, Muzeul Regiunii Porților de Fier, Drobeta-Turnu Severin; Domagoj Dujmić, Muzej Slavonije, Osijek; Viktoria Kiss, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, Budapest; Sanjin Mihelić, Arheološki Muzej u Zagrebu; Nona Palincaș, Institutul de Arheolo-

gie »Vasile Pârvan«, Bucharest; Dragana Rajković, Muzej Slavonije, Osijek; Jasna Šimić, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Sveučilište J. J. Strossmayera, Osijek; Magdolna Vicze, Matrica Muzeum, Százhalombatta. – Richard Pearce, University of Southampton assisted with the SEM work. Maps were drawn by Ian Kirkpatrick and annotated by the authors. We are grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their comments. – This research was financially supported by HERA grant 09-HERA-JRP-CI-FP-020, »Creativity and Craft Production in Middle and Late Bronze Age Europe«.

## References

- Balen 2005: J. Balen, Sarvaš. Neolitičko i eneolitičko naselje. Katalozi i Monografije Arheološkoga Muzeja u Zagrebu 2 (Zagreb 2005).
- 2011: J. Balen, Đakovo-Franjevac. Kasno bakrenodobno naselje. Katalozi i Monografije Arheološkoga Muzeja u Zagrebu 7 (Zagreb 2011).
- de Beaune 2013: S. de Beaune, Introduction: Esthétique du geste technique. *Gradhiva* 17, 2013/1, 4-25.
- Bodnár et al. 2014: Cs. Bodnár / A. Kreiter / Z. May / P. Pánczél / M. Tóth, Mészbetétes kerámia az Alföldön – helyi vagy idegen? Encrusted pottery in eastern contexts; »foreign« or local? »A bronzkor kutatásának helyzete Magyarországon«. Paper presented at MTA BTK RI és ELTE BTK RI, Budapest December 17-18, 2014 (Budapest 2014).
- Bóna 1975: I. Bóna, Die mittlere Bronzezeit Ungarns und ihre südöstlichen Beziehungen. *Archaeologia Hungarica* 49 (Budapest 1975).
- Budden/Sofaer 2009: S. Budden / J. Sofaer, Non-Discursive Knowledge and the Construction of Identity. Potters, Potting and Performance at the Bronze Age Tell of Százhalombatta, Hungary. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 19/2, 2009, 203-220.
- Črešnar 2010: M. Črešnar, Poskus določitve kulturne skupine Kisapostag v vzhodni Sloveniji [Attempted definition of the Kisapostag culture of the Early Bronze Age in north-eastern Slovenia]. *Zbornik Soboškega Muzeja* 15, 2010, 107-134.
- Dimitrijević 1977-1978: S. Dimitrijević, Zur Frage der Genese und der Gliederung der Vučedoler Kultur in dem Zwischenstromlande Donau-Drau-Sawe. *Vjesnik Arheološkog Muzeja u Zagrebu* 3, 1977-1978, X-XI. 1-96.
- 1979: S. Dimitrijević, Vučedolska kultura i vučedolski kulturni kompleks. In: *Praistorija jugoslavenskih zemalja*. 3: Eneolitska doba (Sarajevo 1979) 267-341.
- Durman 1988: A. Durman, The Vučedol Culture. In: A. Durman, *Vučedol*. Treće tisućljeće p. n. e.; Muzejski prostor Zagreb Jezuit-

