

*Routledge Studies in Archaeology*

# **TRAVELLERS IN TIME**

## **IMAGINING MOVEMENT IN THE ANCIENT AEGEAN WORLD**

Saro Wallace



# Travellers in Time

*Travellers in Time* re-evaluates the extent to which the earliest Mediterranean civilisations were affected by population movement. It critiques both traditional culture-history-grounded notions of movement in the region as straightforwardly transformative, and the processual, systemic models that have more recently replaced this view, arguing that newer scholarship too often pays limited attention to the specific encounters, experiences and agents involved in travel.

By assessing a broad range of recent archaeological and ancient textual data from the Aegean and central and east Mediterranean via five comprehensive studies, this book makes a compelling case for rethinking issues such as identity, agency, materiality and experience through an understanding of movement as transformative.

This innovative and timely study will be of interest to advanced undergraduates, postgraduate students and scholars in the fields of Aegean/Mediterranean prehistory and Classical archaeology, as well as anyone interested in ancient Aegean and Mediterranean culture.

**Saro Wallace** held full-time lectureships at the Universities of Bristol, Cardiff, Reading and Warsaw (2004–10). Her career has also included a number of research fellowships, including those of the Leverhulme Trust, the Alexander S. Humboldt Foundation, the W.F. Albright Institute, and the Center for Hellenic Studies, Harvard University. She has been the recipient of numerous primary research grants including those of the British Academy, the Institute for Aegean Prehistory and the Society of Antiquaries. Since 2008 she has directed field research (survey and excavation) in the landscape around the Bronze to Iron Age site of Karfi, Crete. Since 2017 she has been Senior Research Fellow in the School of Arts, Languages and Cultures, University of Manchester.

## Routledge Studies in Archaeology

For more information on this series, please visit [www.routledge.com/Routledge-Studies-in-Archaeology/book-series/RSTARCH](http://www.routledge.com/Routledge-Studies-in-Archaeology/book-series/RSTARCH)

### Recent titles

**22 Life of the Trade**

Events and Happenings in Niumi's Atlantic Center

*Liza Gijanto*

**23 Exploring the Materiality of Food 'Stuffs'**

Transformations, Symbolic Consumption and Embodiment(s)

*Edited by Louise Steel and Katharina Zinn*

**24 Archaeologies of "Us" and "Them"**

Debating History, Heritage and Indigeneity

*Edited by Charlotta Hillerdal, Anna Karlström and Carl-Gösta Ojala*

**25 Balkan Dialogues**

Negotiating Identity between Prehistory and the Present

*Edited by Maja Gori and Maria Ivanova*

**26 Material Worlds**

Archaeology, Consumption, and the Road to Modernity

*Edited by Barbara J. Heath, Eleanor E. Breen and Lori A. Lee*

**27 New Perspectives in Cultural Resource Management**

*Edited by Francis McManamon*

**28 Dwelling**

Heidegger, Archaeology, Mortality

*Philip Tonner*

**29 Travellers in Time**

Imagining Movement in the Ancient Aegean World

*Saro Wallace*

# Travellers in Time

Imagining Movement in  
the Ancient Aegean World

Saro Wallace

First published 2018  
by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN  
and by Routledge  
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

© 2018 Saro Wallace

The right of Saro Wallace to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by her in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

*British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

A catalog record for this book has been requested

ISBN: 978-1-138-08848-1 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-10983-1 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon  
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

For Eddie Peltenburg and David Ridgway, questing travellers  
who taught me about data, context and imagination.



**Taylor & Francis**

Taylor & Francis Group

<http://taylorandfrancis.com>

# Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	xi
<i>Chronology used in this book</i>	xix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xxviii
<b>1 Imagining movement</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>Timing, context and aims of this book</i>	1
<i>The conceptual toolkit: existing approaches to Mediterranean movement</i>	5
<i>The Aegean focus: European/Mediterranean, disciplinary and data context</i>	9
A European and Mediterranean location	9
Disciplinary and cultural perspectives on the ancient Aegean	10
Aegean data quality: special features	11
<i>Analysing ancient culture change: earlier approaches and the ways they are built on in this book</i>	13
<i>Movement and culture change in the ancient Aegean: recent region-specific perspectives</i>	16
<i>Summary: context, methods and parameters of the present study</i>	19
<b>2 Movement as explanation: the heritage</b>	<b>33</b>
<i>Introduction</i>	33
<i>The Classical archaeology tradition</i>	34
<i>Nation, race, ethnicity and movement</i>	37
<i>Imperial legacies</i>	43
<i>Sociocultural change and movement: frameworks of past scholarship</i>	49
<i>Conclusions</i>	54

<b>3</b>	<b>Movement, ‘Anatolianising’ culture and Aegean social change c. 3500–2300 BC</b>	<b>67</b>
	<i>Introduction</i>	67
	<i>The long view on Neolithic-EB movement: questions of origins and identity</i>	71
	<i>The timing and nature of late FN sociocultural changes: evidence and interpretation</i>	74
	<i>Envisioning movement’s roots and pressures</i>	85
	<i>Approach, experience and response in movement</i>	91
	<i>Longer-term impacts of movement</i>	103
	Movement models and the late EB II crisis – a regional-scale view	106
	Movement, culture change and the Aegean: EB II–III	113
	<i>Conclusions</i>	120
<b>4</b>	<b>Crete and Cretans in the Mediterranean, eighteenth to sixteenth centuries BC</b>	<b>138</b>
	<i>Introduction</i>	138
	<i>Angles of approach in this study</i>	141
	<i>Origin points: multi-centredness on palatial Crete, MM II–LM IA</i>	143
	<i>Connective relationships among groups on Aegean islands/peninsulas</i>	148
	<i>Case studies</i>	152
	<i>Crete-linked movement and the Aegean mainland</i>	169
	<i>Envisaging encounters</i>	176
	<i>Language, script, ethnicity, movement</i>	188
	<i>Mainland state trajectories and movement: LH II/LM IB</i>	193
	<i>Conclusions: movement and transformation in the MB–early LB Aegean</i>	195
	<i>Crete-linked movement and the east Mediterranean: regional case studies</i>	196
	Introduction	196
	Coastal Anatolia	197
	Cyprus	204
	Egypt and the southern Levant	209
	<i>Conclusions: Crete-linked movement in the Aegean and east Mediterranean, MB–LB I</i>	219
	<i>The farthest shore: the central Mediterranean</i>	221

5	<b>'Aegean' expansion: new dynamics, new boundaries in the later LBA</b>	243
	<i>Introduction</i>	243
	<i>'Aegeanisation': a bloc forms</i>	248
	<i>Movement and cultural realignment</i>	249
	<i>LM IB destructions and their context</i>	254
	<i>Conclusions on the Aegean 'bloc' and movement</i>	261
	<i>Culture as currency: Aegean painted pottery and movement in the later LBA</i>	263
	<i>Aegean movement and Cyprus</i>	266
	<i>Making space: the Aegean bloc in wider eastern interactions</i>	273
	<i>Looking west (and north): movement and inequality from a different perspective</i>	280
	<i>General conclusions</i>	292
6	<b>Myth and movement from c. 1200 BC</b>	307
	<i>Introduction</i>	307
	<i>Legacies of tradition: texts in Greek</i>	310
	<i>Non-Greek texts: the 'Sea Peoples'</i>	315
	<i>'Crisis' and new kinds of movement: archaeological evidence from the twelfth-century Aegean</i>	322
	<i>Aegean 'elites' and movement</i>	336
	<i>East Mediterranean consumption patterns from c. 1200 BC – the 'Aegeanising' pottery boom and its significance</i>	340
	<i>Pottery and other cultural items as 'diagnostics' for Aegean movement to the east from c. 1200 BC – a review</i>	344
	<i>New settlement sites</i>	345
	<i>Fortifications</i>	346
	<i>Fineware innovations</i>	348
	<i>Cookware/cooking practice</i>	350
	<i>Handmade ware</i>	357
	<i>Pork consumption</i>	359
	<i>Weaving technology</i>	361
	<i>Figurative art</i>	363
	<i>Tomb and other architecture</i>	365
	<i>Summary on 'ethnofossil' evidence</i>	369
	<i>'Philistines': review of a classic migration model in the present data context</i>	370
	<i>Conclusions: Aegean movement east, 1200–1000 BC</i>	373

<b>7</b>	<b>Later Iron Age Mediterranean movement and 'Greek colonisation'</b>	<b>391</b>
	<i>Introduction: changes in Aegean-based travel c. 1200–1000 BC</i>	391
	<i>Ethnic actors and Mediterranean growth from the tenth century on</i>	402
	<i>'Colonisation' in the eighth- to sixth-century central Mediterranean: introduction</i>	411
	<i>Aegeans and others in central Mediterranean encounters</i>	413
	<i>Movement and changing local dynamics in Sicily/south Italy c. 800–600 BC</i>	429
	<i>Non-Aegean movement from the east: travellers' outlooks and reception environments in the later Iron Age west</i>	441
	<i>'Greek'-framed polities in wider local context; regional landscapes beyond the polis in the seventh–sixth centuries BC</i>	449
	<i>Living 'Greekness': social relationships in and outside 'Greek' polities in the central Mediterranean from c. 700 BC</i>	454
	<i>Creative traditions and movement</i>	458
	<i>Conclusions on Aegean-linked travel in the Iron Age–Archaic Mediterranean</i>	460
<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusions: movement disassembled</b>	<b>482</b>
	<i>Movement and history: finding patterns</i>	482
	<i>Movement's scale and impact: concepts and terminology</i>	487
	<i>Transformative movement in Mediterranean context</i>	488
	<i>Imagining encounters</i>	489
	<i>Travelling into the future: ongoing approaches to ancient movement</i>	494
	<i>Index</i>	497

# Figures

2.1	Photograph of Cretan children used to support early twentieth-century arguments about the significance of cranial form in the archaeological record	42
2.2	Louis-François Cassas, <i>The Olympeion at Athens with the Acropolis in the distance</i>	45
3.1	Site distribution in the FN Aegean, including known west Anatolian sites dating in Late Chalcolithic IV/FN IV	69
3.2	Innovative types of pottery in Late Chalcolithic 4 Anatolia	76
3.3	(a) ‘Cheese-pots’ and other new forms from late FN Crete: Gaidouronisi island off Crete; (b) Photo: ‘cheese-pots’ from the surface of a late FN site, SE Crete	77
3.4	New pottery forms at FN IV Knossos (Stratum IC group)	78
3.5	Locations of Final Neolithic–EB I sites in northern Kea mentioned in the text	80
3.6	Crete: map of late FN sites	83
3.7	SE Crete: new concentration of sites in the latest FN	84
3.8	Bakla Tepe – excavation photograph of part of the Late Chalcolithic settlement	87
3.9	Burial finds at Bakla Tepe	88
3.10	Part of the West Anatolian/east Aegean development zone in Late Chalcolithic 4: ancient sites in the Izmir area and adjacent islands	89
3.11	Reconstruction of a recent experimental paddled longboat made from reeds, which took two weeks to travel from Athens to Melos	90
3.12	EB metal objects of distinctive Aegean type; daggers; scale 1:3	93
3.13	Photograph, FN site of Plakias Paligremnos, SW Crete	95
3.14	Photograph, FN site of Ayia Fotia Mertoriza	95
3.15	Photograph, FN site of Ziros Rizoviglo, SE Crete	96
3.16	Reconstruction drawing of the defensible FN site of Livari Katharades, SE Crete	96
3.17	Lebena: levels in <i>tholos</i> tomb I, with burial assemblages dating back to EB I and including small amounts of FN IV material	98

3.18	Finds from the Ayios Haralambos collective cave burial, Lasithi, Crete: accumulation of skulls against N wall of room 5. From S	100
3.19	Phaistos: deposits suggesting FN III–IV ceremonial activity: E-W section through Room XIX showing cooking installation 71; hearth 68; pits 69e and 69w	100
3.20	Pottery from the Phaistos FN IV deposits	101
3.21	FN–EB furnaces at Chrysokamino: reconstruction of use	102
3.22	Evidence for early Aegean metalworking: slagged crucibles from EB I Poros, Katsambas	105
3.23	Plans of fortified sites in the EB II–III Cyclades: Kastri (Syros), Mt. Kynthos (Delos), Panormos (Naxos)	106
3.24	Daskaleio-Kavos: (a) location map with trenches and (b) site plan	107
3.25	Ship imagery engraved on bedrock at FN–EB Strofilas, Andros, near fortification wall	109
3.26	Changed cultural forms in EC I Cyprus: ceramic/cooking artefacts; architecture; bronzeworking tools and bronze artefacts	111
3.27	‘Lefkandi I’-type ceramic forms, Ayia Irini	114
3.28	Giant serving vessel from EB III Lerna	116
3.29	Outsize obsidian blades, FN IV Petras Kefala	117
3.30	Egyptian-type animal amulets, EM–MM Crete	119
4.1	Map of central and east Mediterranean with sites/areas mentioned in the text, also showing palatial centres on Crete	144
4.2	Cretan ‘villa’: Chondros Viannou in south central Crete. LM IIIA–B town settlement above it	147
4.3	Akrotiri: site plan	153
4.4	Akrotiri: plan showing inscribed finds and examples of inscribed objects	154
4.5	Crete-linked ‘replica rings’ from Akrotiri	155
4.6	Akrotiri: (a) fresco with shipping scenes from west house Room 5, south wall; (b) Drawings of fresco fragments from west house Room 5, south wall, showing shipping scenes	155
4.7	Location map: Kastri site, Kythera, and its surroundings	157
4.8	Kastri, Kythera: plan of multichambered MM III/LM I tomb (Tomb E)	158
4.9	Location map: Ayios Giorgios hill near Kastri, Kythera	159
4.10	Phylakopi, Melos: site plan	161
4.11	Phylakopi: plan of the ‘Mansion’ and superimposed (LH III) megaron: find-spots of Linear A tablet (MI 2) and other Linear A-inscribed finds	162
4.12	Plan of Ayia Irini, Kea	164
4.13	Ayia Irini: plan of House A	165
4.14	Ayia Irini: goddess figurine from the ‘temple’: room 1; period IV	166

