

KO-RO-NO-WE-SA

Proceedings of the 15th international colloquium on Mycenaean studies, September 2021

edited by J. Bennet, A. Karnava & T. Meißner

Ariadne Supplement Series 5, Rethymno 2024, p. 311-324

© The Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Crete, Greece, and the individual authors

Migration in the Mycenaean world: the evidence for immigrants

Stavroula Nikoloudis

The flow of goods and ideas through exchange networks set up around the Mediterranean reflects contacts between the Mycenaean world and the surrounding regions, including Cyprus, Egypt, the Levant and Anatolia. This indirect knowledge of other communities, conveyed by objects and raw materials from far-away places and stories told by traders and travellers visiting different centres of exchange,¹ was augmented by the actual settlement in Mycenaean societies of people having arrived there from elsewhere. The knowledge that Mycenaean communities included such 'others' is significant because it demonstrates that Mycenaean societies were indeed culturally diverse.²

While it is often difficult to detect such 'outsiders' in relation to the dominant group in power, in the archaeological record alone, we are able to retrieve such details, however laconic, from the Linear B administrative documents in the form of 'toponymics' (i.e. adjectival designations of people indicating their geographical origins: e.g. 'Knidian women' in the texts from Pylos, discussed below).³ The toponymics used to record groups and individuals point to their diverse geographical ori-

¹ BURNS 2010; CLINE & STANNISH 2011.

² NIKOLOUDIS 2008a.

³ While 'others' (outsiders) in relation to the ruling dominant group ('insiders') could refer as much to differences in social class as to geographical origin, it is the latter type of identity group that is the subject of this paper. Of course there is potential for overlap because immigrants often constitute marginalised groups with restricted access to status and power. See ANTHIAS 1999, 162.

gins, both near and far from the Mycenaean polities in whose texts they appear. While the 'ethnic' identity of such people is unknown to us (because ethnicity as a social construct is self-ascribed, subjective and fluid, and the Linear B accounting records do not contain the kind of literary discourse that might allow an in-depth exploration of the topic),⁴ their toponymics give us a degree of understanding of their 'cultural' identity. As Jonathan Hall notes,⁵ 'ethnicity' is connected with discourse, or 'saying' (beliefs), whereas 'culture' is connected with praxis, or 'doing' (lifestyles). Put simply, culture is a way of doing things, and different groups do things differently. In this sense, and based on ethnographic research, it is reasonable to expect that people originating from different places might practise culture differently: they might speak one or more different languages (or different dialects), enjoy a different cuisine and use different cooking techniques and utensils, wear different clothing (due to environmental, religious or other factors), produce different music, and so on. These differences between groups of people, whether large or small in scale, when considered in context, lead to the identification of distinct cultural groups. Of course, no culture exists in a vacuum, and there are often interesting borrowings, mixing, and other outcomes resulting from cultural encounters and interactions.⁶ We may not always be able to pinpoint or explore such 'entanglements' in detail,⁷ due to the nature of our data sets, but being aware of their potential and, further, their likelihood is important, especially since the presence of external groups and individuals, or 'others', in Mycenaean societies is confirmed by the toponymics. This awareness can guide and inform our textual and archaeological research. At the very least, it reminds us to 'people' the past and to consider the 'agency' of these social actors of the past.⁸

Recently, human migrations have become prevalent in international news, challenging national borders and disrupting notions of identity in a globalised world. In view of the potential of these migrations to shed new light on the phenomenon, it seems pertinent to reconsider the relevant Mycenaean evidence. The migration of people from one place to another can take a variety of forms. It is often divided by migration

⁴ HALL 2002, 9-24.

⁵ HALL 2002, 19.

⁶ HALL 2002; STOCKHAMMER 2012; CAMERON 2013; BOCCAGNI 2017.

⁷ STOCKHAMMER 2012.

