More than people and pots: identity and regionalization in Ancient Egypt during the second intermediate period, ca. 1775-1550 BC

Sacco, A.

4
ETHNICITY

During the Second Intermediate Period in Egypt, and mostly in its northern part, groups of foreigners, meaning people who originally came from other lands outside Egypt, had an important presence. But what does this mean, precisely? What did it mean to be Egyptian or foreigner (i.e. Asiatic, Nubian, Cypriot) in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period? Is it useful and correct to talk about ethnicity in such a situation? Did the groups coming from outside Egypt contribute in a special way to the material culture in Egypt?

This chapter first illustrates what is known from both written and archaeological sources about foreign groups, namely groups of people coming from or whose origins were from lands outside Egypt, living in the country during the Late Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period. Afterwards, the contribution of anthropology to the study of ethnicity, and how this can be applied to archaeology, is discussed. This chapter elaborates also on the main concepts recurring in the study of ethnicity in archaeology, especially when examining empires and groups among which there is an imbalance of power (such as acculturation, assimilation, emulation, hybridity, creolisation, and resistant adaptation), and addresses the debate about Romanization as an example of how these concepts are used. Lastly, it is checked if and how the study of ethnicity can be correctly applied to Second Intermediate Period Egypt.

FOREIGN GROUPS IN THE LATE MIDDLE KINGDOM AND THE SECOND INTERMEDIATE PERIOD

A number of different foreign populations may be identified in Egypt during the Late Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period based on a careful analysis of the relevant material culture. These include Asiatics, people from Cyprus and the Aegean, and those who produced the Pan-grave culture. The evidence for these different groups is discussed in the following subsections.

The Asiatics

The best-known foreign groups living in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period are the ones coming from the Levant, namely from Syria-Palestine and Lebanon, from which also the Hyksos Dynasty arose. In Egyptology, these groups from the Levant are generally referred to as Asiatics ('Amu, to use the Egyptian word), without any further internal distinction.[1] This means that we cannot determine the precise groups that constituted this Asiatic community and the history of their arrival in Egypt.[2]

As it appears from names written on documents,[3] the Asiatic presence in the Delta was nothing new or peculiar to the Second Intermediate Period. Already during the Late Middle Kingdom, Tell el-Dab'a, was inhabited by a mixed community composed of people from the Levant and the Near East.[4] During the Second Intermediate Period, other peoples arrived from the Aegean,[5] and from Cyprus.[6]

Tell el-Dab'a was an important hub in the trade and communications networks of the eastern Mediterranean, as well as between the Mediterranean and the inner parts of Egypt, not only by sea, but also by land.[7] As it seems from the pottery, the closest relations were probably with the northern Levantine coast during the Middle Kingdom,[8] and with the southern Levantine coast, Cyprus, and the Mediterranean during the Second Intermediate Period.[9] However, there are scholars suggesting that the main relations were with southern Palestine both during the Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period.[10]

From the cemeteries in area F/I of Tell el-Dab'a, ranging from the late Twelfth to the early Thirteenth Dynasty,[11] it seems that Asiatic cultural features were most evident in tombs in earlier strata, probably because the foreign community was less integrated in Egypt. This appears both from the

1 Bader 2012a, 218; Bader 2017, 20–21; Bietak 2010, 146; Schneider 2010, 151.
2 For example, one of the possibilities include immigrant men marrying local women: Bader 2012a, 219–20.
3 Bader 2012a, 222; Bader 2017, 20–21; Bietak 2010, 146; Schneider 2010, 151–54; Sparks 2004, 28.
4 Bader 2012a, 221–223; Bader 2017, 21–23; Bietak 1996; Bietak 1997; Bietak 2002; Schneider 2010, 157–59.
5 D.A. Aston 2002, 54; Bietak 1997, 104.
6 Karageorghis 1995.
7 Ahrens and Mynářová 2011; Bader 2017, 21–22; Holladay Jr. 1997, 203–8; Oren 1987.
8 D.A. Aston 2002, 52–55; Bietak 1987; Bietak 1996, 30–31; Bietak 1997, 97; Cohen-Weinberger and Goren 2004, 80–88.
9 Ben-Tor 2004; Ben-Tor 2010; Bietak 1987; Kopetzky 2002, 244.
10 McGovern and Harbottle 1997, 149–53.
11 For these cemeteries: Schiestl 2002; Schiestl 2008b; Schiestl 2009.

layout of the cemeteries, from the architecture of the tombs and of their superstructures, from the position of the bodies, from the funerary equipment and the offering deposits.[12] Noteworthy is the statue of an official whose skin colour, hairstyle, and dress are of a type usually associated with Asiatics.[13] Noticeable is also the presence of temples of Levantine type in area A/II of Tell el-Dab'a, which were built during the Early Second Intermediate Period and which would point to Near Eastern cults going on.[14]

However, from archaeological evidence, such as the objects used as burial equipment,[15] and from the names mentioned on the name-lists,[16] it also appears that these Asiatics progressively adopted, in a relatively short period covering only a few generations, Egyptian cultural traits, and became part of the Egyptian administration. They were active as mercenaries, held administrative functions, were involved in mining operations in the Sinai and were engaged in seafaring. From this, it seems that they had an important role as far as interconnections with outside Egypt are concerned.[17]

Cyprus and the Aegean

Cypriot vessels[18] are found in Egypt, especially in Tell el-Dab'a but also in sites in Middle and southern Upper Egypt, from between the Late Middle Kingdom and the Early Second Intermediate Period,[19] with a peak in the Late Second Intermediate Period.[20] These vessels were made in Cyprus and were used to trade precious liquids or oils, and witness the trading activity conducted by Cypriots in the Mediterranean.[21] These vessels show strong connections with Cyprus, and could even to suggest the presence of a Cypriot community in Egypt.[22]

Moreover, contacts with Crete and the Minoans seem to be witnessed by pottery dated to the periods known as Middle Minoan I and II, corresponding

