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ABSTRACTS
Curved saw marks on Late Bronze Age architecture and sculpture from Mainland Greece demonstrate that Mycenaean masons employed a stone-cutting tool known as a pendulum saw. Recent experimental work has enhanced our understanding of the tool’s operation and design since physical examples are missing from the archaeological record.1 Further questions about the pendulum saw, however, remain including why craftspeople limited its use to select sites and occasionally modified its design. Evidence for the device comes from late 14th and 13th century BC contexts at Mycenae and Tiryns in the Argolid and Gla and Orchomenos in Boeotia. The temporal and spatial exclusivity of the pendulum saw highlight intra- and interregional craft links indicative of stoneworker mobility or the transfer of specialized cutting methods via other means.

The prospect of masons traveling from one Mycenaean site to another can account for technological transfer, but it may not be the sole reason for trans-regional craft similarities. In this paper, I attempt to differentiate between artisan itineracy from shared technology through analyses of saw cuttings on palatial and funerary stonework from the four Mycenaean sites mentioned above. What emerges is that craftspeople utilized the pendulum saw from site to site in both comparable and varied ways. Interpreting the implications of these observations is more complicated. Groups of stoneworkers may have shared and modified the pendulum saw technology on their own. Such a scenario, however, should have resulted in traces of the stone-cutting device beyond the four sites discussed here. A more likely conclusion is that elite, palatial sponsors dictated the movement of masons and specific technological skills from one place to another—between not only Mycenae and Tiryns but also the Argolid and Boeotia. The varied uses of the pendulum saw, however, imply some artisan autonomy since distinct craft decisions correspond to different construction projects.

---

Greek painters and the lives of their artworks. Aspects of cultural kinesis and diffusion in the Classical world

Travelling and circulation of painters and artworks in inter-regional contexts, and occasionally reaching even remote destinations, has proved to be a dynamic and seminal factor in the transmission and dissemination of narrative languages, technical knowledge and aesthetic styles, likely to enhance - under specific circumstances - the formation of transcultural phenomena, already since the Late Bronze Age. Painters’ mobility as a critical aspect of Aegean painting has been extensively discussed within Crete and the Greek mainland, where common iconographic patterns and technologies have been recognized in the surviving body of Aegean wall painting, while Aegeanizing iconography at Near Eastern sites suggests the existence of a wider “artistic koine” of the East Mediterranean. Painters and craftsmen in such contexts may have travelled in small groups or as freelancers responding to inter-palatial exchange or inter-regional demand; their mobility may have been compelled by economic or natural hazards, such as the interruption of Theran workshops’ activity due to the volcanic eruption, or motivated by social interaction and trading networks between the peoples of the Aegean, Egypt and Syro-Palestine. Although a direct mobility of Minoan craftsmen travelling overseas remains highly controversial, the evidence of Aegean style iconographies within local Levantine or Egyptian architecture certainly presupposes a “transfer” of knowledge and a will to embrace culturally a “foreign” aesthetic style, in like manner the Romans received “foreign pictures” – the term signifying the paintings of Greek masters – in their public spaces. Greek paintings in their new context were no longer a model of reference as they used to be, but a valued component of an eclectic whole. Private painting collections (pinacothecae), acquired by the Roman aristocracy became a symbol of luxury and social prestige, as Latin texts record.

While material evidence in the Aegean allows for a comprehensive evaluation of the pictorial production and its direct or indirect circulation in time and space, physical remains of Classical painting are hitherto extremely scarce and fragmentary. Our major source of information on Greek painters and their artworks is based on literary and epigraphic testimonia coming from contemporary and mostly later sources of the Augustan and Imperial periods. Panel painting was designated as the most preeminent form of artistic expression in the Classical world and Pliny the Elder goes so far as to claim that “only panel paintings are deserving of glory” (NH 35.37), a claim also sustained by Cicero (Brut. 70) and Quintilian (Inst. 12.10). In his short history of Greek painting in Book 35 of the Natural History, Pliny pays an overwhelming attention to the panels produced by Greek painters, discusses their subject matters, their pictorial techniques and painting materials, stretching from the late 5th century painter Apollodoros of Athens through the end of the
Hellenistic period and beyond. Sporadic information on their social mobility is often quoted with respect to their career development and artistic competitions, the patrons who hired them and the communities in which their works were disseminated. Amongst the variety of reasons that stimulated painters’ mobility and relocation, a prominent one was the prosperity and activity of cities and courts and the prestigious commissions they were offered. Polygnotus from Thasos, for example, moved from his native island to Athens shortly after Thasos stopped minting its coins, but he returned to settle on the island by the time financial recovery returned sometime after the mid of the 5th c., as is indicated by the lists of theoroi from 440 BC. The legendary painter Zeuxis of Herakleia was invited at the court of king Archelaus of Macedon sometime during the last quarter of the fifth c. BC., where he produced paintings for the palace, which then became a popular attraction, according to Aelian (Hist. Misc. 14.17). Apelles arrived at the court of Philip sometime after the middle of the fourth c. BC, to pursue his career as a leading figure in the arts of the 4th c. BC. We know from Pliny the Elder that after the defeat of king Perseus at Pydna in 167 BC, Macedonian painters had to migrate to other cities in order to continue their activity (the well-known painter Herakleides for example had to move to Athens, HN 35.135).