4.15	Ayia Irini: Cretan pottery imports among finds from Room 16	167
4.16	Ayios Stephanos summit: site plan showing excavation trenches 1959–77	171
4.17	Fine pottery assemblages, showing the advent of Cretan imports and styles, from (a) MH I late and (b) MH II–III Ayios Stephanos, Area Nu	172
4.18	Ano Englianios: map of palace site and surrounding area	173
4.19	Early mainland grave circles and tholoi: plans of Tholos III and grave circle at Ano Englianios, site of the LBA palace of Pylos	174
4.20	Aerial views of Tumulus A at Voidokoilia and Ayios Ioannis tumulus at Papoulia	175
4.21	Aegina Kolonna: plan of large Middle Bronze Age building	178
4.22	MB/LB I mainland pottery of distinctive regional types, moving in complex mainland-centred networks: Grey Minyan ware	180
4.23	Niello daggers from Mycenae and Pylos, part of the National Archaeological Museum collection in Athens	183
4.24	Silver ‘Siege Rhyton’ from the Mycenae shaft graves, showing an attack on a walled town: photograph and detail drawing	183
4.25	Gold signet rings from Mycenae	184
4.26	Fine cup types of Cretan, Kytheran and mainland manufacture, showing development of the ‘Vaphcio’ form: example (a) is from MM IIIB Knossos	186
4.27	Metal goods, including new cup types, from male graves in Mycenae Grave Circle B	187
4.28	Early kylikes in Crete (LM II tombs at Katsambas)	187
4.29	Galatas Megali Magoula: site plan	189
4.30	Cypro-Minoan signs inscribed on different objects, LC IIA–IIIA, c. 1450–1200 BC: (a) gold ring from a tomb, LC IIA Kalavassos Ayios Dimitrios; (b) bronze votive object (‘kidney’) from temple 2, LC IIC Kition; (c) bronze object from ritual/specialised context, LC IIC–IIIA Enkomi; (d) jar handle from LC IIIA Maa Palaeokastro	192
4.31	Iasos: fine cups of Cretan type, some of Milesian manufacture	198
4.32	Miletus: imported fine Cretan vessels from period III; Miletus catalogue numbers AT.99.264.1; AT.99.633.1; AT.98.347.3; AT.99.913.1; AT.99.84.12; AT.98.137.1; AT.98.160.1; AT.99.597.1	198
4.33	Miletus, period III: Cretan-type cooking pot, catalogue number AT.98.80.2, Scale 1:3	199
4.34	Iasos: (a) Anatolian-type jug (Iasos inventory no. 2041/Milas Museum 638); (b) Cretan fineware import, probably from north central Crete (Iasos AG/NM/20) (MM IIB–IIIB)	200

4.35	Česme: excavation photograph	201
4.36	Cemetery of Skarkos, Ios: Cretan-type cooking pot in grave	202
4.37	Non-pot Cretan-type artefacts in western Anatolia: (a) Miletus: horned stand, Miletus catalogue number AT97.404.12; (b) Limantepe: loomweights	203
4.38	Map showing sites in the east Mediterranean mentioned on the text but not indicated in Figure 4.1	205
4.39	Toumba tou Skourou: plan and section of Tomb 1	208
4.40	Cretan-type pottery in Egypt: imported MM IIA sherds from Lahun in the Middle Nile area	210
4.41	(a)–(c) ‘Keftiu’ paintings, tomb of Rekhmire at Thebes (reign of Tuthmosis III/Amenhotep II). Held in the Metropolitan Museum, New York	212
4.42	Tell el-Dab’a: (a) plan of fresco find locations; (b) frescoes with bull scenes, made in Cretan style and technique	214
4.43	Frescoes of Cretan type and technology in the Levant: Alalakh: fragments from Level VII palace	215
4.44	Frescoes of Cretan type and technology in the Levant: Kabri: (a) fragments with representation of sea and boats; (b) architecture	216
5.1	Map of sites referred to in this chapter	244
5.2	LM III representations of oared galleys: (a) LM IIIB larnax from Skaphidara near Knossos (Heraklion Archaeological Museum 18985); (b) rim fragment of LM III cup from Phaistos palace area; (c) pithos/jar base from Room 4 of LM III house b, west of the ‘piazzale del Teatro’ at Phaistos	245
5.3	(a) Frescoes of warriors at Pylos palace, LH IIIB; (b) Larnax from LM III Episkopi, Crete, with war scenes	246
5.4	(a) Palace-style jars, one with boar’s tusk helmet motif, from LH II tombs at Katsambas, Crete; (b) Bronze swords, Zapher Papoura cemetery, Knossos: graves 44 and 36	253
5.5	Palaikastro ‘kouros’: acc ritual figurine smashed in the LM IB destruction of Building 5	255
5.6	Central building with ‘megaron’ plan at LM IIIA Ayia Triada	259
5.7	LM III <i>tholos</i> tombs: plan and section of the <i>tholos</i> in the LM III cemetery of Armenoi, west Crete	260
5.8	Pictorial pottery in the east Mediterranean: (a) chariot kraters: (1) from Cyprus, provenance unknown, Pierides Collection 33; (2) from Enkomi tomb, British Museum; (b) Krater with Cypro-Minoan sign from twelfth-century Pyla <i>Kokkinokremos</i>	262
5.9	Canaanite jar imports in Crete, from LM IB and LM IIIA:1 deposits in House X, Kommos	267
5.10	LBA tomb form diversity at Enkomi: plans and sections	270

5.11	Female figurine from LC II Cyprus with features similar to those of contemporary Aegean figurines; Cyprus Museum Inventory Number A 53	271
5.12	(a) 'Horned God' figurine in bronze, LC IIIA Enkomi; (b) 'Ingot God' figurine in bronze, LC IIIA Enkomi	272
5.13	Ulu Burun wreck: plan	274
5.14	Imported Aegean fine wares, and ivory and bronze items in typical Aegean styles, from sites on the Adriatic coast of Italy	282
5.15	Aegean-related pottery from thirteenth-century south Italy: grey wheelmade local imitations of typical Aegean drinking wares from Broglio di Trebisacce, 2, 7, 9–11	283
5.16	Tokens from LBA central Mediterranean sites: (a) Vivara; (b) Pantelleria; (c) Monte Grande	284
5.17	Italian and Italian-type bronze objects in the Aegean: (a) knife found at LH IIIC Ialysos, Moschou Vounara cemetery, T15/26; Archaeological Museum of Rhodes inv. no M1600 (3579); traces of bone or ivory at the handle and the ring; (b) knife found at LM IIIB/C Knossos; Archaeological Museum of Iraklion inv. no. 4495; (c) Razors found at the settlement of Kastrokefala in Crete and the Achaia Klaus cemetery in the Peloponnese	287
5.18	New connections between Italy and the Aegean in the latest Bronze Age: Tiryns-type amber beads from Frattesina, Po valley	288
5.19	Glykys Limin site: detail of the lower Acheron region, showing the reconstructed shoreline and Bronze Age bay	290
5.20	Aegean-type objects in the Adriatic: sherd from Debelo Brdo	291
6.1	Map of all sites mentioned in the text	308
6.2	Thebes: Medinet Habu mortuary temple reliefs: (a) Rameses III's land battle; (b) detail of invaders' ship	316
6.3	Anthropoid coffin lid from twelfth-century Beth She'an in the southern Levant, from the collection of the Rockefeller Museum, Jerusalem	317
6.4	Depictions of seaborne warfare on early twelfth-century pictorial pottery	323
6.5	Map of new sites in the Aegean from c. 1200 BC: Crete	326
6.6	Map of new and continuing sites in the Aegean from c. 1200 BC: mainland	327
6.7	Photograph: fortification wall at Kranidi Profitis Elias, from SW	328
6.8	Photograph: site of Zakro Ellinika, Crete, from SE	329
6.9	Photograph: site of Elliniki Korifi, Crete, from SW	329
6.10	Plan: Karfi settlement	330
6.11	Photograph: Grotta on Naxos, from E	331
6.12	Photograph: defensible acropolis near the Knidos promontory, western Anatolia. From S	332

6.13	Map: Iron Age I sites in the coastal Levant	333
6.14	Tel Mique: site plan	334
6.15	Maa <i>Palaeokastro</i> : site plan	339
6.16	Locally-made Aegeanising fine wares (11A–D); contemporary Cypriot imports (11E–F); and jug-type cooking pot (11G) from Tell Kazel, Syria	341
6.17	Pottery of Aegeanising type from Bademgediği Tepe and other east Mediterranean sites, early twelfth century BC	342
6.18	Fortification wall at Kritsa Castello, Crete, from W	347
6.19	‘Cooking jug’ type gaining popularity in coastal east Mediterranean sites from c. 1200 BC: one- and two-handled cooking jugs from Crete, mainland Greece and Ashdod in the southern Levant	351
6.20	Local and other types of cooking pots from Tell Kazel	352
6.21	Hearths in the Levant post-1200 BC: (a) tanour ovens, Tel Jemmeh; (b) pebbled hearth, Tel-es-Sa’fi; (c) Maa <i>Palaeokastro</i>	354
6.22	Hearths in LM IIIA/B and LM IIIC Aegean rural households: (a) Kefali Chondros Viannou, Crete; (b) Monastiraki Chalasmeno, Crete	356
6.23	Handmade burnished ware vessels from Sinda, Maa <i>Palaeokastro</i> and Hala Sultan Tekke in Cyprus	358
6.24	Twelfth-century spool-shaped loomweights: (a) Tel Afis; (b) Karphi	362
6.25	Aegeanising figurines in the southern Levant – example from Ashdod Stratum XII	364
6.26	Reconstruction of a chamber tomb from thirteenth-century Tell el-Far’ah	366
6.27	Altar D with horns of consecration, Kition <i>Kathari</i> . From SE	367
6.28	Enkomi: town plan showing locations of LC IIIA temples (post-1200 BC), redrawn by L. Sollars	368
6.29	Plan of ‘Ashlar Building’ housing the Horned God figurine, in LC IIIA	369
6.30	Enkomi: plan of ‘Temple of the Ingot God’. The bronze figurine was found in room 4	370
7.1	Map of sites mentioned in the text (detail of Italian sites mentioned is given in Figure 7.22)	392
7.2	Cypriot-type bronze and iron items in the twelfth-century Aegean: (a) bronze stand from chamber tomb I at Vrokastro, Crete; (b) iron knife from Gypsades grave VII, Knossos	394
7.3	Juglet of Cypriot Base-Ring type from a tomb near the settlement of Veni, west Crete	395
7.4	Finds of Cypriot-originating or Cypriot-type metal objects in Sardinia: (a) ingot distribution map; (b) Miniature tripod stand from ritual cave site of Pirosu-Su Benatsu, near Cagliari	396

7.5	Individual cist grave burials of the post-collapse period, Perati: plan of tomb 123	398
7.6	Early cremation at Perati: tomb 1, pit 1	399
7.7	Twelfth/eleventh-century cremations at Atsipades, Crete	399
7.8	Aegean pottery imports of types dating as early as the tenth century BC: (a) Tel Hadar: PG <i>lebes</i> basin; (b) Amathus: pendent semicircle skyphos, Limassol Museum inv. LM 834/182	401
7.9	Export traditions from coastal Anatolian polities: late seventh-century Ionian kylix found at Carthage	405
7.10	Levantine-type goods in the Aegean, previously seen as signifying large-scale/exploitative settlement of easterners there: (a) Lekythos: Cretan or Dodecanesian manufacture, Cypriot Black-on-Red style (Eleutherna cemetery); (b) imported Black-on-Red juglet (Ialysos cemetery, Rhodes, tomb 82); (c) imitation of Black-on-Red oinochoe (Camiros cemetery, Rhodes); (d) imitation of Black-on-Red juglets (Ialysos cemeteries, Rhodes)	408
7.11	Tripillar shrine at Kommos: reconstruction	409
7.12	Phoenician-type grave monuments (cippi): Knossos Atsalenio cippus, front, rear and side views	410
7.13	Early Aegean pottery imports in the central and west Mediterranean likely to have travelled on Cyprus- or Levant-based voyages: SOS amphora, Malaga, eighth–seventh century BC	414
7.14	Evidence of eastern-based routes west through the Aegean: Sardinian askos, eighth century BC, from the Knossos Tekke cemetery	415
7.15	Pithekoussai: topography, ancient sites (dots) and modern settlements (hatched lines/capitals)	416
7.16	Pithekoussai: (a) view of the Acropolis and Valle di San Montano cemetery locations, from W; (b) view of Valle di San Montano cemetery location, from E	417
7.17	Pithekoussai: cist and jar burial types in the Valle di San Montano cemetery	419
7.18	Pithekoussai: (a) Euboean-made imitation of standard Corinthian kotyle type; (b) Euboean-type krater used as grave marker. Manufacture location unknown	420
7.19	Locally made Euboean-type krater, Pithekoussai	421
7.20	Imported transport amphora used for burial 575 at Pithekoussai. Secondary inscription in Aramaic	421
7.21	(a) Drinking vessel (kotyle) with ‘Nestor’s cup’ inscription, Pithekoussai, Museo Archeologico di Pitecusa 21. Rhodian-made with Euboic Greek inscription; (b) reconstruction of the metric inscription	422

