



THE ROLE OF MIGRATION THEORY IN EGYPTOLOGY

Elisa Priglinger

Austrian Academy of Sciences, Vienna

ABSTRACT

Migration research is an ever-expanding field that can be explored from several different perspectives. It has always been a part of archaeological and historical interpretation, although it has not yet been thoroughly examined as a subject in its own right. Therefore, for a better understanding of the phenomenon of migration in the past, it is crucial to study it in the wider context of historical studies. Since the 19th century, these studies were strongly influenced by two theoretical schools of thought, namely Diffusionism and Evolutionism, which have sought to explain cultural development and social change. This paper examines the progress of migration research since the 19th century and its application to ancient Egypt over time.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this contribution is to question the use and relevance of theories on migration derived from other fields in Egyptology. Migration research in archaeology is very much connected with the detection of culture change, and therefore considerations on migration are always also a question of the culture theoretical view taken. Thus, the paper begins with a detailed overview of the development of culture theory within the social sciences since the 19th century. The most important points of contact on the topic of migration are emphasized, thus illustrating the inseparable connection between migration research and the theoretical discourse. Subsequently, the main developments of migration research within archaeology are explained and its applications to Egyptology. Obviously, ancient Egypt played an essential role in early migration research but has since completely disappeared from the picture.

Nevertheless, there is much potential for reversing this development, as summed up in an outlook at the end of this paper.

DEFINING CULTURE

This paper must begin with the history of the archaeological concept of culture.¹ Definitions of the concept of culture are so numerous and diverse that it is simply not possible to extract a single one.² Through the so-called *cultural turn* in cultural studies,³ and its influence on several fields in social sciences, the concept of culture changed greatly.⁴ This *cultural turn* was a movement that put culture at the center of contemporary debate within the social sciences. As a result, there was a change in the understanding of culture that led to an extended theoretical approach to this topic.⁵ This was motivated by the emerging interdisciplinary orientation and the request for multiple perspectives in context of culture analysis.

Since Max Weber (1920), sociology is a science the purpose of which is to explain social action, while cultural studies unite all disciplines that address processes of human life from the perspective of their cultural meaning.⁶ This assessment by Weber can be seen as the attempt to establish cultural studies as a subject that on the one hand emphasizes the social action's values and on the other hand maintains its scientific objectivity.

Due to the fact that it is quite problematic to define culture and therefore to present a holistic development of a theory of culture, in this paper, the narrower archaeological concept is in focus. *Archaeological culture* is commonly understood as being defined by a recurring assemblage of artifacts (pots, implements etc.) and other types of *culture traits*, such as burial rites or house forms. This term was particularly widespread after the use by V. Gordon Childe in 1929.⁷ The idea of archaeological culture has its roots in Central European archaeology, which is closely associated with the understanding of archaeological cultures as historic entities.⁸ In this respect, it is crucial to keep in mind that the concept of archaeological culture is based on archaeologists' interpretation and does not necessarily mean that groups of humans can be connected to artifacts with all certainty.

Another scholar who defined the concept of archaeological culture is Gustaf Kossinna who, based on the method of cross-dating through typologies by Oscar Montelius,⁹ developed a system of distribution of certain types of archaeological cultural areas. Based on Leo Frobenius,¹⁰ Kossinna formulated the concept of "Kulturkreis." According to him, those areas correspond to the areas of particular people or tribes.¹¹ He aimed towards an ethnic interpretation of archaeological cultural groups and hoped he could trace the prehistory of Germanic peoples back to the Bronze Age.¹² Kossinna's work was greatly influenced by nationalistic thoughts and defended a racist ideology of Germanic superiority, for which he was later strongly criticized.¹³ Even though his racial connotations were revised by some of his disciples, his correlation between people and culture remained part of the archaeological concept of culture.¹⁴

Childe, who adopted Kossinna's main idea, retained the concept of *culture* and *cultural group* but removed the racial aspect and regarded people as a social grouping rather than a biological race. As a famous advocate of the culture-historical archaeology and also Marxist archaeology, he was

involved in bringing these concepts to Britain. In his later work, Childe often replaced the term *people* with *society*, which he used as synonyms in his early work. During the 1940s, Childe started to differentiate between the archaeological and the anthropological understanding of culture.¹⁵ Consequently, he was able to use culture and people interchangeably and to maintain the idea that a society uses one language. From then on, Childe emphasized the use of *culture* only in reference to material culture and not to behaviors and attitudes, as it was used at the time across the social sciences.¹⁶ By doing so, he created a fracture between archaeological and anthropological theories, one that remains today to some extent.¹⁷

While discussing the definition of culture, and its meaning for identity-making, it is important to keep in mind the origin of the concept of archaeological culture and that it is primarily to be understood as a categorization aid.

HISTORY OF RESEARCH IN CULTURE THEORY

In order to understand the close connection between migration research and culture theory, it is necessary to have a look on the history of research on the subject of culture change since the 19th century. In the context of cultural studies, it is relevant to link its development within various research fields since the topic of culture can be studied from very different angles. Indeed, in addition to the investigation of disciplines that examine cultures, one must consider studies in geography, anthropology, sociology, and philosophy. This is important as, especially in early historical science, these research fields were strongly intertwined.

BEGINNING OF CULTURAL STUDIES

Over time, descriptions and interpretations of culture and culture change have evolved tremendously and reflect changes in scholarly focus. The concept of culture is closely linked to ideas of otherness and foreignness.¹⁸ Defining culture would potentially allow for a separation of one culture from another, but as can be observed in the vast literature on ancient cultures, it is in fact very difficult to do so. One reason is the fact that there is not always an emic account of these cultures that could possibly contribute to some clarification. In this context, it is important to deal with the development of sociological and philosophical approaches to get an understanding of the scope of the discussion about cultural change.

EVOLUTIONISM

Socio-cultural evolutionary theories offer explanations for cultural and social developments of societies or cultures in the course of human history. The description of specific transformational mechanisms and changes can vary greatly. Theories in the 19th and to some extent in the 20th centuries were based on the idea that different societies were at different levels of social development, and an evolutionary model that considered mankind as a whole was needed.¹⁹ These theories were based on the idea that the technology and culture of Western societies were more advanced than those of the rest of the world.²⁰

Two different traditions from the second half of the 19th century, to which modern theories of social and cultural evolution are occasionally linked, must be distinguished. The theory of evolution by Charles Darwin follows the principle of evolution by natural selection; he called this mechanism of species transformation “Descent with modification.”²¹ This concept was not only relevant for scholars in biology but also for those focusing on explanations of culture change and therefore had a considerable impact on culture theory.

The second tradition is traced back to Herbert Spencer, who as early as 1864 was the first person to develop the concept of evolution as the progressive development of the physical world and biological organisms, as well as human culture and societies. He is known for the expression “survival of the fittest,”²² which was then borrowed by Darwin for his theory on natural selection. Spencer’s theory is based on the principle of ontogeny, the development of a single individual or organism. It contrasts with phylogeny, the basis of Darwin’s theory, which implies the historical development of a species of living beings in the sense of biological evolution.

CRITICISM OF EVOLUTIONISM

Oswald Spengler, a cultural theorist and history philosopher who presented his popular cyclic theory during World War I, is worth mentioning here. Spengler’s main work, “*Der Untergang des Abendlandes*,”²³ did not consider the history of cultures linearly—as continuous progress—but rather as recurring cycles. He regarded the different *high cultures* (“*Hochkulturen*”) as being equal and defined them as organisms. As an analogy to the biological life cycle of each living being (born,

growing, mature, and finally decayed), he compared the development of cultures as plants that emerge, experience a flowering period, and perish after their completion. He set the duration of each high culture as circa one millennium. After this period, cultures, if their bearers are not destroyed by a newly emerging culture, enter their final, sterile stage, that of *civilization*. In this context, Spengler quoted the Egyptian culture as a good example for this development, which final phase he saw ending with the 19th Dynasty.²⁴

The extreme generalization of the early evolutionary theories was strongly criticized and led to the strict rejection of the distinction between *primitive* and *civilized* societies, that is, the assumption of a uniformly constant development of societies.²⁵ Critique of the classical social Evolutionism led to the development of theories that focused more on the consideration of individual societies in their respective historical context.²⁶

One response to this classical Evolutionism was the establishment of cultural relativism. It sought to avoid an ethnocentrism that views one’s own culture as authoritative and classifies and judges all other cultures in terms of their own world view.²⁷ Franz Boas’ work and that of his students dominated American anthropology during the first half of the 20th century. Their cultural relativism concentrated on a person’s own culture and aimed to understand a person’s beliefs, values, and practices without judging it against the criteria of another. The idea was that cultures cannot be ranked: all humans see the world through the lens of their own culturally acquired norms. This mindset became popular as a response and critique of racism, anti-Semitism, and nationalism. Universal concepts, such as evolution, were subjective, while cultural relativism focused on an emic viewpoint that aimed to understand cultural phenomena on their own.

In the 1940s, Neoevolutionism appeared also as a critique of ethnocentric social Evolutionism and was incorporated into anthropology and sociology two decades later. Within this school, some societal developments were still ascribed to biological theories, but many dogmas of the classic Evolutionism were rejected. Instead it introduced probability and the impact of free will on the process of social evolution. Neoevolutionism should be understood as a hypernym for various movements,²⁸ which were concerned with long-term evolutionary

social change. Of importance is the abandonment of deterministic positions, which postulate that certain occurrences are determined by preconditions. Another fundamental idea was that social development is neither goal-driven nor automatically equated with social progress.