Contrary to wall painting which is static and intrinsically linked to its architectural setting, panel painting is a portable artifact. Ancient sources deliver significant information on their “biographies”, as regards their circulation (extraction from their initial contexts) and their reception from the cities or the individuals who purchased them. Alexander the Great, for example, removed a painting of Aristeides from the city of Thebes to Pella, his native town (NH 35.99). Aratos from Sicyon gained the favor of Ptolemy Philadelphos by sending him drawings and paintings from the Sicyonian school (Plutarch, Aratus 12.5). Augustus paid the city of Cos a hundred talents to carry Apelles’ legendary Anadyome off to Rome (NH 35.91). Although the actual archaeological documentation is frustratingly sparse as far as wooden pinakes are concerned, a fortiori insufficient to resurrect the artistic excellence of a lost masterpiece of Apelles or Aristeides, the late Classical and Hellenistic funerary corpora from ancient Macedonia and Thessaly offer a tangible eikastic material susceptible to contribute to our understanding of Greek painters’ and craftsmen’ mobility. While relocation of craftsmen has been suggested for the production of the large corpora of funerary stelai, the large-scale figurative paintings of Macedonian tombs reveal the activity of itinerant artists trained in centers of mainstream production. From the technological examination of large-scale Macedonian painting their dependence on pre-existing panel originals allow us to distinguish both “copies” of preexisting works and the impact of great masters on local art.
Kyriaki Chryssou – Karatza

Hellenic Folklore Research Centre, Academy of Athens

Saturday 15:00

**Introduced agricultural product species’ mobility and development: A case-study of Santorini tomato**

The introduction of new plant species for nutrition had a considerable impact in local agricultural production and culinary/dietary codes. Particular kinds of plants were used in specific ways each time in local cuisines. The case of the small sized tomato in Santorini (Tomataki Santorinis), is very interesting regarding the way of its mobility in places and in time. As we know, in the 19th century, tomato, as a relatively new kind of plant, coming from the “New World” was imported and cultivated in Greece as an ornamental plant. Almost half of a century passed until its fruit was consumed as a vegetable. In Santorini the cultivation of the small sized tomato has been recorded since the end of the 19th century and has followed a remarkable course as it became the third most important product of the island in terms of production volume.

We will try follow the course of this particular plant species in place, time and use, developing from an “introduced” plant to a commonly acknowledged “traditional” local Greek product of a Protected Designation of Origin (PDO).

During the last 20 years, the development of tourism on the island of Santorini, along with the need to promote unique local traditional tasting experiences of the past, revived the interest for the cultivation and exploitation of Santorini tomato. Today, “PDO Tomataki Santorinis” is considered as a remarkable local product while its processing and commercialization uses modern means.
Bela Dimova, Joanne Cutler and Margarita Gleba
British School at Athens; University of Cambridge

Saturday 9:30

**Mobility and textile workers**

Textile production in the ancient Aegean involved a number of craftspeople with different skills along the chaîne opératoire: from the people who produced and processed fibres, through spinners and weavers, to dyers and fullers and tailors. These craftspeople are not equally visible in the archaeological record, but we can be certain that many moved in a variety of ways and for a variety of reasons, and brought their craft skills along. This paper examines the historical and archaeological evidence for such movement, seeking to identify who moved, how, why, and to what effect. It does so through a series of case-studies, ranging from the Bronze Age and the first millennium BC.