⁸ Cf. DRIESSEN 2018, 22.

scholars into voluntary (economic) and forced (political) migration, although overlap is possible.⁹ Whether the departure from their homeland and arrival in a new land is due to financial hardship and/or chronic warfare and raiding, migrants are usually thought of as independently deciding to leave, carefully weighing their options as they plan when and where to move, often relocating to places where they have existing relationships. In reality, as Catherine Cameron highlights, many migrations, especially those resulting from war and captive-taking, are characterised by rushed decisions and limited or non-existent choices.¹⁰ Migrations of refugees, for instance, who are forced out of their homes to seek safety elsewhere, do not fit neatly into the model and should be kept in mind.¹¹ The aim then is to review the evidence for immigrants in the broadest sense – i.e. the physical presence of groups and individuals originating from elsewhere living in Mycenaean communities. Strictly speaking, the term ‘immigrants’ designates *permanent* residents (Oxford Dictionary 1996), but given our limited understanding of the processes underway in Mycenaean times, the evidence for (likely) short-term residents is also included. The focus is on the textual evidence but a few promising archaeological analyses are incorporated into the discussion as they demonstrate the value of an integrated approach.

The toponymics appearing in the Linear B texts from the Mycenaean palaces on the mainland and on Crete reflect culturally diverse populations, with local (within the polity) and supra-local (beyond the polity, including overseas) identifications of groups and individuals.¹² Contacts with Egypt are suggested by the evidence at Knossos, Crete, including a man described as *a₃-ku-pi-ti-jo Aigyptios* ‘Egyptian’ on tablet **KN Db 1105**. Mainland texts tend to feature more toponymics referring to western Anatolia and the eastern Aegean. For example, the **A-** series of texts from Pylos record about 750 female workers, most of whom seem to be dependent on the palace for their rations, as well as their children, reaching a total of about 1500 individuals.¹³ These women work as corn-grinders, bath-pourers/attendants, and predominantly as tex-

⁹ CAMERON 2013, 219; DRIESSEN 2018, 20.

¹⁰ CAMERON 2013, 218-220.

¹¹ For useful insights drawn from contemporary migrations, see DRIESSEN 2018, 19-22; CAMERON 2013.

¹² For details, see NIKOLOUDIS 2008a, 46-49.

¹³ CHADWICK 1988.

tile-workers. Alongside local women, there are women workers from further away places, including Knidos, Halikarnassos, Miletus and the islands of Chios and Lemnos, as well as women from *a-si-wi-ja* 'Aswia' i.e. Hittite Assuwa > Aswia > later Greek Asia, likely meaning the area later known as Lydia.¹⁴ It is unclear if these women were captives or refugees, slaves or free. One group (PY Aa 807) is specifically called *ra-wi-ja-ja* 'war-captives', derived from **lāwiā* 'war-plunder' (attested as Attic λεία, Ionic λήϊη). John Chadwick believed that most of the women would have been bought in the slave markets of the eastern Aegean coastal sites for exploitation as a labour force.¹⁵ They may have been kept together, in their respective groups, on arrival at the Pylian polity for communication purposes (as speakers of the same language or dialect) to ensure maximum productivity. It is also possible that some of the women were part-time corvée workers.¹⁶ Toponymics related to Cyprus are found equally on Crete and the mainland. At Pylos, a man known as *ku-pi-ri-jo* *Kyprios* 'Cypriot' (PY Un 443) is viewed by John Killen as a 'collector', who may have been a high-status, semi-independent merchant, with ties to Cyprus, organising external trade for the palace, either personally conducting it or arranging it through others.¹⁷ Where individuals are concerned, it is sometimes difficult to determine whether these terms served as true toponymics indicating one's original homeland or if they had come to be used, over time, as onomastics.¹⁸ For instance, did the name of the female 'key-bearer', a religious official and landholder at Pylos, *ka-pa-ti-ja* (PY Ep 704.7), indicate her own origin from the island of Karpathos near Rhodes? Or did it perhaps convey an older family memory of that homeland, or some other association with that place?

Onomastics themselves may be used, with caution, as a source of information about cultural diversity. The higher number of non-Greek personal names appearing at Knossos may have belonged to the population groups that the Mycenaeans encountered when they arrived there, including the Anatolian-like names *pi-ja-mu-nu* (KN Ap 5748), *ku-ka-da-ro*

¹⁴ CLINE 1997, 190-192.