A central idea of neoevolutionistic theories considered that societies go through a number of phases and therefore they can develop toward higher and more complex stages (this is known as regular patterns of development). However, these phases were not considered deterministic, and accidents and freewill can have an impact on the process of social evolution.²⁹

DIFFUSIONISM

In addition to the evolutionist paradigm, another dominant approach developed: Diffusionism, which was the central concept in the culture-historical tradition. It was an attempt to understand the nature of culture in terms of the origin of culture traits and their spread from one society to another. Diffusionism, as originally used in 19th and early 20th century anthropology, was a term for the assumption of any spread of cultural innovation and did not exclude migration or invasion. An independent occurrence of such innovations was considered extremely rare.³⁰

The starting point of this debate was a philosophical disagreement regarding human creativity. The theory of evolution assumes that innovation is a common feature of social life and that the shared mental qualities of our species make it necessary for significant inventions to be developed independently in many societies. By contrast, diffusion theory is based on the assumption that humans are by nature conservative and not inventive and that the main route of progress in cultural history has been through the spread of civilization from a few cultural centers.

Already this short introduction makes it clear how closely, in particular, the concept of Diffusionism is related to the emergence of the subfield migration research. More about this in connection with the archaeological context follows in the part of the migration theory.

NEW ARCHAEOLOGY AND BEYOND

With the appearance of New Archaeology in the 1960s, an intense questioning of traditional explanations of cultural change began. At the same

time, behavioral approach in geography became influential and concentrated on questions of how and why people perceive environments in the way they do.

Altogether, this new approach initiated a change of perspective and triggered a rejection of diffusionist arguments. In particular, Grahame Clark promoted this change in the context of migration to the British Isles during prehistoric times.³¹ His ideas were part of the New Archaeology that demanded a better investigation into long-term processes because culture change is the result of an environmental adaptation process. Moreover, it was considered important to separate and analyze the different aspects of societies (cultural or non-cultural phenomena) and only then try to bring everything together.³² This processual approach of the 1960s/70s attempted programmatically to propagate social-scientific models, system theory, and the search for some kind of historical “laws.” The close connection with sociology and its theory formation (à la Talcott Parsons³³ and Niklas Luhmann³⁴) became obvious. In this way, the language of systems thinking was increasingly integrated into archaeology.³⁵

These Systemic thoughts enabled a new approach to archaeological sources,³⁶ as well as the attempt of mathematical approaches.³⁷ The resulting models are difficult to apply for the practical explanation of social changes, but their importance is not to be underestimated by their abstract theoretical approach, since they allow a description of systemic transformation. As a comprehensible example, the systems theory of evolution can be cited,³⁸ which, in the sense of a biological culture theory, provides interesting indications for a society conceived as an organism. The systems theory has shown that systems have their own laws and dynamics, which also allow self-regulation. This is a crucial point for the explanation of change itself. Self-regulation means that a system can adapt its own function. This process is important to either maintain a function or adapt to new conditions. In terms of culture, in some cases, change might be much more likely to be understood as an adaptation of its own function (in the sense of an efficient society) than, for example, as a result of migration.

Another very important approach at this time was the emphasis on environment, demography, and subsistence.³⁹ This viewpoint consequently led to a preference for a neo-evolutionary perspective—like in other social sciences disciplines—and the

emphasis on continuity. Population movements, on the other hand, were seen as events rather than processes—this did not leave much room for explanatory models based on migration.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s strong criticism against processual archaeology arose, noting that it was too mechanistic and did not sufficiently take into consideration the role of the individual.⁴⁰ This rejection was then applied to questions regarding movements in history and led to broader discussions in theoretical archaeology.⁴¹ Finally, one point of critique was that migration had been largely ignored for decades because of the systems-oriented archaeology. Simultaneously, the critique was made that traditional explanatory models to migration are barely adequate because of the idea that normative “cultures” correspond to “peoples.” Furthermore, migration should be seen as patterned processes, which is why it is possible to approach them through general principles.⁴² A side effect of this welcomed re-evaluation of mobility was a trend towards a separation of social and environmental perspectives because some archaeologists did not incorporate environmental issues in their work and judged the important role of the natural environment as a deterministic view in culture change.⁴³

After this introduction to the emergence and the essential development of cultural theory in the context of cultural change, the genesis of migration research and its application in Egyptology is now in the foreground.

MIGRATION THEORY

In the second half of the 19th century, the search for interpretation of social and cultural change led to interest in the topic of migration, as well as questions of climate change, which opened up an even broader field for interdisciplinary research.

EARLY PHASE OF MIGRATION RESEARCH

As described in the upper part, migration is one fundamental explanation for culture change within the culture-historical approach. After the introduction of the concept of culture in archaeology, the typological method by Montelius, and the further development by Kossinna, the mobility of people was seen as a main factor of cultural transformation. The origin of this idea can be traced back to romanticism and the “ex oriente lux” model that stated that civilization spread to Europe from the Orient, that is the Far East.⁴⁴ Essential for further

intellectual development was Johann Gottfried Herder’s philosophy and his apprehension of peoples’ character (“Volksgeist,” means the spirit of a people). In the late 18th century, he developed the idea that the common character of peoples is not alterable.⁴⁵ If that were indeed true, every change within a culture would be the result of an external influence. In this sense, migration was one of the better explanations for culture change and thus became a widespread idea in social sciences.

The development of migration theory is connected to a couple of disciplines, which went hand in hand, especially during the early phase of cultural studies. Crucial for the intensive work on the subject of migration were linguistic questions. Within prehistoric anthropology, the focus was especially on the movements of Germanic peoples. Scholars also tried to explain the migration of Indo-Europeans from Asia to Europe. This examination was initiated by questions of comparative linguistics and the search for the Indo-European protolanguage.⁴⁶ The close link between migration theory and linguistic can also be traced in research in later years.⁴⁷

Geography played an eminently important role in migration theory from the very beginning. At the end of the 19th century, the deterministic approach was also introduced in geography and foregrounded the relation between humans and nature. Friedrich Ratzel, zoologist and geographer, can be considered as the founder of a general theory of migration.⁴⁸ His work was influenced by Darwin’s evolutionary theory and Social Darwinism. In particular, Ernst Haeckel, who reconstructed an evolutionary history of life whilst using embryology as evidence of ancestral relationships,⁴⁹ and Moritz Wagner, who did pioneering research on geographical isolation and its role in speciation,⁵⁰ had a strong impact on Ratzel’s theoretical thoughts. Ratzel established a connection between human geography and the naturalistic concept. Many of his disciples went in the direction of environmental determinism. This pattern of thinking has been widely criticized because it was used during the end of the 19th and the 20th century to justify racism, imperialism and colonialism.

Ernst Ravenstein, a German demographer, established a base for migration research and brought up the question of natural environment and climate.⁵¹ He focused on observations of internal migration mainly within the United Kingdom, and

international migration worldwide. He noticed that there are several factors for migration and did not stress climate to be the most influential one. However, he argued, as Ratzel did, that natural environment is a relevant factor in the context of movement of people. About two decades later, Ellsworth Huntington, a US-American geographer, went one step further and coined “climate change migration.”⁵² He linked the end of the Roman Empire and the *Barbarian Invasions* of Rome with an intensive climate change in Eastern Asia.⁵³ Huntington’s climatic determinism is a simplistic explanation of changes in human behavior, and is paradigmatic of attempts to connect very different phenomena to climate change.

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE DURING 20TH CENTURY RESEARCH

Although other theoretical approaches were pursued,⁵⁴ the natural environment and climate change were the main focus of migration theories at the end of the 19th century. In contrast, at the beginning of the 20th century, environmental conditions and changes were hardly discussed in geography as explanation for migration.⁵⁵ Even within behavioral approaches in 1960s geography, the natural environment (including climate) was not discussed much, and the term *environment* addressed mainly economic and governmental circumstances or transportation infrastructure.⁵⁶ It is noticeable that economic reasoning played a bigger role during most of the 20th century. Furthermore, deterministic approaches lost their importance within social sciences and the idea arose—at least in the Western world—that progress implies a decreasing impact of nature on human fate.⁵⁷ The thought behind this assumption implies that early migration was indeed caused by environmental factors: and while peoples back then could not handle changing natural conditions, modern societies are advanced enough to cope with natural forces.⁵⁸

Beyond that, natural determinism became more and more problematic because of its use to prove a hierarchy of development and to justify colonial oppression.⁵⁹ By the end of World War II, a connection between environment and mankind’s development was taboo and led to the examination of either one of the two as separate research fields. The New Geography and the neo-Marxist movement in the second half of the 20th century

displaced any environmental explanatory models within human geography.⁶⁰ The New Geography spread the quantitative revolution that was a major paradigm shift towards an empirical law-making geography.⁶¹ There was not much space left for a descriptive, regional geography and consequently the examination of the *human dimension* was excluded.

Eventually, at the end of the 1980s, the question of the natural environment’s role in migration experienced a revival. One major reason for that was the rising of certain environmental concerns and the associated increasing fear of climate change.⁶² At this point, the topic became a political issue. This renewed interest in the role of climate and environment can be observed in many disciplines today, such as geography, anthropology, sociology and also archaeology.

