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ABSTRACT
This paper summarizes the results of my research on protohistoric complex polities in the Dumaguete-Bacon area of southeastern Negros Island in the central Philippines. A preliminary report on the 1988-89 survey and excavations was presented at the 1994 IPPA meeting (Bacus 1996b). In this paper I focus on results pertaining to the internal organization of the Dumaguete polity’s economy and chiefly elites’ external political-economic relations. To begin to elucidate variability among protohistoric Philippine polities, the paper concludes with a brief comparison of Dumaguete’s political economy with that of two other contemporary Visayan polities, Cebu and Tanjay.

The nature and dynamics of protohistoric (c. 11th-16th century AD) sociopolitical formations have been the focus of my research in the Dumaguete-Bacon area of southeastern Negros Island in the central Philippines since 1987 (Figure 1). At the 1994 IPPA meetings in Chiang Mai, I presented a preliminary report on the 1988-89 fieldwork which discussed the material remains and the radiocarbon dates from the excavations at the Yap and Unto sites (Figure 2), briefly discussed the survey of approximately 30 sq. km within the Dumaguete-Bacon area (Figure 2), and summarized the analysis of Chinese and Spanish historical accounts that provide “historic baselines” for understanding various social and political-economic aspects of protohistoric polities (Bacus 1996b). This paper presents a summary of the results of my research on complex polities in the Dumaguete-Bacon area (see Bacus 1995, 1997, 1999, in press, for detailed discussions of the research), focusing specifically on two issues: the internal organization of the economy, and chiefly elites’ external political-economic relations. It concludes with a brief comparison of the economy of the Dumaguete polity with that of two other contemporary Visayan polities, Cebu and Tanjay.

Theoretically, the research is informed by political approaches in archaeology (Brumfiel and Earle 1987; Roseberry 1988; Barker and Pauketat 1992). These are a form of anthropological political economy that emphasize both structure and agency in analyzing social relations based on unequal access to wealth and power, and take account of local, regional and external processes, symbolic processes and history. In archaeological studies, the dynamics of social change are viewed as primarily arising from internal social negotiation, and explanations of change in complex societies assign primary emphasis to the motivations and goals of political actors, and to the opportunities and constraints under which they labor.

In addition to the Yap and Unto excavated and surface collected materials and surface collections from 71 additional sites recorded during the survey, the database for the study included materials from sites located outside the Dumaguete-Bacon area. In particular, it comprised decorated earthenware assemblages from 59 other sites located outside the survey area including the Kalanay, Bagumbayan and Sasak Cave sites; the pre-12th to 16th century Tanjay chiefly center and sites in its region; and the c. 14th-16th century political centers at Cebu City, Calatagan, and Fort Pilar (Guthre n.d.; Fox 1959, 1970; Solheim 1964; Hutterer 1973, 1982; Spoehr 1973; Nishimura and Tidalgo 1982; Masučñana 1986; Bay-Peterson 1987; Junker 1990, n.d.; Nishimura 1992, n.d.; see Bacus 1995 for details on dating) (Figure 3).

Investigation of the sociopolitical formations in the Dumaguete-Bacon area, which is not discussed below (though see Bacus 1995, 1996a, 1997), suggests that a complex polity (i.e., “chiefdom”) existed in this area by the 11th century AD and continued until the beginning of Spanish colonialism in the mid-16th century. I refer to this as the Dumaguete polity, using the singular to refer to the
general persistence of a similar form of sociopolitical organization and not to continuity in the ruling lineage. It appears to have had its political center at Yap, a settlement of c.0.5 sq. km (as currently estimated from 1997 coring data), located below present day Dumaguete City. The surveyed area, and sites within, represent only a portion of the polity’s region. The evidence of such a sociopolitical formation provides the context for analyzing chiefly economy and interaction, which are discussed below.