¹⁵ CHADWICK 1988, 90-93.

¹⁶ UCHITEL 1984.

¹⁷ KILLEN 1995, 218-221.

¹⁸ PALAIMA 1991, 280.

(KN Uf 836), *wa-du-na-ro* (KN C 912).¹⁹ Furthermore, the names of divinities appearing in the Mycenaean records may reflect another dimension of the society's multicultural character: the non-Greek name of the divinity *pi-pi-tu-na* (KN Fp 13) on Crete and the appearance of *po-ti-ni-ja a-si-wi-ja* (PY Fr 1206), the 'Aswian *Potnia* = Mistress/Lady of Aswia' on the mainland reveal a certain openness to external influences.

The rower texts from Pylos (PY An 1, An 610, An 724) record a total of about 500-600 male rowers who seem to have provided their service to the palace, by manning its fleet, in return for the use of land.²⁰ Tablet PY An 724 lines 3-4 stipulates that a settler owes service as a rower. PY An 610 specifically refers to *ki-ti-ta ktitai* 'settlers, inhabitants' (cf. Classical Greek κτίτης, verb κτιζω 'I occupy'), *me-ta-ki-ti-ta metaktitai* 'after-settlers' and *po-si-ke-te-re pos-ikteres* 'immigrants' (cf. Doric ποτί for πρὸς 'to' and verb ἴκω 'I come') in lines 2, 5 and 6 respectively. Some of these rowers seem to be from nearby areas (e.g. seven men are listed as *za-ku-si-jo* 'Zakynthians', from the island of Zakynthos to the northwest, An 610.10), but it is possible that others originated from further afield. The terminology used here suggests the settling of land in stages. Chadwick connects these *ki-ti-ta* 'settlers' with the *ki-ti-me-na* lands of the E-series landholding records.²¹ One wonders whether the absence of the specific terms *ki-ti-ta*, *me-ta-ki-ti-ta* and *po-si-ke-te-re* from those landholding texts might be due to these men's postulated subordinate and marginalised status as relative 'outsiders' to the area and to the socio-political hierarchy: perhaps these rowers worked on some of the lands mentioned in the E-series which were actually 'held' by more prominent members of the community.

The Hittite Tawagalawa letter constitutes a unique source of evidence for the interaction of Mycenaeans and western Anatolians.²² Now generally dated to the reign of Hittite King Hattusili III (1264-1239 BC), the letter complains to the king of Ahhiyawa about a local troublemaker named Piyamaradu, who is accused of regularly attacking Hittite territory and encouraging resistance (KUB XIV iii 7-17). On this occa-

¹⁹ BILLIGMEIER 1970, 179.

²⁰ PALAIMA 1991, 285-286; DEL FREO 2001-2002, with references.

²¹ CHADWICK 1987, 82.

²² BRYCE 1989, 3-5; 2003, 51-59, 76-85. The toponym 'Ahhiyawa' is taken to refer to the Mycenaean world or some component of it. It is unclear if a specific centre was meant here. The names of the two kings are not preserved. See also BECKMAN *et al.* 2013, 5-6, 100-122.

sion, Piyamaradu is blamed for the displacement of about 7,000 people from the Lukka Lands in southwest Anatolia (later Lycia) to Ahhiyawa. Some of these individuals had gone willingly with him to the Mycenaean world (perhaps as refugees seeking protection from another leader – this occurred frequently in Anatolia, where alliances were constantly changing between individuals and between states), while others seem to have been taken by force during this latest raid. The letter expresses the Hittite king's desire to have his subjects returned.