SCIENTIFIC METHODS

Since the 1990s, migration is once more part of an explanatory model for culture change⁶³ and has been refreshed in the last decades by new scientific methods, especially isotope analyses. Indeed, one of the most promising approaches in migration research seems to be a combination of archaeological interpretation and isotope analyses.⁶⁴ The analysis of human dental and skeletal material can help uncover ancient migrations patterns.⁶⁵ Strontium is absorbed with food and water in different isotopic ratios depending on the geographical location and is incorporated in bones and teeth. Isotopic signatures can help recognize movements of individuals, especially if the individual’s signature does not match the region where the remains are found.⁶⁶ As the development of the teeth in the age of twelve is completed and teeth are not remodeling continuously throughout the organism’s lifetime, one can infer the region in which a person grew up. On the other hand, bone samples reflect roughly the last ten years of life because bones do remodel and thus their isotope ratios change over time. In combination, this data can track down past mobility given that we have a good mapping of strontium in rocks, water, soil, plants and animals, since that is needed for the determination of the origin.⁶⁷ Another important method is the oxygen isotope analysis because its ratios ($\delta^{18}\text{O}$) are strongly related to its environment and thus can provide a marker of mobility. Almost all of the oxygen that deposits in

the teeth and bones comes from the water we drink which derives from meteoric water (i.e., from rain or snow). Variation in oxygen isotopes reflects differences in climatic conditions (e.g. water origin, coast/inland, precipitation, temperature, humidity).⁶⁸

One major advantage of this scientific method is that it provides a strong methodological approach to understand ancient migration.⁶⁹ Isotope analysis can contribute additional information where there were only artifactual and architectural evidence. However, this alone cannot answer all substantial questions, and therefore it should come as a complement to archaeological theory.⁷⁰

Migration must be understood as process, which can evolve from very different conditions, situations, and functions in a very complex and dynamic way.⁷¹ The combination of isotope analysis and methods of cultural studies can be an extremely fruitful approach, but these are two different areas that require a good knowledge of both fields. It is necessary to deepen both the methodological practice and the theoretical research to bring historical knowledge closer to archaeological contexts and sociological thoughts.⁷²

It is crucial to understand that ethnic identity is not automatically a question of biology but rather depends on various factors.⁷³ In this connection, also the far-reaching interpretation of ancient DNA analysis was criticized because there is the risk of continuing to resort to romantic paradigms within historical constructions.⁷⁴ With regard to an investigation of sociological, anthropological, and archaeological theories, it is necessary to identify a social reference in order to recognize culture or ethnicity.⁷⁵ At the beginning, therefore, is the search for sociologically determined groups that act as bearers of a certain culture. Subsequently, questions can be explored regarding the social groups involved and their developments, as well as the relationships within a single group and with other groups.⁷⁶

ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

The field of archaeology has been greatly dependent on established interpretations and thoughts on culture, and especially cultural change that are influenced by the research theories mentioned above. As a result, migration is a commonly used explanation for certain transformations in different areas of archaeological research, especially in

prehistoric archaeology, which is to some extent because of the absence of written sources.

The equation of culture and ethnic group was at the core of thinking in culture-historical archaeology at the beginning of the 20th century.⁷⁷ However, migration was poorly theorized.⁷⁸ Traditional explanatory models of change, that is, concepts of migration and diffusion, are deeply anchored in archaeological interpretation but originally arose in anthropology. In addition to the assumption that each cultural transformation is due to migration, Kossinna and Childe⁷⁹ represented the idea of cultural diffusion and the transfer of knowledge within archaeology. At the same time, however, an opposing position emerged, which assumed that culture and cultural traits develop parallel and independently: the so-called *independent invention*.⁸⁰

Egyptology

Hyperdiffusionists represent an extreme approach in that they claim that one proto-culture is at the origin of all major inventions: ancient Egypt was offered as this example of proto-culture. In the early 20th century, for instance, Grafton Elliot Smith insisted on the idea that the ancient Egyptians were at the origin of all remarkable inventions, which then spread elsewhere via migrants and voyagers. Smith postulated that the knowledge and technology of copper production, as well as megalithic phenomena, diffused from Egypt to the rest of the world (this is known as Egyptocentric Diffusionism).⁸¹ Another proponent of this theory is William James Perry, who refined Smith's view and added the idea that the megalith culture spread from Egypt and that megalith builders were prospectors in search of certain stones and pearls.⁸²

Today, in academic circles, Egyptocentric Diffusionism is no longer a topic of discussion, but, in the early 20th century, these scholars were highly regarded and had some influence on the cultural debate.⁸³ It is evident that cultural diffusion fit ideologies specific to late imperial Britain.⁸⁴ However, it was also a fruitful time for the fields of archaeology and anthropology: those subjects grew and developed methodologies and specializations at universities, including the subject of Egyptology.

Egypt and the Early Research on Ethnicity

Anglophone scholars were already in the late 19th early 20th century interested in ethnic origin.

Research on ethnicity was directly linked to contemporary concerns that, at a time of colonialism, African groups could be capable of achievements equal to white people. Scholars such as William Matthew Flinders Petrie⁸⁵ and George Andrew Reisner⁸⁶ interpreted cultural change as replacement of one group of people with another. Petrie is of particular interest because he had great influence on the British School through his numerous publications, but also because he introduced anthropological investigations, for the first time in a systematic way, to Egyptian archaeology.⁸⁷ The racially determinist approach is clearly present in his work, and as a result questions of racial identities found its way into the Petrie Museum at University College London, an institution that hosts his collection.⁸⁸

Petrie explained change in material culture through questions of races. He linked individual strata and typologies of findings (particularly ceramics) with ethnic groups and postulated that in the early ages of ancient Egypt a number of invasions took place.⁸⁹ Furthermore, Petrie followed the theoretical ideas of eugenics and defined several conflicts within societies as well as culture and *civilization* as a struggle between degeneration, superiority, and assertiveness.⁹⁰

Another eminent scholar interested in questions of human migration was James Henry Breasted. He was a diffusionist and wanted to demonstrate that the origin of European civilization could be traced back to the Near East, and especially to ancient Egypt. For instance, he claimed to have found the origin of European cathedral architecture in New Kingdom temples in Thebes.⁹¹ In the course of his research, Breasted increasingly focused on a link between geography, *race*, and civilization. Further, he started to map the geo-racial boundaries of early civilization and incorporated physical anthropology to define his racial categories.⁹² In his view people within the orbit of Western Civilization were white, and people outside it were of color and therefore inferior. Breasted's "Great White Race," which was the only one to play a role in the rise of civilization, included a range of types to which the Egyptians belonged.⁹³

Another perspective of importance for Egyptological research at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries was the strong influence from the field of biblical archaeology. The

study of Egypt's interconnections was dominated by questions about the biblical land, for example in the works of Breasted,⁹⁴ Müller,⁹⁵ and Petrie.⁹⁶ The general orientation towards a scientific study of racism in the 19th century⁹⁷ was not introduced in the German Egyptology that focused on archaeological research. However, racially oriented studies by the German anthropologist Johannes Friedrich Blumenbach had been conducted on the Egyptian mummies at the British Museum at the end of the 18th century.⁹⁸ He used especially craniology for his analysis of mummies, which was part of a taxonomic system Blumenbach developed.⁹⁹

On the other hand, Richard Lepsius and Adolf Erman still separated questions of language and *race* in accordance with the positivistic Berlin School. In the 1920s, the German Egyptology involved evermore with racial investigations in context of archaeological research. It was Georg Steindorff who marked a turning point for the Berlin School and oriented his research towards racial anthropology.¹⁰⁰ His efforts to connect the ancient Egyptians with Europe led him to focus on the *Libyan*-assertion that was concerned with the linkage of Georg Möller's blond-haired *tmḥw*¹⁰¹ and the Nubian C-group.¹⁰² Möller postulated that the *tmḥw* belonged to the light-skinned and blond-haired North African Berber race. Steindorff based his theories on the work of Möller, who also developed a diffusionistic theory and stated that megalith builders from Europe migrated to North Africa—probably across the Strait of Gibraltar—in the mid-3rd millennium BCE (the opposite of Smith's theory).¹⁰³ This hypothesis fitted expectations of the time and was well received inside and outside the field of Egyptian archaeology.

The Second Half of the 20th Century and Recent Theory Construction

After the end of World War II, the topic of migration in ancient Egypt was only ever briefly discussed or not addressed at all in Egyptian archaeology.¹⁰⁴ Even though Egyptology did not participate in this theoretical discussion, this does not mean that there was no significant contribution on cultural exchange from Egyptologists, but their focus was on typological studies and relationships between types of artifacts. At the time, the widespread Egyptological viewpoint was also clearly shaped by the idea of Egypt's isolation. Ancient Egypt was

primarily characterized by an outward demarcation, largely without innovation and a rigid adherence to tradition. This perspective has been preserved in traces in the formulation of Egypt as “vorachsenzeitliche Kultur.”¹⁰⁵ This thinking must also be understood in conjunction with the cultural-anthropological approach of the 20th century, according to which culture was seen as a fixed set of characteristics.¹⁰⁶ The result was that it was long assumed that Egypt had little or no external influence.¹⁰⁷

The discussion re-started in the second half of the 20th century, with questions of contacts between Egypt and other empires and the role the ancient Egyptians played in their neighboring regions. However, these investigations were more concerned with questions of trade, rather than mobility or migration. Nevertheless, this data gathering was very important in the understanding of the relationships between these regions.¹⁰⁸ Various scholars concentrated their attention on specific areas or time periods to explain single phenomena in connection to movements or the “others.”¹⁰⁹

The bigger picture and the link to the general discourse within cultural studies were missing. It was Jan Assmann who first attempted to put the question of foreignness in ancient Egypt into a larger context and discussed the cultural construction of this concept.¹¹⁰ In his work, he explains that it is possible to draw a line between what is perceived as *own* and *foreign*,¹¹¹ whereby his presumption is based on a concept of a closed culture.¹¹²

Another scholar who tried to deepen the understanding of “foreigners” in ancient Egypt and to connect cultural concepts to the archaeological material evidence is Thomas Schneider.¹¹³ He highlights the great adaptation of people to the social and cultural system, which he calls *acculturation*,¹¹⁴ and points out that the modern meaning of the word *foreign* is not applicable to ancient Egypt.¹¹⁵ Hence, the significance lies in the differentiation between people inside and outside the Egyptian system, not in the people’s origin. Schneider favors the concept of segmented assimilation¹¹⁶ for the acculturation processes in ancient Egypt, because this notion accounts also for a social differentiation. The theory suggests that different immigrating individuals assimilate into different social strata, without the possibility to climb up the social ladder.¹¹⁷

Another aspect stressed by Schneider is the circumstance that the individual affiliation was one’s

place of birth and not an Egyptian territory defined by the state. This kind of membership was also part of the cultural identity, and therefore there was an “otherness” between Egyptians as well.¹¹⁸ In this context, the representation of foreigners (people who were not part of the social and cultural system) both in written descriptions and artistic depictions follows a certain ideological scheme.¹¹⁹ Thus, this concept must be taken into account when discussing the role of the “other” in ancient Egypt.