12 Schiestl 2002; Schiestl 2008b; Schiestl 2009, 206–15.
13 On the statue, see: Do. Arnold 2010, 191–200; Schiestl 2006.
14 Bietak 1996, 36–40; Bietak 2003a; Forstner-Müller 2003, 163; Forstner-Müller 2010, 134; V. Müller 2002, 271–75.
15 Bader 2012a, 218–19; Bader 2017, 20–25; Forstner-Müller 2008, 100; Schiestl 2009, 200–6.
16 Bader 2017, 20–21; Schneider 2010, 151–54; Sparks 2004, 26–28, 46–48.
17 Do. Arnold 2010, 183–84; Bietak 1987, 41–43; Bietak 1996, 14, 19; Bietak 1997, 96–100; Bietak 2010, 140–42; Schiestl 2008b, 253–54; Schiestl 2009, 211–15; Schneider 2010, 151–54.
18 For the Cypriot pottery: Aston et al. 2004; Bietak 1997; Fuscaldo 2009; Gallorini 2011; Karageorghis 1995; Maguire 1995; Maguire 2009; Merrillees 1968; Merrillees 1974b.
19 Maguire 2009, 11.
20 Merrillees 1968, 193.
21 Karageorghis 1995, 73; Maguire 2009, 52–68; Merrillees 1968, 188–93.
22 Bietak 1996, 35.

to the Middle Kingdom and the Early Second Intermediate Period, found in Northern and Middle Egypt and dating mostly to the late Middle Kingdom and the early Second Intermediate Period,[23] as well as by the wall paintings found in Tell el-Dab'a, in a palatial precinct of the Early New Kingdom, and inspired by Minoan motives.[24] Furthermore, neutron activation analysis conducted on Middle Minoan and Kamares sherds in Lahun has shown that both imported and imitated pottery were present at the site.[25] It cannot be said, though, if a community of Minoans could have been present in Egypt.

The Pan-grave culture

Another group of non-Egyptian origins present in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period is the one of so-called Pan-grave culture, named in this fashion after the distinctive shallow and pan-shaped substructure of its tombs and attested in the very late part of the Late Middle Kingdom and, mostly, in the Second Intermediate Period.[26] This group is known only from archaeological evidence, in other words tombs and very few settlements and all the small finds found there,[27] mostly located in the middle and southern part of Egypt, at sites like Rifeh,[28] Mostagedda,[29] Qau el-Kebir,[30] Balabish,[31] Hu,[32] Esna,[33] Abydos[34] and in Kahun.[35]

Their characteristic grave goods include black-topped vessels, leather garments used to cover the deceased and often embellished with beads, distinctive jewellery items, such as bracelets and necklaces made of disc beads of ostrich eggshell or of rectangular slips of mother-of-pearl, as well as leather weapons, and animal bones mostly from cattle and sheep.[36] Because of the

23 Kemp and Merrillees 1980.
24 For more information on these paintings: Bietak 2005; Bietak and Marinatos 1995; Bietak, Marinatos, and Palivou 2007.
25 Fitton, Hughes and Quirke 1998.
26 Schneider 2010, 151–54.
27 For more information on Pan-Grave culture: Bourriau 1981a; De Souza 2013; De Souza 2019; Liszka 2012a; Säve-Söderbergh 1956. There is also a discussion on Pan-Grave cemeteries in: Bourriau 1997.
28 Described in: Petrie, Thompson, and Crum 1907.
29 Described in: Brunton and Morant 1937.
30 Described in: Brunton, Gardiner, and Petrie 1930.
31 Described in: Wainwright and Whittemore 1920.
32 Described in: Petrie and Mace 1901.
33 Described in: Downes 1974.
34 Described in: Peet 1914; Randall-MacIver, Mace, and Griffith 1902.
35 Described in: Kemp 1977.
36 See the finds described in Brunton, Gardiner, and Petrie 1930; Brunton and Morant 1937; De Souza 2013; Downes 1974; Kemp 1977; Merrillees 1970; Peet 1914; Petrie and Mace 1901; Petrie, Thompson, and Crum 1907; Randall-MacIver, Mace, and Griffith

similarities between their burial customs and grave goods and the ones found in Nubia, these people are believed to be of Nubian origins.[37] It is nowadays disputed that their origins were in the Nubian Eastern Desert, and similarities between their grave goods, especially the pottery, and the objects attributed to pastoralists cultures from Nubia indicate contacts between the groups of Pan-grave culture and the latter.[38] It is possible that peoples of Pan-grave culture moved to Egypt from Nubia when the weakness of the central power made it easier to cross the boarders between the two lands.[39] However, it is also possible that they were already living in Egypt and the political fragmentation of the period under examination made them feel necessary to display their identity more conspicuously, thus becoming archaeologically visible.[40]

Based on the objects used as grave goods, especially bucrania and animal skin and weapons, but also flints and tools made of bone and stone, people of the Pan-grave culture seem to be mostly pastoralists, but involved also in other activities such as mercenaries.[41] The usually small size of the cemeteries and the demographic of the deceased further suggests that the people of Pan-grave culture consisted of small groups composed mostly of families, which seem to have been offering different types of services to the Egyptian population in exchange for resources.[42]

Furthermore, people of the Pan-grave culture, because of a supposed similar warlike nature and supposed similar geographical origins, have been associated with the Medjay,[43] which were people of Nubian origins employed as police force in the New Kingdom and the later part of Egyptian history, known mostly from written documents. Nevertheless, this identification is not supported by the newest evidence.[44]

Lastly, the Pan-grave tombs in the cemeteries of Mostagedda and Qau el-Kebir have been divided into three phases on the basis of the Egyptianization of the funerary equipment, namely the proportion to which the funerary equipment contain objects considered of Egyptian or Nubian style.[45] Here too, it seems that the objects of traditional Egyptian style become progressively

1902; Wainwright and Whittemore 1920.

37 Bader 2012a, 218; De Souza 2013; De Souza 2019, 145-157; Gatto 2014; Liszka 2012a; Liszka 2015; Näser 2012; Näser 2013; Weschenfelder 2014.

38 As argued in: Liszka 2012a; Liszka 2015.

39 As argued in: Gatto 2014; Näser 2012; Näser 2013; Weschenfelder 2014.

40 As argued in: Liszka 2015.

41 De Souza 2013; De Souza 2017, 148-49; Liszka 2012a.

42 As argued in: De Souza 2019, 48-49; Gatto 2014; Näser 2012; Näser 2013; Weschenfelder 2014.

43 Especially in: Bietak 1966; Bourriau 1981; Bourriau 2010, 22–23; Merrillees 1970; Schneider 2010, 151–53.

44 See especially the discussion in: Liszka 2012a; Liszka 2015.

45 Bourriau 1981; Bourriau 2010.

more common than the traditional Nubian ones in the funerary equipment. Nevertheless, this trend could be less straightforward than thought.[46]

MATERIAL CULTURE AND CUSTOMS

In this section, different types of material culture and archaeologically visible customs are discussed. These include pottery, metal artefacts, scarabs, offering pits, and burial customs.