DUMAGUETE’S POLITICAL ECONOMY

Early historic Visayan chiefs engaged in a range of activities that were simultaneously political and economic (see Bacus 1996a, 1996b which synthesizes historical evidence for all areas of the archipelago on political economy, which I have since critiqued to suggest a less conflated reconstruction specific to the Visayas [Bacus 1999]). Political economy, as used here, refers to how the ruling elite control the acquisition and distribution of wealth and staple goods to support the distribution of power, and vice versa (Brumfiel 1992:558). To investigate Dumaguete’s political economy, I have drawn on three models of chiefly control of the craft and wealth sector of the economy: tributary, prestige goods, and wealth finance. These models share a view of the ruling chief as central in sponsoring craft specialization and organizing exchange, the products of which s/he uses to create and maintain social inequality, to strengthen political coalitions and enhance power by attracting clients and allies, and to fund new institutions of control (Brumfiel and Earle 1987). I briefly summarize these models in their synchronic form below, though it should be noted that the first two are part of dynamic models of social change. Models of the organization of the subsistence economy have yet to be evaluated. Currently, there is little archaeological evidence pertaining to Dumaguete’s subsistence economy, except for small quantities of animal remains and a few carbonized rice remains in earthenware pottery dated to the last few centuries BC and 11th century AD from the Unto and Yap sites, respectively.

In the tributary model (Wright 1977, 1984; see also Welch 1991), the chief extracts tribute of food and goods from producers. The chief distributes a portion of the craft goods to lesser nobility, and not to the entire populace, with each receiving the same set of items. These craft goods are made
Figure 3: Location of additional sites (i.e., Calatagan, Kalanay, Bagumbayan, Cebu City, Sasak, Fort Pilar, and the Guthe sites; which are indicated by numbers [see Note 2 which lists Guthe site designations for each map number]) with decorated earthenware assemblages analyzed in this study.
by specialists, either part-time specialists locally supported by commoner production or full-time specialists supported by chiefs, or are goods imported from other polities. What distinguishes this model from the following two models is that craft production occurs primarily outside the center(s).

In the prestige goods model (Frankenstein and Rowlands 1978), the ruling chief controls access to local wealth objects and those obtained through external exchange. The chief distributes some of these as, for example, status insignia, funerary goods and bridewealth, to lesser elite to support his/her superordinate status and gain political advantage. The chief controls the production of wealth items at the local level and at the center for those goods requiring specialized skills, and controls specific local resources. All of these comprise the sources of wealth used in external exchange. Items procured or produced at the local level differ among the settlements and are passed up as tribute. Production or procurement of wealth items at both the center and local levels contrasts with the tributary model, as does the paramount’s distribution to the lesser elites of only minimal quantities of locally produced prestige goods, and only a subset of the foreign prestige goods.

In the wealth finance model (D’Altroy and Earle 1985; Brumfiel and Earle 1987; Earle 1991) ranking chiefs also employ valuables as a means of payment for political services. These valuables may be produced at the level of the local community and amassed as direct payments, or produced at the paramount center by craft specialists attached to the chiefly elite in contrast to the tributary model. Raw materials given as tribute are often used in the manufacture of these goods by, in some cases, craft specialists who fulfill part of the labor obligation from local communities. Wealth objects may also be obtained through long-distance exchange, and special goods may be manufactured for exchange. Unlike in the previous model, local communities may produce or provide the same valuables or raw materials.

The differences among these models highlight questions for archaeological investigation: What are the foreign goods and local craft goods, and what are their respective distributions within the polity? What goods constituted valuables/prestige goods within the polity, and how does their distribution and production differ from that of utilitarian goods? Is there evidence of craft specialization, and if so, where does this occur? Answers to such questions enable reconstruction of some of the ruling elite’s economic practices, as summarized below. The aim, however, is not to fit Dumaguete’s political economy to any one of these models; rather, to the extent that there are similarities, the relevant model’s implications for political change would be expected to apply. To the extent that they are not, the Dumaguete evidence may be used to reformulate our general understanding of chiefly political economy.