According to Trevor Bryce, there were two main incentives for the Mycenaean interest in western Anatolia: (1) access to raw materials, such as timber, gold and copper, and (2) recruitment of human labour from the Luwian regions of southwest Anatolia for the palaces' large-scale textile industries and construction projects.²³ Indeed, Strabo's reference (*Geog.* 8.6.11) to the fortification walls of Tiryns having been constructed by Cyclopes from Lycia might point to a tradition acknowledging the contribution of foreign workers from that part of the world to such monumental building projects. The recruitment of human labour through the forced resettlement of conquered people was very common in Anatolia where, since the 15th century BC, the Hittites themselves often raided Luwian territory in the west and transported people and livestock back to the Hittite homeland.²⁴ Some of the female workers recorded in the A-series of texts at Pylos might reflect a similar practice underway in the Mycenaean world. It is also tempting to consider whether some of the rowers of the **PY An** texts were members of displaced population groups such as those mentioned in the Hittite Tawagalawa letter. In two rather tantalising cases, the sons of women textile workers are linked with the rowers from *a-po-ne-we* and *da-mi-ni-ja* (**PY An 610**): on **PY Ad 684**, the boys are called the rowers' *ko-wo* ('sons' or, in Maurizio Del Frego's view, 'apprentices'²⁵) and on **Ad 697** the boys are recorded as 'serving as rowers'. Whether or not these links were based on family bonds, they suggest the teaching of specialised skills to a younger generation. It is not difficult to imagine the arrival of human labourers, both skilled and unskilled, perhaps even a steady supply of them, being welcomed by the Mycenaean palace authorities whose power depended on the smooth functioning of a system sustained by,

²³ BRYCE 2003, 85–86.

²⁴ BRYCE 2003, 84.

²⁵ DEL FREO 2002–2003.

and reliant on, a large and varied human workforce.²⁶

Another potential example of the kind of transplantation of population groups noted in the Tawagalawa letter and occurring in the contemporary Anatolian world has been suggested in the case of a possible enclave of foreign inhabitants at *sa-ra-pe-da*, appearing on text **PY Un 718**.²⁷ This tablet records the anticipated contributions of food and drink for a banquet in honour of the god Poseidon by four parties: (1) *e-ke-ra₂-wo*, taken to be the name of the Pylian *wanax*, (2) the *da-mo*, the established group of landholders and administrators, (3) the *ra-wa-ke-ta*, the official traditionally viewed as the military commander of the state, and (4) the *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma*, appearing as such only in this text, as an animate entity expected 'to give' a certain contribution and interpreted as a group of agricultural labourers, quite possibly immigrants (with the term *ka-ma* known from other contexts to designate a type of cultivable landholding). The main arguments for proposing the settlement of an immigrant group at *sa-ra-pe-da* (represented in part or in full by the *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo ka-ma*) are as follows: (1) the special (= unusual) forms used by Hand 24, in this tablet (*po-se-da-o-ni*, instead of regular *po-se-da-o-ne*) and in the related texts **Er 312** and **Er 880** (*pe-ma*, instead of regular *pe-mo*), could potentially reflect a different dialect – of the tablet-writer or of the people at *sa-ra-pe-da* from whom the information was obtained;²⁸ (2) the fact that the *wo-ro-ki-jo-ne-jo* group will contribute the least amount of all four contributors probably reflects its inferior status and limited access to resources, possibly due to the foreign origin of its members; (3) it is tempting to view the strange place-name *sa-ra-pe-da* as originally coined for an uninhabited area from two Luwian elements, *sara-* 'on, above; over, up' and *pida-* (n.) 'place, precinct', by foreign settlers or by Greek-speaking officials overseeing these settlers' migration to the Greek mainland from Anatolia.²⁹ The content and layout of tablet **PY Un 718** seem to present the king as the representative of the privileged, landholding group known as the

²⁶ For work or defence or both, as CAMERON 2013, 221, notes: "host groups may welcome migrants to increase their own group size" in relation to that of their neighbouring groups.

²⁷ NIKOLOUDIS 2008b, with further details supporting this interpretation.

²⁸ PALAIMA 1998-1999.

²⁹ NIKOLOUDIS 2008a, 52 with references. Research shows that incoming immigrant groups are sometimes settled on the outskirts of existing settlements (CAMERON 2013, 226); a location in the Further Province, which was gradually incorporated into the existing territory controlled by the palace at Pylos (DAVIS & BENNET 1999, 115), might be tentatively posited.

da-mo and the *ra-wa-ke-ta* as the representative of the second group, interpreted as less privileged, landless, immigrant labourers. If so, and given that warfare is one of the most common ways that emerging states successfully integrate their subject populations, including newcomers, by engaging them in a common struggle which reinforces overall group unity and identity,³⁰ it would make sense that the military leader would be associated with the group mentioned last here.

