

A B S T R A C T S  
B O O K



4TH ANNUAL MEETING

GÖTEBORG, SWEDEN

SEPTEMBER 23-27 1998

**E**uropean  
**A**ssociation of  
**A**rchaeologists

EAA 4TH ANNUAL MEETING  
ABSTRACTS BOOK

*Editorial*

Anna-Carin Andersson • Per Cornell •  
Håkan Karlsson • Jens Kjærsgaard • Magnus Rolöf

*Design/layout*

Magnus V. Rolöf

COVER ILLUSTRATION

Rock-carving RAÄ 614 (detail) at Skee, Tanum, Bohuslän  
Photo: Lasse Bengtsson

Meeting Secretariat of the  
EAA 4th Annual Meeting

*c/o Dept. of Archaeology, Göteborg University*  
Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden  
EAA-98@archaeology.gu.se  
<http://www.hum.gu.se/~arkeaa>

Printed by Göteborgs Länstryckeri AB September 1998



domestic as well as agricultural and industrial technologies. Their nature and range makes it possible to argue strongly for the movement of people to the island, rather than for other mechanisms of technology transfer and culture change. This identification of an intrusive group, with a distinctive habitus, opens up questions of prehistoric ethnicity, and the processes by which the initial maintenance of different life-ways by indigenous and settler communities eventually gave way, as a common cultural system developed.

Yutina T. (*Russia*)

#### THE TYPOLOGY OF THE PRIKAMYE MIGRATION PROCESSES OF THE MIDDLE AGES

Date Sat 26  
Time 1015-  
1035

The Prikamye is a unique area of the Ural region. A great variety of landscape, flora and fauna was the key factor in the economic development of the local population. The ethnic history of the population in the 1st-2nd millennia A.D. was greatly influenced by the migration (external and internal) processes in the area. The most significant process for the Prikamye population was the Great Migration in the middle of the 1st millennium A.D. This event is covered in detail in the archaeological works. However, less attention is paid to the internal migration processes of the population in the Kama basin. Researchers established the facts of the Prikamye population's migrations, their directions and reasons, but the essence of the phenomenon wasn't defined.

The typology of the Prikamye migrations of the 1st-2nd millennia A.D. includes several types, such as: internal ethnic migrations, external migrations (ethnoemigration, ethnoimmigration) etc. The problem of the migration origin is thoroughly examined in the theoretical works of such researchers as Y.V. Bromley, N.Y. Merpert, V. F. Ghening and others. At the modern theoretical and applied levels the following problems are being worked out: the typology of antiquity migrations, the methods of analysing the migrations, the description of each migration type with its characteristic features.

The further research of the Prikamye migration processes of the 1st-2nd millennia A.D. is possible on the basis of the integration of archaeology, ethnology, ecology, palaeodemography, history etc. Such integration will provide vast opportunities: for establishing the fact of migrations itself; for bringing out the regularities of their development, the essence and the importance of the phenomenon for the historical process in the Prikamye on the whole.

Yakar J. (*Israel*)

#### IDENTIFYING PREHISTORIC MIGRATIONS IN THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORDS OF ANATOLIA

Date Sat 26  
Time 1110-  
1130

The diffusion of various technologies and architectural traditions in prehistoric Anatolia are often explained as the natural outcome of cultural interaction between neighboring regions. However, when dealing with cases of abrupt socio-economic changes or cultural regression one should also weigh the possibility of migrations. Based on historically and archaeologically well-documented examples, it is possible to assume that large-scale prehistoric migrations originating from beyond or within the geographical borders of Anatolia would have left their prints in the local and regional stratigraphies. The archaeologically well-recorded early 12th century BC population movements from the Balkans demonstrate that socio-economic changes reflect to some extent in material culture records. This is particularly true in cases when a superimposed culture is less sophisticated than the one it replaces.

At least two cases of massive population intrusions can be postulated to have occurred in prehistoric Anatolia; the first in the south-central plateau in the early/mid fifth millennium BC, and the second in eastern Anatolia in the first half of the third millennium BC. The prehistoric mounds of Kurucay Hoyuk in the Lake District and Can Hasan in the Konya plain clearly document major departures from the late sixth millennium local subsistence strategies, architectural conventions and technologies when these two and most likely many other sites in south-central Anatolian plateau were re-settled in the fifth millennium BC. The newcomers seem to have been culturally affiliated with groups of farmers and pastoralists inhabiting a geographical zone extending from the Balkans to north-central Anatolia.

The second case is documented by a number of multi-period sites along the Euphrates valley in eastern Anatolia. Among them, Norsuntepe in the Elazig and Arslantepe in the Malatya provinces provide the clearest signs of cultural changes brought about by Transcaucasian groups in the EBA I-II. Although there is little doubt that Anatolia was often infiltrated or invaded since the Neolithic period via Thrace, Transcaucasia and northern Mesopotamia, generally speaking the archaeological records of most superimposed groups can only point in the general direction of their secondary or primary homelands. In other words, while changes in the material culture can indicate externally introduced socio-economic transformations, they provide very little information, if at all, about the ethnicity of a superimposed culture.