7.22	Seal of Cilician 'Lyre-player' type from Pithekoussai grave 223	423
7.23	Example of pottery grave goods in prestigious south Italian bucchero tradition deposited in Pithekoussai graves (vessel 3)	424
7.24	Examples of bow fibulae from tombs at Pithekoussai	425
7.25	Iron tools from Tomb 678, Pithekoussai	427
7.26	Metal-rich tomb 180 at Pontecagnano	428
7.27	Map of sites mentioned in the text: Sicily and south Italy	430
7.28	L'Amastuola: (a) local-tradition cooking pots and (b; c) Aegean-type fineware found at the site	432
7.29	L'Amastuola: burial stela	433
7.30	Photograph: Morgantina settlement, from west	434
7.31	Polizzello: (a) site plan; (b) plan of buildings on the summit; (c) plans of chamber tombs in east necropolis	435
7.32a	Morgantina: (a) traditional type of multiple burial and associated assemblage in tomb 6, of late eighth–early seventh century date	437
7.32b	Morgantina: (b) single rock-cut 'fossa' burial of the same period	437
7.33	Plans of eighth-century chamber tombs from Villasmundo and Licodia	438
7.34	Variety of Iron Age burial types in Sicily: (A–D) Mulino della Badia-Madonna del Piano; (E–F) Cassibile	439
7.35	Traditional types of burial, Sicily: Iron Age chamber tomb with multiple burial at Sant'Angelo Muxaro, Sicily	440
7.36	'Nora Stone'	443
7.37	Features of change related to Levant-originating travel at south Iberian sites: Astarte statue, Seville, seventh century BC (Archaeological Museum of Seville inv number RE 11136). Inscribed in Phoenician script with a dedication to Astarte	444
7.38	Figures from Monte Prama cemetery, Sardinia	445
7.39	Location map of Mozia island, in its protected lagoon, and site distribution map on Mozia	447
7.40	Photograph: Mozia tophet	448
7.41	Area of Metaponto: reconstruction of city house plots and land divisions recalling those of Archaic Aegean states, based on field evidence	450
7.42	(a) Temples of the eighth and seventh centuries BC at Lagaria (Timpone della Motta); (b) fine pottery of Greek type found at the Timpone della Motta site	452
7.43	House plots at Megara Hyblaea: plan and axonometric view of the area of the agora at the mid-sixth century BC. Grey shading shows eighth-century houses	456

# Chronology used in this book

Sources: Bietak 2003; Boardman et al. 1982; Cline 2014: Table 2.2; Düring 2011a: 176; Hassan 1985; Steiner and Killebrew 2014; Knapp 2013: 521; Leighton 2012; Lemos 2003; Malone 2003; Manning 2010; 2008; Manning and Bronk Ramsey 2010; Manning et al. 2006; Regev et al. 2012; Tomkins 2007: 32–44; 2008; Twiss 2007; Soles 2004; Yakar 2011). Details of and debates around chronology are explained further in the relevant chapters. I have given a late seventeenth-century BC absolute date (following Manning and Bronk Ramsey 2010, who gives c. 1620 BC) for the Thera eruption and end of Late Minoan IA, noting the dates of 1680–1550 BC given for LM IA in the Wiener's 'Modified Aegean Short Chronology' (Wiener 2003: 389). Revised ranges for Egyptian traditional regnal dates given by Bronk Ramsey et al. (2010) in line with C14 data help indicate the extent of the possible discrepancies when traditional dates for Egyptian contexts are used to date imported Aegean and other pottery. Many simplifications of chronology have been made for the purposes of this book, with most detailed attention given to Aegean chronology: Aegean terms or general ones are used throughout the book in preference to local chronologies when discussing Aegean contacts with other areas.

Abbreviations used:

EN/MN/LN/FN: Early/Middle/Late/Final Neolithic  
(Cypro-)JPPNA/B/C: (Cypriot) Pre-Pottery Neolithic A/B/C  
EChal/MChal/LChal: Early/Middle/Late Chalcolithic  
EB/MB/LB(A): Early/Middle/Late Bronze (Age)  
EM/MM/LM: Early/Middle/Late Minoan  
EH/MH/LH: Early/Middle/Late Helladic  
EC/MC/LC: Early/Middle/Late Cypriot  
EIA: Early Iron Age  
PG/EG/MG/LG: Protogeometric/Early Geometric/Middle Geometric/Late Geometric  
CG: Cypro-Geometric  
A: Archaic

<i>Absolute date BC</i>	<i>Crete</i>	<i>Mainland</i>	<i>Cyclades</i>	<i>W. Anatolia</i>	<i>Levant</i>	<i>Cyprus</i>	<i>Egypt</i>	<i>S. Italy</i>
7000	Aceramic Neolithic	Mesolithic/Aceramic Neo	Mesolithic	Pre-pottery Neolithic B	Late PPNB	Late Cypriot – PPNB	Aceramic Neolithic	Mesolithic
6500				Early Pottery Neolithic	PPNC/Pottery Neolithic			
6200	Early Neolithic	Early Neolithic	Early Neolithic	Late Neolithic	Pottery Neolithic			
6000	Middle Neolithic	Middle Neolithic	Middle Neolithic	Early Chalcolithic	Early Chalcolithic			Neolithic
5500						Pottery Neolithic		
5300	Late Neolithic	Late Neolithic	Late Neolithic	Middle Chalcolithic	Middle Chalcolithic (Ubaid)		Early Fayum Neolithic (c. 5200)	
5000								
4500	Final Neolithic	Final Neolithic	Final Neolithic	Late Chalcolithic	Late Chalcolithic			
4000							Late Fayum Neolithic	
3700						Early Chalcolithic	Early Predynastic (Naqada) from c. 3750	
3600	Final Neo III	Final Neo III	Final Neo III					
3500	Final Neo IV	Final Neo IV	Final Neo IV	Late Chalcolithic 4	Late Chalcolithic 4		Late Predynastic (Naqada)	Late Neo

<i>Absolute date BC</i>	<i>Crete</i>	<i>Mainland</i>	<i>Cyclades</i>	<i>W. Anatolia</i>	<i>Levant</i>	<i>Cyprus</i>	<i>Egypt</i>	<i>S. Italy</i>
3400					Early Bronze I	Middle Chalcolithic		
3300								
3200								
3000	Early Minoan I	Early Helladic I	Early Cycladic I	Early Bronze I	Early Bronze II		Old Kingdom: Dynasty I	
2900					Early Bronze III			
2700				Early Bronze II		Late Chalcolithic		
2600	Early Minoan II	Early Helladic II	Early Cycladic II					
2500					EB IV/Int Bronze Age			
2400						Prehistoric Bronze Age 1		
2300				Early Bronze III			First Intermediate Period	
2200	Early Minoan III	Early Helladic III	Early Cycladic III					Early Bronze Age
2100	Middle Minoan IA	Middle Helladic I	Middle Cycladic I					
2000				Middle Bronze I	Middle Bronze I	Prehistoric Bronze Age 2	Start of Middle Kingdom – Mentuhotep II: 2064/2055	
1900	Middle Minoan IB	Middle Helladic II	Middle Cycladic II				12th Dynasty	Middle Bronze Age
1800	Middle Minoan II/IIIA	Middle Helladic III	Middle Cycladic III	Middle Bronze II	Middle Bronze II		Second Intermediate Period	

*(Continued)*

(Continued)

<i>Absolute date BC</i>	<i>Crete</i>	<i>Mainland</i>	<i>Cyclades</i>	<i>W. Anatolia</i>	<i>Levant</i>	<i>Cyprus</i>	<i>Egypt</i>	<i>S. Italy</i>
1750	Middle Minoan III				Middle Bronze III	Middle Cypriot III		
1700	Late Minoan IA	Late Helladic I	Late Cycladic I	Middle Bronze III				
1680								
1650					Late Bronze I	Protohistoric Bronze Age: Late Cypriot IA		
1640								
1620	Thera eruption c. 1620?: LM IB begins	Late Helladic IIA	Late Cycladic II					
1600				Middle Bronze IV: Hittite Old Kingdom				
1570							New Kingdom: Dynasty 18 'A'; Ahmose 1570/1550	
1550								
1520		Late Helladic IIB/IIIA:1						
1500	LM II/IIIA		Late Cycladic III	Late Bronze I			Dynasty 18 'B': Hatshepsut: 1498/1473	

<i>Absolute date BC</i>	<i>Crete</i>	<i>Mainland</i>	<i>Cyclades</i>	<i>W. Anatolia</i>	<i>Levant</i>	<i>Cyprus</i>	<i>Egypt</i>	<i>S. Italy</i>
							Thutmose III: 1492/1479	
1470								
1450								
1430	LM IIIA Knossos destruction: LM IIIA:2 begins	Late Helladic IIIA:2			Late Bronze IIA	Protohistoric Bronze Age 2: LC IIA		
1410								
1400							Dynasty 18 'C'/D' transition; Amenhotep III: 1408/1390 Akhnaten: 1370/1352	Late BA
1370								
1350								
1330	Late Minoan IIIB	Late Helladic IIIB		Suppiliummas: 1344		LC IIC		
1320				Mursilis II: 1321				
1300				Late Bronze II		Protohistoric Bronze Age 3	Dynasty 19: Rameses II 1297/1279 to c. 1273	Recent BA
1290				Muwatalilis: 1295				

(Continued)

(Continued)

<i>Absolute date BC</i>	<i>Crete</i>	<i>Mainland</i>	<i>Cyclades</i>	<i>W. Anatolia</i>	<i>Levant</i>	<i>Cyprus</i>	<i>Egypt</i>	<i>S. Italy</i>
1270				Hattusilis III: 1267				
1250								
1230				Tudhaliyas IV: 1237				
1210							Merneptah: 1213/1195; Seti II: 1204/1186; Rameses III: 1202/1184	
1200	LM III C/ Subminoan	Late Helladic IIIC		Early Iron Age	Iron IA	LC IIIA		Final BA
1150					Iron IB	LC IIIB		
1100						Cypro- Geometric IA	Third Intermediate Period	
1080								
1050		Proto- geometric	Proto-geometric	Proto-geometric		Cypro- Geometric 1B/II		EIA 1
1000	Proto- geometric				Iron IIA			
950								
925					Iron IIB			
900	PG B	Early Geometric	Early Geometric	Early Geometric				EIA 2

<i>Absolute date BC</i>	<i>Crete</i>	<i>Mainland</i>	<i>Cyclades</i>	<i>W. Anatolia</i>	<i>Levant</i>	<i>Cyprus</i>	<i>Egypt</i>	<i>S. Italy</i>
850	Early Geometric							
800								Orientalising
750	Late Geometric	Late Geometric	Late Geometric	Late Geometric		Archaic	Dynasty 25	
730					Iron IIC			
720							Reunification under Shabaka: 716 BC	
700	Archaic	Archaic	Archaic	Archaic			Assyrian attacks begin	Proto-Archaic
674							Dynasty 26: Psammetichos I: 664	
660							Nechos II	
650								Archaic
610					Babylonian			
600								
550					Iron III/Persian		Persian period: Dynasty 27: Cambyses 525	
530								
500								Punic
480	Classical	Classical	Classical	Classical				