Within the Dumaguete polity, the non-perishable foreign imports included glazed Asian wares (i.e., porcelains from China, and possibly Thailand and Vietnam), and high-fired decorated earthenwares from the Thai state of Ayutthia (AD 1350-1767). Glass beads may also have been foreign imports, though archaeological evidence of bead manufacturing in the Santa Ana area of Masila (Dalupan, pers. comm.) suggests they could have been obtained from elsewhere in the archipelago. The glazed Asian wares exhibit restricted distribution within the area; only Yap has the earliest ones which date to the 12th-13th centuries. Over time, glazed wares continued to be present at Yap, but also appeared at other settlements (Figure 4). Fourteenth- fifteenth century porcelains have been found at three other sites including two sites, Unto and H3, that I have elsewhere (Bacus 1995, 1997, 1999) suggested were inhabited by lesser elite individuals during this period. Sixteenth or 16th-17th century porcelains occur at nine other sites. The limited number of sites with glazed wares, combined with their occurrence at settlements occupied by lesser nobility, is consistent with all of the models’ expectations for the distribution of political valuables. This also appears to be the case for Thai earthenwares; their presence only at Yap

![Figure 4: Distribution of glazed Asian ceramics; squares indicate 14th-15th century ceramics and triangles indicate sites with 16th, 17th-century ceramics.](image-url)
further suggests that the chiefly élite restricted their use to
the center.

Locally-made prestige goods included decorated earthenware pottery and possibly some iron goods. Some of the earthenware pottery and iron (and possibly other metal) production occurred near élite residences at Yap and Unto. Evidence of earthenware production includes burnt clay lumps and a clay-filled feature. The similarity of the pastes of most of the decorated earthenwares to those of the more abundant plain wares suggests they were locally produced. Decorated earthenware production occurred at Yap during all periods of occupation, and at Unto during the 15th century. Plain and decorated earthenware pottery, produced elsewhere in the archipelago, was also imported into Dumaguete (discussed below). The locally-made decorated earthenwares are associated with 11th and 15th-16th century élite residences at Yap, and with 15th century élite residences at Unto. These wares also exhibit restricted distribution within the area. Only 21 of the survey sites have yielded these wares, and all in small quantities. At present only six sites have decorated wares that can be dated to the protohistoric period (primarily 15th-16th century, though one site may have wares from the 12th-14th century [Bacus 1999]). Such restricted distribution suggests the ruling élite also used these as political valuables within the polity.

The association of iron smelting activities, indicated by slag and metal pieces, with élite residences at Yap parallels archaeological findings at other protohistoric centers such as Cebu City and Tanjay (Hutterer 1973; Junker 1990; Nishimura 1992). The chiefly élite may well have controlled iron craft specialization. Restriction of its production to the Yap center is consistent with the wealth finance and particularly the prestige goods model. There is also some evidence for iron and its production at Unto after the 15th century. This may also indicate craft specialization, as well as either a change in control over its production, its status, or the location of chiefly élite settlements. Whether the iron goods produced at Yap and Unto were prestige or utilitarian items, or both, is not yet known. Nineteen of the survey sites have fragments of iron objects, but since all of these sites are multi-component, it is not yet possible to assign them dates nor examine changes in their distribution over time. Nonetheless, not all sites have iron goods which lends support to interpreting at least some of them as prestige items.

Beads have only been found at Yap, though not in the 15th-16th century deposits. Their association with élite residences in the two earlier periods, combined with their apparently very restricted distribution, suggests the Yap élite used them as status items and not as valuables for distribution to lesser or non-élite individuals.