For certain communities of people, mobility was an inherent condition of their lives, though it interacted with textile work in different ways. For example among mobile pastoralists, mobility shaped the technological choices that textile producers made. In Early Iron Age in northern Greece, loomweights are almost absent from many sites, indicating that these communities used a different, perhaps more portable type of loom.

Written sources ranging from Homer to the Classical and the Roman imperial period inform us that slaves were involved in textile production in numbers and sometimes there is explicit reference to these slaves coming from distant places, and being brought explicitly for their skill. At the other end of the status spectrum, high-born women who were also skilled in textile manufacture, moved long distances for marriage.

The archaeological study of textile production tools and textiles offers another entry into investigating craftspeople’s mobility. In the Bronze Age, the spread of discoid loomweights has been linked to the movement of women carrying a ‘Minoan’ weaving tradition across the south Aegean; the distribution of spools in the Late Bronze Age has also been discussed as proxy evidence for migration and several peculiar loomweight shapes may indicate similar movements at a smaller scale in the north Aegean during the Classical and Hellenistic period. The case of Athens and Corinth, however, reminds us that if textile production is linked to a more specialised mode of ceramic production, the transfer of loomweight shapes may reflect the movement of potters, rather than weavers.
Mimika Giannopoulou
Independent researcher

Sunday 10:30

**Itinerant workshops of *pithoi*-makers**

In Greece the workshops making large storage vases without using the potter’s wheel, such as those in the Gulf of Messenia, at Ainos and in Cyprus, and the workshops making storage vases using the tournette, such as those of Thrapsano in Crete, produced about 90% storage vases. In general, the makers of large storage vases in Greece and in Cyprus constituted a separate community of vase-makers and the organization of their workshops was different in many ways from those in which the kick-wheel was used. The former did not call themselves vase-makers (*αγγειοπλάστες*) but *pithoi*-makers (*πιθαράδες*) or jar-makers (*τζαράδες*). Making storage vases was a seasonal occupation, mainly during the summer months, which was also determined by climatic conditions.

Alongside the permanently established workshops, there were also the so-called ‘itinerant’ workshops. Teams of potters who made storage vases, from the area of the Gulf of Messenia, Thrapsano in Crete, Cyprus and Ainos, were migrating seasonally to various regions, where they made and marketed their products.
This paper showcases cases of mobility of painters, who worked in the region of Macedonia in the nineteenth century until the fourth decade of the twentieth century. Particular mention will be made in the case of painter Ioannis, who originated from a village in Thessaly, but settled in Siatista around 1830. His son Christodoulos worked as a painter and photographer in Siatista and the area nearby, reaching out the regions of Central Macedonia and Thessaly. Another group of painters with considerable mobility originates from Selitsa (modern-day Eratyra). The members of this group are connected with family relationships, like Georgios Zografos and his son Emmanouil, who were active from the beginning up to the mid-nineteenth century, or Papazikos and his sons, Dimitrios and Thomas, whose activity extends until the end of the nineteenth century. Works by painters from Selitsa have been found not only in their hometown but also in other regions of Macedonia as well. This paper will close by making a brief reference to a family of painters from Vogatsiko - the Mplianga family - who settled and worked in the area of Florina from the late nineteenth century until the 1940s. The specific issues that are being investigated in this paper include the conditions of mobility, due to the professional practice of painting, the change in the style of painting, due to cultural and technological changes like the invention of photography, as well as the status of the artists within their working community.
Mobility of people and livestock: shifting archaeological models and methods

In Greece, as elsewhere, mobile herding has occupied a dramatically unstable place in the imagination [the last word used deliberately!] of archaeologists. Long ignored, from the 1970s and 1980s nomadic or transhumant pastoralism grew greatly in academic popularity and was identified in a range of temporal and geographical contexts on the basis of more or less tangential archaeological proxies (often related to diffusion of material culture traits) and indeed in some cases on the basis of absence of evidence. Today the subject is undergoing another revolution as we finally have relatively direct (isotopic) methods of detecting seasonal and life-time movements of both people and livestock, although these new data are as yet often interpreted uncritically and with reference to a rather limited set of heuristic models.