## Bibliography

- Bietak, M., 2003. Science versus archaeology: problems and consequences of high Aegean chronology. In M. Bietak, ed., *The synchronisation of civilisations in the eastern Mediterranean in the second millennium B.C. II: proceedings of the SCIEM 2000 Euroconference, Haindorf 2001*. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: 23–33.
- Boardman, J., I. E. S. Edwards, and N. G. L. Hammond, eds., 1982. *The Cambridge ancient history, volume 3: part 1: the prehistory of the Balkans, the Middle East and the Aegean world, tenth to eighth centuries BC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bronk Ramsey, C., et al., 2010. Radiocarbon-based chronology for dynastic Egypt. *Science* 18 June 2010, 328.5985: 1554–7.
- Cline, E. H., 2014. *1177 BC: the year civilization collapsed*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Düring, B., 2011a. *The prehistory of Asia Minor: from complex hunter-gatherers to early urban societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hassan, F., 1985. Radiocarbon chronology of Neolithic and Predynastic sites in Upper Egypt and the Delta. *African Archaeological Review* 3: 95–116.
- Knapp, A. B., 2013. *The archaeology of Cyprus: from earliest prehistory through the Bronze Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leighton, R., 2012. *Prehistoric houses at Morgantina: excavations on the Cittadella of Morgantina in Sicily 1989–2004*. London: Accordia Research Institute.
- Lemos, I., 2003. *The protogeometric Aegean*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Malone, C., 2003. The Italian Neolithic: a synthesis of research. *Journal of World Prehistory* 17.3: 235–312.
- Manning, S. W., 2008. Some initial wobbly steps towards a Late Neolithic to Early Bronze III radiocarbon chronology for the Cyclades. In N. Brodie, J. Doole, G. Gavalas and C. Renfrew, eds., *Horizon: a colloquium on the prehistory of the Cyclades*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute: 55–9.
- , 2010. Beyond the Santorini eruption: some notes on dating the Late Minoan IB period on Crete, and implications for Cretan-Egyptian relations in the fifteenth century BC (and especially LM II). In Warburton: 207–27.
- Manning, S. W., and C. Bronk Ramsey, 2010. The dating of the earlier Late Minoan IA period: a brief note. In Warburton: 227–47.
- Manning, S. W., et al., 2006. Chronology for the Aegean Late Bronze Age 1700–1400 BC. *Science* 312: 565–9.
- Regev, J., et al., 2012. Chronology of the Early Bronze Age in the southern Levant: new analysis for a high chronology. *Radiocarbon* 54.3–4: 505–24.
- Soles, J. S., 2004. Appendix A: radiocarbon results. In Soles and Davaras: 145–9.
- Soles, J. S., and C. Davaras, 2004. *Mochlos IC: period III: neopalatial settlement on the coast, the artisans' quarter, and the farmhouse at Chalinomouri: the small finds*. Philadelphia: INSTAP Academic Press.
- Steiner, M., and A. E. Kilbrew, eds., 2014. *The Oxford handbook of the archaeology of the Levant: c. 8000–332 BCE*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tomkins, P. D., 2007. Neolithic: Strata IX–VIII, VII–VIB, VIA–V, IV, IIIB, IIA and IC. In N. Momigliano, *Knossos pottery handbook: Neolithic and Bronze Age (Minoan)*. London: British School at Athens: 9–48.

- , 2008. Time, space and the reinvention of the Cretan Neolithic. In V. Isaakidou and P. Tomkins, eds., *Escaping the labyrinth*. Sheffield: Studies in Aegean Archaeology: 21–47.
- Twiss, K., 2007. The Neolithic of the southern Levant. *Evolutionary Anthropology* 16: 24–35.
- Wiener, M. H., 2003. Time out: The current impasse in Bronze Age archaeological dating. In R. Laffineur and K. Foster, eds., *Metron: measuring the Aegean Bronze Age*. Liège: Aegaeum: 363–99.
- Yakar, J., 2011. The archaeology of Anatolia: background and definitions. In S. Steadman and G. Macmahon, eds., *The Oxford handbook of ancient Anatolia (10000–323 BCE)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 56–99.

# Acknowledgements

The original idea for this book was voiced to various colleagues from about 2006 onwards, long before my first book, on the Cretan Iron Age, was published. In the ambitious new range of research, of a qualitatively different type, needed to complete the present volume, those colleagues' early encouragement, belief and interest proved important driving factors. Grants from INSTAP enabled the continuation of my fieldwork and its publication alongside work on this entirely fieldwork-less project, helping me keep my access to and interest in primary research fully alive. Concentrated library-based research and writing were able to take place thanks to the lectureship I held at Reading until 2009, a Visiting Professorship at the University of Warsaw in 2010, the award of a two-year Humboldt Senior Research Fellowship at the University of Heidelberg 2010–12, and a Glassman Holland Research Fellowship at the Albright Institute for Archaeological Research, Jerusalem, in 2012. The support of Donald Haggis, Joseph Maran, Diamantis Panagiotopoulos, Seymour Gitin, Louise Hitchcock, Chris Mee and Irene Lemos was invaluable in getting these positions. I welcomed the chance to present my first thoughts around the subject and receive feedback in public in lectures and talks at the Universities of Erlangen, Louvain, Heidelberg, Freiburg and Warsaw, and at the Albright Institute in Jerusalem, and I thank warmly all those who extended hospitality in this regard, particularly Birgitta Eder and Jan and Florence Driessen. Insights from discussions and trips with Carl Knappett, Krzysztof Nowicki, Sy Gitin, Jan Driessen, Philip Sapirstein and Laura Preston were much welcomed and influential on the work, though all errors and misjudgements remain my own. As usual, Krzysztof Nowicki was an energisingly strong arguing partner around numerous issues and a fount of new ideas and information on the FN–EBA transition in the Aegean: debate around his research was an important new stimulus and structure for parts of the book. I thank all the different reviewers who have considered this book for their contributions. Matt Gibbons at Routledge was a patient and supportive editor, and I would like to thank all the copy and production editors who made the book ready for publication.

Regarding illustrations, which make such a difference to the accessibility of texts about archaeology, I would likely to warmly thank the very large

number of fellow scholars and their publishers who have recognised this in giving permission to reproduce or adapt their original illustrations here without charge. The objects and sites we study are not our property: public funds mostly pay for our time and skill in making images of them in the public interest. Once these images been placed in the public domain with appropriate credit, most producing scholars and institutions do not attempt to benefit financially from their credited reproduction in other published settings, provided the latter can be freely accessed through public educational/research institutions, and are not mainly aimed at generating commercial profit. Were they to do so, the effect would inevitably be to diminish public access to and understanding of the objects and sites illustrated, by tending to discourage image reproduction. I am hugely grateful to see that so many of my colleagues recognise this.

'From the third millennium BC onward the magical civilizations of ancient western Asia increasingly came into contact with coastal and island centres in Greece, Crete, the Cyclades and Cyprus. What was the nature of that contact and can we ascertain its directionality? Who controlled trade between various regions? Were western Asiatic symbols of authority emulated in Mediterranean centres? What social classes or cultural groups were involved? . . . the data at hand cry out for evaluation in a globalising, holistic context, particularly given the current interest in ancient world systems, prestige goods economies and the role of distance and the exotic.'

(Knapp, A. B., 2000. Mediterranean Bronze Age trade: distance, power and place. In E. Cline and D. Harris-Cline, eds., *The Aegean and the Orient in the 2nd millennium BC: proceedings of the 50th anniversary symposium, Cincinnati*. Liège/Austin: Aegaeum: 193–205 at 196)

'How are we to interpret or explain [this] 'pulsing' of connectivity across the millennia . . . this cycling of influence clockwise around the Aegean, from Anatolia, to Crete to the mainland. . . . Is this . . . somehow characteristic of archipelagos, more than other kinds of geographical regions? Is it perhaps attributable in some way to the role of hubs and gateways in such environments? And how is it that for each of these pulses, the scale and direction of connectivity shifts?'

(Horden, P., and N. Purcell, 2000. *The corrupting sea: a study of Mediterranean history*. Oxford: Blackwell.  
Horden and Purcell 2006: 735)

'the connectivity was always there to some degree . . . but . . . how far the *potential* was realised from one age to another: this is the essence of an historical account of Mediterranean connections.'

(Harris, W. V., 2005. The Mediterranean and ancient history.  
In W. V. Harris, ed., *Rethinking the Mediterranean*.  
New York: Oxford University Press: 24.  
Harris 2005: 24)

# 1 Imagining movement

## Timing, context and aims of this book

The idea of population movement as a repeated major driver of sociopolitical and economic change has a long history in scholarship on the ancient Aegean. The volume and quality of evidence available for this region has increased exponentially in the last twenty years – due among other factors to generous funding from the Institute for Aegean Prehistory, the increased physical mobility and intellectual connection of scholars within frameworks including the European Union, and the development of scientific and systematic archaeology in the Aegean region. The change means that older interpretative schemes need refreshing and re-evaluating to keep pace, and this is happening in a variety of ways. Established general ideas about movement as a factor in social and cultural transformation seem notably important to re-evaluate and test in this context. That is the main aim of this book, which draws together and analyses data at secondary level in a strongly historical and contextual framework covering a long timespan. It aims to help work out new specific and general models for understanding movement's role in the region, drawing on a variety of archaeological and anthropological approaches to the study of cultural and social connection and change.

The long-timespan coverage essential to a historical understanding of movement in this region is achieved through a series of case studies, all chosen for their rich and accessible data and the high-profile history of interpretation of that data in terms of movement. In all these cases, the secondary data drawn on have recently been significantly updated and (as a result) have formed the subject of interesting new interpretative approaches – the latter varying significantly in relation to the periods and data types concerned. Brand-new work on the Final Neolithic period has produced large amounts of evidence pertaining directly to questions of long-distance movement at the very start of the Bronze Age (c. 3500–3000 BC). Detailed new scientific data and restudies of old excavation assemblages from new perspectives, along with rich new theoretical approaches including network-based

## 2 *Imagining movement*

approaches, encourage the questioning/refinement of models of movement couched in terms of political expansion/colonisation from Crete in the Middle Bronze to early Late Bronze Age (c. 2000–1600 BC). Updating of the record (including improved studies of ceramic technology/exchange and newly nuanced approaches to linguistics and ancient texts) encourages rethinking of the society and economy of mainland Greece during the emergence of ‘Mycenaean’ states in the Late Bronze Age (1700–1200 BC) and of later LBA/Early Iron Age (1450–700 BC) long-distance interaction in and outside state frameworks. The Early Iron Age has seen a recent major extension of research into areas such as landscape, subsistence and settlement, shifting the basis and context of evidence on which scholars can discuss movement as a force for change. Looking at Aegean-based travels in the Archaic–Classical period (c. 700–333 BC), the recent growth of sophisticated, post-culture-historical and postcolonial approaches to the encounters involved (e.g. in the ‘Greek colonisation’ phenomenon in Italy), as well as new fieldwork researching the cultural interfaces of this period, provide an exciting starting point.

How wide are this book’s interests and its likely readership? The geographical range and long time-depth make it necessary to present some backup/introductory information for each case study period, but it would be impossible (and obscure the focus of the book) to provide textbook-style data summaries for each case. The presentation and discussion of information is on a selective basis, but the approach to material I use in each discussion is contextual. By this I mean that data from single or few sites/parts of sites, and/or specific types of data (e.g. from burials only, or from texts only) are never relied on as the main props for argument, and that all available data is proportionately assessed in a linked-up fashion and historical perspective (this is what is meant whenever I refer to a ‘contextual’ or ‘contextualised’ approach: see Hodder 2009). By the nature of the theme, areas outside the Aegean will be extensively discussed, though at a necessarily more limited level than those within it: the same balanced and contextual approach will be maintained in approaching this data.

The study argues its relevance in the context of world archaeology and in particular European archaeology: population movement as a driver in social and cultural change has recently re-entered the archaeological and sociopolitical spotlight across the continent (e.g. Anthony 1990; Burmeister 2000; Champion 1990; Chapman and Hamerow 1989; Chapman and Dolukhanov 1992; Dziegielewski et al. 2010; Härke 1998; 2004; Hakenbeck 2005; Lightfoot 2005: 1–2; ed. 2005; Prien 2005; Reynolds 2011: 343; van Dommelen 2014; ed. 2014). For ancient Mediterranean studies as a whole there is especially strong relevance in addressing movement. Intensive attention was given to the theme of movement during the early development of systematic scholarship on the region’s prehistory in the late nineteenth through early twentieth centuries. At that time, understandings of ancient movement were often embedded in notions of culture as racially/ethnically inherent (and thus of cultural

change/ 'progression' as a natural consequence of population mobility). These notions were sited in contemporary nationalist, imperialist and early modernist discourses which the study evaluates and tries to position itself outside (see e.g. Hobsbawm 1989: 56–84; 142–65; 243–62; Kristiansen and Rowlands 2005: 22; Said 1978; 2003). In the 1960s–80s, the popularity of quantitative methods and ecological/processual perspectives in archaeology (applied relatively late and in a limited way in the Mediterranean) tended to marginalise the question of movement's relationship to large-scale sociocultural change – promoting instead a focus on internally generated patterns of change. This was in overt reaction to older diffusionist perspectives (see Anthony 1990; Hakenbeck 2005; Trigger 1998 for reviews) and has in turn during the last two decades into 'Mediterraneanist' perspectives on prehistoric movement and its effects in this region. The latter stress long-term, regular, and environmentally driven factors and patterns in the way people moved (see e.g. Knapp and Blake 2005; Harris 2005; ed. 2005).