- ski trg 4, 21.7.-31.8.1988 [exhibition catalogue] (Zagreb 1988) 45-48.
- Kiss 2012: V. Kiss, Middle Bronze Age Encrusted Pottery in Western Hungary. *Varia Archaeologica Hungarica* 27 (Budapest 2012).
- 2013: V. Kiss, Problems of the Koszider Period in Transdanubia. In: M. Vicze / I. Poroszlai / P. Sümegi (eds), *Koszider: Hoard, Phase, Period? Round Table Conference on the Koszider Problem (Százhalombatta 2013)* 63-96.
- Kos et al. 2015: K. Kos / H. Posilivić / A. Durman / M. Ristić / S. Krehula, White Encrustation Produced from Deer Antler Phosphate on Prehistoric Ceramics from Podunavlje. *Archaeometry* 57/4, 2015, 636-652.
- Kos/Posilivić/Durman 2013: K. Kos / H. Posilivić / A. Durman, Prapovijesne inkrustacije u Podunavlju. *Obavijesti – Hrvatsko Arheološko Društvo* 45, 2013, 17-24.
- Lave/Wenger 1991: J. Lave / E. Wenger, *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation* (Cambridge 1991).
- Maritan et al. 2006: L. Maritan / L. Nodari / C. Mazzoli / A. Milano / U. Russo, Influence of firing conditions on ceramic products: Experimental study on clay rich in organic matter. *Applied Clay Science* 31/1-2, 2006, 1-15.
- Mauss 1935 [2006]: M. Mauss, *Les techniques du corps* [Trans. B. Brewster]. In: N. Schlanger (ed.), *Marcel Mauss: Techniques, Technology and Civilisation* (Oxford 2006) 77-95.
- McTigue/Wenk 1985: J. W. McTigue / H. R. Wenk, Microstructure and orientation relationships in the dry-state aragonite-calcite and calcite-lime phase transitions. *American Mineralogist* 70, 1985, 1253-1261.
- Motzoi-Chicideanu 2011: I. Motzoi-Chicideanu, *Obiceiuri funerare în epoca bronzului la Dunărea mijlocie și inferioară* (București 2011).
- Reich 2006: Ch. Reich, *Das Gräberfeld von Szeremle und die Gruppen mit inkrustierter Keramik entlang der mittleren und unteren Donau*. *Berliner Beiträge zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte N.F.* 13, 1-2 (Berlin 2006).
- Roberts/Sofaer/Kiss 2007: S. Roberts / J. Sofaer / V. Kiss, Characterization and textural analysis of Middle Bronze Age Transdanubian inlaid wares of the Encrusted Pottery Culture, Hungary. A preliminary study. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 35/2, 2007, 322-330.
- Șandor-Chicideanu 2003: M. Șandor-Chicideanu, *Cultura Țuto Brdo-Gârla Mare. Contribuții la cunoașterea epocii bronzului la Dunărea Mijlocie și Inferioară* (Cluj-Napoca 2003).
- Šimić 2000: J. Šimić, *Kulturne skupine s inkrustiranom keramikom u brončanom dobu sjeveroistočne Hrvatske* (Cultural groups with encrusted ceramics in the Bronze Age in North-East Croatia). *Biblioteka Slavonije I Baranje* 2 (Zagreb et al. 2000).
- Sofaer 2015: J. Sofaer, *Clay in the Age of Bronze. Essays in the Archaeology of Prehistoric Creativity* (Cambridge 2015).
- Sofaer/Bender Jørgensen/Choyke 2013: J. Sofaer / L. Bender Jørgensen / A. Choyke, *Craft Production: Ceramics, Textiles, and Bone*. In: A. Harding / H. Fokkens (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the European Bronze Age* (Oxford 2013) 469-491.
- Sofaer et al. 2013: J. Sofaer / S. Mihelić / S. Roberts / R. Williams, *The Composition of Inlays in Encrusted Ceramics from the Pannonian Plain*. Paper presented at the 2013 Croatian Archaeological Society Annual Meeting, Vukovar, Croatia (Vukovar 2013).
- Sørensen 2015: M. L. S. Sørensen, »Paradigm lost« – on the state of Typology within Archaeological Theory. In: K. Kristiansen / L. Šmedja / J. Turek (eds), *Paradigm Found. Archaeological theory – present, past and future. Essays in Honour of Evžen Neustupný* (Oxford 2015) 84-94.
- Tasić 2003-2004: N. Tasić, *Historical Picture of Development of Bronze Age Cultures in Vojvodina*. *Starinar* 53-54, 2003-2004, 23-34.
- Vicze/Poroszlai 2000: M. Vicze / I. Poroszlai (eds), *Százhalombatta Archaeological Expedition (SAX) Annual Report I* (Százhalombatta 2000).