This paper will begin by reviewing shifting archaeological perceptions of livestock and herder mobility and of associated exchanges of craft-making ideas and skills. It will then ask whether new methods of isotopic analysis of both horizontal and vertical displacement are matched by adequate ‘ethnographic’ models of likely livestock mobility.
Evangelos Karamanes
Hellenic Folklore Research Centre, Academy of Athens

Sunday 12:20

Animal Husbandry Mobility in Greek Ethnography and Folklore

As is well known, Greek mountains in the Peloponnese and mainland Greece (Pindos Mountains with its branches) have for centuries been a privileged space for nomadic and semi-nomadic livestock of mainland Greece. The absence of borders in the wider geographical context of the Ottoman Empire facilitated the movement of herds of small ruminants (sheep and goats) mainly to the plains of Thessaly, central and eastern Macedonia, Chalkidiki but also to the plains of Aitolia-Akarnania, Arta and Thesprotia. The geographical terrain of the wider region, with its relatively high mountains not far from the plains and coasts, favored the development of a transitional livestock farming, which was an excellent mean of exploiting the mountain pastures in the summer. Plain available pastures and milder temperatures allowed the herds to survive the harsh winters. This type of movement of humans and animals has deep roots over time - this is also known from ethnoarchaeological data - and concerns many Mediterranean countries; whose geographical terrain provides fertile ground for a similar type of animal husbandry and livestock mobility.

The context of pastoral mobility in mainland Greece raises many questions that have concerned researchers over time such as:

- Specialization of specific ethnic (or cultural) population groups in animal husbandry (Vlachs, Sarakatsans, Kopatsarei etc.) and creation of complex social networks that affect spatial mobility (access to privileged winter pastures etc.). Moreover, mobility affects historical evolution of pastoral populations and their integration in modern economy through commerce and immigration.
- Transhumant and nomadic livestock, has experienced times of great prosperity and decline, in accordance with the wider conditions of each historical period.
- Animal husbandry coexisted with the systematic cultivation of land in planes, and even in settlements situated at high altitude.
- In the form we know in modern times animal husbandry and agriculture it was formed within the Ottoman Empire (preserving many elements from previous periods) and was transformed drastically with the completion of the Greek state in its present territory and the simultaneous definition of national borders in the second decade of the 20th century, the agricultural reform in the 1920s and 1930s which removed from the large herds vital plain pastures and the endless plagues of World War II and Civil War.
- Gender affects, within pastoral societies, division of labour, tasks and in some ways spatial mobility.
- New choices concerning animal reproduction annual circle, production of milk, dairy products and meat are related to technological transfers related to spatial mobility.
- Although seemed archaic, this type of mobile farming has adapted to modernity with the accession of Greece to the European Economic Community in the 1980’s (hereafter the European Union) some three decades ago, and today, is facing challenges of globalization.

Greek and foreign ethnographers have worked on the field within pastoral communities all over Greece in much different occasions, using different methodologies and producing renown (and in some cases emblematic publications) in Ethnology, Social Anthropology and Laographia (p.e. Alan Wace and Maurice Thompson on Pindus Vlachs, John Campbell, George Kavvadias and Angeliki Hatzimichali on the Saracatsans, Michael Herzfeld on Cretan pastoralism and its values). Members of Greek academia and especially researchers of the Folklore Archives / Hellenic Folklore Research Centre, Academy of Athens, since the emblematic work of Demetrios Loukopoulos on the pastoral life in Roumeli in the late 1920’s till the present time have an important and relatively unknown presence in the study of various aspects of pastoral culture, including mobility.
**Elias Kolovos and Denise Klein**

University of Crete and Leibniz Institute of European History, Mainz

Friday 18:30

**Mobilities in the Ottoman world**

Although the Ottoman Empire was a “sedentary empire”, as opposed for example to the Mongol Empire, it has been described in historiographical terms also as a “moveable empire” (Kasaba 2010). Mobile groups, nomads, migrants, and refugees, lived and acted in the vast area of the Ottoman Empire, in different geographical and historical circumstances. The Ottoman elite also moved a lot, the Ottoman traveler Evliya Çelebi being a case of a moveable Ottoman *par excellence* (see furthermore Faroqhi, *Travel and Artisans in the Ottoman Empire: Employment and Mobility in the Early Modern Era*, Tauris 2014). Our paper for the *Craftspeople mobility* workshop will provide a general overview of the available sources and the recent scholarship on mobility/ties in the Ottoman world and discuss more closely: a) artisans moving across the Aegean world, and their records in the Ottoman and Greek sources; b) non-elite migrants in Istanbul, the capital and center of Ottoman trade, and their representation in literary texts.
Potters migrations within the Siphnian Diaspora: The rule and a few marked exceptions