Factors contributing to general recent renewal of interest in ancient movement include the postmodern humanities' focus on the construction of social and cultural identity, especially in the material dimension (e.g. Buchli 2002; Diaz-Andreu et al. 2005; Shennan 1994) and their turn to a reflexive mode (e.g. Hodder 2000). The field of postcolonial studies (encompassing both the history of interaction and text-focused structural analysis) has stimulated new thinking around movement forms and their relationship to power, culture and society in the past – and has particular resonance in the Mediterranean context. Materiality and cultural practice are increasingly highlighted as active agents *in* movement, rather than passively determined by it (e.g. Desai and Nair 2005: 3–5; Gosden 2004: 25; Gosden and Marshall 1999; 169–78; Liebmann and Rizvi 2008; Lyons and Papadopoulos 2002; Moro-Abadia 2006; Prakash 1995; Rogers 2005: 332; Stein 2005; ed. 2005; Thomas 1994; van Dommelen 1997; 2012; van Dommelen and Rowlands 2012: 20; van Pelt 2013). For the archaeology of the Mediterranean in particular, there is a recognition that the region's particular geography and distinctive early history limits the value of analysing subregional cultural change 'stories' in isolation from each other (e.g. Blake and Knapp 2005; van de Mierop 2005: 123; see most recently Broodbank 2014a). Postcolonial perspectives have highlighted the compartmentalising effects of European imperial and colonial discourse on scholarly narratives of ancient movement and change in the region, including the use of reductive ethnic and cultural categories (such as 'Greekness') in this context. Many older accounts of movement in the region now appear to need 'decolonizing' (Broodbank 2014a: 28; Hamilakis 2005: 177; 2008): a process which is still incomplete and to which this book tries to contribute. It is also increasingly apparent that processual-type/systemic approaches in anthropology and archaeology, seeking predictable/repeated patterns in human behaviour at local or regional level, have simply 'stepped over' the legacies of imperial/

#### 4 *Imagining movement*

colonial discourse in ancient movement studies, rather than engaging with them. Arguing long-distance movement to be generically and systemically characteristic of certain regional areas (as Mediterraneanism does) can itself tend toward quasi-imperialist reductionism (Diamond 1997; 2005; with McAnany and Yoffee 2010 for critiques; Given 1998; Harris 2005: 38–42; Herzfeld 2005: 48; de Pina-Cabral 1989; Pluciennik 2006: 473; Shavit 1988; van Dommelen 2005: 115).

Another recent stimulus to interest in the impact and experience of ancient movement is the high political resonance of movement, sociocultural change and ethnicity in contemporary Europe following the collapse of the Soviet empire, the expansion of the European Union, economic globalisation and its crisis, and the effects of post-imperial cultural/ethnic conflicts in the Middle East, including refugee movements (e.g. Abulafia 2005; Arnold 1998; Dzino 2012; Goddard et al. 1994; Gori 2012; Härke 2004: 453; Oras 2012; Wicker 1997). New kinds of cross-border population shift and newly emergent identities, self-consciously articulated through consumption practice (Dietler 2010: 214) are leading European societies to revisit questions of nationalism, ancestral links to territory, and the origins/inherence of cultural and religious traditions. Study of the past, including past movement, is acknowledged as important in elucidating and developing discussion of these political hot topics (e.g. Atkinson et al. 1996; Diaz-Andreu 2007; Diaz-Andreu and Champion 1996; Diaz-Andreu and Smith 2001; Eriksen 2002; Finney 1999: 71–2; Giddens 1990: 182).

If the Mediterranean is a recurrent locus of interest in all the above debates, the Aegean has a special role within both European and Mediterranean frameworks of discussion. As a result of a surge in development-led archaeological rescue projects in Greece and Turkey during the last two decades, and of especially well-funded academic research on Aegean prehistory in the same period,<sup>1</sup> a rich regional data set is ripe for new discussion. The volatile nationalisms characteristic of the colonial and postcolonial Mediterranean, and their relationship to archaeological interpretation, have been the subject of especially prolific historiographic review and dissection within Greek cultural studies. The discipline of Aegean prehistory entered a phase of intense self-reflection unparalleled in many other Mediterranean archaeologies as it passed its hundred-year mark (e.g. Cherry et al. 2005; Damaskos and Plantzos 2008; Hamilakis 2002; 2005; 2007; Hamilakis and Momigliano 2006). Due to the long history of international interest in Aegean prehistory/Classical archaeology, echoes of multiple *different* national/nationalist archaeologies have clearly affected, and continue to affect, work on ancient movement and culture change in the region, producing cross-currents of great interest when reassessing approaches to the transformative role of ancient movement.

In archaeology, as in the wider humanities, a postmodern ‘loss of innocence’ (i.e. the expectation that notionally ‘raw’ sources of data will be already mediated in various ways by the time we access them) means that most scholars no longer straightforwardly equate cultural change patterns

to the movement of groups with innate, bounded or permanent characteristics. This book has no need to re-fight this ground. Rather, it seeks to recognise and address continuing hunger among both professional students of archaeology and the interested public for coherent, evidence-based and up-to-date explanations of the origins and transformations of the world's first civilisations, with their rich, accessible, culturally connected and politically high-profile sites, landscapes and artefacts (Galaty et al. 2010; see e.g. Aruz et al. 2013; Feldman 2006 as recent responses). The massive cultural, social and political transformations seen in the east Mediterranean region between the Neolithic and Iron Ages, alongside evidence for intense and varied contacts/movements across the region in the same periods, continue to require exploration and explanation. If we fail to adequately address/envision ancient movement and its potentially transformative effects in this context, the subject and the data remain highly liable to misunderstanding and misappropriation (Bernal 1991; Lefkowitz and Rogers 1996; Morris 2003: 41; Snodgrass 2005: 57). This book's tackling of the subject head-on, and in a reflexive light, aims to develop positive, detailed, well-grounded and stimulating movement models. While the general relevance of movement to ancient Mediterranean social and economic developments is widely accepted, fragmented and often contradictory accounts of/debates on movement as a *specific* driver in complexly-patterned change still abound in the literature and need re-evaluation and linkage, without overgeneralisation (see Broodbank 2012: 27; Knapp and van Dommelen 2010: 1–3; see most recently Molloy 2016).

### **The conceptual toolkit: existing approaches to Mediterranean movement**

In any new long-timeframe work discussing Mediterranean movement, the concept of Mediterraneanism must be engaged with (Morris 2003; Renfrew 2003: 316). Increasingly well-defined in the historical and archaeological literature over the last twenty years, this approach now affects most readings of early movement in the region (though some recent general works while clearly informed by its outlooks, make little overt reference to it; see e.g. Demand 2011). The term subsumes understandings of the Mediterranean lands as an intrinsically connected and 'connective' cultural and historical region over the very long term. Inherent parallels have often been suggested with other regions facing and using a small-scale connective zone, including the Sahara margins, Micronesia and Japan (e.g. Abulafia 2005: 92). Both human agency *and* environment are seen in this perspective as constructing 'connectivity' (the latter defined as embedded, active and ongoing contact through movement at various scales; see e.g. Broodbank 2014a: 20; Calvo et al. 2011; Knapp 2013: 383–4). However, following the establishment of the earliest visible connections between human populations within the region (now dated around the eleventh millennium BC: see

Broodbank 2006) connectivity is usually viewed in these models as having become a *permanent* feature of the Mediterranean. Though shifts in the perception and exploitation of the environment over time are acknowledged, connectivity often seems viewed as timeless – transcending and directing history (Knapp suggests ‘Connectivity involves mobility, modes of travel and communication, and social exchanges – all mechanisms that motivated or modified island identities, and in turn *drove* the migrants, mariners and merchants that brought together people and things’ [my emphasis]; see also Hodos [2012: 251], who suggests that connectivity subsumes shared ‘social values’; Broodbank [2014a: 50–2] suggests an intrinsically ‘connected’ early Mediterranean before a fragmenting ‘gridiron’ of national identities and monotheistic religions was imposed; Foxhall, more cautiously, notes the evident loss of patches of connectivity at different Mediterranean times and places within this picture, stressing dynamic ‘themes and variations’ on ‘deep structures’ of connection [Foxhall 2014: 108]). Connectivity and related Mediterraneanist concepts are rooted in the broad-spectrum approach to the region’s cultural and economic history developed by Fernand Braudel (1976) which has proved of natural interest to archaeological scholarship, given the latter’s long timescales, wide geographical scope, concerns with basic human-environment interactions, and ability to map past contact at multiple levels (see e.g. Blake and Knapp 2005: 12–13; 15–16; Cherry et al. 2005; Harris 2005; Horden and Purcell 2000; 2005; Manning 1994: 226; Papaconstantinou 2007; Toumazis 2007).

I argue here that the focus of Mediterraneanism on constant, patterned and repeated factors in movement, and in the latter’s relationship to society and culture, can be problematic, despite extensive re-examination and nuancing of the approach in some quarters (see e.g. Mantzourani and Catapoti 2007). Emphasis on inherent and determining pattern is still central to the approach, which would otherwise be mainly descriptive – though recent works, like Broodbank’s, have focused less on repeated/predictable sociocultural patterns/systems and more on the Mediterranean as effectively unified by historical exceptionality, alongside certain very general environmental ‘common denominators’ – risk; fragmentation; inter-accessibility of subregions (Broodbank 2014a: 19). Mediterraneanism is, in many applications, a *normalising* discourse on movement. My study is informed by many aspects of this perspective and by studies under its aegis – but I also aim to explore Mediterraneanism’s limitations by highlighting and exploring contingent and agent-led episodes of movement with socially transformative effects. Mediterraneanism remains, nonetheless, a less biased and more open perspective in which to explore movement than many other approaches considered in this study, including Europeanist and Orientalist ones (Broodbank 2014a: 20–5).

An older, more emotively and politically laden set of movement models (to which many Mediterraneanist perspectives/models react) is rooted in the region’s especially dense cultural evidence for ancient movement, including a rich web of early text accounts referring to it. Many of these older

models, characterised by the strong ‘personification’ of sociocultural/ethnic groups, were predicated on limited archaeological data and grounded in concepts of culture history. The belated takeup in Mediterranean archaeology of processual-type approaches, drawing on anthropological thought and favouring cross-cultural generalisation as a tool of inference from the data (Tartaron 2008: 84), produced strong reaction to such models (seen as rooted in ‘unscientific’ positivist discourse) from the 1970s onwards (Adams 1978; Levy 2007). In the same period, increases in the quality and quantity of data, and the advent of science-based studies in archaeology, produced a boom in research on provenance and various forms of exchange in connection to movement (among many others see e.g. Duistermaat and Regulski 2011; Gale 1991; Jones et al. 2011; van Wijngaarden 2003; Zerner 1993). Attempts to encapsulate the evidence for early Mediterranean movement and related socioeconomic change within systemic models emerged in this context, perhaps most notably in the area of world-systems theory. Such models have often tended to see inherently rational aggrandisement in ancient societies as both pushing movement *and* determining its effects (e.g. Algaze 1993; Rowlands et al. 1987; A. Sherratt 1994; S. Sherratt 2012; Sherratt and Sherratt 1991; 1993). Mediterraneanism, while retaining special emphases on environment and the very long term, has partly tied into and drawn on systemic perspectives – both approaches highly conscious of (and reactive to) older culture-historical/diffusion-based models of movement as event and takeover (Cherry 2005; Sherratt 2005). World-systems and Mediterraneanist approaches have been exceptionally and admirably ambitious in looking to join the early history of the Mediterranean with that of Europe and Asia, thus challenging the localist and/or evolutionary perspectives of some processual-type models (Broodbank 2012: 28). By their systemic nature, however, they have tended to depersonalise and dematerialise contact processes, largely failing to produce narratives of sociocultural change with much depth or diversity, or to provide insight into the uncertainty and open-endedness of interaction experiences<sup>2</sup> (for critiques see Dietler 2005: 29–30; Gilboa 2005: 66; Kardulias 1999; Kohl 2012; Kotsakis 2007: 114; 2008: 63–4; Lightfoot 2005: 3; Maran 2011: 282–3; Peltenburg 2007; Rahmstorf 2012: 101; Renfrew 2004: 257; Sherratt 2012; Stein 2005: 8 for critiques). They have offered usefully broad, but essentially superficial, structures of thinking about ancient movement, rather than attempts at investigating its deep social and cultural ramifications.

Perspectives emphasising materiality have been a feature of archaeology, including Mediterranean archaeology, in the past decade. They are rooted partly in phenomenological approaches to the archaeological record, as well as in concerns with the construction of identity through consumption. Engagement with such perspectives helps avoid tendencies to extreme abstraction of movement as a social and cultural force, and aids reconstruction of experiences around it. Recent applications have included investigation of object agency – i.e. of the multiple and unpredictable meanings things carry and

evoke, especially when moved – meanings linked to objects’ transportation and receptive context, but also to their intrinsic forms. Dietler (2005: 59) notes (in the context of colonial history/anthropology) that the adoption of objects or practices over time and space must be seen as ‘an active process of creative appropriation, manipulation and transformation played out by individual and social groups with a variety of competing interests and strategies of action, embedded in local political relations, cultural perceptions, and cosmologies’ (and see, for example, Bourdieu [1997], whose work on the relationship between material environment and practice foreshadows many recent observations; De Marrais et al. 2005; Gosden and Marshall 1999; Hicks 2010; Latour 1987; 1999; Martin 2005; Tilley 1990; Tilley et al. 2006; for applications in the Mediterranean see Brysbaert 2010; Burns 2010; Knappett 2005; Knappett and Malafouris 2008; Whitley 1998). However, most uses of object agency perspectives in the Mediterranean to date have been in small and chronologically specific case studies. There is usually limited focus on the wider historical context affecting contemporary movement, interaction and social and cultural change (Chapman 2014: 44; see Broodbank 2014a; 2014b on the need for more joined-up, ‘historical’ approaches in this context).