The pottery

Pottery types are one of the features most analysed to study ethnicity and cultural groups, also as far as the Second Intermediate Period is concerned. Previous studies on the pottery of this period have demonstrated that pottery types became regionally diverse during this period,[47] particularly in the eastern Nile Delta, in the region of Memphis and the Fayyum,[48] and in the region of southern Upper Egypt around Thebes.[49]

Furthermore, specific types of pottery found in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period are usually connected to particular ethnic or cultural groups, starting with the Tell el-Yahudiyah pottery.[50] This latter is found both in Egypt, mostly in the eastern Nile Delta and in the Memphis-Fayyum region, as well as in Cyprus, Syria-Palestine, and Nubia.[51] It originated in the Levant during the MB IIa, corresponding to the Late Middle Kingdom, and from there it spread to inner Syria-Palestine, Cyprus, and Egypt, where it was first copied and then developed in a local branch, with specific local features. Particularly in Egypt, the Tell el-Yahudiyah ware was imported and copied during the transition between the MB IIa and the MB IIb, corresponding to the transition between Late Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period. Successively, during the MB IIb, corresponding to the Second Intermediate Period, it became locally produced and gave origin to an Egyptian branch. Its last attestations are dated to the MB IIc, corresponding to the very late part

46 De Souza 2013; De Souza 2019, 145-153.

47 For regionalization in Egypt during the Second Intermediate Period: Bourriau 1997; Bourriau 2010.

48 For the study of regionalization related to the region of Memphis: Bader 2007; Bader 2008; Bader 2009.

49 For the study of regionalization related to the Theban region: Seiler 2010; Seiler 2005; Seiler 2012.

50 D.A. Aston 2002, 51–53; D.A. Aston 2008; Aston and Bietak 2012; Aston et al. 2004, 122–55, 229–37; Forstner-Müller 2002, 167–68; Kaplan 1980; Kopetzky 2008, 196–206.

51 D.A. Aston 2008, 171; Bietak 1997, 94; Forstner-Müller 2002, 168; Van den Brink 1982, 68–69.

of the Second Intermediate Period, or to the LB I, corresponding to the Early New Kingdom.[52]

All in all, the quantity of vessels imported from the Levant rose noticeably during the Late Middle Kingdom,[53] and show links mostly with the northern Levantine coast.[54] During the Second Intermediate Period, imports decreased to very low levels, while the locally-produced imitations of, or vessels inspired by, these imports increased.[55] Moreover, from these vessels it seems that the closest connections had switched to the southern Levantine coast and Cyprus by then.[56] The typology of the pottery seems to confirm the contacts as described here.[57] Nonetheless, according to petrographic studies on Canaanite jars from Tell el-Dab'a, both during the Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period contacts were mostly with the northern Levantine coast.[58] Lastly, the Neutron Activation Analysis on imported Canaanite amphorae suggests that the contacts were mostly with southern Palestine. [59]

Important for examining the links between Egypt and foreign groups is in particular the study of the Canaanite jars.[60] These latter were amongst the few types of pottery that kept being imported into Egypt from the Levant during the Second Intermediate Period, because they were used in trading food and liquids. Furthermore, for the same purpose it is informative to study vessels used to trade precious oils and liquids, such as the juglets of Levantine Painted ware,[61] and the Cypriot vessels.[62] All in all, these types of vessels seem to confirm the history of contacts described above.

52 D.A. Aston 2008, 172; Aston and Bietak 2012, 551–56; Bietak 1989a; Kaplan 1980, 60–66.
53 Arnold, Arnold, and Allen 1995, 14, 30; D.A. Aston 2002, 43; Aston et al. 2004, 300; Bietak 1997, 105.
54 D.A. Aston 2002, 52–55; Bietak 1997, 97; Bietak 2002, 42; Cohen-Weinberger and Goren 2004, 80–88.
55 Aston et al. 2004, 323–24; Cohen-Weinberger and Goren 2004, 80–81; Kopetzky 2008, 195.
56 Aston et al. 2004, 220; Bietak 1991; Karageorghis 1995, 74; Kopetzky 2002, 244.
57 Aston et al. 2004, 300–93.
58 Cohen-Weinberger and Goren 2004.
59 McGovern and Harbottle 1997.
60 Arnold, Arnold, and Allen 1995, 13–20; D.A. Aston 2002, 43–46; Cohen-Weinberger and Goren 2004; Kopetzky 2008, 213; McGovern and Harbottle 1997.
61 Arnold, Arnold, and Allen 1995, 17, 30; D.A. Aston 2002, 53; Bagh 2002; Bagh 2013; Bietak 1997, 98; Bietak 2002, 38–39; Cohen-Weinberger and Goren 2004, 81; Czerny 2002, 133.
62 Beck et al. 2004; Karageorghis 1995; Maguire 2009.

The metal artefacts

Metal artefacts can also be associated with ethnic groups, such as the duckbill axes, usually connected to groups coming from the Levant. For the Middle Bronze Age, for phase IIa, the metal artefacts from Tell el-Dab'a have been the most studied. The objects include both weapons, tools, and jewellery, in precious or non-precious metals. The analysis of the metal suggests a similar development as with the pottery, namely that relative uniformity gave way to regionalized or local styles from the Middle Kingdom to the Second Intermediate Period.[63] These objects were clearly produced in local workshops.[64]

Moreover, analyses of the metal artefacts found in Tell el-Dab'a during the Hyksos Dynasty show that a smaller percentage of tin was used in bronze alloys than in previous periods. This change in making bronze, combined also with changes in the use of silica, suggests that the Hyksos administration had no or only limited direct access to raw materials. Thus, the regionalization detected in the material culture was not only due to the rising of new governments that wished to affirm their new identities, but also to the changed economic and trade relations derived from the new political conditions.[65]

In addition to that, it should be considered that metal objects were also used as symbols to indicate associations other than ethnic identity, such as social class, gender, or age group.[66]

The scarabs

Scarabs are another important class of objects, which have been studied in detail and which sometimes carry features that could have ethnic or cultural significance, such as the 'anra scarabs, usually associated with the Hyksos Dynasty.[67] In the eastern Delta in particular, the scarabs were executed in a style that was essentially a mix of earlier Egyptian scarabs and Palestinian scarabs produced during MB IIa and developed all through MB IIb.[68] These scarabs imitated the Egyptian Middle Kingdom ones and bear pseudo-hieroglyphic inscriptions.[69]

63 As shown in: Philip 1995a; Philip 2006.
64 As shown in: Czerny 1999, 117–18; Philip 1995a; Philip 1995b; Philip 2006.
65 Bourriau 1997, 160.
66 Philip 1995a; Philip 1995b; Philip 2006.
67 Ben-Tor 2004, 31–32; Mlinar 2004, 123–25.
68 As demonstrated by the scarabs discussed in: Ben-Tor 2004; Ben-Tor 2007; Mlinar 2004; Quirke 2004, 173–75.
69 Ben-Tor 2004 32–34; Ben-Tor 2010 91–93.