The diaspora of Siphnian potters to the four corners of the Aegean and beyond is a phenomenon that took place largely from 1830 to 1960. There are indications of seasonal movements before 1830, especially to nearby islands, but the main trigger was the demand for household pottery in large cities, that were being founded or rapidly expanding after 1830. Siphnians emigrated especially to Athens, where the population boom and the water shortage dictated the production of large numbers of water vessels, beside pottery for cooking, storage and other needs (Siphnians were rarely involved in the production of building materials or large storage vessels, the “pithoi”, for wine or oil). But apart from Athens, Siphnian potters’ colonies were founded gradually in every Greek city or island, while simultaneously the island itself exported its own pottery products to areas where local production could not meet the local needs or the local quality was inferior. Out of the wide range of Siphnian pottery, only the famous cooking-pot, the Siphnian “tsoukali”, was rarely produced outside Siphnos and the island itself kept the right to export it almost exclusively and en-masse from circa 1900 onwards.

Siphnian workshops abroad were usually manned by Siphnian skilled workers, be it the owners (master potters) or just staff. This movement of skill and labour had three main reasons: (i) economic (avoiding the cost of freight, especially the expensive sea freight), (ii) income opportunity for farmers who would make a better living as potters and who could not be employed in the island’s saturated pottery economy and (iii) cultural, since the fame of Siphnians as expert potters had long been established as an unquestionable advantage. But there were many secondary (and sometimes extraordinary) reasons for such movement. Love affairs, escaping a local scandal, the foundation of a factory looking for skilled labour, being commissioned by the Government to move on a specific policy project or just sheer coincidence, were among those that have been recorded.

Siphnian potters, both the ones who remained on the island and the settlers abroad, imposed the forms and style of everyday pottery (except for storage jars) and the relevant nomenclature that describes it to almost every part of Greece. “Siphnios” was a synonym for “potter” almost everywhere, while “Siphneikos Yalos” (Siphnian beach) was in several cases the toponym of a coastal area with pottery activity. And yet this influence was not unidirectional. Commercial contacts with the destinations of the products, as well as family or business relations between the islanders and the settlers hand an effect also on Siphnos, as language, technology, raw materials and innovation were brought back to the island. So the colonisation worked both ways between the metropolis and its colonies.
In the present lecture, we will examine four particular cases that represent exceptions to the general scheme outlined above, which are grouped into two themes:

**Theme A:** Moving to a destination that is as strong in pottery tradition as the place of origin

(i) The case of a Siphnian potter who moved for private reasons in the 1920s to Aegina, itself a celebrated pottery centre with a very different tradition from – and in some ways competitive to – Siphnos, and how he and his sons were – or were not - assimilated to the pottery culture of their new home and to what extent they influenced it (or even changed it).

(ii) The parallel case of a Kythnian potter who moved to Aegina in the same decade and was completely assimilated.

**Theme B:** Moving against the odds

(iii) The case of a Siphnian tsoukali-maker who broke the rule that “good tsoukalia are made only in Siphnos” and established a very successful “tsoukalario” in far-away Thassos, in the North Aegean, in 1908.

(iv) The case of Siphnian pottery workers who were invited to Lesbos in the 1930s, 40s and 50s to make tsoukalia from local clay, in order to substitute imports from Siphnos and were subsequently turned into successful local tsoukalades.
Placing potters' mobility in a broader social context - stories from the prehistoric Aegean

For the purpose of the current workshop, we would like to reflect on our research on potters’ mobility in prehistoric Aegean with the aim of placing such phenomena in a broader social, but also political and historical context. Based on selected case studies, we want both to discuss the potential of archaeological material to shed light on such issues, but also to underline some inherent limitations. Hopefully the discussion triggered by the workshop contributions will help us find ways to overcome at least some of them.