In all three models, the chief distributes valuables as political payments to a restricted group of people, the lesser élite and certain others, and limits the types of prestige goods distributed. In the tributary model, the paramount distributes the same set of craft items to all local élites, whereas in the prestige goods model the chief distributes only minimal quantities of such goods and none of the resources that are exchangeable sources of wealth. Within the Dumaguete polity, for the 11th century, only Yap has yielded probable wealth items — beads and decorated earthenwares — suggesting these were chiefly élite status items and not ones used as social/political payments. In the 12th-14th century, such status items probably included beads, possibly decorated earthenwares and 12th-13th century glazed ceramics, all exclusive to Yap. In the 14th-15th century, glazed ceramics were no longer exclusive to Yap but occurred at two other sites. The latter appear to have been small centers occupied by lesser élite individuals, and thus consistent with prestige distributions to the lesser élite as posited in the models. Interestingly, one of these small centers (Unto) has evidence both consistent with and contradictory to the tributary model as it appears to have received and produced prestige goods (i.e., glazed ceramics and decorated earthenwares, respectively) during the 15th century. In the 15th-16th century Yap continued to have glazed ceramics and decorated earthenwares and, at this time, was the only settlement with Ayuthia earthenwares. Up to ten other sites have glazed ceramics, possibly fewer since some date to the 16th-17th century, and five or six other sites have decorated wares. One of these sites, a small center, has both types of ceramics; the other sites were smaller settlements. Such a distribution seems partially in accord with the models though it also suggests the disbursement of social/political currency to the non-élite. Small settlement sites and the specific contexts of wealth items require further investigation. The evidence thus far is also consistent with the tributary and prestige goods models in that the chief appears to have distributed only the same types (two, possibly three if iron is included) of prestige goods. Furthermore, wealth items occur in small quantities when found outside the center. While consistent with the models, this may partially reflect the more intensive investigations at Yap.

The results provide significant information on Dumaguete's political economy, allowing comparisons with other protohistoric Visayan polities, as briefly discussed in the concluding section below. Further work though is clearly needed. Areas for future research include, for example, assessing the socio-political nature of the survey sites that have yielded prestige items; and determining whether the restriction of valuables to the center in the early protohistoric period was due to the regional scale of the polity, its
settlement configuration (i.e., lesser élite individuals did not reside outside the center), and/or their use as chiefly élite status items.

INTERPOLITY INTERACTIONS

Within the Philippines, there has been almost no archaeological research on interactions among protohistoric (or earlier) polities. Analysis of Chinese and Spanish accounts suggests various types of interactions with most apparently organized, controlled and/or financed by chiefs (for detailed discussion see Bacus 1995). Accounts most frequently mention the exchange of or for locally manufactured valuables, foreign goods, food products and raw materials (Anonymous 1565:7-142; Legazpi 1567:8-238; Legazpi 1569:57; Anonymous 1570:91; Riquel et al. 1574:243, 245; Loarca 1582:113; Dasamarrías et al. 1591:84; Dasamarrías 1592:289). Interestingly, the goods having value in exchange were those local craft goods and resources restricted to the élite, and/or under some level of chiefly control, as well as foreign goods which were also under chiefly control via their control over coastal ports, trading vessels and sponsorship of long-distance trade expeditions. Some chiefly-sponsored feasts and rituals also involved chiefly élite from other polities, and served to create or reinforce alliances important for exchange and providing allies for warfare (Loarca 1582; Plasencia 1589:119-120; Chirino 1604:129, 134-5, 145; Boxer MS 1590:190, 201, 207-9, 213-4). Not all interactions though were peaceful, and accounts do record various raiding and warfare activities (particularly after the beginning of Spanish colonialism [Bacus 1999]). Chiefs may have used such methods to disrupt the local economy of other competing polities, and as an alternative to exchange for acquiring valuable goods and resources (e.g., Lavezaris 1574:287; Loarca 1582:151; Junker 1990).