Agents and their experiences are becoming of ever greater interest in regard to understanding ancient movement. In a plea for more personified, experience-focused and historically contextualised accounts of Mediterranean movement, Kotsakis (2008: 64; 55) asks that future research on this field include not only ‘definition and elucidation of migratory processes and their constitutive parts’ but investigation of ‘the condition and the active transformational quality’ of movement. Kristiansen and Rowlands (2005: 1–2; 23) identify questions of social and cultural transmission, including ‘how knowledge is produced, assessed, and transmitted’ as under-explored fields in contemporary archaeology generally. Yet many recent perspectives on Mediterranean interaction still largely avoid addressing issues of movement’s experience, agency and materiality. Again, they risk treating consumption or other experience of objects acquired over distance as somehow irrelevant to, or entirely separate from, the experience of movement. In this way it is possible to underestimate movement’s feedback into social relationships, identities and changes (see Cornell and Fahlander 2007a; 2007b; Manning 2014: 112).

In engaging with the case study data, the present book analyses, draws and builds on aspects of all the above approaches. My argument is that if movement (with all its related and messy impacts) matters in past societal development, then we need a more anatomised, contextualised and embodied understanding of its effects and experiences, including the forms of power associated with and emerging from it. Existing models of movement in the ancient Mediterranean – often surviving, battered, from much earlier periods/agendas of research, and heavily assumption-laden – need in this process to be better-defined and more systematically reassessed, rather

than being pushed to one side. Recent (reactive) tendencies to processualise, endemicise, systematise or otherwise normalise ancient movement in the region can fail to fully engage with the contingent nature and powerful impact of movement and its related encounters, and themselves need critiquing in a more imaginative and more broadly, deeply contextualised perspective.

Reviewing the significance of movement in the ways above seems most usefully undertaken in a long-timeframe, cross-period comparative context, covering large parts of the region. This avoids either interpretative dead-ends (where focus on ‘proving’ individual movement episodes often results in the question ‘So what?’) or overgeneralised assumptions about standard/inherent movement patterns/types across the region, which may not actually apply well to many periods. A strongly *constructive* critique of existing narratives or models, in an historiographically informed perspective, also seems important. Proving or querying the existence of movements over distance, mapping related cultural and connections, and examining the various agendas and overtones behind earlier models cannot substitute for *actually trying to evaluate and describe the significance of specific movements/encounters in transforming ancient societies over time* (Burmeister 2000; Brysbaert 2010: 186–8; Knapp and van Dommelen 2010: 5–6). The focus on agency in much recent archaeological thought (tying in with materiality-centred approaches) highlights the need to investigate and imagine, rather than assume or model in standard fashion, how people in receiving areas experienced movers from other regions, and the objects/materials associated with them (see e.g. Given 2004: 13 for an example of imaginative approaches to agent experiences in interaction). I am ambitious in aiming at this in each case study here, with varying results which I hope will at least provide an enriched basis for further argument.

My focus is on evidence for specific, directional movements (usually at a significant scale) linked to episodes of transformative social change. But as Mediterraneanist perspectives stress, such movements cannot be properly understood unless viewed alongside other kinds and outcomes of movement. Throughout, I will look at how contingency and context affected movement’s nature and impact, especially by addressing differences and similarities between the cases studied, which all involve the same kind of highly characteristic landscape/seascape, and societies with a shared, contact-rich history – the *longue-duree*, environment-conscious setting of classic Mediterraneanism.

## The Aegean focus: European/Mediterranean, disciplinary and data context

### *A European and Mediterranean location*

Re-exploring the role of large-scale movement in past sociocultural change can inform and challenge current conceptions of movement’s impact. This point is especially relevant in the European (especially Mediterranean)

context. Small-scale movement (of individuals/families) over distance and across political boundaries has become highly normalised in western Europe today. Even where this actually, in sum, represents large-scale migration (permanent movement of large numbers of people over distance and across political boundaries within short periods of time), it has often not been perceived as such (at least until the refugee crises of the last few years) due to dispersal of migrants on entry and their relatively efficient, peaceful processing into host societies (whether through the emergence of enclaves or deeper cultural integration in a globalised cultural environment) rather than the drastic, large-scale and visible transformation of those societies.

This modern European reality is echoed in (and partly normalised by) some recent Mediterraneanist accounts of ancient movement, which often view the Mediterranean population as essentially socially and culturally accommodating and inherently mobile, with ‘connectivity’ more or less endemic. This study will question the usefulness of ideas about ‘normality’ of movement and ‘connectivity’ over long periods, highlighting both (a) differences between various kinds of ancient movement and their social effects in and around southern Europe, and (b) differences between these movements and recent historical movement (including colonial movement) *rooted in* Europe. In this context, the Aegean, with its exposed ‘junction’ location at Europe’s historical edge – still forming a locus of large-scale and transformative movement – *and* its special, prominent historical role in the way ‘Europe’ has been perceived and defined, offers an ideal study. The fragmented, interdependency-promoting nature of Aegean geography has been highlighted by Mediterraneanist models (with the Aegean region often viewed as a ‘super-charged’ mini-Mediterranean: see Harris 2005). Exploring issues around ancient and historical Aegean movement can usefully encapsulate and test wider debates and perceptions around movement in the European and Mediterranean arenas.

### *Disciplinary and cultural perspectives on the ancient Aegean*

I noted above (and will show further in the case studies to follow) that recent processual and/or systems-based models of ancient Mediterranean movement have reacted to much late nineteenth- to mid-twentieth-century scholarship, which had strong diffusionist and culture-historical preoccupations. In both perspectives, the Aegean has been of consistently high interest.

The early growth of Aegean prehistory as a discipline was rooted in a European intellectual and political environment where ‘ancient Greece’ had special resonance. Late-imperial European politics affected not only how data were gathered from the region, but assumptions about how past movements there had operated, including a view of cultural attributes as ethnically innate and able to be automatically/aggressively imposed through movement (see Bernal 1991; Diaz-Andreu 2007; Moro-Abadia 2006: 6; Norton 1996; Said 1978). Interpretations of movement in this vein in turn

reinforced contemporary national and imperial agendas at a number of levels and across a range of settings (Dietler 2005: 35). Many established narratives of movement and social transformation in Aegean prehistory are rooted in models developed in this period. At the same time, the role of competitive foreign-led fieldwork and scholarship in building archaeology as a discipline in the Aegean encouraged rapid, politicised entrenchment of interpretations of ancient material and created a generally conservative academic environment, holding back the advent of a globalised, reflexive discourse (Hamilakis 2007: 57–125; Cherry 2005). The traditional association of Classical archaeology with ‘art-historical’ approaches helped to support this, promoting scholarly views of specific types of artefact, ancient texts, and monumental buildings and sites as straightforward expressions of ancient societies’ values and attributes.

Against this background, as noted above, the last forty years of research in the Aegean have been dominated by somewhat belated and often simplified applications of processual approaches, focused around finding predictable and generalised patterns in human behaviour over long timescales and large areas. Cases from entirely different geographical and historical settings have often been cited as analogies for ancient Aegean developments, while studies drawing on regional ethnography as analogy for ancient practice have focused heavily on framing the exploitable parameters of Aegean landscapes and seascapes: see Fotiades 1995; Renfrew and Wagstaff 1982; Rogers 2005). Some recent approaches to the role of movement as a factor in ancient social and cultural change are systems- and process-orientated, though less ecologically-focused (Knappett and Nikolakopoulou 2005). As we shall see, state formation (one of the preoccupations of processual archaeology) has been a major theme in Aegean prehistory during the last few decades, used to justify a large proportion of field research projects. This perspective has helped clarify regional data patterns to a valuable and stimulating extent. Indeed, this book can be read as just one more attempt to narrate the multiple ‘emergences’ of state societies in the Aegean. I will argue here, notwithstanding, that research on Aegean prehistory needs to stretch itself in new ways, exploring its rich database using a variety of alternative tropes/routes to those already discussed. The study of movement forms a relevant and important example for the reasons outlined above, allowing application of a variety of new perspectives developed in wider archaeological discourse.

### *Aegean data quality: special features*

The case studies here are linked by the Aegean theatre in which they occurred and by their interconnected histories, but the range of space and time involved (c. 3500–333 BC) still makes the scale of the data involved intimidating. While scholars into the 1970s could attempt sweeping cross-period analyses (including of phenomena like movement) in a fairly guilt-free fashion,<sup>34</sup> given the limited amounts of data and the generally low-resolution nature

of data recovery and processing, this scenario has changed as standards in retrieval and analysis have risen.

In this context, contemporary analysts of Aegean material often prefer to focus on small subregional patterns and extrapolate processes, rather than trying to develop a picture of large-scale, diachronic and complexly-related developments (Foxhall 2014: 107). Like most of my contemporaries in Mediterranean archaeology, I have previously sub-specialised in analysis of one period/area (the Early Iron Age Aegean). I cannot, and do not attempt to, offer exhaustive review of/deep familiarity with the data in all the cases addressed here. Yet given the quantity and quality of data now available, there is no easy way (or any scholar supremely qualified) to write a study of early Aegean movement with the kind of long-term and wide spatial scope I have set out above (see Broodbank 2014b: 102; 2014c: 117). Recognising the complexities of the data and engaging with them in new ways, as well as adopting a contextual approach, is the way forward adopted here.

Partly thanks to the volume and complexity of data available, Aegean-linked movement over long timeframes has recently mostly been treated in small regional or thematic chunks, via a variety of papers and edited volumes (often citing or subsuming studies of other Mediterranean areas as a way of enlarging the frame of reference, especially as Mediterraneanist approaches have gained traction). Many of these works have tended to focus on trade, or on the techniques of travel (Cline 1994; Cline and Harris-Cline 1998; Galanaki et al. 2007; Gale 1991; Laffineur and Greco 2005; Papageorgiadou-Banis and Giannikouri 2008; Stampolidis and Karageorghis 2003; Steel 2013; Tartaron 2013; van Dommelen and Knapp 2010; van Wijngaarden 2007; Wachsmann 2013). Works offering a synthetic, broadly contextualised perspective on movement's role in the region are limited in number: they include Broodbank's *The Making of the Middle Sea* (2014a) which has the Aegean as a specially highlighted interest and is aimed at a general audience, and Knappett's strongly theory-engaged volume on networks (2011), which uses the earlier Bronze Age Aegean as a major case study. There still seem further opportunities to use big themes and multi-period syntheses to build footholds in the bog of data and reach out from the Aegean to archaeology as a world discipline (Broodbank 2014b). While accepting that we will never obtain the complete, unambiguous sets of evidence providing a 'final answer' to the kinds of big questions posed here (Shanks and Tilley 1987), limiting commentary to period/area case studies or general reviews of theory/past approaches risks leaving those questions permanently obscured.

The Aegean data has some special facets which need consideration in any synthetic approach. As my case studies show, an important one is the existence of early texts in this region, but the latter's often limited volume and range of types. We will see that close and literal readings of ancient text accounts, in many ancient-historical/art-historical approaches, has tended to encourage 'event'/'takeover' models of Aegean movement. In contrast, approaches rooted in anthropology have tended to minimise,

deconstruct or challenge text-centred accounts of movement, often in a useful way (see Manning 2008: 36–7; Whitley 2000: 264). Sophisticated, nuanced readings of ancient texts, of a type recently gaining ground, *can* offer light on the way ancient social identities and encounters were constructed, in ways not available from the analysis of archaeological data. They can also caution against straightforward assumptions about movement and its impacts on the basis of texts.

Approaches to the use of texts as a source do *not* neatly separate Aegean prehistorians from Classical archaeologists, as we shall see. Aegean prehistory as a discipline is heavily rooted in Classical studies, and later text accounts relating to migration and other forms of movement are still often cited in interpreting social and cultural change in Aegean periods which are wholly or largely ‘prehistoric’. The Late Bronze through Archaic/early Classical periods, which I address here, have long been approached using text-based models of movement of various kinds – e.g. readings of the contemporary Amarna and Hittite letters and the Linear B documents, Homer, and selected Classical accounts. Thus in several of my case studies, I will need to engage with the evidence of ancient texts in some form or another – another kind of ‘rich data’ challenge, full of opportunities as well as pitfalls.

### **Analysing ancient culture change: earlier approaches and the ways they are built on in this book**

I place the concept of *transformative* change (denoting a number of changes in society concentrated within a particular timeframe, and strongly visible in terms of cultural practice) at the core of this book. But there are few, if any, instances in my case studies of ‘overnight’ deep change across a comprehensive range of cultural/social categories. This scenario has traditionally been one of the most tempting to analyse and explain with models of mass migration and related automatic cultural transfer (Rouse 1986). In the case studies treated here, change can be seen to have occurred within a noticeable and defined period, but at a variety of rates and levels.