The offering pits

Offering deposits in temples are also fruitful category of study, that have been used in studying ethnic and cultural traits in the Second Intermediate Period. They are peculiar to Tell el-Dab'a and have been also the topic of a specific publication in the series dedicated to the Hyksos' capital.[70] More specifically, these offering deposits are found in areas A/II, F/I, F/II, and R/III, from stratum E to stratum D/3, and show the introduction of the use of burying both artefacts used in rituals and remains of ritual meals, in other words pottery and bones of animals, in specific pits.[71] The practice belongs to the Egyptian cultural sphere.[72] However, no pig bones have been found in the temples of Levantine types in Tell el-Dab'a, so that it could be perhaps concluded that pigs were not eaten or at least not sacrificed by the Asiatics living in Tell el-Dab'a.[73]

The burial customs

Burial customs in late Middle Kingdom and Second Intermediate Period have also been the topic of specific studies, mostly concerning the graves' structure, architecture and orientation, the funerary equipment and the orientation and position of the bodies.[74] The burial customs are one of the features most associated with ethnic and cultural significance.[75]

Concerning Tell el-Dab'a, based on the evidence found in stratum F, it seems clear that between the end of MB IIa and the beginning of MB IIb burial customs changed. These changes include a different orientation and an increased use of foetal positions for the bodies of the deceased, while new tomb types were introduced.[76] The first of these types is the rectangular mud brick chamber tomb, which was placed in a ditch and featured both a sloping roof and protruding bricks in the walls. The second type of grave is the rectangular mud brick chamber tomb placed in a pit, featuring either a single or a double-vaulted roof, as well as protruding bricks in the walls. The tombs

70 V. Müller 2008.
71 Bader, Kunst, and Thanheiser 2008; Forstner-Müller 2002, 132–34; V. Müller 1998, 793–95; V. Müller 2002, 269–71; V. Müller 2008; Schiestl 2009, 190–92.
72 Müller 2008.
73 Bader, Kunst, and Thanheiser 2008; Forstner-Müller 2002, 134; V. Müller 1998; V. Müller 2002; V. Müller 2008.
74 Bietak 1997, 103–4; Czerny 1999, 29–31; Forstner-Müller 2002; Schiestl 2002; Schiestl 2008b; Van den Brink 1982.
75 Bourriau 1991a; Bourriau 2001; Miniaci and Quirke 2009; Van den Brink 1982.
76 Bourriau 2001; Forstner-Müller 2002, 165–69; Schiestl 2002, 331–50; Van den Brink 1982, 45–46, 69.

bearing a single-vaulted roof could also be without protruding bricks in the walls and were also used to bury children.[77]

Another feature that seems to have been peculiar to the Asiatic people living in Egypt during the Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period s the use of donkey burials, which may have served to identify the deceased as being involved in trade or travel.[78] At Tell el-Dab'a, burials with donkeys are found from stratum H to stratum E/1, so from the late Middle Kingdom to the Late Second Intermediate Period.[79] Another characteristic feature of Asiatics living in Egypt during the Middle Kingdom and during the Second Intermediate Period is the practice of multiple burials,[80] including servant burials,[81] namely young girls buried at the entrance of the main tombs. All the features suggest that the Asiatics, even if they had adopted the Egyptian culture in everyday life, were perhaps more conservative as far as their burial customs were concerned.[82]

An evolution is detectable also in the burial customs of the Pan-grave group. The main features of these evolution, apart from the aforementioned Egyptianization, include a change in the body position of the deceased from one contracted and laying on the side, mostly the left, to one supine and with arms extended on the sides or over the pudenda. This change can be observed between the second and the third of the mentioned phases.[83] Furthermore, the shape of the grave changes from circular to oval in the second phase and to rectangular in the third phase.[84]

STUDYING ETHNICITY

Models for the study of ethnicity, and how it is expressed and shaped, have originally been developed in the anthropological field. Amongst these models, the first one considering together ethnicity, identity and interaction be-

77 Forstner-Müller 2002, 168–71; Schiestl 2002, 331–50; Schiestl 2008b, 246–53; Van den Brink 1982, 19–26.
78 Bietak 1981, 246; Bietak 1997, 103; Bietak 2010, 159; Forstner-Müller 2002, 165; Forstner-Müller 2010, 132; Schiestl 2002, 331–50; Van den Brink 1982, 46–47, 75–83.
79 Bietak 1981, 246–47; Bietak 1996, 25; Bietak 1997, 103; Bietak 2010, 159; Forstner-Müller 2010, 132; V. Müller 2002, 271; Schiestl 2002, 331–32, 341–43, 350; Van den Brink 1982, 35, 38, 42, 46–47.
80 Forstner-Müller 2002, 172; Schiestl 2002, 331–50; Van den Brink 1982, 70–72.
81 Bietak 1981, 245; Bietak 1989c; Bietak 2010, 159; Forstner-Müller 2002, 165; Forstner-Müller 2010, 132; Van den Brink 1982, 48–50.
82 Forstner-Müller 2002, 184; Schiestl 2002, 331–50; Schiestl 2008b, 250–54; Van den Brink 1982, 95.
83 Bourriau 1991a; Bourriau 2001; Bourriau 2010; De Souza 2013; De Souza 2019, 145-48.
84 Bourriau 1981a; De Souza 2013; De Souza 2019, 145-48.

tween groups has been the so-called Instrumentalist Perspective, elaborated by Fredrick Barth.[85]