Our discussion will involve three different case studies: Cretan-origin potters on Kythira and Peloponnesian sites during the Early and Middle Bronze Age, Aeginetan potters along the Euboean Gulf at the end of the Late Bronze Age, and Mycenaean-tradition potters in Macedonia during the Late Bronze Age. In particular, we will consider the question of scale in the movement of potters. Where they travelling alone, as members of organized groups or constituted part of a larger movement of people that involved segments of, or even entire communities? The temporal scale of such movements will be also considered, i.e. distinguishing between itinerant and relocating craftsmen. Furthermore, we aim at exploring in each case what the impact of such phenomena was for the recipient and origin communities and how developments in the broader sociopolitical sphere might have influenced, acting both as push and pull factors, the decision of potters to move.
Trade secrets and craftspeople mobility, from Genoa to Chios (15th – 18th century)

The development of silk manufacturing in Chios is directly linked to the period of Genoese rule (1346-1566 AD), considered to be a period of prosperity for the island, particularly as regards the local textile and silk industry which flourished following the introduction of new knowhow from Genoa and the subsequent development of an export and transit trade in silk fabrics. The quality of local production improves radically, while the production of woven silk fabrics increases and, via Genoa, these reach the markets of Europe, Asia and Africa. Apart from the wider area around Chóra, the capital, silk manufacturing flourishes both in the northern and southern parts of the island. Fabrics of exceptional quality, such as silk-and-cotton dimities, samites, silk satin (atlází), gold- and silver-woven brocades (dibá) along Venetian patterns, velvets following Genoa’s models, taffetas similar to moiré, are used for the gentlewomen’s attire to the great admiration of the travellers visiting it during the 16th to the 18th century.

Based on the sources, the lecture’s emphasis will be on a) the immigration and installation of Genoese craftsmen, members of the merchant guild of Genoa specialising in silk fabrics (Arte Serica) on the island in the late 15th century (weavers, dyers, reelers/spinners); b) the transfer of knowhow to the local textile and silk industry through the transmission of their trade secrets and the installation of specialised tools (instrumenti), looms, that they brought with them to produce woven fabrics, c) their contribution to the development of the textile sector throughout the island, both on a cottage-industry and a domestic level; d) the role played by the development of textile and silk manufacturing on the island and its people (economy, commerce); and, e) the multiple aspects of the woven fabrics’ materiality: the role of Chiote cloth in shaping the local vestimentary system on the basis of Genoese dress guidelines.
Krzysztof Nowicki
Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology, Polish Academy of Sciences

Friday, 18:00

Population movement in Crete and the Southeast Aegean during the Final Neolithic and the Bronze Age: evidence, facts and myths

The identification of population movement in the Aegean, on a large interregional scale or within more restricted geographical areas, has been a subject of endless debates from the very beginning of archaeological activities in the region. Depending which theoretical approach 'ruled' the field, population movement was either presented as the main cause of every change of the Aegean cultures, or it was almost entirely eliminated from the discussion and, instead, a variety of social, behavioral, economic and environmental factors were to play a decisive role in these changes. The latter approach dominated the studies of the last decades of the twentieth century, as represented by processual and postprocessual archeology, the first of which was particularly aggressive against any kind of 'historical' explanation, including population movements, invasions, wars, etc. The weakest point of this approach was a very selective attitude to archaeological evidence, which was treated more as a statistical element than a subject worth of individual detailed analysis. However, archaeological sites have their individual characteristics and histories, which have to be properly studied and analysed before any general 'model' of the population changes is proposed. I will argue, therefore, that archaeological evidence, and especially that which is related to individual settlements' location and history, as well as settlement patterns and their changes, is the key element in the search for any kind of population movement. Settlement, its characteristics and changes, is obviously a better testimony for a large scale population movement than selected types of objects, their appearance or disappearance. The latter, however, may represent sometimes much more restricted and targeted movement of individuals or specialized groups of people. The consequences of different types of movement may have affected different aspects of human behaviour and thus, different types of archaeological evidence.

In this paper I will address the problems of population movement on a large scale related to the broader geographical phenomena, as that which can be reconstructed for the Final Neolithic and the beginning of the Bronze Age (ca. 3700-3000 BC) and the end of the Bronze Age (ca. 1250-1100 BC), but also, I will propose possible scenarios for more restricted population relocations being the results of regional conflicts and territorial competition, as these which seem to be plausible for the changes after the turn of the EM II (ca. 2300-2100 BC), in the transition between the Proto- and Neopalatial periods (ca. 1750-1650 BC), and after the LM IB destructions (ca. 1450-1400 BC).
The ethnographic worlds of craftspeople mobility. Geographies of movements in space and time

The focus on material aspects of culture during the last decades of 20th century in the Greek cultural studies (Folklore, Ethnology and Anthropology) and therefore the emphasis on the social and economic dimensions of cultural phenomena and practices were decisive for the shift of the study of handicrafts merely as artifacts towards the exploration of their “social life”, as well as the study of their producers.