My archaeological study of chiefly élite interaction has focused on prestige-goods exchange and alliance using decorated earthenware assemblages from the Dumaguete-Bacong sites and the 59 other sites mentioned above (total of 950 sherds and vessels from 82 sites). I selected decorated earthenwares for several reasons, including:

1. Previous researchers (e.g., Solheim 1964; Hutterer 1977, 1986) had recognized the inter-island distribution of several broadly defined styles, some of which are present in the Dumaguete-Bacong assemblages, and had hypothesized that such distributions were due to archipelago-wide exchange systems;
2. Archaeological evidence indicates that decorated earthenwares were prestige items during the protohistoric period, which suggests they may have also been used in interpolity exchange (Junker 1990; Bacus 1995, 1999);
3. Stylistic studies of decorated ceramics (e.g., Hantman and Plog 1982; Plog 1990; Graves 1991; Crown 1994) indicate they may transmit messages about social identity which suggests their possible role in forming and maintaining alliances.

The study of prestige-goods exchange among polities has examined whether the distribution of decorated earthenware styles was the result of exchange from their respective production centers. Because there has been very little research on the spatial and temporal distribution of Philippine ceramic designs, I first needed to define "decorative styles" in the decorated earthenware assemblages used in this study. A "decorative style" is defined as sherds or vessels dating to the same time period from at least two sites from different regions, and thus presumably from different polities, that share at least one design motif. A design motif can be either:

1. A fixed configuration of a single element which is the smallest self-contained component of a design that is manipulated or moved around as a single unit, or
2. A fixed combination of elements that are used to form larger components of the decoration.

Based on a comparison of design motifs in the decorated earthenware assemblages, I identified six decorative styles. All appear to date to approximately the 14th-16th centuries, except for one, the Kalanay/Solamillo Carved and Impressed, which shares motifs with the Kalanay Impressed and Baguapantoa Impressed types (Solheim 1964:7) and is characterized by a row of carved or impressed scallops encircling the vessel, often around its maximum diameter, with carved notches, triangular in cross-section, and short vertical incised/impresed lines often interspersed between the scallops. This style may date to the 3rd century AD and occurs at 10 sites (in the sample) or four islands. The other decorative styles identified in the assemblages analyzed have been designated

1. Kalanay/Unto Incised, found at eight sites on four islands (Solheim 1964:Fig. 16c, 16d), characterized by a motif consisting of a series of paired diagonal incised lines, often slightly angled at the ends, located around the neck/upper body area of the vessel;
2. Calsangan Incised, found at 13 sites on eight islands (including, e.g., the Calsangan site – see Fox 1959:Fig. 17), characterized by multiple wavy or zigzag horizontal incised lines often in conjunction with multiple straight horizontal incised lines;
3. Pilar Triangular Stamped, found at four sites on three islands (including the Fort Pilar site – Spoehr 1973:Fig. 96), characterized by triangular carved stamps impressed in one or more rows around the upper body of the vessel;
4. Pilar Rosette, found at five sites on four islands (also including the Fort Pilar site – Spoehr 1973:Fig. 100),
characterized by floral or rosette stamped impressions, usually in several rows, around the body of the vessel; 5. Cebu Incised, found at two sites on two islands (Hutrer 1973: Fig. 9a), characterized by one or more rows of wide “V” shaped incisions with short vertical incisions within and between them located on the upper exterior portion of the rim.

To assess whether each decorative style was from a single production area, I compared several attributes of the pastes, specifically of the nonplastic inclusions, of the available decorated wares within each style. Such comparison should identify pottery produced in the same place since temper from distant sites or different islands should be distinctive (as suggested in ceramic studies such as Arnold 1981; for the Philippines specifically, see Solheim 1952; Solheim and Shuler 1959; Schean 1965; Stark 1993). This is supported by my comparative analysis of plain earthenwares from the Bai and Dumaguete-Bacon areas where the majority of the earthenware pastes are specific to each area (Bacus 1995, 1997).