The *ra-wa-ke-ta*'s apparent association with marginalised groups has also contributed to the proposed interpretation of the **PY Ea** series as a record of a tanning operation on the outskirts of the Pylian centre. Leather-working was an integral part of Mycenaean industrial production and, if correctly interpreted, the **Ea** texts present us with a work assignment, possibly a seasonal one, carried out, in part, by immigrant workers.³¹

It was noted at the outset that archaeological evidence may also provide relevant information regarding immigrants in the Mycenaean world. Instead of a misguided 'pots equal people' approach which ignores the complexity of the possible interactions between humans and material culture,³² a more nuanced methodology involving a thorough contextual analysis of the objects concerned may be rewarding. For example, in his careful analysis of the manufacturing techniques of all the pottery in Room 60 of the palace at Pylos, Bartłomiej Lis has identified a group of partly handmade pots which were not produced following the standard (palatial) Mycenaean techniques of pottery making, leading him to propose that the individual responsible for this particular output of vessels was most likely a non-local potter, originating from somewhere else in Messenia or even further away but, importantly, trained in a non-Mycenaean potting tradition. Lis' methodical approach opens the way for the kind of fine-tuned analysis that may be possible in this arena, by detecting a degree of cultural differentiation in the archaeological record.³³ With similar ingenuity, Phillip Stockhammer has studied the 'entanglement' occurring between humans and pottery in the context of food consumption, when objects from one cultural sphere are introduced to users from a different cultural sphere. Selecting three

³⁰ DAVIS & BENNET 1999, 107.

³¹ NIKOLOUDIS 2012.

³² DRIESSEN 2018, 19.

³³ Lis 2016, esp. 506-511.

Aegean-type vessel forms imported to the southern Levant, namely the conical cup, the amphoroid krater, and the kylix, he examines how these objects were adopted, even refashioned in some cases, by their non-Mycenaean users to serve their particular needs. While his emphasis is on “the transformative power of intercultural encounters,”³⁴ his analysis demonstrates that attention to such details could uncover precious information about the cultural identity of social actors involved in such transformations. For example, instead of equating the presence of Mycenaean kylikes in the Levant with the presence of Mycenaeans there, or even the adoption of a popular Mycenaean drinking vessel abroad, his thorough contextual analysis demonstrates the appropriation of the Aegean kylix as an incense-burner to serve local needs in the Levant. Careful contextual analyses of ceramic and other artifacts may yield important cultural information about their users.

The imposing Lion Gate Relief at Mycenae, reminiscent of the entrance guarded by lions at the contemporary Hittite capital of Hattusa-Bogazkoy in Anatolia, has been re-studied by Nicholas Blackwell.³⁵ Alongside Mycenaean technology (e.g. the use of the pendulum saw), he has identified tool marks and stone-working techniques of the Anatolian tradition, and has suggested that the relief’s builders may have included skilled craftsmen moving between rulers in the Mediterranean region, possibly as part of a royal gift-exchange network. Engaging specialised, skilled labour in this manner is attested as a popular practice in the textual records of other contemporary cultures in the Near East and might have resulted in the temporary residence of such foreigners in the Mycenaean centres for varied lengths of time depending on the work assignment. The Pylian textual references to ‘Cretan workmanship’ (*ke-re-si-jo we-ke*, **PY Ta 641.1**) and Cretan (crafts?)men (*ke-re-te*, **PY An 128.3**) also come to mind.

A reinvestigation of the human remains of Grave Circle A at Mycenae has determined that there are likely foreign, i.e. non-local, individuals buried there, on the basis of strontium analyses of their teeth. Three individuals, including one definite and one probable female, may be foreign.³⁶ The definite female has been interpreted as a woman of very high rank buried in the centre of Grave III and the probable one from Grave

³⁴ STOCKHAMMER 2016, 91.

³⁵ BLACKWELL 2014, 482-484.