According to this model, ethnicity is dynamic, malleable, situational, self-defining, and, at times, pluralistic. Hence, ethnicity is something that is done, actions and behaviours that are consciously adopted, changed, or abandoned by people interacting in the same groups or by groups interacting with each other, according to the situation at hand. This definition helps to realize that ethnic groups are abstract concepts more than something material, so that they have no fixed boundaries and are constantly in flux.[86] Nevertheless, this definition also implies that ethnicity is a mere instrument that groups and single persons use, change and shape at discretion and only for their own self-interest and advantage, so that it can misrepresent the ethnic group and does not consider the compromises and limitations involved in the process of self-definition. Furthermore, the Instrumentalist model focuses only on opportunism and does not deal with the psychological ties to an ethnic group and other dynamics of adoption different from self-interest.[87]

Other limitations to this model are that people and groups interacting with each other, despite having a wide range of elements to choose as ethnic symbols, have nonetheless limitations to their choices. These boundaries are dictated by a person's biological factors (such as age, sex, colour), by social factors,[88] and by the fact that they have to be mutually accepted and recognized as symbols by other persons belonging to the same group. Moreover, it should not be ignored that a person can show a plurality of ethnicities, which can be exaggerated or changed or suppressed, and can use markers from multiple ethnicities. However, also in this case the range is limited.[89]

In opposition to the Instrumentalist model stands the Primordialist model,[90] according to which ethnicity is a monolithic element naturally belonging to a group and as such innate to it and unchangeable, regardless of the historical, political, and social situation. The problems with this view are self-evident, since research has shown how ethnicity can actually be more or less

85 Barth 1969, 9–37.

86 Barth 1969, 27–32; Dever 2007, 52–53; Emberling 1997, 297–300; Hodder 1982, 210–11; Jones 1997, 72–76; Jones 2008, 325-28; Liszka 2012a, 47–48; Lucy 2005, 94–95; McInerney 2014, 3-4; Reger 2014, 112-13; Sipekas 2014, 70-71; Smith 2003, 16–17; Smith 2007, 218–19.

87 Fesler and Franklin 1999, 2; Jenkins 2008, 12–13, 17–19; Jones 1997, 76–79; Liszka 2012a, 48; Lucy 2005, 95–98; Smith 2003, 17–19.

88 Hodder 1982, 189–90.

89 Barth 1969, 16–19; Insoll 2007, 4-5; Jenkins 2008, 15, 19–24; Liszka 2012a, 49–50; Lucy 2005, 96–97; Sipekas 2014, 70-71; Voss 2015, 16.

90 Geertz, 1973; Hall 2000, 17–18; Jones 2008, 321-25; Liszka 2012a, 47–48; Shils 1975; Siapkas 2014, 68-69; Voss 2015, 27.

changed and adapted, according to the situation. Furthermore, the Primordialist view of ethnicity is more emphasized in groups that feel threatened and use the ethnic element to assert and defend their existence against threats felt from the outside or from the inside of the group.[91]

All in all, it can be said that a part of the traits is chosen according to the situation and change, while another is perceived as a natural and unchanging feature of the group.[92] This theory has been well summarized in the concept of habitus,[93] elaborated by Pierre Bourdieu regarding social groups.[94] It is defined as the predisposition towards certain behaviours, acquired from a young age onwards and transformable in different contexts. In other words, habitus is the complex of learned behaviours and customs, of repetitive actions taught to members of a group. The elements forming the complex of the habitus are used in everyday life and carry no strong ethnic consciousness.[95]

At this point, it is useful to quote Siân Jones's definition of ethnic groups:

> Ethnic groups are culturally ascribed identity groups, which are based on the expression of a real or assumed shared culture and common descent (usually through the objectification of cultural, linguistic, religious, historical and/or physical characteristics).[96]

Thus, ethnic groups set themselves apart from the other ones with whom they come into contact, based on perceived differences in their culture and in their ancestry. Jones defines accurately also the concepts of ethnic identity and ethnicity. The former concerns the way in which a person identifies him/herself with a specific group as based on perceived common cultural traits and descent, while the latter concerns the psychological, social, and cultural phenomena that derive from this identification and from the interaction between groups.[97]

It is apparent that the concept of ethnicity cannot be considered a synonym with the concept of culture. This latter is the whole of a group's language, material culture, territory, physical attribute, religion,[98] and history. On the

91 Hall 2000, 17–19.
92 Jones 2008, 326-27; Stek 2013, 347–48.
93 Fesler and Franklin 1999, 3–4, 8; Jones 1997, 87–92; Liszka 2012a, 61–62.
94 Bourdieu 1977.
95 Derks and Roymans 2009, 3; Hall 2000, 17–19; Jones 1997, 109–10, 114, 120; Knapp 2014, 37; Liszka 2012a, 67; Lucy 2005, 91; Siepkas 2014, 170 and 172; Smith 2003, 1–2, 9, 204; Smith 2007, 231–33; Smith 2014, 195.
96 Jones 1997, 84.
97 Jones 1997, xiii.
98 An insightful discussion about religion as ethnically meaningful int he context of Roman urban society is in: Rüpke 2014.

contrary, ethnicity can be considered only a part of a group's linguistic,[99] religious, and common cultural features, more precisely the part used by the group to define itself as one and as different from other groups.[100] However, important for the definition of an ethnic identity seems to be a joint association to shared myths of common descent, which are putative and normally recognized by people, but not factual. Being part of a common descent seems to determine who is included in an ethnic group and who is excluded from it.[101]

This mechanism of inclusion/exclusion works both in intra-group, person-to-person, interactions, and in inter-group, group-to-group, interactions.[102] It is useful to distinguish between these two levels also in archaeological analysis because, according to each occasion and type of interaction, a person could choose to display or not display his/her ethnicity, leaving different traces in the material culture.[103] Hence, it can even occur that different ethnic groups share a plethora of cultural features. It is thus important to study ethnicity in the larger historical, geographical, cultural context. This context gives a more complete and more comparative image and allows us to detect ethnicities when they appear stronger, which is usually in situations of conflict.[104]

Ethnicity and boundaries

From what has been discussed so far, it becomes evident that groups of objects, or assemblages, cannot be unequivocally given ethnic significance and be equated to ethnic groups. Assemblages can have other meanings, acquire other types of associations and signify other types of congregations, such as social, familiar, commercial ones.[105] Furthermore, the same object can change its significance and acquire or lose ethnic meaning or be appropriated by an-

99 For examples of when language is chosen as ethnic element and when not: Bader 2017, 14; Derks and Roymans 2009, 2; Hall 2000; Haarmann 2014, 17-22.