The results suggest that very few of the decorated earthenwares of the same style were produced within a single area. Only a few cases of exchange are suggested. These are between the Yap and Tanjay settlements, which share sherds of Pilar Rosette style exhibiting the same paste; Unto and site C40 (on Siiquior Island) – (#38 in Figure 3), which share Kalaanay/Solamillo Carved and Impressed sherds of similar paste; and Tanjay and site B4 (on Kaulungan Island) – (#12 in Figure 3), which share Pilar Triangular Stamped sherds also of similar paste. Technological analysis of the remaining decorated sherds that did not belong to any of the decorative styles revealed exchange of other decorated earthenwares between Yap and Tanjay. Manila White ware (identified by A. de la Torre) was also present at Yap. It thus appears that decorated earthenwares were not items used to any great extent in prestige-goods exchange, at least during the 14th-16th centuries.

Such results, while not definitive, are not completely unexpected given the involvement of Philippine chiefs in long-distance trade during this period. These trade networks provided them with presumably more politically-valuable goods (see Helms 1979, 1987 for discussion of the ideological basis for political valuation of foreign goods). The evidence also appears consistent with the dynamics posited by the prestige goods model in which chiefs devalue local wealth items once they gain control over foreign wealth objects, such as trade wares in the case of the Dumaguete and other Visayan polities. While it is not yet clear whether decorated earthenwares were valuables prior to the 11th century, the available evidence from Yap, where very few 11th century decorated earthenwares were recovered, and from Tanjay, where none were recovered from pre-12th century contexts, suggests they were not such items at least within these two polities. This suggests transformations in political economy once chiefs began to participate in foreign trade, particularly changes in the areas of the economy under their control (i.e., production of certain types of earthenware vessels). Investigating such possible transformations requires much more evidence of pre-11th century Dumaguete than is currently available.

Prestige-goods exchange, however, is only one type of chiefly interaction that may account for the distribution of similarly decorated earthenwares. Considerable evidence exists from areas outside the Philippine archipelago for elite participation in shared symbolical systems (e.g., Earle 1987; Helms 1987). Between polities, chiefly elites may employ certain symbols or styles to mark their alliance, status and legitimize authority. Various studies provide evidence for the use of decorated ceramics in transmitting messages about social identity, and I have attempted to assess whether these decorative styles were possible symbols of chiefly elite alliances. In doing so, I have drawn upon Wiessner’s (1983, 1984, 1985) theory of emblematic styles. She views style not only as a means of transmitting information about personal and social identity, but as active in reproducing, disrupting, altering or creating social relationships such as affiliation and solidarity. Emblematic style transmits messages corresponding to group identity, and a special type of this style, referred to as iconographic style, is of particular relevance here. Iconographic “stylistic statements ... contain clear, purposeful, conscious messages aimed at a specific target population,” and thus should exhibit stability and consistent patterns of attribute association (Wiessner 1985:161).

Such an understanding of style, combined with a political economic view of chiefly interactions and data on Philippine polities, suggested several expectations concerning the variation in design components, regional distribution and production location of earthenware decorative styles that were iconographic. An iconographic style should exhibit a high degree of redundancy or consistency in the attributes comprising the style throughout the area of its use and production (Plog 1990; Crown 1994). Ethnoarchaeology and archaeological research indicates this would not otherwise be expected between regions, islands or polities (Graves 1991). The redundancy figures calculated (using the information statistic H where 1.0 equals complete redundancy [Shannon 1949; see also Braun 1985 and Hegmon 1995 for archaeological studies using the H-statistic to measure stylistic diversity in ceramics]) for each of the decorative styles, excluding Cebu Incised because of its small sample size, indicate redundancy is relatively high for three styles (with 0.65-0.96 representing the lowest and highest of the range of redundancy figures; redundancy
was calculated more than once for each style using different subsamples). The remaining two styles (Calatagan Incised and Pilar Rosette) have lower redundancy figures, but their respective ranges overlap with those of the other styles suggesting redundancy is relatively high for all five styles.