In considering this kind of change, the heritage of culture-historical approaches in European archaeology comes to the fore (for a recent overview of these, see Hakenbeck 2005). These approaches overlap with many past and current perspectives in Classical archaeology, and had considerable influence on early movement and culture change models for the Aegean: for the continuing application of such approaches to Aegean prehistory (see e.g. Bouzek 1974; 1985; 2010; Korfmann 1995: 175–6; for critiques see e.g. Kotsakis 2007; Sjögren 2010: 94–100). With varying degrees of nuance, these perspectives have tended to equate the character of social groups with aspects of their cultural production: when the latter change, the group is seen as inherently altered – often in terms of the physical replacement or augmentation of its membership. Frequently noted problems with these approaches include their failure to envision the full range of social dynamics affecting cultural

practice (encouraging overreliance on simple tropes, including movement, to explain change) and their assumption that cultural boundaries are coterminous with ethnopolitical ones. The latter again tends to favour views of movement as a straightforward force in cultural change.

A related problem, especially within the Classical archaeology tradition, has been the tendency to focus on selected cultural features (often highly visible, accessible or spectacular ones) in mapping change, even though these may be subject to distorting factors (as in areas like prestige goods consumption, as classically demonstrated by e.g. papers in Appadurai 1986). Archaeologists will always need to map patterns of cultural practice in space to understand social developments – but they increasingly recognise that such mapping (and naming) needs to be fluid in nature and to be based on strong understandings of context – that is, the wider social, material, economic and historical fields in which individual aspects of material culture operate and are embedded (Hodder 1978; 1982). Scale and timing, as well as context, seem crucial to identifying transformative social change through cultural data. The shifts treated as transformative in my case studies cover extensive parts of the Aegean/east Mediterranean region, and are quite long-term (often covering several centuries) yet still form identifiable horizons in time, with permanent effects. It is unlikely from the outset that *all* features of representative cultural change were present in all subregions concerned, *or* that they appeared simultaneously. Indeed, variations in the quality and timing of sociocultural change across regions can be highly informative when reconstructing the role of movement in producing change at large scales.

Other legacy issues associated with the consideration of transformative change include that of social class. We shall see from the case studies that older movement-linked models of change in the ancient Mediterranean often reconstructed migrants and the societies they affected as lying at social extremes (e.g. elite warriors; barbarians). This tendency was linked to the models' focus on change in highly visible and distinctive artefacts/practices (such as grave goods) associated with the wealthier part of society. World-systems perspectives usefully moved away from these kinds of preoccupations, favouring more sophisticated models of multilevel social aggrandisement and mobility as linked to/structuring movement and related cultural change. By their nature, though, these models tended to use extremely broad culturally-based class/identity definitions, and to assume standardised processes/contexts of movement for individual socioeconomic classes (e.g. long-range prestige goods/materials procurement on the part of regional elites, with the regular travelling involved subcontracted to a merchant class). The effect of such approaches has often been to leave the non-elite part of society (i.e. the vast majority) either largely undiscussed or else reified (see e.g. Foxhall 2014: 108; Gosden 2004: 41–2; Killebrew 2005: 23–4). Yet – except in rare cases where a small invasive/alienised elite was able to impose deep cultural changes across an entire society – we should expect that most movements with transformative effect involved a range of social groups (Knapp 1998:

196–7). In this book I will try to avoid reading contact/movement-linked change in one segment of society as having generalised, automatic or uniform impact. This is necessary for balance and nuance, even though the Bronze Age east Mediterranean social environment *was* a highly unequal one, in which elite movements and interactions did produce disproportionate effects on society. I maintain balance in this area again through addressing the broadest range of contextual data possible.

Language and script forms have traditionally been heavily relied on by scholars identifying movement-linked social change in the early Mediterranean. There is a strong history of linguistic reification of ancient social/ethnic groups and their movements – often in isolation from or purely hypothetical connection with other aspects of culture. In the Aegean, language has been given special weight thanks to its associations with a resonant ‘Greek’ ethnic identity, first identified/promoted in texts and other cultural forms of the eighth to sixth centuries BC. Assumptions grounded in culture history – e.g. that mapping language spread allows us to identify the spatial origins and movements of ‘the Greeks’ as a consistent ethnic group as far back as the latest Bronze Age – have been widespread (see Renfrew 1998: 240 for an overview). Yet the most recent studies of ancient texts and linguistics have stressed the manipulability of language in structuring ethnicity, and its consciously politicised use in the ancient world. Bearing these aspects of linguistic culture in mind, I will in this book treat language evidence consistently within the deep context of the wider material record when assessing sociocultural change and its causes, including movement. The issue of class comes into play again when addressing the significance of language change. In the whole period covered here, the vast majority of the Mediterranean population were not literate: writing grants us access to information only about an unrepresentative elite. In this context, we should remember that change in written language need not always indicate either deep social change or related large-scale population movement.

In the context discussed above, many older models identifying ancient Aegean cultural change as directly driven by movement clearly require review (Manning 1994: 221). Though this is already occurring in the scholarship to some degree, it often involves simply sidelining movement as a complex, overburdened subject (Sjögren 2010: 128–30). Many scholars working on topics/areas where older movement-based models have a strong presence have been preoccupied with the better documentation and delineation of sociocultural change and with exploring other, ‘internal’ modes by which it might have occurred, rather than directly readdressing issues around movement. Since the 1980s, the application of scientific techniques has been a valuable way of refining or testing small-scale hypotheses about cultural change and innovation. Applicable to a wide range of archaeological material, these methods have the potential to help circumvent issues like class bias in investigating sociocultural change and movement’s role in it – e.g. characterisation of diet and lifeways across populations (through bone isotope and organic residue

analysis) or of basic practices such as manufacturing, processing and cooking (through micromorphological study of soils, ceramic petrography and again organic residues). Changes in burial rites and goods (a focus of traditional movement models relying on limited, selective data collection) can now be evaluated in conjunction with detailed quantitative and qualitative analysis of human skeletal remains (elucidating genetic composition, place of birth, age at death, sex distribution and other elements of possible diachronic change in burial populations). These methods parallel those used in analysing ancient culture change across the rest of the world and contribute strongly to a contextual archaeology. However, their context of application to movement and culture change in the ancient Aegean has hitherto been variable and restricted. There is no Aegean parallel yet, for example, to large-scale integrated NW European studies utilising techniques like DNA and strontium isotope analysis to elucidate the relationship between multifaceted cultural change and movement (e.g. Eckerd 2010; Leach et al. 2009; Price et al. 2004: 9–40; Pluciennik and Brown 2001). These restrictions are partly due to difficulty in accessing large bodies of Aegean material for scientific analysis (especially when regional or national boundaries are crossed, thanks to the politicised history of archaeology in the region, discussed in Chapter 2). Another restricting factor is the unsystematic methods which were prevalent in data collection in the early days of Aegean prehistory, compromising the condition of collected material. Interest in and opportunities for this sort of large-scale scientific research are improving notwithstanding (Kovatsi et al. 2010; Triandaphyllou 2010). Yet few are under the illusion that scientific techniques alone will provide clear answers on how and why sociocultural change occurred, including in possible relation to movement. Rather, better-clarified models and developed research questions seem core. A study like the present one can best use science techniques in making contextualised assessments of the *diversity* of change across social and cultural categories, the regional *concentration* of change, and the *permanence* of change.

### **Movement and culture change in the ancient Aegean: recent region-specific perspectives**

I have noted a current general tendency to wariness in presenting long-distance directional movement as a factor in social and cultural change in the early Aegean (for critiques of this attitude, especially in regard to processually immersed Anglo-Saxon scholarship, see e.g. Maran 2007: 4; Rahmstorf 2012). Another legacy of processual approaches, reinforced by ‘Mediterraneanist’ perspectives and awareness of climate fragility and catastrophe in the contemporary era, is an ongoing preoccupation with how climate and ecology may have encouraged movement and/or culture change. Ethnographic, landscape and bioarchaeological studies since the 1970s have heightened scholarly awareness of Mediterranean landscapes’ high vulnerability to climatic changes, particularly the potential effects of

small shifts in rainfall levels on subsistence and social systems, as well as offering material for phenomenological studies on land use and on travel through landscapes/seascapes (Broodbank 2012; Halstead and O'Shea 1989; see the large body of recent research on the climatic events likely to have influenced movement near the end of the Early Bronze Age discussed in Chapter 3). Across the east Mediterranean, ecological explanations (often movement-linked) for state emergence, collapse and other major cultural horizons are currently being enthusiastically explored – sometimes *in preference* to explaining movement stimuli, modes and effects in terms of society, agents and experience. Post-processual archaeologists are highly aware of the pitfalls of ecologically determinist viewpoints, so correlations between past climate change and episodes of sociocultural change are rarely presented in terms of direct determination. But the subtext is clear: environment (especially environmental catastrophe) is seen as a potential major driver of both movement and culture change – even while the relationship between the last two phenomena is left hanging. The tendency has been especially strong for early prehistory – where the most systematic reconstruction of ancient climate over long timescales and the most serious consideration of it as a driver for momentous cultural transitions, such as the origins of farming, have applied (Kaniewski et al. 2008; Manning 2014: 114; Mithen and Black 2011; Moody 2005; Nüzhet Dalfes et al. 1997; Peltenburg 2000; Trigger 1984: 367–8; for recognition of the need to better contextualise ancient response to/perceptions of climate change in the early Mediterranean, see Broodbank 2014a: 43–4). Climate-based models of movement-linked culture change seem most convincingly used at the large (e.g. east Mediterranean) scale, on the basis of strong scientific evidence, and in regard to deep, long-term changes in subsistence culture. Their use often appears unsatisfactory or incomplete when explaining transformative sociocultural change in already partly complex societies and/or small areas (e.g. the Aegean in the relatively short Middle Bronze or Iron Age periods), especially in the absence of much Aegean-specific data on climate. Climate-driven models of movement rarely appear as part of a joined-up conceptualisation of *how* movement might have occurred in social and cultural terms, taking into full account its experiences, benefits, practicalities and long-term effects.

A sophisticated take on environmentally-conditioned movement and culture change, involving stimulating and insightful comparison between different Mediterranean and non-Mediterranean areas, has emerged out of island archaeology (which has roots in processual approaches and links closely into Mediterraneanist and systems-type models). The original notion of islands as 'ecological laboratories' (housing consistent ethnocultural groups forming useful subjects on which to test hypotheses about movement as change stimulus) has recently been backgrounded. The *process/experience* of movement and related cultural change in maritime areas is now the focus, with islands seen as particularly informative nodes in light of their multidirectional connections (e.g. Broodbank 1999; 2000: 5–39; 68–107; 272–5; Cherry 2004;

for earlier island archaeology approaches see Evans 1973; 1977; Renfrew and Wagstaff 1982; for critiques, stressing a lack of attention to agency, history and contingency, include Erlandson and Fitzpatrick 2006: 7–8; Knapp 2007; Rainbird 1999). In a Mediterraneanist-type treatment of early complex social and economic systems in the Cyclades, Broodbank (2000) masterfully examined the ways in which specific topographical and spatial characteristics, including ‘islandness’ and connectivity, are likely to have conditioned ancient agents’ actions and perceptions in movement – moving beyond a view of landscape/environment as directly conditioning of agents to see it as one of several strong factors in agents’ experience. Broodbank’s long-timeframe focus on the Neolithic to early palatial periods (c. 5000–2000 BC) encompassed several well-acknowledged transformative sociocultural horizons, which he attempted to contextualise in relation to movement. Overall, however, movement of an endemic, continuous kind is the most heavily stressed in this and related subsequent work by this author. Some general/limited accounts of specific, directional movement tropes and impacts are attempted, but Broodbank shares with some other recent scholars the systemic conception of movement networks as an analytical tool. Knappett and others have focused on identifying patterns in movement during another transformative period of Aegean prehistory (the emergence, consumption and impact of palatial culture on and around Crete, c. 2000–1600 BC) while also recognising the variable conditioning of movement by environment and agency (Knappett 2011; Knappett and Nikolakopoulou 2005; 2013; Knappett et al. 2008). Others have used network models to investigate movement in later Aegean periods (especially Archaic to Classical: Antonaccio 2013; Hodos 2006; 2012: 254–5; see also Constantakopoulou 2007; Demand 2011; Malkin 2004: 358–9; 2011; Malkin et al. 2009 for adaptations of the network concept in analyses based largely on textual sources). Such approaches help avoid the assumptions about movement as unidirectional and predictable in its effects found in older scholarly narratives (especially those based on texts). More open-ended and less purely economically-focused than world-systems models, and taking account of agency, cognition and social structure, network perspectives *potentially* offer the chance to explore diverse (e.g. cross-class) aspects of cultural change in relation to movement, and to address targeted and episodic kinds of movement, as well as endemic ones. Yet they have as yet been applied to few periods and still engage relatively little with socially wide-ranging/episodic/transformative experiences and outcomes of movement. Where not text-centred, they tend to focus on moveable artefacts and the ‘agency’ of the latter, rarely directly visualising moving people and their behaviour (though see recent developments like Gorogianni et al. 2016). Like their forebears in processual archaeology and systems theory, network models can tend to be ahistorical, objectifying movement/contact developments during particular points in/spans of time (and sometimes favouring the use of decontextualised cross-period or external analogies to describe these developments) rather than seeing them as historically grounded

and shaped. The best such models (usually incorporating Mediterraneanist-type assumptions about connectivity) acknowledge environment as both a structuring factor in movement and a conceptual product of movement. They take a contextual approach, focusing on the perceptions, materials, structures and systems conditioning movement and its effects, rather than isolating movement as a system in itself (Broodbank 2014a: 20; Davis and Gorogianni 2005; van Oyen 2012). Some rightly stress connectivity as unevenly and consciously structured and conceptualise moving actors as connective nodes in themselves (Antonaccio 2005: 248). In my case studies, I try to build on the best of these approaches in a more overtly historical perspective, less focused on simplifying the growth of movement systems as repeated patterns than on highlighting their contingent nature.