³⁶ DICKINSON *et al.* 2012, 181-182.

V. The researchers note the possibility that these non-local women were spouses arriving at Mycenae through arranged marriages underpinning diplomatic, political alliances with external powers to strengthen the status and power of the rulers at Mycenae. Skeletal analyses may have more to tell us in the future.

Returning to the textual data before closing, there is another piece of comparative evidence worth considering in relation to the presence of immigrants in the Mycenaean world. Several ethnographic examples highlight the role of key authority figures in facilitating the peaceful co-existence of diverse cultural groups in various societies and the integration of ‘outsiders’ into their wider communities. In addition to the Mycenaean *ra-wa-ke-ta*, we know of Bronze Age New Kingdom Egyptian administrators³⁷ and Hittite Empire officers and dignitaries³⁸ who were responsible for numerous population groups throughout their respective jurisdictions. The Archaic and Classical Athenian *polemarch*, who was the commander-in-chief of the army and happened to judge all cases involving non-citizens (*metics*),³⁹ serves as a particularly striking parallel to the *ra-wa-ke-ta*, if the latter has been interpreted correctly, in terms of overlapping responsibilities for the military and for outsiders. The Gortynian *ksenios kosmos* in Crete also seems to have been an official concerned with matters relating to foreigners and other non-citizens, called upon in a 6th century BC legal inscription to offer protection for those who settled in Gortyn by not allowing them to be enslaved or plundered.⁴⁰ It seems that the presence of newcomers, across time and space, warranted officials (newly created or existing posts) to take on relevant responsibilities for the maintenance of social order.

The evidence for immigrants invites contemplation concerning the changes gradually affecting and transforming one’s sense of identity and belonging in a new land. At what point, for instance, would ‘outsiders’ or ‘newcomers’ start to feel as though they belonged to Mycenaean society? When, if ever, would the foreign children accompanying their mothers at Pylos (A- series) begin to feel allegiance to this new land? How receptive was the host society? Would immigrants have opportunities for advancement? Could they ascend the social hierarchy by means

³⁷ KUHRT 1995, 218-220.

³⁸ KUHRT 1995, 266-267, 272-274.

³⁹ BURY & MEIGGS 1975, 118.

⁴⁰ GAGARIN & PERLMAN 2016, 70-73.

of a particular skill (e.g. nautical capabilities, unique pottery insights, textile expertise, useful design know-how)? Or is Mycenaean society/culture best thought of as a closed and guarded club of elites to which lower social classes and foreigners were unequivocally barred entry?⁴¹ It is quite likely that the highest echelons of society were off limits. It is also true that the status of immigrant groups in a host society that is ruled by a dominant group is usually low. As expected, immigrants are found among the slaves, bought or captured, and the dependent or semi-dependent day-labourers and seasonal workers that enabled the overall system to function. However, there are indications of several potential non-locals holding somewhat elevated positions in the Mycenaean world – e.g. *ku-pi-ri-jo* and *ka-pa-ti-ja* at Pylos, and the buried female spouse (?) in Grave Circle A at Mycenae. This allows for the possibility that the experiences of some ‘outsiders’ who were living in Mycenaean communities may have been of a different character, with a higher degree of incorporation and participation in the host culture. In any case, it would be in the interests of the ruling administration to seek to foster a collective identity of some kind and a sense of ‘belonging’ for the marginalised, including immigrants, since this would serve to reinforce social cohesion and stabilise and strengthen the overall polity. This would assist a variety of mobilisation efforts, from defence against an external enemy to participation in internal construction projects.⁴² The Linear B records inform us of state-sanctioned Mycenaean banquets that aimed to cater for large numbers of people (possibly as many as several thousand members of the society at a time).⁴³ It is likely that the long-term strategic plans of the palaces included both strategies of exclusion (keeping the ruling elite conveniently distant from the rest of the populace) and inclusion (for social order). We may not be able to answer the questions about identity and belonging to our full satisfaction, but it is worth keeping them in mind as such considerations would have been at the core of the human relationships and associated power dynamics propping up the Mycenaean palatial systems.