Decorated earthenwares having such a symbolic role should also be restricted to chiefly centers. Three of the decorative styles (Pilar Triangular, Pilar Rosette, Cebu Incised) appear to have had such a distribution. For the Kalanay/Solamilo Carved and Impressed style, tentatively dated to the 3rd century AD, not enough is known about polities of this period to evaluate its distribution. Interestingly, two styles (Kalanay/Unto Incised, and Calatagan Incised) were present at Unto but absent from its political center at Yap. Unto may have been occupied by lesser elite individuals at this time suggesting these styles were active in different elite alliance systems, and possibly ones aimed at disrupting those of the ruling chief at Yap. One of the styles is found at a number of centers, including those that shared styles with Yap. Given Unto’s closer proximity to interior areas, which yielded the forest products in demand in foreign trade, these elite individuals may have used their position to gain direct access to valuables needed in political negotiations via other polities, and thus engaged in restructuring political relations within the polity. Such an interpretation though requires much more information from the sites at which these styles occur.

Finally, vessels exhibiting iconographic style should have been produced within each polity. The technological analysis of the sherds and vessels of each decorative style (discussed above) found few instances where exchange could account for their inter-island distribution. This suggests multiple production locales for each decorative style. Unfortunately, the earthenwares from six sites (Kalanay, Calatagan, Bagumbayan, Fort Pilar, Sasa Cave and Cebu City) were not available for this analysis, and thus the extent to which exchange may or may not account for their inter-island distribution cannot yet be determined.

The results appear consistent with decorative earthenware styles as iconographic, and possibly as symbols of chiefly elite alliances. However, other possible explanations, such as emulation, need to be evaluated. Furthermore, these decorative styles are currently represented by small quantities of sherds or vessels. For Yap, Cebu City and Tanjay where I had large samples of decorated wares, those belonging to a decorative style represent a tiny proportion of the total decorated assemblage. The larger context of which the archipelago was a part during the protohistoric period, specifically the active participation of Philippine chiefs in long-distance trade with Asian states, may account for the limited use of earthenwares in elite symbolism. As Helms (1979) has shown, a central part of the political process is elite competition for control of esoteric knowledge, as exhibited through access to exotic objects, that identifies them with universal forces and which creates a broad commonality in elite iconography that cross-cuts polities over a large area. By the 11th century, Philippine chiefs competed for recognition by the Chinese court, which if granted, resulted in their receiving of titles, emblems of their tributary status, and of course, a large quantity of Chinese goods. Spanish accounts clearly suggest the existence of a common archipelago-wide elite iconography during the contact period consisting of shared styles in dress, including the wearing of silk clothing and gold jewelry, and their display of greater quantities and types of foreign goods. This form of elite iconography would not have distinguished specific alliances, and would have only been widespread sometime after the 10th century. It is possible that, prior to this, decorated earthenwares may have been used more in this regard, though this is currently difficult to assess as only one decorative style dates to this period.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This paper has presented a summary of the results of my research into sociopolitical and economic dimensions of 11th to 16th century polities, focused particularly on the activities of the chiefly elite in the Dumaguete-Bacoor area of southeastern Negros Island. One of the aims of the research is to provide data for comparison with other contemporary Visayan polities in order to understand variability in protohistoric socio-political and economic structures within the archipelago. I thus conclude with a brief comparison of the Dumaguete, Cebu City and Tanjay polities, particularly in regards to their political economies (see Bacus 1999 for a more detailed comparison).

The material expression of elite status at Yap parallels those seen at the contemporary political centers at Cebu City and Tanjay (of the Cebu and Tanjay polities, respectively). The elite occupied larger residences than commoners at the Yap and Tanjay centers (based on significant differences in postmold diameters at Tanjay [Junker 1990] and similarly large diameters at Yap [Bacus 1995]). At the Cebu center, the residences uncovered all have postmolds of similar or larger diameters than the elite residences at Yap and Tanjay (Hutterer 1973; Nishimura 1992). Elite residences also had more types and/or higher densities of foreign and local valuables (see below).

