



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Investigating the provenance of obsidian from Neolithic and Chalcolithic sites in Bulgaria

Citation for published version:

Bonsall, C, Elenski, N, Ganecovski, G, Gurova, M, Ivanov, G, Slavchev, V & Zlateva-Uzanova, R 2017, 'Investigating the provenance of obsidian from Neolithic and Chalcolithic sites in Bulgaria', *Antiquity*.
<https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2017.2>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.15184/aqy.2017.2](https://doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2017.2)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Antiquity

Publisher Rights Statement:

This article has been published in a revised form in Antiquity <http://dx.doi.org/10.15184/aqy.2017.2> This version is free to view and download for private research and study only. Not for re-distribution, re-sale or use in derivative works. © copyright holder.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Investigating the provenance of obsidian from Neolithic and Chalcolithic sites in Bulgaria

Clive Bonsall, Maria Gurova, Georgi Ganecovski, Radka Zlateva, Nedko Elenski, Georgi Ivanov & Vladimir Slavchev

Introduction

Portable energy-dispersive X-ray fluorescence (pXRF) has become a widely used tool for chemical characterization (source identification) of obsidian found in archaeological contexts. While laboratory techniques like neutron activation analysis (NAA) and inductively coupled plasma mass spectrometry (ICP-MS) can analyze more elements and have lower detection limits, pXRF can provide quantitative data of sufficient resolution to be able to match obsidian artefacts with their volcanic sources. At the same time pXRF offers several advantages for obsidian research: (i) it can be deployed 'in the field' (i.e. on site or in a museum) without the need to bring samples back to a lab for analysis, (ii) information on elemental composition can be obtained relatively quickly, and (iii) measurements require no special preparation of a sample and cause no visible damage to it.

The research outlined here forms part of a wider study of archaeological obsidian in Southeast Europe involving archaeologists from Bulgaria, Romania and the UK, with the aim of reconstructing changes in patterns of procurement, production and use of obsidian between the Middle Palaeolithic and the Iron Age.

Bulgarian finds

Obsidian is a scarce commodity in archaeological contexts in Bulgaria. It has been reported from just a few sites, and the number of obsidian pieces from any individual site is very small.

We identified and analyzed artefacts from four sites: Ohoden, Dzhuljunica and Varna in northern Bulgaria, and Dzherman at the foot of the Rila Mountains in the southwest of the country (Figure 1). The sites range in age from Early Neolithic to Chalcolithic (c. 6050–4200 cal BC) and are located some 600–800 km from the nearest geological sources of obsidian in the Aegean, Carpathians and Central Anatolia (Figure 2).

pXRF analyses of 32 minor and trace elements were performed with a 'Niton XL3t ultra' analyzer, operated in the fundamental parameters 'mining mode'. Results were compared with measurements taken on geological samples from various sources, and both sets of data were calibrated against 23 geological reference standards (CRMs) (Figure 3).

Results

Two varieties of obsidian were identified among the artefacts analyzed. Comparison with measurements made on geological source samples from the Carpathians, Aegean, the Central Mediterranean and Central Anatolia, shows the chemical profiles of the Bulgarian finds to be most similar to sources in the Carpathian Mountains (cf. Rosania *et al.* 2008). Group 1 matches closely with the Carpathian 1 (C1) source area in Slovakia, while Group 2 most likely comes from the Carpathian 2 (C2) source area in Hungary (Figure 4).

Within this very small sample of artefacts there are several regular blades or blade segments, all made from C1 obsidian – which generally is considered to have better knapping qualities than C2 obsidian (Tripković 2004; Dobosi 2011; Milić 2016).

The work presented here represents the first systematic chemical characterization study of archaeological obsidian from Bulgaria. It expands the number of recorded find spots of Carpathian obsidian south of the River Danube, and helps to fill a major gap in the spatial distribution of Carpathian obsidian between the finds in northern Serbia and southern Romania and what previously were seen as remote outliers, at Mandalo (Kilikoglou *et al.* 1996) and Dispilio (Milić 2014) in northern Greece (Figure 5).

Our work also raises questions about the consumption of Carpathian obsidian in Bulgarian prehistory. How was the material transmitted over distances of more than 600 km – what were the social mechanisms involved and how did they develop through time? Were the C1 and C2 sources utilized simultaneously, or at different periods? Was C1 obsidian favoured over C2 for the production of regular blades? Was obsidian acquired mainly in the form of raw material or as pre-prepared blanks? Was it only from Carpathian sources that obsidian reached prehistoric settlements in Bulgaria?