100 Bader 2017, 13, 17; Derks and Roymans 2009, 1; Hall 2000, 25–26; Hodder 1982, 11–12; Knapp 2014, 35; Siapkas 2014, 67; Smith 2014, 194-95; Voss 2015, 26, 29.

101 Derks and Roymans 2009, 7–8; Ganter and Kühr, 2014; Hall 2000, 25–26; Knapp 2014, 35; Reger 2014, 113-16; Siapkas 2014, 67 and 73.

102 McInerney 2014, 3.

103 Derks and Roymans 2009, 4–6; Hall 2000, 30; Knapp 2014, 35-37. This is visible also in the material culture of the Second Intermediate Period, as shown in: Bader 2012a; Bader 2017.

104 Barth 1969, 11–15, 20–24; Derks and Roymans 2009, 1; Dever 2007, 53; Hodder 1982, 187–88; Jones 1997, 106–10; Liszka 2012a, 56–57; Lucy 2005, 91–94, 109; McInerney 2014, 5-6; Smith 2003, 1–3; Smith 2007, 220–21; Voss 2015, 6.

105 Derks and Roymans 2009, 6; Knapp 2014, 37; Jones 2007, 48; Jones 2008, 327-328; Siepkas 2014, 72; Stek 2014, 38; Stek 2013, 347.

other group.[106] This means that assemblages are not indisputably bound to specific territories either. Therefore, it makes little sense to focus on their geographic origins.[107]

This also implies that diagnostic types and geographic origins cannot unproblematically be used as tools in investigating ethnicity in archaeology,[108] making some scholars altogether sceptic about the possibility to analyse ethnicity in archaeological research.[109] However, what can actually help is studying the archaeological context, in other words the place in which the objects were found and how the objects were positioned and grouped.[110] This can give hints about their use and about the significance attached to them, including the ethnic one. [111] This allows also to examine ethnicity not only from an external, etic, point of view, including our own point of view, but also from an emic, internal perspective.[112] This latter is the way in which somebody belonging to an ethnic group sees the group he/she belongs to, and how the same group defines itself.[113]

This emic point of view is important, given that the self-definition is usually formulated not only to emphasize the features in common within the same group and to see it as a unity, but mostly to set it apart and mark it as different from another group, so to create an 'us versus them (the other)' dialectic. This means not only that a determined group sees itself as a unity and as different from another one, but also that the same 'others' have to recognize and acknowledge this difference. Hence, a dialogue between groups and a system of inclusion/exclusion in and from them must take place.[114]

This system means also limited access to the resources available only to the group, which can be considered exclusion when the dominant group applies it against the dominated group, and usurpation when the dominated group manages to apply it against the dominant group. Limited access and selections can start because of external changes in the groups(s), such as mi-

106 Derks and Roymans 2009, 6; Stek 2014, 38, 2013, 347.
107 Derks and Roymans 2009, 6; Stek 2014, 38, 2013, 347.
108 As discussed in: Bader 2012a; Bader 2017; Jones 2008.
109 Derks and Roymans 2009, 3; Smith 2014, 195.
110 As shown in: Bader 2012a; Bader 2017.
111 As discussed in depth in: Bader 2012a.
112 Hall 2000, 17–19; Siepkas 2014, 70; Smith 2003, 19; Stek 2013, 350; Watson 1995, 688–90.
113 Derks and Roymans 2009, 4; Jones 1997, 56–59; Kemp 2006, 42–46; Knapp 2014, 36; Liszka 2012a, 51–52; Lucy 2005, 98–100; Smith 2003, 19–20; Smith 2007, 230–31.
114 Barth 1969, 14–16; Derks and Roymans 2009, 1; Dever 2007, 57; Emberling 1997, 306–8; Hall 2000, 26–27; Jenkins 2008, 58–64, 82–83; Jones 1997, 60–63; Jones 2008, 326-27; Kemp 2006, 20–25; Knapp 2014, 35-36; Liszka 2012a, 52–53; Lucy 2005, 98–101; McInerney 2014, 3; Siepkas 2014, 71-72; Smith 2003, 4–9, 19–23; Smith 2007, 218–21; Smith 2014, 194-95; Voss 2015, 14, 26–27.

gration influxes in a determined territory, or endogenous changes, born from phenomena within the group itself.[115] It derives that a group emphasizes its ethnicity and its identity and focuses on inter-group relations only when it feels threatened and unifies against a danger, so that this emphasis is more common between dominated and excluded groups.[116]

In general, ethnic groups do not possess static and fix boundaries, but the boundaries are usually flexible and are often crossed. Persons, objects, and ideas from other groups can be accepted in a group through special procedures, such as marriage.[117] Thus, a part of objects and ideas crosses boundaries of ethnic groups and is used, or at least known, by more populations, and can or cannot carry ethnic significance; on the contrary, another part is used as actual ethnic marker.[118] This display of ethnicity, and the mechanisms of inclusion/exclusion to which it is connected, is particularly active in cities and regions where different ethnic groups meet and interact.[119]

Lastly, it should be taken into consideration that ethnic borders do not coincide with our concept of national borders. In ancient times national borders were more permeable than nowadays and could be crossed with ease, as shown by written documents.[120] Furthermore, the concept of Egyptian nationality is a modern one, created in the nineteenth century.[121] In ancient Egypt, a foreigner who came to Egypt was considered Egyptian once he/she had adopted what was regarded as the set of Egyptian traditions and fulfilled an established role in Egyptian society, which usually happened in a short span of time.[122] Therefore, the presence of foreigner groups and multicultural contacts in Egypt is not limited to the people from the Levant and the eastern Mediterranean living in Lower and Middle Egypt during the Middle Kingdom and the Second Intermediate Period.[123]

115 Hall 2000, 26–27; Smith 2014, 194-95.
116 Hall 2000, 31; Smith 2014, 194-95.
117 Barth 1969, 9–11; Dever 2007, 52; Hall 2000, 28–29; Jones 1997, 15–39; Liszka 2012a, 66; Lucy 2005, 88, 97–98, 103; Reger 2014, 120-21; Schneider 2010, 152; Smith 2003, 1–2, 9, 204; Smith 2007, 218–19, 231–33; Stek 2013, 348–49.
118 Barth 1969, 9–15; Jones 1997, 96; Knapp 2014, 37; Siepkas 2014, 72; Smith 2003, 2; Smith 2007, 220–21; Smith 2014, 208-9; Voss 2015, 26.
119 Barth 1969, 19–21; Insoll 2007, 4; Jones 1997, 96; Reger 2014, 112-16; Schneider 2010, 146–47; Smith 2003, 6; Smith 2007, 220–21; Voss 2015, 26.
120 Kemp 2006; Liszka 2012a; Schneider 2010, 147–48; Smith 2003.
121 Moers 2015.
122 Kemp 2006; Liszka 2012a; Schneider 2010, 147–48; Smith 2003.
123 Bietak 1996, 36–40; Bietak 2002, 36; Forstner-Müller 2003; Forstner-Müller 2010, 134; V. Müller 2002, 271–75.