The circulations of people, objects, ideas or practices, in the pre-modern world in Balkan Peninsula during the Ottoman rule till the beginning of 20th century questioned the notion of sedentarism, moreover negated the static perception of the local cultures as isolated communities, an idea based on the isomorphism of space, place and culture.

In this context many efforts have been done for exploring the general issue of migration, its reasons, forms and consequences. As part of this procedure, craftspeople mobility has been of considerable interest to researchers. Their studies have focused on the historical appearance of the technical specialization and the factors that affected the propensity of mobility. Searching for the craftsmen, their techniques and their crafts, researchers have explored the social, economic and cultural aspects of craftsmen activities.

The “mobility turn”, the recent multiple, interdisciplinary interest of the humanity studies, referring to the emergence of both new forms of mobility and a new academic focus on mobility, give us the opportunity to enrich the theoretical approaches, the methods, the methodological tools and disciplinary perspectives in the ethnographic study of mobility in specific contexts.

The recent discussion on mobility turns the interest beyond the basic questions of why and how of mobility, and its dichotomy versus fixity. Considering mobility as a complex phenomenon, we can investigate its multiple forms and dimensions, such as physical, temporal, social, economic and symbolic. Mapping the movements, the routes, the range, the trajectories of craftsmen, in the specific case, we look for relations, exchanges, inequalities and exclusions, proximities and influences, affections and emotions, continuities and discontinuities, tradition and innovation, communities and identities, the elements that constitute the geographies of mobility. Tracing the historical emergence and transformation of practices, places, objects and techniques, these geographies facilitate the understanding of multiple forms and dimensions of mobility in space and time.

---

Paraskevas Potiropoulos and Panayiotis Kamilakis
Hellenic Folklore Research Center, Academy of Athens

Saturday 12:00

Building across time and space. The case of masons from Epirus and western Macedonia (Greece)

The presentation intends to discuss craftspeople mobility, focusing on builders specialized in masonry. More specific, among many cases of masons in Greek mainland and islands, the paper concerns those of northern Greece, in the region of Epirus and western Macedonia, during the period from the eighteenth until the first decades of the twentieth century.

Organized in groups known as “bouloukia” with a well-defined hierarchy and used a secret professional language, masons moved across places, from the neighboring villages to supra-regional places, for a period ranging from seasonal to long term absence from home community – involving sometime the relocation -, to build various kinds of constructions (houses, churches, bridges, mills, etc.).

In order to understand the reasons, scales, modes and contexts of mobility, the paper examines the historical appearance of this technical specialization in that region and the factors that affected the propensity of mobility. Regarding the models of masons’ mobility, the paper analyses the regularities and disruptions in its spatial extent and temporal scale and its transformation due to specific historical conditions.

Moreover, the paper tries to investigate the role of mobility in building techniques, precisely the degree to which the masons were carriers of morphological influences in building structure or they were adapted in the local vernacular architecture. Finally, it concerns the role of mobility in social relations: within the group, between the group of masons and recipient societies and the status of them in home community.
Cooking ware and cultural contacts in Ancient Italy. Two keys studies: Magna Graecia and Roman Piedmont

As archaeological studies have been emphasizing in the last 30 years, food is a major part of daily social practices and represents a fertile research field for developing a better knowledge of ancient societies. In particular, food practices can provide seminal information for processes of cultural transmission and human mobility in areas of colonial contacts and during important historical phases of transformation and transition where different social groups and individuals interacted. Recently, especially for the Mediterranean area, particular attention was paid to the study of the kitchen wares as a potential cultural indicator of culinary practices and patterns in association with the analysis of other evidences.

This paper will try to give a overall picture on the cooking wares attested in two chronologically and culturally distant key-studies within the Mediterranean area, i.e. pre-Roman south Italy ("Magna Graecia") and Roman Piedmont. In the first case, South Italy had intense contacts between indigenous societies and Greek groups, both with their own kitchen ware repertoires and culinary traditions, at least since from the second half of the 8th c. BC. On the contrary, the area of the modern Piedmont (NW Italy), which was occupied by local communities of Gallo-Celtic and Ligurian traditions, saw the arrivals of Romans in the second half of the 2nd century BC. I will show how the two areas developed different approaches for what regards the transmission, the assimilation and the adaptation (or refuse) of alien ‘batteries de cuisines’ and food practices.