Overall, the evidence attests to the presence and interaction in the

⁴¹ Consider the relevant discussions in DAVIS & BENNET 1999, 112-115; CAMERON 2013, 221-226; DRIESSEN 2018; MARAN & WRIGHT 2020, 115-117.

⁴² MARAN & WRIGHT 2020, 115.

⁴³ MARAN & WRIGHT 2020, 115 with references; see also WEILHARTNER 2017, 232 for ‘work feasts’ as “‘remuneration’ in return for part-time corvée work for special commissions”.

Mycenaean world of culturally diverse population groups and individuals. Toponymics relate to nearby and overseas places, and the individuals and groups designated by non-local place-names include seemingly dependent female workers as well as higher-status individuals. The non-Greek forms of some personal names suggest mixed populations, while the worship of foreign divinities could suggest an accommodation and welcoming of ‘others’. The rowers described as ‘settlers’ and ‘immigrants’ point to the arrival of newcomers. The Hittite Tawagalawa letter alludes to the recruitment of human labour – whether by force, or invitation, or both – from southwest Anatolia in order to maintain the Mycenaean palatial systems, and the hypothesis of a migrant ‘enclave’ at *sa-ra-pe-da* awaits identification on the ground. The archaeological evidence supports the presence of non-locals in the communities as well. The length of their stays may have varied (e.g. itinerant skilled craftsmen and foreign spouses). In time, by sharpening our textual and archaeological analyses, we might be able to gain a better understanding of the possible degrees of incorporation of these voluntary, forced, individual and group arrivals into Mycenaean societies. For now, whether short-term or more permanent residents, whether slaves, captives, refugees, or independent settlers, the evidence confirms for us that through their own migration experiences or their families’ memories and migration stories, these immigrants helped to create the multicultural Mycenaean communities in which they lived.

Bibliography

- ANTHIAS, F. 1999 Theorising identity, difference and social divisions. In M. O'BRIEN, S. PENNA & C. HAY (eds), *Theorising modernity, reflexivity, environment and identity in Giddens' social theory*, 156-178.
- BECKMAN, G. M., BRYCE, T. & CLINE, E. H. 2011 *The Ahhiyawa texts*, Society of Biblical Literature 28.
- BILLIGMEIER, J. C. 1970 An inquiry into the non-Greek names on the Linear B tablets from Knossos and their relationship to languages of Asia Minor, *Minos* 10, 77-83.
- BLACKWELL, N. G. 2014 Making the Lion Gate relief at Mycenae: tool marks and foreign influence, *AJA* 118, 451-488.

- BOCCAGNI, P. 2017 *Migration and the search for home. Mapping domestic space in migrants' everyday lives.*
- BRYCE, T. 1989 The nature of Mycenaean involvement in Western Anatolia, *Historia* 38, 1-21.
- BRYCE, T. 2003 History. In H. C. MELCHERT (ed.), *The Luwians*, Handbuch der Orientalistik 68, 27-127.
- BURNS, B. E. 2010 *Mycenaean Greece, Mediterranean commerce, and the formation of identity.*
- BURY, J. B. & MEIGGS, R. 1975 *A history of Greece to the death of Alexander the Great*, 4th ed.
- CAMERON, C. M. 2013 How people moved among ancient societies: broadening the view, *American Anthropologist* 115, 218-231.
- CHADWICK, J. 1987 The muster of the Pylian fleet. In *Tractata Mycenaea* 1985, 75-84.
- CHADWICK, J. 1988 The women of Pylos. In J.-P. OLIVIER & T. G. PALAIMA (eds), *Texts, tablets and scribes. Studies in Mycenaean epigraphy and economy offered to Emmett L. Bennett, Jr.*, *Minos-Suppl.* 10, 43-95.
- CLINE, E. H. 1997 Achilles in Anatolia: myth, history and the Assuwa rebellion. In G. D. YOUNG, M. W. CHAVALAS & R. E. AVERBECK, assisted by K. L. DANTI (eds), *Crossing boundaries and linking horizons. Studies in honor of Michael C. Astour on his 80th birthday*, 189-210.
- CLINE, E. H. & STANNISH, S. 2011 Sailing the great green sea? Amenhotep III's "Aegean List" from Kom El-Hetan, once more, *Journal of Ancient Egyptian Interconnections* 3, 6-16.
- DAVIS, J. L. & BENNET, J. 1999 Making Mycenaean: warfare, territorial expansion and representations of the other in the Pylian kingdom. In R. LAFFINEUR (ed.), *Polemos. Le contexte guerrier en Egée à l'âge du Bronze*, *Aegaeum* 19, 105-120.
- DEL FREO, M. 2001-2002 La tablette An 724 de Pylos, *Minos* 37-38, 143-171.
- DICKINSON, O. T. P. K., PAPAZOGLU-MANIODAKI, L., NAFPLIOTI, A. & PRAG, A. J. N. W. 2012 Mycenae revisited part 4: assessing the new data, *ABSA* 107, 161-188.
- DRIESEN, J. 2018 Introduction. In J. DRIESEN (ed.), *An archaeology of forced migration. Crisis-induced mobility and the collapse of the 13th c. BCE Eastern Mediterranean*, *Aegis* 15, 19-23.
- GAGARIN, M. & PERLMAN, P. 2016 *The laws of ancient Crete: c. 650-400 BCE.*