The presence of Asian tradewares indicates that all three polities participated, either directly or indirectly, in long-distance trade networks. Cebu apparently engaged in such trade at an earlier date than the other two polities as indicated by the presence of 9th-10th century Asian ceramics. By Spanish contact, Cebu was one, if not the largest, of the
international trading centers in the Visayas. The differential distribution of glazed tradewares within the centers, as well as within the Tanjay and Dumaguete regions, suggests they were valuables or élite status items. Within Dumaguete, it appears that the earliest glazed ceramics were markers of élite status, and only later became prestige goods distributed by the chief to lesser élites and possibly commoners. A similarly broad distribution (i.e., including non-élite settlements) of glazed ceramics in the 15th-16th centuries is also found in the Tanjay polity. While decorated earthenwares appear to have been prestige items within the Dumaguete and Tanjay polities, within the Cebu region (as opposed to the polity's region, for which data are not yet available) these wares do not exhibit the same differential distribution as glazed tradewares.

In regard to élite control over the production or acquisition of valuables, all three centers had craft specialists located adjacent to or within élite residential areas. This included specialists engaged in the production of iron goods and decorated earthenware pottery, though there is only evidence of the latter at Yap and Tanjay. This is consistent with the expectations of the prestige goods and wealth finance models. By the 15th-16th century, though, iron casting also occurred at subsidiary centers in both Dumaguete and Tanjay which differs from the prestige goods model. Cebu's chief, at least at Spanish contact, also controlled trade at the port (Pigafetta 1525) and presumably also had some control over the imported and exported goods. Even though Dumaguete and Tanjay did not, at Spanish contact, have ports like Cebu's, nonetheless, their chiefly élite appear to have controlled the distribution of imported goods within the polity. The types of exported goods, and the extent of élite control over their acquisition/production, unfortunately remains archaeologically unknown for all three polities. The evidence from Dumaguete, Cebu and Tanjay thus exhibits consistency with some of the expectations of the three political economy models, and particularly the prestige goods and wealth finance models. Comparison of Dumaguete, Cebu and Tanjay, suggests their respective chiefly élite similarly controlled areas of the economy and used foreign goods in socio-political negotiations. Dumaguete though, like Tanjay, differed from Cebu in the scale of its economy, the production of decorated pottery under élite control and the political valuation of these goods. Such differences may reflect differences in the nature of Dumaguete's (and Tanjay's) participation in long-distance trade networks, and Cebu's status as a major international port.

Archaeological investigations over the last 20 years in the Visayas have provided considerable evidence on protohistoric complex polities. Recent research on the Dumaguete polity contributes to this growing body of data on the nature and dynamics of sociopolitical and economic organization. While comparative studies of protohistoric polities are only now beginning to be possible, it is clear that such studies will enable us to understand similarities and differences in their structure and transformation. This will further provide a basis both for evaluating textually-based reconstructions of the archipelago's history, and contributing to anthropological theories of complex societies.
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NOTES

1. Solamillo is the Magsuhot site shown on Figure 1.
2. Site numbers assigned by Guthrie 1928, n.d. #2 - C11, #3 - C86, #4 - C214, #5 - B7, #6 - B649, #8 - C25, #9 - C35, #11 - C5, #12 - B4, #13 - C14, #14 - C15, #15 - B15, #16 - C33, #17 - C76, #18 - B1, #19 - C67, #20 - C68, #21 - C70, #22 - C63, #23 - C64, #24 - C65, #25 - C66, #26 - B10, #27 - C1, #28 - C2, #29 - C7, #30 - C16, #31 - C17, #32 - C22, #33 - C23, #34 - B23, #35 - C34, #36 - C36, #37 - C37, #38 - C40, #39 - C51, #40 - C52, #41 - C74, #42 - C55, #43 - C56, #44 - C57, #45 - C13.
Sites B124, C10 and G72 corresponding to #1, #7 and #10, respectively could not be located. Tanjay and sites within its region are not shown on this map. Key: B = burial; C = cave; G = grave.
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