Beginning with the issue of cultural contacts between Egypt and the Syro-Palestinian region during the Middle Kingdom and the Hyksos Period, Bettina Bader focuses on questions of cultural mix, especially in the eastern Nile Delta.¹²⁰ She also emphasizes the discussion on the application of concepts like hybridization¹²¹ or creolization¹²² to ancient Egypt. Within the context of cultural theory, the concept of hybridity has become popular, not least because of the increasing influence of postcolonial studies.¹²³ This thread, which has been developing since the middle of the 20th century, deals with the history of colonialism and imperialism and investigates the culture and identity of the nations or groups of peoples affected by colonization. In this context, the term hybridity became a cultural-theoretical key concept, which encompasses the idea that an original or uniform identity does not exist. Homi Bhabha utilized hybridity in relation to colonial and postcolonial encounters where groups mix elements of their culture, consciously or unconsciously, creating new expressions and meanings. Inspired by the popularized idea of the hybridity of Bhabha,¹²⁴ discourses in philosophy, sociology, science of media, and art also increasingly use it to describe processes of mixture. Some Egyptologists have been rather skeptical towards the use of the terms hybridization and creolization, because in archaeology usually the ideas in question are not sufficiently distinguished from each other.¹²⁵ The issue of hybridization was addressed, in particular, in questions of cultural contact between Egypt and Nubia.¹²⁶ It should also be understood that these concepts have become particularly important in the context of postcolonial studies and may not be easily applied to other political circumstances. In addition, certain concepts, such as hybridity, have their origins in biology, sometimes creating a maybe unwanted link between *racial mixes* and cultural mixing. For that reason, Bader, for example, speaks—at least as

interim solution—in favor of the use of the “entanglement” model, introduced by Philipp Stockhammer,¹²⁷ to describe phenomena of cultural mixing in ancient Egypt.¹²⁸ The reasons are that it does not carry political weight in debates such as race and does not indicate that one culture is inferior to another. The concept behind this is the formation of entangled archaeological remains, which makes it impossible to distinguish between the individuals behind it.¹²⁹

Much later than in other fields of cultural studies, ethnicity became also the object of investigation and is part of the discussion about identity and the shaping of self-images in ancient Egypt.¹³⁰ The notion of ethnicity originated from anthropology and underwent a number of transformations during the 20th century. For a long time, essentialist explanations prevailed and thus ethnicity was seen as unalterable, definable, and predetermined by biology and geographical conditions. On this basis, it was often correlated straightly to language, material culture, or descent (and *race*). In the 1960s, a constructivist approach was established in which ethnicity was a social construct, not biologically determined or objectively definable.¹³¹ In Egyptology, in connection to cultural contacts and foreigners in ancient Egypt, a debate developed about ethnicity as well.¹³² The discipline stands at the beginning of a far-reaching discussion that can be conducted only within the wider spectrum of cultural studies.

POTENTIAL AND OUTLOOK

The methodological difficulties in determining population movements based on the archaeological remains may have led time after time to a neglect of the theme of migration or its use exclusively as an explanation for the spatial distribution of archaeological finds.¹³³ In addition, the colonial and racial bias that have underpinned much research into migration in the past have made migration a sensitive subject, and some have been reluctant in bringing it back to the center of discussion.

The possibilities presented by new scientific methods such as aDNA and Sr-isotope analysis contributed to a renewed focus on this topic and certainly offer potential for many prospective studies. In any case, it is eminently important to address the phenomenon of migration from several different perspectives in order to avoid one-sidedness of the data and premature conclusions.¹³⁴

A theoretical and comparative extension, in combination with bioarchaeological methods, seems to be the most promising approach for migration research in the future.

In the context of ethnicity, Egyptian archaeology needs to follow the progress made in other disciplines, such as prehistoric archaeology. Indeed, further attempts must be made to develop the methodological approaches to the question of the identification of ethnicity. Analogies between different geographic and temporal spaces can help deepen our understanding of the phenomenon of migration. Once migration is understood as processes that are made up of different components, it is possible to compare one migration process to another. This does not mean trying to identify an identical pattern but that there are certain characteristics that are traceable in different historical contexts. Stefan Burmeister, for instance, argued that the study of recent migrations is intended to provide the necessary knowledge of essential migratory phenomena, as well as the underlying structures.¹³⁵ By gaining an understanding of at least some components of certain migration processes, it would become possible to picture some kind of ideal-typical process. In turn, this would help to reflect on mechanisms within movements that are yet to be explored.

The inclusion of ethnological data may well be seen as a fruitful methodological approach that should be used to answer specific questions around the migration process.¹³⁶ The connection of archaeology and ethnology is not only applicable for prehistoric periods but provides an opportunity to rethink several interpretations for protohistory and history. In particular, questions relating to a specific geographic area can be examined this way. For example, decisions that are made due to changing environmental conditions may be comparable through times. The same is true in respect to the motivation for migration that is linked to the society-environment relationship.

SUMMARY

This paper explored the connection between migration research and culture theory as a whole, while linking it to various strands of theoretical thinking and their development. What this paper demonstrated is that migration theory is deeply engrained with a number of theories that have their

origin in spatial and temporal contexts that tremendously influenced their formation and use; in particular, questions of race, mobility and environment cannot be dissociated from the cultural environment in which they emerged, very much connected to questions of racial difference and colonialism. Today, contemporary concerns and interests similarly influence the research in archaeology and anthropology (as well as other subjects, of course).

Interestingly, at the very beginning of the development of migration theory, ancient Egypt was a central focal point of debate. As an “early civilization,” it was part of broader historical interpretations and served as important case study. In connection with diffusionist approaches, Egyptologists even played a leading role and dominated the contemporary debate. However, with the end of the heyday of the cultural-historical approach, ancient Egypt seems to have taken a back seat. For a long time, the theoretical discussion in the English-speaking world was not followed up, whereby Egyptologists almost entirely avoided the theoretical reasoning.

In the last decades, it became clear that besides improvements of archaeological techniques and methods, it is inevitable to advance archaeological theory. For this reason, it is especially important to understand that the diversity of sources we have to deal with in Egyptology requires also a diversity of theoretical frameworks.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This contribution is part of the ERC project “The Enigma of the Hyksos.” This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program (grant agreement No 668640). I should like to express my thanks to Bettina Bader and Vera Müller for their thoughts and comments on an earlier draft of my paper. I would also like to thank Angela Stienne for her English editing and the anonymous reviewers for their comments.

NOTES

¹ For a discussion in Egyptology, see: Thomas Schneider, “Foreign Egypt: Egyptology and the Concept of Cultural Appropriation,” *Ägypten & Levante* 13 (2003): 155–161; Bettina Bader,

“Zwischen Text, Bild und Archäologie – Eine Problemdarstellung zur Konzeptualisierung von Kulturkontakten,” in Susanne Beck, Burkhard Backes and Alexandra Verbovsek (eds.), *Kontakt – Konflikt – Konzeptualisierung*, Beiträge des sechsten Berliner Arbeitskreises Junge Aegyptologie (BAJA 6) 13.11.–15.11.2015, GOF IV.63 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2017), 13–17.

² For definitions of culture, see: Alfred Kroeber and Clyde Kluckhohn, *Culture. A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology 47.1 (Cambridge, Mass.: Peabody Museum, 1952); Andreas Reckwitz, “Multikulturismustheorien und der Kulturbegriff,” *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* 11.2 (2001): 179–200; Aleida Assmann, *Einführung in die Kulturwissenschaft. Grundbegriffe, Themen, Fragestellungen* (Berlin: Schmidt, 2006), 9–12; Stefanie Rathje, “Der Kulturbegriff – Ein anwendungsorientierter Vorschlag zur Generalüberholung,” in Alois Moosmüller (ed.), *Konzepte kultureller Differenz* (Münster-New York: Waxmann, 2009), 83–106.

³ “Cultural studies” is here used as translation of the German *Kulturwissenschaften*, which investigates the material and symbolic dimension of culture as a multidisciplinary subject of study. It encompasses the cultural aspects of various disciplines, such as anthropology, art history, literary sciences, sociology, etc. This research field can be considered as a branch of the humanities.

⁴ See for a current overview: Doris Bachman-Medick, *Cultural Turns: New Orientation in the Study of Culture* (Berlin—Boston: De Gruyter, 2016).

⁵ Main publications include: Hayden White, *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination of Nineteenth Century Europe* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1973); Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973); Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1977).

⁶ Max Weber, “Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus,” in Max Weber (ed.), *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie:*