- HALL, J. M. 2002 *Hellenicity: between ethnicity and culture*.
- KILLEN, J. T. 1995 Some further thoughts on 'collectors'. In R. LAFFINEUR & W.-D. NIEMEIER (eds), *Politeia. Society and state in the Aegean Bronze Age*, *Aegaeum* 12, 213-226.
- KUHRT, A. 1995 *The ancient Near East: c. 3000-330 BC* 1.
- LIS, B. 2016 A foreign potter in the Pylian kingdom? A reanalysis of the ceramic assemblage of Room 60 in the palace of Nestor at Pylos, *Hesperia* 85, 491-536.
- MARAN, J. & WRIGHT, J. C. 2020 The rise of the Mycenaean culture, palatial administration and its collapse. In I. LEMOS & A. KOTSONAS (eds), *A Companion to the archaeology of Early Greece and the Mediterranean*, 99-132.
- NIKOLOUDIS, S. 2008a Multiculturalism in the Mycenaean world. In B. J. COLLINS, M. R. BACHVAROVA & I. C. RUTHERFORD (eds), *Anatolian interfaces: Hittites, Greeks and their neighbours. Proceedings of an international conference on cross-cultural interaction, September 17-19, 2004, Emory University, Atlanta, GA*, 45-56.
- NIKOLOUDIS, S. 2008b The role of the *ra-wa-ke-ta*. Insights from PY Un 718. In *Colloquium Romanum 2006*, 587-594.
- NIKOLOUDIS, S. 2012 Thoughts on a possible link between the PY Ea series and a Mycenaean tanning operation. In *Études Mycéniennes* 2010, 285-302.
- PALAIMA, T. G. 1991 Maritime matters in the Linear B tablets. In R. LAFFINEUR & L. BASCH (eds), *Thalassa. L'Égée préhistorique et la mer*, *Aegaeum* 7, 273-310.
- PALAIMA, T. G. 1998-1999 Special vs. normal Mycenaean: Hand 24 and writing in the service of the king? In J. BENNET & J. DRIESSEN (eds), *A-NA-QO-TA. Studies presented to J. T. Killen*, *Minos* 33-34, 205-221.
- STOCKHAMMER, P. W. 2012 Chapter 4: conceptualizing cultural hybridization in archaeology. In P. W. STOCKHAMMER (ed.), *Conceptualizing cultural hybridization. A transdisciplinary approach*, 43-58.
- STOCKHAMMER, P. W. 2016 Past food for thought: the potential of archaeology, *Gastronomica: the Journal of Critical Food Studies* 16, 91-101.
- UCHITEL, A. 1984 Women at work: Pylos and Knossos, Lagash and Ur, *Historia* 33, 257-282.
- WEILHARTNER, J. 2017 Working for a feast: textual evidence for state-organized work feasts in Mycenaean Greece, *AJA* 121, 219-236.