Ethnicity and imperialism

Ethnicities can also be superimposed by one group onto another, creating ethnic stereotypes. This process means both associating people that spontaneously would have not considered themselves as elements of the same group and including in the ethnicity of these people markers that would have not spontaneously been used. Through time and interaction with the imposing ethnic group, and to facilitate relations with it and obtain more favours from it, the imposed ethnic group would adjust itself to the imposed ethnic stereotypes, resorting to a situational ethnicity.[124] This kind of ethnicity is mostly found within the context of colonialism and empires. There are a few main concepts that have been used when studying situational ethnicity, and in general when analysing ethnicity in empires, such as assimilation, acculturation, creolisation, and hybridity.

Acculturation and assimilation are similar concepts, and represent two stages of the same process in which a group, usually a dominated one, acquires and uses traits from another one, usually the dominant one, until it appropriates them completely and changes its own culture. Both acculturation and assimilation are based on the principle of emulation, according to which the dominated group acquires the culture of the dominated group by emulating its features, or a part of them, sometimes for practical reasons and sometimes because the culture of the dominant group seems better.[125] Acculturation represents the stage in which the group simply uses these traits, but still perceives itself different from the group from which the traits derive.[126] Assimilation is the stage in which the group not only uses these traits, but switches its own traits for the new ones and does not perceive itself different from the group from which the traits derive.[127]

Hybridity and creolisation concern another type of process, by which a group, usually a dominated one, receives and mixes traits from another group, usually the dominant one, with its own cultural traits. The main difference is that hybridity does not take into count the imbalance of power between the dominant and the dominated group and the real motives behind the adoption or the rejection by the dominated group of particular cultural traits of the dominant group. It does not consider the resulting hybrid culture

124 Hall 2000, 17–19; Reger 2014, 121-22; Smith 2003, 20–21; Stek 2013, 350; Voss 2015, 13–14; Watson 1995, 688–90.

125 Millett 1990a, 37–38; Webster 2001, 216.

126 Berry 2003, 17–19; Hall 2000, 30–31; Jones 1997, 50–51; Liszka 2012a, 103–10; Schneider 2010, 144–46; Smith 2003, 2, 19.

127 Hall 2000, 30–31; Jones 1997, 54–55; Kemp 2006, 33–42; Liszka 2012a, 110–11; Schneider 2010, 144–46; Smith 2003, 22–24.

as a culture of its own.[128] However, hybridity carries problematic assumptions, such as the purity of the cultures from which it derives, or 'parents', and that the hybrid culture inherit characteristics from the 'parents', like in a genetic transmission, which define its identity and success.[129] On the contrary, the concept of creolisation, also called ethnogenesis, also considers the reasons and negotiations of power behind the selection of particular cultural traits of the dominated group, focusing especially on the rejected ones, and regards the resulting creole culture as a culture of its own born from specific local circumstances.[130] Creolisation in particular is based on the concept of resistant adaptation, namely the dominated group adopts a part of its traits from the dominant group, but it adapts them to its own culture and social conditions, while at the same time refusing other cultural traits of the dominant group.[131]

From the archaeological point of view, following one or the other concept also means having different ways of interpreting material culture. If using the concepts of acculturation, assimilation, and emulation, one would have a more monolithic vision of ethnicity and ethnic groups, and would expect that the distribution of specific objects in geographical areas can show the presence of a particular dominant or dominated group there, which is a reasoning that, as previously shown, is not correct.[132] If using the concepts of hybridity and creolisation, [133] ethnicity is considered more differentiated and the objects are analysed not as signs of the presence of a particular dominant or dominated group, but as part of a new culture and as signs of the negotiation and dialogue processes between the two groups.[134]

The case of Romanization

Situational ethnicity is found also in the phenomenon of Romanization.[135] This is a useful case-study to examine for this thesis, because it concerns how local groups interact with a newly imposed power, as it could be also the Hyksos Dynasty in northern and middle Egypt, and how we can better analyse the relations that get established.

128 Knapp 2014, 41-43; Reger 2014, 112-15; Webster 2001, 211–12.
129 Reger 2014, 113-115.
130 Webster 2001, 217–19; Voss 2015, 9–37.
131 Webster 2001, 218.
132 Jones 1997, 109–25; Voss 2015, 35.
133 On some problems inherent in using the term 'hybridity', see: Bader 2017, 14–15; Stockhammer 2013.
134 Webster 2001, 219–23. An example of hybridity as defined here is the material culture developing during the Second Intermediate Period in Tell el-Dab'a and the Eastern Delta: Bader 2012a, 218; Bader 2017, 14–15.
135 Bader 2017, 17–18; Jones 1997, 29–39, 129–35; Liszka 2012a, 54–55; Lucy 2005, 103–5, 108.

Acculturation through emulation is the main concept used by Ramsay MacMullen[136] in his study of the entire Roman empire during the time of Augustus. Though the wide geographical range, the focus on the non-elites and the use of archaeological material are appreciable, this study is very much embedded in the division between a monolithic Roman culture, exported mostly through conquest and migration of Romans and Italics, and a monolithic native culture, with this latter presented as a passive receiver of the former.

Another theory of acculturation, which is based on progressive emulation and partially differs from the one proposed by MacMullen, has been suggested by Martin Millett,[137] in his analysis of the Roman empire in Britain. According to him, native elites who are given governing power by the Romans emulate Roman material culture, to reinforce their social position. This emulation, then, works its way down the social scale in a progressive emulation. In summary, this theory makes Romanization a process participated in by the native population, which then plays a more active role and is not just a passive receiver of Roman culture.[138] It is evident that this approach is focused very much on the elites and on the division between a dominant Roman culture and a subordinate native culture, which can react in different ways, by accepting specific Roman cultural features, while rejecting or reworking other ones.