- (*Erstauflage* 1920) (Tübingen: Mohr, 1988), 165.
- ⁷ Gordon Childe, *The Danube in Prehistory* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929).
- ⁸ Ulrike Sommer and Alexander Gramsch, "German Archaeology in Context. An Introduction to History and Present of Central European Archaeology," in Alexander Gramsch and Ulrike Sommer (eds.), *A History of Central European Archaeology. Theory, Methods, and Politics* (Budapest: Archeolingua, 2011), 7–39.
- ⁹ Oscar Montelius, *Die typologische Methode* (Stockholm: Selbstverlag, 1903).
- ¹⁰ Leo Frobenius, *Der Ursprung der afrikanischen Kulturen* (Berlin: Borntraeger, 1898), esp. 3–12.
- ¹¹ Gustaf Kossinna, *Die Herkunft der Germanen. Zur Methode der Siedlungsarchäologie*, Mannus-Bibliothek No. 6 (Würzburg: C. Kabitzsch, 1911), 3; Kossinna, *Ursprung und Verbreitung der Germanen in vor- und frühgeschichtlicher Zeit*, *Irmisul. Schriften und Blätter für deutsche Art und Kunst* 1 (Berlin-Lichterfelde: Germanen-Verlag, 1926), 21.
- ¹² Gustaf Kossinna, "Die vorgeschichtliche Ausbreitung der Germanen in Deutschland," *Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde* 6 (1896): 1–14.
- ¹³ Ulrich Veit, "Ethnic Concepts in German Prehistory: A Case Study on the Relationship between Cultural Identity and Archaeological Objectivity," in Stephen Shennan (ed.), *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity* (London: Routledge, 1989), 35–56; Sebastian Brather, *Ethnische Interpretationen in der frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie. Geschichte, Grundlagen und Alternativen*, *Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde* 42 (Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 2004), 59–96.
- ¹⁴ Ulrich Veit, "Gustaf Kossinna und V. Gordon Childe. Ansätze zu einer theoretischen Grundlegung der Vorgeschichte," *Saeculum* 35/3–4 (1984): 326–364.
- ¹⁵ See: Gordon Childe, *Social Evolution* (London: Watts, 1951).
- ¹⁶ Barbara McNairn, *The Method and Theory of V. Gordon Childe* (Edinburgh: Univ. Press, 1980), 60–61.
- ¹⁷ Hans-Peter Wotzka, "Zum traditionellen Kulturbegriff in der prähistorischen Archäologie," *Paideuma: Mitteilungen zur Kulturkunde* 39 (1993): 31–32.
- ¹⁸ A socio-cultural system can encompass several ethnic groups and develop structural similarities, which are then perceived as belonging together by their relatives and handed down as a demarcation to the "others". Essential work on this concept within the cultural sociology: Fredrik Barth, "Introduction," in Fredrik Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Cultural Difference* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1969), 9–38; Barth, "Enduring and Emerging Issues in the Analysis of Ethnicity," in Hans Vermeulen and Cora Govers (eds.), *The Anthropology of Ethnicity: Beyond 'Ethnic Group and Boundaries'* (Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis, 1994), 11–32; Rogers Brubaker, "Ethnicity Without Groups." *Archives Europeenes de Sociologie* XLIII (2002): 163–189; in the Egyptological context: Jan Assmann, "Zum Konzept der Fremdheit im alten Ägypten," in Meinhard Schuster (ed.), *Die Begegnung mit dem Fremden, Wertungen und Wirkungen vom Altertum bis zur Gegenwart*, *Colloquium Rauricum* 4 (Stuttgart-Leipzig: Teubner, 1996), 77–99.
- ¹⁹ Theorists included Auguste Comte, Herbert Spencer, Edward Burnett Tylor, Lewis Morgan. Those evolutionary theories were established independently to Charles Darwin's theory of evolution.
- ²⁰ For details on theological approaches, see: Erik Wright, "Models of Historical Trajectory," in David Held and John Thompson (eds.), *Social Theory of Modern Societies. Anthony Giddens and his Critics* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1991), esp. 90–98; Ernst Mayr, "The Idea of Teology," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 53/1 (1992): 117–135.
- ²¹ Charles Darwin, *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection: Or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (London: John Murray, 1859). Darwin's theory of descent with modification was refined by August Weismann and Alfred Wallace and is later known as Neo-Darwinism.
- ²² Herbert Spencer, *Principles of Biology* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1864); Spencer, *The*

- Principles of Sociology* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1876).
- ²³ Oswald Spengler, *Der Untergang des Abendlandes: Umriss einer Morphologie der Weltgeschichte* (Vienna: Braumüller, 1918).
- ²⁴ The Egyptian culture was an important focus of Spengler's work although his knowledge was quite limited. See especially the critical review by Wilhelm Spiegelberg, "Aegyptologische Kritik an Spenglers Untergang des Abendlandes," *Logos: Zeitschrift für systematische Philosophie* 10 (1921): 188–194.
- ²⁵ See for example Franz Boas, Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead.
- ²⁶ Stephen K. Sanderson, *Evolutionism and Its Critics. Deconstructing and Reconstructing an Evolutionary Interpretation of Human Society* (Boulder—London: Paradigm, 2007), 35–47.
- ²⁷ Franz Boas, *The Mind of Primitive Man* (London: Macmillan, 1911); Boas, *Primitive Art* (Oslo: Harvard Univ. Press, 1927); Boas, *Anthropology and Modern Life* (New York: Norton, 1928); Boas, *General Anthropology* (Lexington, Mass.: D.C: Heath, 1938); See also the work of Julius Evola, Ray Birdwhistell, Ruth Benedict and Margaret Mead.
- ²⁸ Famous theorists are Leslie White, Julian Steward, Talcott Parsons and Shmuel Eisenstadt.
- ²⁹ For example, Leslie White, Lewis Morgan and Gerhard Lenski concentrate on technology as main factor in the evolution of societies/cultures. White divided culture into five stages of energy control, whereby every society go through this order of stages even if single phases can be left out. See Leslie White, *The Science of Culture. A Study of Man and Civilization* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Co, 1949), 362–393.
- ³⁰ The founder of diffusionism is the German zoologist and geographer Friedrich Ratzel (1844–1904).
- ³¹ Grahame Clark, "The Invasion Hypothesis in British Archaeology," *Antiquity* 40 (1966): 172–189.
- ³² Kent Flannery, "Culture History vs. Culture Process: A Debate in American Archaeology," *Scientific American* 217 (1967): 119–122; David Clarke, *Analytical Archaeology* (London: Methuen, 1968).
- ³³ Talcott Parsons, *The Structure of Social Action. A Study in Social Theory with Special Reference to a Group of Recent European Writers* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1937); Parsons, "The Present Status of 'Structural-Functional' Theory in Sociology," in Talcott Parsons (ed.), *Social Systems and The Evolution of Action Theory* (New York: The Free Press, 1975), 100–117.
- ³⁴ Niklas Luhmann, "Soziologie als Theorie sozialer Systeme," in Niklas Luhmann (ed.), *Soziologische Aufklärung: Bd. 1: Aufsätze zur Theorie sozialer Systeme* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1970), 113–136; Luhmann, *Soziale Systeme: Grundriss einer allgemeinen Theorie* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984); Luhmann, *Die Gesellschaft der Gesellschaft* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1997).
- ³⁵ Sally Binford and Lewis Binford, *New Perspectives in Archaeology* (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1968); Kent Flannery, "Archaeological Systems Theory and Early Mesoamerica," in Betty Meggers (ed.), *Anthropological Archaeology in the Americas* (Washington: Anthropological Society of Washington, 1968), 67–87; Flannery, "The Cultural Evolution of Civilizations," *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 3 (1972): 399–426.
- ³⁶ See for example for the Maya culture: Dorothy Hosler, Jeremy Sabloff and Dale Runge, "Simulation Model Development: A Case Study of the Maya Collapse," in Norman Hammond (ed.), *Social Process in Maya Prehistory* (London-New York: Academic Press, 1977), 559–561; for Qin Dynasty: Gideon Shelach, "Collapse of Transformation? Anthropological and Archaeological Perspectives on the Fall of Qin," in Yuri Pines, Lothar von Falkenhausen, Gideon Shelach and Robin D.S. Yates (eds.), *Birth of an Empire, New Perspectives on Chinese Culture and Society* 5 (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 2014), 113–138.
- ³⁷ See Colin Renfrew and Kenneth Cooke (eds.), *Transformations: Mathematical Approaches to Culture Change* (New York: Academic Press, 1979); Colin Renfrew and Paul Bahn, *Archaeology: Theories, Methods, and Practice*, 2 (London: Thames and Hudson, 1996), 455–462.

- ³⁸ See for example, Rupert Riedl, *Die Ordnung des Lebendigen: Systembedingungen der Evolution* (Hamburg: Parey, 1975); Riedl, "A Systems-analytical Approach to Macro-evolutionary Phenomena," *Quarterly Review of Biology* 52 (1977): 351–370; Franz Wuketits, "Die systemtheoretische Innovation der Evolutionslehre", in Jörg Ott, Günter Wagner and Franz Wuketits (eds.), *Evolution, Ordnung und Erkenntnis* (Berlin-Hamburg: Parey, 1985), 69–81; Wuketits, "Evolution als Systemprozess: Die Systemtheorie der Evolution," in Rolf Siewing (ed.), *Evolution: Bedingungen, Resultate, Konsequenzen* (Stuttgart: Fischer, 1987), 453–474.
- ³⁹ Lewis Binford, "Post-Pleistocene Adaptations," in Binford and Binford (eds.) 1968, 313–141; L. Binford, *An Archaeological Perspective* (New York-London: Seminar Press, 1972), esp. 20–32; it is possible to draw a line between the early processual archaeology as "functional-processual," especially applied to early farming communities, and a form of "cognitive-processual" approach which also reflects on thoughts and actions of individuals and can be used for more complex communities.
- ⁴⁰ With Bruce Trigger and Ian Hodder leading the way, see: Bruce Trigger, *Time and Tradition. Essays in Archaeological Interpretation* (Edinburgh: Univ. Press, 1978); Ian Hodder, "Postprocessual Archaeology," *Advances in Archaeological Method and Theory* 8 (1985): 1–26.
- ⁴¹ Kristian Kristiansen, "Prehistoric Migrations – the Case of the Single Grave and Corded Ware Cultures," *Journal of Danish Archaeology* 8 (1989): 211–225; David Anthony, "Migration in Archaeology: the Baby and the Bathwater," *American Anthropologist* 92 (1990): 895–914; Anthony, "The Bath Refilled: Migration in Archaeology Again," *American Anthropologist* 94 (1992): 174–176; Susanne Hakenbeck, "Migration in Archaeology: Are We Nearly There Yet?," *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 23/2 (2008): 9–26.
- ⁴² Anthony 1990, 895–914.
- ⁴³ See for example: Ian Hodder, *Reading the Past: Current Approaches to Interpretation in Archaeology* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1986); Philip Duke and Michael Wilson, "Introduction: Postprocessualism and Plains Archaeology," in Philip Duke and Michael Wilson (eds.), *Beyond Subsistence: Plains Archaeology and the Postprocessual Critique* (Tuscaloosa, AL: Univ. of Alabama Press, 1995), 7.
- ⁴⁴ Oscar Montelius, *Der Orient und Europa. Einfluss der orientalischen Kultur auf Europa bis zur Mitte des letzten Jh. v. Chr.* (Stockholm: Kungl. Hofboktryckeriet, 1899); on the positioning of Egyptology since Champollion on European reception and construction of ancient Egypt, see in detail: Martin Fitzenreiter, "Europäische Konstruktionen Altägyptens. Der Fall Ägyptologie," in Thomas Glück and Ludwig Morenz (eds.), *Exotisch, weisheitlich und uralt: Europäische Konstruktionen Altägyptens* (Münster: Lit-Verl., 2007), 321–347.
- ⁴⁵ Bernhard Suphan (ed.), *Herders Sämtliche Werke*, Vol. 14 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1909), 38; Also Herder's "Kugelmodell:" Suphan, *Herders Sämtliche Werke*, Vol. 5 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1891), 509.
- ⁴⁶ Ernst Wahle, "Geschichte der prähistorischen Forschung," *Anthropos* 45 (1950): 533; Hans Gummel, *Forschungsgeschichte in Deutschland. Die Urgeschichtsforschung und ihre historische Entwicklung in den Kulturstaaten der Erde*, Band 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1938), 173, 187–188.
- ⁴⁷ See recent work of Peter Raulwing, "Manfred Mayrhofer's Studies on Indo-Aryan and the Indo-Aryans in the Ancient Near East: A Retrospective and Outlook on Future Research," *Journal of Egyptian History* 5 (2012): 248–285.
- ⁴⁸ Friedrich Ratzel, *Anthropogeographie* (Stuttgart: Engelhorn, 1882).
- ⁴⁹ Ernst Haeckel, *Anthropogenie oder Entwicklungsgeschichte des Menschen* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1877).
- ⁵⁰ Moritz Wagner, *The Darwinian Theory and the Law of the Migration of Organisms* (London: Edward Stanford, 1873).
- ⁵¹ Ernst Ravenstein, "The Laws of Migration," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* 52.2 (1889): 241–305; Ravenstein, "Lands of the Globe still available for European Settlement," *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society* 13 (1891): 27–35.
- ⁵² Ellsworth Huntington, *The Pulse of Asia: A Journey in Central Asia Illustrating the Geographic Basis of History* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin and