To address these questions, it will be necessary to increase our sample of obsidian from Bulgarian archaeological sites and to date much more precisely the contexts in which obsidian occurs. These will be among the priorities for the next phase of our research.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Katalin Biró (Hungarian National Museum, Budapest), Gerhard Trnka (University of Vienna), Ciprian Astaloş (UCL, London), Mike Branney (University of Leicester) and Angus Calder (University of St Andrews) for access to geological samples and reference standards, and to staff at Niton UK (Winchester) for advice on calibrating 'raw' data from the pXRF analyzer.

Figures

- Figure 1.** Obsidian artefacts from Ohoden (A), Dzherman (B), Dzhuljunica (C) and Varna (D) in Bulgaria.
- Figure 2.** Site locations in relation to major obsidian source areas (base map: Google Earth 7.0, viewed 8 June 2016): Da – Dzhuljunica, Dn – Dzherman, O – Ohoden, V – Varna.
- Figure 3.** Comparison of pXRF and recommended values for Rubidium (Rb) in 23 pressed powder geochemical reference standards. Values for goodness of fit (r^2), slope and intercept are a measure of the performance of the Niton XL3t Ultra analyzer and are used to derive calibration factors. Performance was good ($r^2 > 0.9$) for all elements of interest.
- Figure 4.** Zr-Sr-Rb compositions of obsidian artefacts from Džerman, Džuljunica, Ohoden and Varna, plotted against the compositional ranges of (calibrated) pXRF data for infinitely thick samples from geological sources in the Carpathians: C1 – Slovakia; C2 – Hungary; C3 – Ukraine (cf. Rosania *et al.* 2008).
- Figure 5.** Bulgarian sites (★) in relation to previously reported finds of artefacts made from Carpathian obsidian (●) – the circle has a radius of 500 km (adapted from Burgert 2015).

References

- BURGERT, P. 2015. Štípaná industrie z obsidiánu v Čechách (Chipped industry from obsidian in Bohemia). *Archeologické rozhledy* 67: 239–266.
- KILIKOGLU, V., BASSIAKOS, Y., GRIMANIS, A.P., SOUVATZIS, K., PILALI-PAPASTERIOU, A., PAPANTHIMOU-PAPAEFTHIMIOU, A., 1996. Carpathian obsidian in Macedonia, Greece. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 23: 343–349.
- MILIĆ, M. 2014. PXRF characterisation of obsidian from central Anatolia, the Aegean and Central Europe. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 41: 285–296.
- MILIĆ, M. 2016. A Question of Scale? Connecting communities through obsidian exchange in the Neolithic Aegean, Anatolia and Balkans. In B.P.C. Molloy (ed.), *Of Odysseys and Oddities. Scales and Modes of Interaction Between Prehistoric Aegean Societies and their Neighbours*. Oxford, Oxbow: 97–122.
- ROSANIA, C.N., BOULANGER, M.T., GLASCOCK, M.D., BIRÓ, K.T., RYZHOV, S., TRNKA, G., 2008. Revisiting Carpathian obsidian. *Antiquity* 82 (Project Gallery).
- TRIPKOVIĆ, B. 2004. Obsidian deposits in the central Balkans? Tested against archaeological evidence. *Starinar* 53–54 (2003–2004): 163–179.

Authors

(*corresponding author)

- **Clive Bonsall***
School of History, Classics and Archaeology, University of Edinburgh,
Edinburgh, UK (Email: c.bonsall@ed.ac.uk)
- **Maria Gurova**
National Institute of Archaeology with Museum, Bulgarian Academy of
Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria (Email: gurovam@yahoo.fr)
- **Georgi Ganecovski**
History Museum, Vratsa, Bulgaria (Email: ganecovski_ar@abv.bg)
- **Radka Zlateva**
Earth and Man National Museum, Sofia, Bulgaria (Email:
radul@mail.bg).
- **Nedko Elenski**
Regional Museum of History, Veliko Tarnovo, Bulgaria (Email:
diviat@abv.bg)
- **Georgi Ivanov**
National Institute of Archaeology with Museum, Bulgarian Academy of
Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria (Email: ivanov.georgi@yahoo.com)
- **Vladimir Slavchev**
Museum of Archaeology, Varna, Bulgaria (Email: vladosl@yahoo.com)




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5