A more nuanced approach is found in Louise Revell's analysis of Britain and Spain during the Roman period.[139] She has examined architecture, use of public spaces, imperial cult and authority, and the participation in religious rituals, to show how Roman culture and identity had multiple forms and was mostly an experience lived in different ways by different peoples. While having the advantage of presenting the Roman culture as more complex and less monolithic than in the previous studies, it still strongly emphasizes a division between Romans and natives and focuses mostly on the elites, still leaving the other social classes as passive recipients of elite culture.

The dichotomy between Roman dominators and native subjected peoples is found also in the analysis of Britain during the Roman period by David Mattingly,[140] who has stressed even more the division between Romans and natives, with the first ones trying to impose their culture and the latter reacting in different ways. Despite having the merits of starting from the lower social classes and of including material culture, his analysis is still based on the concepts of imperialism and colonialism, focusing on the conquering and dominating aspect of the Roman occupation, and exploitation, of Britain.

136 MacMullen 2000.
137 Millett 1990a, 1990b.
138 Millett 1990a, 37–38; Millett 1990b, 68–69.
139 Revell 2009.
140 Mattingly 2010.

A diversion from this approach is used by Greg Woolf,[141] who, despite maintaining the separation between a 'Roman' and a 'native' culture, has demonstrated how both are not monolithic and absolute, but relative categories. Focusing his analysis on Gaul during the Roman period, Woolf has first shown how a few of the native elites actively created a new social order by including, by their own volition, Roman ideas in their own system, partially also to get the favour of Rome, while others consciously rejected it.[142] From this model, which seemingly was too attached to the point of view of the elites, Woolf followed the example of Mattingly and revised his theory by applying an approach from the lower levels of Gallic society, which also included the examination of material culture.[143] He concluded that Roman and native ethnicities were fluid and permeable aspects of the culture and of the identity of a person or a society, which could change with time and occasion.

Jane Webster[144] has proposed a different approach, again starting from the non-elite levels of society and using material culture, however, still embedded in the separation between Romans and natives. Starting from America and the Caribbean as an example for methodological purposes, and then examining Roman-Celtic iconography, she has suggested the concepts of creole material culture and resistant adaptation for the cultures of the Roman provinces. According to these concepts, both the Roman and the native cultures are mixed and reused by the native populations in their own way, but in a context of an imbalance of power. This means that not all levels of society had the same means and the same aims for reusing Roman cultural traits. Thus, different outcomes originated, each with its own characteristics and goals.

Nowadays, scholars studying Roman archaeology and the archaeology of Roman provinces have tried to surpass the dichotomy Roman-native, by focusing on the study of the objects themselves, their archaeological context and possible use,[145] and the economic and social processes so attested, without attaching any particular ethnic connotation to them. For example, Tesse Stek,[146] in his examination of the Romanization of Italy, has demonstrated how Roman culture was actually reusing symbols already known elsewhere in the Mediterranean and Greek culture, and how different economic and social processes, other than acculturation and besides simple military conquest, were at play and have to be taken into consideration.[147]

141 Woolf 1997; Woolf 1998.
142 Woolf 1997.
143 Woolf 1998.
144 Webster 2001.
145 Pelgrom and Stek 2015, 11; Stek 2014, 31–36.
146 Stek 2013; Stek 2014; Stek 2017.
147 Stek 2014, 36–39; Stek 2013, 341–50; Stek 2017.

Lastly, new perspectives on the Romanization debate have been given by recent studies using globalization concepts, taken from modern social sciences.[148] These studies focus on the connections within the Roman world on a larger geographical scale and on longer time spans. Furthermore, they use conflict-based models, in which local elements create new societies and new power structures by competing and cooperating in a larger system that connects them. From this, it derives that these studies stress networks of local elements and on how they are linked to each other. Finally, this means that the origin of the objects or their use as ethnic markers, thus talking about Roman and native material cultures, is not relevant.[149]

In the end, what matters is how objects were used and how they connected people, beyond specific meanings of ethnicity and identity that they could acquire. This has been called the "material turn" in the Romanization debate, because it focuses on the objects themselves and does not try to give preconceived labels to the peoples using them.[150]

ETHNICITY IN THE SECOND INTERMEDIATE PERIOD?

After what has been discussed so far in this chapter it seems that, like in the debate about Romanization, there is the risk of focusing too much on an opposition Egyptian/non-Egyptian, where non-Egyptian includes Asiatics, Nubians and Cypriot, and on a simplistic process of acculturation and assimilation. Furthermore, there is the risk of considering the dominant Hyksos and the groups from the Levant as passively assimilating or reusing the culture of the dominated Egyptians. Though undoubtedly there where objects new to Egyptian traditions that were introduced by people of Asiatic, Nubian, or Mediterranean descent, their use in Egypt did not necessarily carry any ethnic meaning. As shown, the regionalization apparent in the material culture and the import of objects, or their imitations, also had other motives, like economic and political reasons.

Despite not being an empire at the time, Egypt, like Rome, was included in a connected world, as it has been shown and as it appears also from Egyptian objects found in the Levant and Mediterranean, such as the vessels with the cartouche of Khayan found on Crete and in Anatolia,[151] or the stone vessels from Egypt found in the royal tombs of Qatna, whose dating covers a period

148 Hingley 2005; Pitts and Versluys 2015; Stek 2014.
149 Hingley 2005; Hingley 2014; Hodos 2014; Pieterse 2014.
150 Stek 2014; Versluys 2014.
151 Mellink 1995.

from the MB IIa to the LB IIa, in other words from the Late Middle Kingdom to the half of the New Kingdom.[152]

Therefore, the present work considers the assemblages of objects detected through network analysis not significant of specific cultural groups, but of entire networking systems, of smaller or larger scale, which include political, religious, social, and cultural groups as well. The focus of the present work is on places and, mainly, on objects, how they circulated and which systems they signify, and how objects introduced from outside Egypt took part in this network. Rather than trying to disentangle ethnicities, I will emphasize how material culture was used at a local level and how places and objects may be connected to each other.

152 Ahrens 2007; Ahrens and Mynářová 2011.