- Company, 1907); Furthermore: Huntington, *Civilization and Climate* (New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press, 1922).
- ⁵³ Huntington 1907, 383.
- ⁵⁴ See for example: Pjotr Kropotkin, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (New York: McClure Philips & Co, 1902); Pjotr Kropotkin, a famous anarchist and geographer, responded with this book to theses of Social Darwinism. He attempted to give several examples for successful strategies in evolution which are based on mutual aid and not on the "survival of the fittest."
- ⁵⁵ See the important works by John Gregory, *Human Migration and the Future – A Study of the Causes, Effects and Control of Emigration* (London: Seeley, Service & Co, 1928); Donald Taft, *Human Migration. A Study of International Movements* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1936); Julius Isaac, *Economics of Migration* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Company, 1947).
- ⁵⁶ Etienne Piguet, "From 'Primitive Migration' to 'Climate Refugees': The Curious Fate of the Natural Environment in Migration Studies," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 103.1 (2013): 150.
- ⁵⁷ Piguet 2013, 151.
- ⁵⁸ Ulrich Beck, "Remapping Social Inequalities in an Age of Climate Change: For a Cosmopolitan Renewal of Sociology," *Global Networks* 10 (2010): 177; William Petersen, "A General Typology of Migration," *American Sociological Review* 23.3 (1958): 259.
- ⁵⁹ Proponents of this theoretical movement, like Karl Haushofer or Ellsworth Huntington, were greatly criticized for their racist utilization of determinism. Karl Haushofer, *Geopolitische Grundlagen* (Berlin-Vienna: Industrieverlag Spaeth & Linde, 1939); and footnote 53.
- ⁶⁰ Piguet 2013, 151.
- ⁶¹ See for example the change of mind of David Harvey during the "Post-revolution geography:" David Harvey, "Revolutionary and Counter Revolutionary Theory in Geography and the Problem of Ghetto Formation," *Antipode* 4/2 (1972): 1–13.
- ⁶² In the 1980s, papers by the United Nations, the Worldwatch Institute, and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change were published. These reports had a huge influence on the re-emerging of explanations that link environment and society; the debate about migration on a global scale started.
- ⁶³ David Anthony, "Prehistoric Migration as Social Process," in John Chapman and Helena Hamerow (eds.), *Migrations and Invasions in Archaeological Explanations*, BAR Int. Series 664 (Oxford: Archeopress, 1997), 21–32; Heinrich Härke, "Archaeologists and Migrations: A Problem of Attitude?," *Current Anthropology* 39 (1998): 19–45; Stefan Burmeister, "Archaeology and Migration. Approaches to an Archaeological Proof of Migration," *Current Anthropology* 41 (2000): 539–567.
- ⁶⁴ Stefan Burmeister, "Archaeological Research on Migration as a Multidisciplinary Challenge," *Medieval Worlds* 4 (2016): 42–64.
- ⁶⁵ For ancient Egypt, see for example: Tasha Dupras and Henry Schwarcz, "Strangers in a Strange Land: Stable Isotope Evidence for Human Migration in the Dakhleh Oasis, Egypt," *Journal of Archaeological Science* 28 (2001): 1199–1208; Michele Buzon and Gabriel Bowen, "Oxygen and Carbon Isotope Analysis of Human Tooth Enamel from the New Kingdom Site of Tombos in Nubia," *Archaeometry* 55 (2010): 855–868; Michele Buzon and Antonio Simonetti, "Strontium Isotope ($^{87}\text{Sr}/^{86}\text{Sr}$) Variability in the Nile Valley: Identifying Residential Mobility during Ancient Egyptian and Nubian Sociopolitical Changes in the New Kingdom and Napatan Periods," *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 151 (2013): 1–9; the opportunity of using strontium isotope geochemistry for the study of ancient human behavior was first shown by Jonathon Ericson, "Strontium Isotope Characterization in the Study of Prehistoric Human Ecology," *Journal of Human Evolution* 14/5 (1985): 503–514.
- ⁶⁶ An additional challenge is the availability of data to define the local bioavailable strontium isotope signature. This signature is very important for evaluating residential mobility since the $^{87}\text{Sr}/^{86}\text{Sr}$ isotope ratio is inherited from the local environment. Environmental samples (freshwater, ancient fauna, soil leachates etc.) are necessary to establish the local baseline of the

isotope signature.

- ⁶⁷ Nicole Slovak and Adina Paytan, “Applications of Sr Isotopes in Archaeology,” in Mark Baskaran (ed.), *Handbook of Environmental Isotope Geochemistry*, Vol. I (Berlin: Springer, 2011), 743–768; also considering constraints of this analysis and methodological difficulties.
- ⁶⁸ See for Egypt: Paola Iacumin, Hervé Bocherens, André Mariotti and Antonio Longinelli, “An Isotopic Palaeoenvironmental Study of Human Skeletal Remains from the Nile Valley,” *Palaeogeography Palaeoclimatology Palaeoecology* 126/1–2 (1996): 15–30.
- ⁶⁹ Gunilla Eriksson, “Stable Isotope Analysis of Humans,” in Liv Nilsson Stutz and Sarah Tarlow (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Archaeology of Death and Burial* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013), 123–146.
- ⁷⁰ See for example the warning of: Stefan Burmeister, “Migration und Ethnizität: Zur Konzeptualisierung von Mobilität und Identität,” in Manfred Eggert and Ulrich Veit (eds.), *Theorie in der Archäologie: Zur jüngeren Diskussion in Deutschland* (Münster: Waxmann, 2013), 259–260; Alexander Gramsch, “Culture, Change, Identity. Approaches to the Interpretation of Cultural Change,” *Anthropologie* 53 (2015): 342–343.
- ⁷¹ Approaches to investigate the processual character of migration are, for example: Heidi Köpp-Junk, “Pharaonic Prelude—Being on the Move in Ancient Egypt from Predynastic Times to the End of the New Kingdom,” *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 12 (2016): 21–40; Thomas Staubli, “Cultural and Religious Impacts of Long-Term Cross-Cultural Migration Between Egypt and the Levant,” *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 12 (2016): 51–88.
- ⁷² Certainly, the fulfillment of this task through the work of an interdisciplinary team is particularly well-suited to meet the requirements of in-depth migration research.
- ⁷³ For instance, for the Middle Ages it has been demonstrated that homogeneities in language, clothes or common objects like weapons cannot be used alone for an ethnic association. See Walter Pohl, “Telling the Difference: Signs of Ethnic Identity,” in Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz (eds.), *Strategies of Distinction: The Construction of Ethnic Communities*, 300–800 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 17–69.
- ⁷⁴ Martin Evison, “All in the Genes? Evaluating the Biological Evidence of Contact and Migration,” in Dawn Hadley and Julian Richards (eds.), *Cultures in Contact. Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 277–294.
- ⁷⁵ Wotzka 1993, 40; See also the anthropologist Fredrik Barth, “Introduction,” in Barth (ed.) 1969, 11–15, 38.
- ⁷⁶ See, for example, efforts towards the field of Egyptian colonialism: contributions in Neal Spencer, Anna Stevens and Michaela Binder (eds.), *Nubia in the New Kingdom: Lived Experience, Pharaonic Control and Indigenous Traditions*, British Museum Publications on Egypt and Sudan (Leuven: Peeters, 2017); Nomadism research in Egypt: Claudia Näser, “Nomads at the Nile: Towards an Archaeology of Interaction,” in Hans Barnard and Kim Duistermaat (eds.), *The History of the Peoples from the Eastern Desert* (Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology Press, 2012), 81–92.
- ⁷⁷ Detailed criticism in: Sian Jones, *Archaeology of Ethnicity* (London—New York: Routledge, 1997), 106–110.
- ⁷⁸ Burmeister 2000, 539; Burmeister, “Migration – Innovation – Kulturwandel. Aktuelle Problemfelder archäologischer Investigation,” in Elke Kaiser and Wolfram Schier (eds.), *Mobilität und Wissenstransfer in diachroner und interdisziplinärer Perspektive*, Topoi – Berlin Studies of the Ancient World vol. 9 (Berlin—Boston: De Gruyter, 2013), 35–58.
- ⁷⁹ Kossinna 1911, 3; Kossinna, 1926, 21; Kossinna, 1896, 1–14; Childe 1951.
- ⁸⁰ As early proponents, see Edward Tylor, *Researches into the Early History of Mankind and the Development of Civilization* (London: Murray, 1865); Lewis Morgan, *Ancient Society, or Researches in the Lines of Human Progress from Savagery through Barbarism to Civilization* (New York: Holt & Co., 1877).
- ⁸¹ Grafton Smith, *The Ancient Egyptians and the*