### Zusammenfassung / Summary / Résumé

#### Technische Innovation und ihre Ausführung bei äneolithischer und bronzezeitlicher inkrustierter Keramik im Karpatenbecken und im mittleren und unteren Donaauraum

Dieser Aufsatz versucht die Verbindungen zwischen technischen Innovationen und sozialen Identitäten bei der Herstellung inkrustierter Keramik zu untersuchen. Die weitverbreitete Verwendung von weißen Einlagen zum Dekor von Keramik und zur Betonung von Motiven lässt auf eine gemeinsame Ästhetik zwischen Kulturgruppen im Karpatenbecken und entlang der mittleren und unteren Donau schließen. Es gab jedoch unterschiedliche Rohmaterialien und ihre Kombinationen, einschließlich Knochen, zerstoßenen Muscheln (Aragonit), Calcit und Quarz. Weiter ist eine klare Verschiebung über die Zeiten von der Verwendung von Calcit und Muscheln hin zu Knochen zu beobachten. Einlagen wurden auch auf verschiedene Arten vorbereitet, da sie unterschiedliche Beschaffenheiten und Eigenschaften beim Reflektieren von Licht aufweisen. Zusätzlich gibt es eine Variation bei den Werkzeugen und den Techniken, mit denen die Rillen für die Einlagen erzeugt wurden, sowie für die Methoden, mit denen die Einlagen in den Gefäßen angebracht wurden. Diese Unterschiede enthüllen gegensätzliche Gewohnheiten und Arten im Umgang mit den Werkstoffen, die darüber hinausgehen, was man sich an Variationen zwischen individuellen Chargen an Einlagen vorstellen kann; sie sind auch nicht mit unterschiedlichen Kontexten korreliert, wie z. B. Siedlungen oder Gräberfeldern.

## Technical Innovation and Practice in Eneolithic and Bronze Age Encrusted Ceramics in the Carpathian Basin, Middle and Lower Danube

This paper explores the relationship between technical innovation and social identity in the practice of making encrusted ceramics. The widespread use of white inlay as a means of decorating ceramics and of highlighting motifs suggests a shared aesthetic between cultural groups in the Carpathian Basin and along the Middle and Lower Danube. There were, however, several different primary materials and combinations of these used to make inlays including bone, crushed shell (aragonite), calcite, and quartz; there is a clear shift over time away from the use of calcite and shell to bone. Inlays were also prepared in different ways, resulting in different textures and light-reflecting qualities. In addition, there is variation in the tools and techniques of the body used to make the inlay beds, as well as methods of affixing inlay to vessels. These differences reveal contrasting practices and ways of engaging with materials that go beyond what might be expected in terms of variation between the production of individual batches of inlay. Nor are they related to associations with different kinds of contexts, for example settlements or cemeteries.

## Innovation technique et pratiques dans la céramique incrustée du bassin des Carpates et du Danube moyen et inférieur à l'Énéolithique et à l'âge du Bronze

Cet article explore les relations entre innovation technique et identité sociale telle que la reflètent la pratique de céramiques à décor incrusté. La large diffusion de décors blancs incrustés comme technique décorative des céramiques et le surlignage des motifs suggère une esthétique commune à différents groupes du bassin des Carpates et du Danube moyen et inférieur. Il existait cependant différentes matières premières et combinaisons de ces derniers afin de faire ces décors. Des ossements, des coquillages broyés (aragonite), de la calcite et du quartz ont été utilisés; il existe une forte distance chronologique entre l'utilisation de la calcite et celle de l'os. Les incrustations étaient préparées de différentes manières, ce qui a pour effet des textures et des reflets différents. De plus, il existe des variations au niveau des outils et des techniques mises en œuvre, aussi bien sur l'âme céramique qui a reçu les incrustations que sur les méthodes de fixation de ces incrustations dans la pâte. Ces différences révèlent des pratiques contrastées et des approches différenciées des matériaux qui vont au-delà de ce que l'on peut attendre en termes de variation entre des productions individuelles et les types d'incrustations. Ces différences ne sont pas non-plus à mettre en relation avec les différents types de contextes, par exemple cimetières ou habitats.

Traduction: L. Bernard

### *Schlüsselwörter / Keywords / Mots clés*

Ungarn / Kroatien / Rumänien / Äneolithikum / Bronzezeit / Innovation / soziale Identität / Keramik  
Hungary / Croatia / Romania / Eneolithic / Bronze Age / innovation / social identity / pottery  
Hongrie / Croatie / Roumanie / Énéolithique / âge du Bronze / innovation / identité sociale / poterie

### **Joanna Sofaer**

University of Southampton  
Department of Archaeology  
Highfield  
GB - Southampton SO17 1BF  
jrds@soton.ac.uk

### **Stephen Roberts**

University of Southampton  
Department of Ocean and Earth Science  
National Oceanography Centre  
GB - Southampton SO14 3ZH  
steve.roberts@noc.soton.ac.uk