Another promising way in which the discourse on ancient Aegean movement and culture change is being developed is through some new approaches to ancient texts – mostly relevant to the Iron Age and later periods. While scholars of the Aegean used ancient sources as more or less authoritative guides to prehistory for much of the twentieth century (e.g. Homer to reconstruct the interactions of Bronze Age states, Thucydides to analyse Aegean trade, settlement and ‘colonisation’ in the central Mediterranean from the eighth century BC, and Aristotle to elucidate the way Archaic cities emerged in the landscape), scholars working in a post-structuralist environment recognise how deeply such texts were politicised and socially conditioned entities, both at the time of their production and in later interpretation (e.g. Hall 1997; 2007; Malkin 2002; 2009). This has encouraged more nuanced evaluation of textual accounts of movement, and new archaeologically- and anthropologically-informed explorations of how movement and related culture change might actually have been experienced by ancient groups, which draw on texts in a wider context of cultural evidence (e.g. Hodos 2006). The effect has nonetheless filtered through only into some parts of the scholarship (Bintliff 2012: 52 for critique). Classical text traditions about origins and movement remain well-entrenched as literal or near-literal accounts in both academic and popular awareness/understanding of the prehistory and early history of the Aegean (especially in contemporary Greece). Superficial reference to texts often still appears tempting in the absence of a cogent, engaged and up-to-date archaeological discourse on movement and the experience of movement in this region. This is another reason for building and testing clear models based on a contextual examination of the ancient evidence (Avdela 2000; Mavroskouphis 1997; Repoussi 2011; Simandiraki 2004; 2005).

### **Summary: context, methods and parameters of the present study**

It seems vital to address questions of generalised or repeated process in movement and its sociocultural impact in relating influential recent perspectives on the ancient Aegean (including Mediterraneanist and systems approaches)

to traditional models grounded in culture history. In this ‘archaeology of movement’, I will thus make no apologies for a broad chronological and geographical scale of approach, allowing me to compare a number of transformative episodes in various Aegean subregions (while very often focusing on the south-central Aegean, where a number of factors have produced concentrated evidence for ancient movement and major sociocultural shifts). Related topics, such as the archaeology of colonialism or of islands, have been treated by single authors at an equally wide, or wider, spatial and diachronic scale (e.g. Broodbank 2000; 2014a; Gosden 2004; Steel 2013). In my case studies, societies in areas including coastal Anatolia, Egypt, Syria-Palestine, south Italy, Cyprus and the Balkans, as well as the Aegean mainland and islands, will all need to be considered when exploring the experiences and effects of movement and interaction. But Aegean-resident groups (whether as migrant or receiver communities) remain at the centre of the discussion throughout, and their contact partner/interlocutor societies in other regions are inevitably treated with less depth in terms of their internal dynamics. It is extremely important, nonetheless (especially in view of the history of scholarship in this field) that my *explanations* of culture change and arguments about its importance and relation to movement avoid an Aegeo-centric bias: I try to ensure this throughout.

Archaeology is the only consistent way of exploring this kind of time/space range and is necessarily the main discipline in use here. Artefacts in exchange circulation have often been the focus of movement accounts for the region in the past. High-visibility ceremonial practices are another favoured area, as we shall see in the case studies. Both fields offer limited perspectives on how sociocultural change may have related to movement. In order to widen the scope of analysis, I here explore the archaeological record in its widest possible sense – including, for example, texts, cultural landscapes, domestic practices and subsistence-related data – without making assumptions about the priority of specific data types in indicating kinds or volumes of movement. I consider not only the ways in which moving agents interacted/ became ‘entangled’ with objects/materials – whether actively using them to communicate and establish themselves, and/or becoming defined by ‘receiving’ communities through associations with particular objects or materials – but how they interacted directly with the people, practices and structures encountered during movement (Stockhammer 2013). This focus will, I hope, help the book to avoid becoming mainly a study of movement in relation to trade, procurement and consumption, focused on imports, imitations, ‘travelling craftsmen’ and other familiar tropes (Cline 1995; Hitchcock 2005) and will give it a richer perspective on movement’s facets and impacts.

My method in dealing with the overwhelming quantities of relevant data applicable to each case study period will be, first, to provide a targeted overview of the currently available *evidence around movement* and socio-cultural transformation in each case (Chapters 3–7). In each case study, this

is followed by an evaluation of previous interpretations of that evidence based on contextualised and updated review. This leads into a updated model of the role of movement in change for the relevant period, drawing on the outlooks, methods and approaches I have highlighted as valuable in the discussion above. I have not approached the data through the lens of any *single* new method or perspective, though the underlying and consistent approach is that of a contextual and historical archaeology. Though the individual case study chapters reflect on historiographical dimensions of the debate in specific detail, Chapter 2 introduces the study's historiographical concerns and references in broader terms, helping to avoid repetition and providing a coherent set of evaluative arguments around this important aspect of the work. Notwithstanding, the book is not intended as a mainly historiographical exercise. The gaps in scholarship around ancient Aegean movement which I have identified above do arise in part from a lack of direct scholarly engagement with older models and the discourses informing them, making it important to revisit these. But simply deconstructing older models and showing how they emerged does not, on its own, offer something more useful to put in their place. My aim is rather to discuss the data from the early Aegean in a way which enriches both region-specific and general understanding of movement as a force in past social and cultural transformations. To this end, I try to model the evidence in positive and structured terms, making no *a priori* assumptions about movement as a likely or inevitably transformative force in any particular period or pattern. My conclusions (Chapter 8) suggest that while movement did often have deeply transformative effects in the Aegean and that some repeated patterns exist, the features of movement and its effects across the period studied are complex, deeply historically grounded and non-predictable. My argument is that movement needs to be rehabilitated in this region as an important factor in change – a factor with its own open-ended and self-sustained patterns, rather than an overdetermined or endemic force. At the same time, it cannot be seen as an inevitably dominant, unique or standard factor in change above other historical forces.

## Notes

- 1 In great part due to the region-wide investment in research by the Institute for Aegean Prehistory.
- 2 Even the most sophisticated, historically-sensitive world-systems approaches can tend by their nature to gloss movers' identity/agency and minimise the effect of encounters/experiences. Sherratt's (2012) encapsulation of Aegean groups' interaction with the south Italian region in the early Late Bronze Age as 'a purely economic device' exemplifies the way functionality/economic rationality is often assumed in analysing interactions within a system. In a recent conference paper – while rightly highlighting the way systems-focused approaches have improved on older assumptions about inherent ethnocultural attributes as structuring movement and its effects – Sherratt commented of Late Bronze Age Mediterranean travellers:

- 'I don't really care about their ethnicity' (Sherratt 2011). I argue that disregarding the way ethnicity or other aspects of ancient identity were constructed and operated in material terms must limit our insight into movement-linked encounters, and thus into their impacts.
- 3 The few full-length synthetic works on the early Aegean with movement as their overt focus which have been written up to this point contrast strongly in angle with the present work's concerns and methodologies (see e.g. Casson's 1974 *Travel in the ancient world*, with its focus on historical text sources and the mechanics of Mediterranean travel; the conference *Bronze Age migrations in the Aegean* (Crossland and Birchall 1974) and the ethnography-driven, processually framed *Invasions and migrations in Greece and adjacent areas* (Hammond 1976).
  - 4 See for example Malkin (2011), who compares networks of Archaic Mediterranean states to globalised modern European societies, strongly and deliberately playing down aspects of directionality in cultural practice and historicity in movement.

## Bibliography

- Abulafia, D., 2005. Mediterraneans. In Harris: 64–90.
- Adams, W. Y., 1978. The retreat from migrationism. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 7: 483–532.
- Algaze, G., 1993. *The Uruk world system: the dynamics of expansion of early Mediterranean civilization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Anthony, D. W., 1990. Migrations and archaeology: the baby and the bathwater. *American Anthropologist* 92.4: 895–914.
- Antonaccio, C., 2005. Excavating colonization. In Hurst and Owen: 97–113.
- , 2013. Networking the middle ground. In van Pelt: 237–45.
- Appadurai, A., ed., 1986. *The social life of things: commodities in cultural perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arnold, B., 1998. The power of the past: nationalism and archaeology in twentieth-century Germany. In Lech and Stepniowski: 237–53.
- Aruz, J., S. B. Graff, and Y. Rakic, eds., 2013. *Cultures in contact: from Mesopotamia to the Mediterranean in the second millennium BC*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art.
- Atkinson, J. A., I. Banks, and J. O'Sullivan, 1996. *Nationalism and archaeology*. Glasgow: Cruithne Press.
- Avdela, E., 2000. The teaching of history in Greece. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 18: 239–53.
- Bernal, M., 1991. *Black Athena: the Afroasiatic roots of classical civilization*. 2 volumes. London: Free Association Press.
- Bintliff, J., 2012. Are there alternatives to 'red-figure vase people'? identity, multi-ethnicity and migration in ancient Greece. In G. Cifani and S. Stoddart, eds., *Landscape, ethnicity and identity in the Archaic Mediterranean*. Oxford: Oxbow Books: 51–63.
- Blake, E., and A. B. Knapp, 2005. Prehistory in the Mediterranean: the connecting and corrupting sea. In Knapp and Blake: 1–22.
- Bourdieu, P., 1997. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bouzek, J., 1974. Bronze Age Greece and the Balkans: problems of migrations. In Crossland and Birchall: 169–77.

- , 1985. *The Aegean, Anatolia and Europe: cultural interrelations in the second millennium BC*. Göteborg: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- , 2010. Migrations: their character and interpretative possibilities. In K. Dzięgielewski et al., eds., *Migration in Bronze and Early Iron Age Europe*. Krakow: Jagiellonian University: 37–47.
- Braudel, F., 1976. *The Mediterranean world in the age of Philip the second*. London: Penguin.
- Broodbank, C., 1999. The insularity of island archaeologists: comments on Rainbird's 'Islands out of time'. *JMA* 12.2: 235–9.
- , 2000. *An island archaeology of the early Cyclades*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , 2006. The origins and early development of Mediterranean maritime activity. *JMA* 19.2: 199–230.
- , 2012. The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean world in the age of Andrew Sherratt. In Wilkinson et al.: 27–36.
- , 2014a. *The making of the Middle Sea: a history of the Mediterranean from the Palaeolithic to the Iron Age*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- , 2014b. Making in the making. *JMA* 27.1: 101–4.
- , 2014c. Back to the (early) Mediterranean. *JMA* 27.1: 116–23.
- Brysbaert, A., 2010. *The power of technology in the Bronze Age eastern Mediterranean: the case of the painted plaster*. London/Oakville: Equinox Publishing.
- Buchli, V., 2002. *The material culture reader*. Oxford: Berg.
- Burmeister, S., 2000. Archaeology and migration: approaches to an archaeological proof of migration. *Current Anthropology* 41.4: 539–67.
- Burns, B. E., 2010. *Mycenaean Greece, Mediterranean commerce, and the formation of identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Calvo, M., et al., 2011. The ways people move: mobility and seascapes in the Balearic islands (c. 1400–850/800 BC). *World Archaeology* 43.3: 345–63.
- Casson, L., 1974. *Travel in the ancient world*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Champion, T. C., 1990. Migration revived. *Journal of Danish Archaeology* 9.1: 214–8.
- Chapman, J., and P. M. Dolukhanov, 1992. The baby and the bathwater: pulling the plug on migrations. *American Anthropologist* 94: 169–74.
- Chapman, J., and H. Hamerow, 1989. *Migrations in archaeological explanation*. Oxford: BAR.
- Chapman, R., 2014. Scales, interaction and movement in later Mediterranean prehistory. In S. Souvatzi and A. Hadji, eds., *Space and time in Mediterranean prehistory*. London: Routledge: 32–49.
- Cherry, J. F., 2004. Mediterranean island prehistory: What's different and what's new. In S. M. Fitzpatrick, ed., *Voyages of discovery: the archaeology of islands*. Westport, CT: Praeger: 233–48.
- , 2005. Reflections on the 'Aegean' and its prehistory: present routes and future destinations. In Cherry et al.: 1–23.
- Cherry, J. F., D. Margomenou, and L. E. Talalay, eds., 2005. *Prehistorians round the pond: reflections on Aegean prehistory as a discipline*. Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology.
- Cline, E. H., 1994. *Sailing the wine-dark sea: international trade and the Late Bronze Age Aegean*. Oxford: BAR.
- , 1995. Tinker, tailor, soldier, sailor: Minoans and Mycenaeans abroad. In R. Laffineur and W.-D. Niemeier, eds., *Politeia: society and state in the Aegean*