- Origin of Civilization* (London—New York: Harper & Brothers, 1911); Smith, *The Migrations of Early Culture* (Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press, 1915).
- ⁸² William Matthew Flinders Perry, *The Growth of Civilization* (London: Methuen, 1924), esp. 37–38.
- ⁸³ Robert Morkot, “On the Priestly Origin of the Napatan Kings: The Adaptation, Demise and Resurrection of Ideas in Writing Nubian History,” in David O’Connor and Andrew Reid (eds.), *Ancient Egypt in Africa*, (London: UCL Press, 2003), 156; Andrew Reid, “Ancient Egypt and the Source of the Nile,” in O’Connor and Reid (eds.) 2003, 70.
- ⁸⁴ See for example Timothy Champion, “Egypt and the Diffusion of Culture,” in David Jeffreys (ed.), *Views of Ancient Egypt since Napoleon Bonaparte: Imperialism, Colonialism, and Modern Appropriations* (London: UCL Press, 2003), 127–145; David Arnold, “Europe, Technology, and Colonialism in the 20th Century,” *History and Technology* 21/1 (2005): 85–106.
- ⁸⁵ William Matthew Flinders Petrie, *The Making of Egypt* (London: Sheldon Press, 1939).
- ⁸⁶ George Reisner, *Archaeological Survey of Nubia*, Bulletin no. 3 (Cairo: National Printing Department, 1909).
- ⁸⁷ See for example: William Matthew Flinders Petrie, *Racial Photographs from the Ancient Egyptian Pictures and Sculptures* (London: Luzac, 1887); Petrie, “Die Bevölkerungsverhältnisse des alten Ägyptens und die Rassenfrage,” *Deutsche Revue über das gesamte nationale Leben der Gegenwart* 20, Vol. 1 (1895): 227–233; Petrie, “The Races of Early Egypt,” *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 31 (1901): 248–255.
- ⁸⁸ Margaret Drower, *Flinders Petrie: A Life in Archaeology* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1995²), 199–230.
- ⁸⁹ See in detail: Debbie Challis, *The Archaeology of Race: the Eugenic Ideas of Francis Galton and Flinders Petrie* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2013); Challis, “Skull Triangles: Flinders Petrie, Race Theory and Biometrics,” *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology* 26/1, Art. 5 (2016): 1–8.
- ⁹⁰ Kathleen Sheppard, “Flinders Petrie and Eugenics at UCL,” *Bulletin of the History of Archaeology* 20/1 (2010): 16–29; Challis 2013.
- ⁹¹ James Breasted, *A History of Egypt from the Earliest Times to the Persian Conquest* (New York: Scribner, 1905), 205, 262, 344.
- ⁹² James Breasted, *Ancient Times, a History of the Early World: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient History and the Career of Early Man*, revised 2nd ed. (Boston: Ginn & Company, 1935), 13, 130–131; Lindsay Ambridge, “Imperialism and Racial Geography in James Henry Breasted’s *Ancient Times, a History of the Early World*,” *Journal of Egyptian History* 5 (2012): 22.
- ⁹³ Breasted 1935, 12.
- ⁹⁴ James Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt I–V* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1906).
- ⁹⁵ Wilhelm Müller, *Egyptological Researches: Results of a Journey in 1904* (Washington: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1906).
- ⁹⁶ William Matthew Flinders Petrie, *Researches in Sinai* (London: Murray, 1906).
- ⁹⁷ Tino Plümecke, *Rasse in der Ära Genetik. Die Ordnung des Menschen in den Lebenswissenschaften* (Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2013), 75.
- ⁹⁸ For this note, I would like to thank Angela Stienne, who wrote her doctoral thesis about “Encountering Egyptian Mummies, 1753–1858” at the University of Leicester.
- ⁹⁹ Johann Blumenbach, “Observations on Some Egyptian Mummies Opened in London,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* 84 (1794): 177–195.
- ¹⁰⁰ Georg Steindorff, “Das Wesen des ägyptischen Volkes. Rede des antretenden Rektors (am 31. Oktober 1923),” in Universität Leipzig (ed.), *Rektorwechsel an der Universität Leipzig* (Leipzig: Universitäts-Druckerei, 1924), 19–23; See also: Susanne Voss and Dietrich Raue (eds.), *Georg Steindorff und die deutsche Ägyptologie im 20. Jahrhundert. Wissenshintergründe und Forschungstransfers*, *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde Beiheft* 5 (Berlin—Boston: De Gruyter, 2016), 112–120.
- ¹⁰¹ Georg Möller, “Die Ägypter und ihre libyschen Nachbarn,” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 78 (1924): 36–60.
- ¹⁰² This connection was based on the similarity

between the skulls of *tmhw* with skulls found in North African megalithic tombs, which were again similar to those from C-group tombs. This study was disseminated in: Oric Bates, *The Eastern Libyans. An Essay* (London: Macmillan, 1914), 245–252, pl. XI.

¹⁰³ Voss and Raue 2016, 120–129.

¹⁰⁴ This was also due to the fact that in the 1930s and 1940s the research focus was strongly on physical anthropology (“Rassenkunde”) and then, after World War II it was practically impossible to discuss the topic of migration and mobility theoretically without starting an ideological debate.

¹⁰⁵ See Jan Assmann, “Große Texte ohne eine Große Tradition. Ägypten als vorachsenzeitliche Kultur,” in Shmuel Eisenstadt (ed.), *Kulturen der Achsenzeit. Ihre institutionelle und kulturelle Dynamik*, Vol. 3 (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1992), 245–280; Emma Brunner-Traut, *Frühformen des Erkennens am Beispiel Altägyptens* (Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 1992²); criticized by Harco Willems, “War Gott ein ‚Spätling in der Religionsgeschichte? Wissenschaftshistorische und kognitivarchäologische Überlegungen zum Ursprung und zur Brauchbarkeit einiger theoretischer Betrachtungsweisen in der ägyptologischen Religionsforschung,” in Susanne Bickel et al. (eds.), *Ägyptologen und Ägyptologien zwischen Kaiserreich und Gründung der beiden deutschen Staaten*, *Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde Beiheft 1* (München: De Gruyter, 2013), 434–435.

¹⁰⁶ Discussed in detail: Schneider, “Foreign Egypt,” 2003, 155–157.

¹⁰⁷ Criticized by: Bader 2017, 16.

¹⁰⁸ Wolfgang Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1962); Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens und Vorderasiens zur Ägäis bis ins 7. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 1979); William Smith, *Interconnections in the Ancient Near East: A Study of the Relationships between the Arts of Egypt, the Aegean, and Western Asia* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1965); Walter Emery, *Egypt in Nubia* (London: Hutchinson, 1965); William Ward, *Egypt and the Eastern Mediterranean World* (Beirut: American

Univ. of Beirut, 1971); Peter Haider, *Griechenland – Nordafrika. Ihre Beziehungen zwischen 1500 und 600 v. Chr.* (Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges., 1988); Anthony Leahy, *Libya and Egypt, c. 1300–750 BC* (London: Univ. of London, 1990); Bettina Bader, “Egypt and the Mediterranean in the Bronze Age: The Archaeological Evidence,” in *Oxford Handbooks Online*, August, 2015, doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935413.013.35 (accessed 15 May 2018).

¹⁰⁹ Donald Redford, *Egypt, Canaan, and Israel in Ancient Times* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1992); Manfred Bietak and Irmgard Hein, *Pharaonen und Fremde. Dynastien im Dunkeln*, Ausstellungskatalog des Historischen Museums der Stadt Wien (Wien: Eigenverlag der Museen der Stadt Wien, 1994); Vivian Davies and Louise Schofield (ed.), *Egypt, the Aegean and the Levant: Interconnections in the Second Millennium BC* (London: British Museum Press for the Trustees of the British Museum, 1995); followed by the important discussion about chronological issues which are the foundation for historical conclusions. On this see especially the volumes of “Contributions to the Chronology of the Eastern Mediterranean,” published at the Austrian Academy of Sciences since the year 2000, in the context of the Special Research Program “Synchronisation of Civilisations in the Eastern Mediterranean in the Second Millennium BC” and beyond that.

¹¹⁰ Jan Assmann, “Zum Konzept der Fremdheit im alten Ägypten,” in Meinhard Schuster (ed.), *Die Begegnung mit dem Fremden. Wertungen und Wirkungen in Hochkulturen vom Altertum bis zur Gegenwart*, *Colloquium Rauricum 4* (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1996), 77–99.

¹¹¹ See for example, Aleida Assmann and Jan Assmann, “Kultur und Konflikt: Aspekte einer Theorie des unkommunikativen Handelns,” in Jan Assmann and Dietrich Harth (eds.), *Kultur und Konflikt* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1990), 27; Jan Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (München: Beck, 1992), 89, 151–152; Assmann 1996, 78.

¹¹² This is criticized by: Bader 2017, 13–14; Thomas Schneider criticized Assmann’s notion of a far too rigid ancient Egypt that resisted innovations

- and was not really dynamic. See Schneider, "Foreign Egypt," 2003, 156.
- ¹¹³ E.g. Thomas Schneider, *Ausländer in Ägypten während des Mittleren Reiches und der Hyksoszeit, Teil 1: Die ausländischen Könige, Ägypten und Altes Testament 42* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1998); Schneider, *Ausländer in Ägypten während des Mittleren Reiches und der Hyksoszeit, Teil 2: Die ausländische Bevölkerung, Ägypten und Altes Testament 42* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003); Schneider, "Foreign Egypt," 2003, 155–161; Schneider, "Foreigners in Egypt. Archaeological Evidence and Cultural Context," in Willeke Wendrich (ed.), *Egyptian Archaeology*, Blackwell Studies in Global Archaeology 13 (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 143–163.
- ¹¹⁴ There is no distinct definition of this term but, in general, it refers to adaptation processes that arise as a reaction to long-term contact situations between members of different cultures and bring about certain changes for the participants. Acculturation is often used in contexts of colonialism and oppression by a dominant culture. The model is frequently applied to emphasize the inferiority of one culture under another. See for the development of this concept in detail: James Cusick, "Historiography of Acculturation: An Evaluation of Concepts and their Application in Archaeology," in James Cusick (ed.), *Studies in Culture Contact: Interaction, Culture Change, and Archaeology* (Carbondale, Ill.: Center for Archaeological Investigations. Southern Illinois University, 1998), 126–145.
- ¹¹⁵ Schneider 2010, 144.
- ¹¹⁶ Alejandro Portes and Min Zhou, "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530 (1993): 74–96.
- ¹¹⁷ Schneider 2010, 145.
- ¹¹⁸ Schneider 2010, 145; see also: Assmann 1996, esp. 85–86; Gerald Moers, "'Unter den Sohlen Pharaos': Fremdheit und Alterität im pharaonischen Ägypten," in Frank Lauterbach, Fritz Paul and Ulrike-Christine Sander (eds.), *Abgrenzung – Eingrenzung: Komparatistische Studien zur Dialektik kultureller Identitätsbildung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 81–160.
- ¹¹⁹ See in particular Antonio Loprieno, *Topos und Mimesis. Zum Ausländer in der ägyptischen Literatur*, Ägyptologische Abhandlungen 48 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1988); Assmann 1996, 84; Stuart Smith, *Wretched Kush: Ethnic Identities and Boundaries in Egypt's Nubian Empire* (London: Routledge, 2003); Gerald Moers, "Auch der Feind war nur ein Mensch. Kursorisches zu einer Teilansicht pharaonischer Selbst- und Fremdwahrnehmungsoperationen," in Heinz Felber (ed.), *Feinde und Aufrihrer. Konzepte von Gegnerschaft in ägyptischen Texten besonders des Mittleren Reiches* (Stuttgart-Leipzig: Hirzel, 2006), 221–281; An example of how new and re-evaluated data shows the perspective on mobility in a different light than depictions in pharaonic sources: Juan Carlos Moreno García, "Invaders or just Herders? Libyans in Ancient Egypt in the Third and Second Millennium BCE," *World Archaeology* 46 (2014): 610–623.
- ¹²⁰ Bettina Bader, "Contacts between Egypt and Syria-Palestine as Seen in a Grown Settlement of the Late Middle Kingdom at Tell el-Dab'a/Egypt," in Jana Mynářová (ed.), *Egypt and the Near East – The Crossroads: Proceedings of an International Conference on the Relations of Egypt and the Near East in the Bronze Age, Prague, September 1–3, 2010* (Prague: Charles Univ., 2011), 41–72; Bader, "Cultural Mixing in Egyptian Archaeology: The 'Hyksos' as a Case Study," *Archaeological Review* 28.1 (2013): 257–286; Bader 2015.
- ¹²¹ What is meant is the concept of hybridity, characterized by literature and theory that examines the effects of the mixture on identity and culture; See Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994).
- ¹²² For the development of this concept, see: Charles Stewart, "Creolization: History, Ethnography, Theory," in Charles Stewart (ed.), *Creolization: History, Ethnography, Theory* (Walnut Creek, Calif.: Left Coast Press, 2007), 1–25.
- ¹²³ See for example, Stuart Hall, "New Ethnicities," in James Donald and Ali Rattansi (eds.), *'Race', Culture and Difference* (London: Sage Publ., 1992), 252–259; Néstor García Canclini, *Hybrid Cultures. Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*

- (Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1995); Robert Young, *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race* (London: Routledge, 1995).
- ¹²⁴ Bhabha 1994; Bhabha, *Über kulturelle Hybridität. Tradition und Übersetzung* (Wien-Berlin: Turia + Kant, 2012).
- ¹²⁵ Stuart T. Smith, *Wretched Kush: Ethnic Identities and Boundaries in Egypt's Nubian Empire* (London-New York: Routledge, 2003); explicitly against the use of this kind of postcolonial models: Kathryn Howley, "Power Relations and the Adoption of Foreign Material Culture: A Different Perspective from First-Millennium BCE Nubia," *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 17 (2018): 18–36; in favour of hybrid identity in a Nubian context: Paul van Pelt, "Revising Egypto-Nubian Relations in New Kingdom Lower Nubia: From Egyptianization to Cultural Entanglement," *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 23 (2013): 523–550; see also John C. Darnell and Colleen Manassa, *Tutankhamun's Armies: Battle and Conquest During Ancient Egypt's Late Eighteenth Dynasty* (Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons, 2007).
- ¹²⁶ Besides references in previous footnote, see also Michele R. Buzon, "Biological and Ethnic Identity in New Kingdom Nubia: A Case Study from Tombos," *Current Anthropology* 47/4 (2006): 683–695; Stuart T. Smith, "Hekanefer and the Lower Nubian Princes. Entanglement, Double Identity or Topos and Mimesis?," in Hans Amstutz, Andreas Dorn, Matthias Müller, Miriam Ronsdorf and Sami Uljas (eds.), *Fuzzy Boundaries. Festschrift für Antonio Loprieno*, Bd. II (Hamburg: Widmaier Verl., 2015), 767–779.
- ¹²⁷ Philipp Stockhammer, "From Hybridity to Entanglement, from Essentialism to Practice," *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 28.1 (2013): 11–28.
- ¹²⁸ Bader 2013, 276–280; Bader 2017, 14–15.
- ¹²⁹ On the question of identity: Gerald Moers, "'Egyptian Identity'? Unlikely, and Never National," in Amstutz, Dorn, Müller, Ronsdorf and Uljas (eds.) 2015, esp. 694–699.
- ¹³⁰ See for an overview: Christina Riggs and John Baines, "Ethnicity," in Elizabeth Froid and Willeke Wendrich, eds., *UCLA Encyclopedia of Egyptology* (Los Angeles, 2012), <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/32r9x0jr> (accessed 15 May 2018); Geoff Emberling, "Ethnicity in Complex Societies: Archaeological Perspectives," *Journal of Archaeological Research* 5/4 (1997): 295–344; Ben Haring, "Occupation: Foreigner. Ethnic Difference and Integration in Pharaonic Egypt," in Wilfred H. van Soldt, Renée Kalvelagen and Dina Katz (eds.), *Ethnicity in Ancient Mesopotamia. Papers Read at the 48th Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Leiden, 1-4 July 2002* (Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2005), 162–172; Patrick Sängler, "Migration, Ethnizität, Identität, Vereinigung und Gemeinde. Überlegungen zur sozio-politischen Einordnung der ethnischen politeumata," in Renate Lafer and Karl Strobel (eds.), *Antike Lebenswelten. Althistorische und papyrologische Studien* (Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2015), 223–237; in the context of this paper, the controversy on the racial origin of the ancient Egyptians is omitted, due to word and topic constraints; but see, for example, Anta Diop, *The African Origin of Civilization* (Chicago: Chicago Review Press, 1974); Martin Bernal, *Black Athena: The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization* (New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2006³).
- ¹³¹ Of interest is Barth's collective volume with a discussion on changing paradigms: Fredrik Barth (ed.), *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference* (Bergen: Univ.-Forl., 1969); see also the new definition of ethnicity by Nathan Glazer and Daniel Moynihan (eds.), *Ethnicity: Theory and Experience* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1975); also the outlined characteristics by: Colin Renfrew, "Prehistory and the Identity of Europe, or, Don't let's be beastly to the Hungarians," in Paul Graves-Brown, Sian Jones and Clive Gamble (eds.), *Cultural Identity and Archaeology* (London—New York: Routledge, 1996), 125–137; John Hutchinson and Anthony Smith, *Ethnicity* (Oxford—New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1996), 6–7; Arthur Knapp, *Prehistoric and Protohistoric Cyprus: Identity, Insularity, and Connectivity* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2008).
- ¹³² John Baines, "Contextualizing Egyptian Representations of Society and Ethnicity," in Jerrold Cooper and Glenn Schwartz (eds.), *The*

Study of the Ancient Near East in the Twenty-first Century: The William Foxwell Albright Centennial Conference (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 360–382; Stuart Smith, “Ethnicity and Culture,” in Toby Wilkinson (ed.), *The Egyptian World* (London-New York: Routledge, 2007), 218–241; Schneider, 2010, 143–144; Moers 2004, 146–159; Bader 2017, esp. 19–21; also: Juan Carlos Moreno García and Thomas Schneider (eds.), *Ethnicity in Ancient Egypt*, *Journal of Egyptian History* 11 (Leiden-Boston: Brill, forthcoming).

¹³³ See Burmeister 2016, 42–44.

¹³⁴ The current project “The Hyksos Enigma,” led by Manfred Bietak (Austrian Academy of Sciences), sets a good example for Egypt by incorporating an array of archaeological, historical, theoretical and analytical approaches.

Due to this diversity, a detailed and also reflected image of the examined epoch can be expected.

¹³⁵ Burmeister 2013, 257.

¹³⁶ See for a recent overview of migration research in ethnology: Mijal Gandelsman-Trier, “Migrationsforschung in der Ethnologie: von ethnischen Enklaven zu transnationalen Netzwerken,” in Felix Wiedemann, Kerstin Hofmann and Hans-Joachim Gehrke (eds.), *Vom Wandern der Völker. Migrationserzählungen in den Altertumswissenschaften*, *Berlin Studies of the Ancient World* 41 (Berlin: Edition Topoi, 2017), 325–345.