TRANSNATIONAL PRESS® LONDON

AVAR – Spring 2025 - Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 11-37
ISSN: 2752-3527 (Print) ISSN: 2752-3535 (Online)
avarjournal.com

Received: 1 January 2025 Accepted: 13 February 2025
DOI: 10.33182/aijls.v4i1.2863

Captives Were Migrants Too

Catherine Cameron[1]

Abstract

Captives were a common type of migrant in small-scale societies in the past, yet they have been almost completely ignored by archaeologists. This article emphasizes that captive taking had significant effects on the composition and cultural practices of ancient societies, and that models typically used to understand ancient migration are inappropriate for understanding the movement of captives. The movement of captives across the boundaries of ancient archaeological cultures challenges our view of archaeological cultures as static entities with fixed geographic and temporal boundaries. Archaeologists are encouraged to develop new models and theory that will allow us to understand the effect of captives on material culture in the societies of their captors; in other words, their effect on the archaeological cultures that are so fundamental to our understanding of the past. Key to new models is the recognition that while scholars assume that migrants make informed decisions about when to move and where to go, captives had no such abilities.

Keywords: *captives, slaves, migrants, archaeological cultures, ethnohistory, enslaved.*

Introduction

I have been asked to contribute to this issue on "Migration and Mobility in the Ancient Near East," although I am not a scholar of the ancient Near East.[2] I have, however, spent much of my career studying ancient human

[1] Catherine Cameron, University of Colorado, Boulder, CO. Email: catherine.cameron@colorado.edu

[2] My thanks to Eric Trinka and Alexiana Fry for inviting me to contribute to this special issue. I was initially drawn to the study of captives by the late Jim Skibo who invited me to put together an edited volume on the topic of my

movement. I am an archaeologist and focused my early work on ancient migration, specifically in the American Southwest. Almost twenty years ago I began a global study of captive-taking, a form of human movement overlooked by archaeologists.[3] The editors of this issue, Drs Trinka and Fry, asked me to provide Near Eastern scholars with new models and conceptual schemes for interpreting human movement in that region. Scholars of the ancient Near East describe groups of people (sometimes large groups) moving in order to flee violence, economic downturns or disasters, or as the results of political machination that push them to a new location.[4] These ancient migrants are often called "refugees" undergoing a process of "forced migration." My research highlights another type of movement. I have found that the enforced movement of captives, sometimes individuals or small groups, formed a constant background to the types of migration archaeologists typically study.

For this global study of captives, I focused on "small-scale" societies, in other words, groups that were not states. They include societies that anthropologists have called tribes or chiefdoms, or bands. This was in part to constrain the size of my project but also because I had spent my career studying small-scale societies and felt I would be best able to explore groups of this size. My data sources were, of necessity, ethnohistoric. Captives are difficult to see in the archaeological record (although methods to identify them are being developed as discussed below), yet

choice for his Foundations of Archaeological Inquiry series at the University of Utah Press. My scholarly life would have been significantly different and less rich without Jim's encouragement. My interest in captives and slavery was sparked by Tien Fuh Wu, my fictive aunt, who endured slavery as a child. Steve Lekson read and commented on this paper, improving it significantly.

[3] Catherine M. Cameron, ed., *Invisible Citizens: Captives and Their Consequences* (University of Utah Press, 2008); Catherine M. Cameron, "Captives and Culture Change: Implications for Archaeology," *Current Anthropology* 52, no. 2 (2011): 169-209; Catherine M. Cameron, *Captives: How Stolen People Changed the World* (University of Nebraska Press, 2016).

[4] Aurora E. Camaño, "Toward a Social Archaeology of Forced Migration: Rebuilding Landscapes of Memory in Medieval Armenian Cilicia," in *Homo Migrans: Modeling Mobility and Migration in Human History*, ed. Megan J. Daniels, IEMA Proceedings, Volume 11 (State University of New York Press, 2022); Eli Itkin, "Post-Destruction Squatter Phases in the Iron Age IIB-C Southern Levant," *Bulletin of American Schools of Oriental Research* 388, University of Chicago Press for the American Society of Overseas Research (2022): 51-72.

they are almost ubiquitous in the accounts of the earliest European explorers in the New World, Africa, Southeast Asia, and elsewhere, confirming that captive-taking was practiced well before the entry of Europeans. On his first day in the Americas, Columbus encountered indigenous people who described in pantomime how attackers had come to seize them.[5]

Over the course of the study, I found that the movement of captives does not align with many of the carefully considered models and theories developed for other types of human movement. The purpose of this article is to emphasize that captive taking was a common form of human movement in the past, that it had significant effects on the composition and cultural practices of ancient societies, and that models typically used to understand ancient migration are inappropriate for understanding the movement of captives. Perhaps most importantly, the movement of captives across the boundaries of our "archaeological cultures" challenges our view of archaeological cultures as static entities with fixed geographic and temporal boundaries. Ethnohistoric accounts of captive-taking and the experiences of captives allow us to explore the nature and scope of this common practice, expand our understanding of the full range of human movement, and further our perception of the nature of social boundaries in the ancient groups we study.

I begin this essay with a brief overview of the archaeological study of migration, including its history and the theoretical focus on voluntary migration. Because of my background, this overview is an Americanist perspective, but I believe that it also has application to other parts of the world. I emphasize the past thirty years of migration studies that have tended to apply theory and models from studies of contemporary migration to the past. These models emphasize voluntary movement with knowledgeable actors sharing information about conditions at the point

[5] Fernando Santos-Granero, *Vital Enemies: Slavery, Predation, and the Amerindian Political Economy of Life* (University of Texas Press, 2009).

of origin and destination. Even those scholars who focus on "forced migration" assume some level of agency on the part of migrants. In the following sections, I describe captive movement, including their origin in raiding and warfare, the motives of captors, their preference for women and children, the distances captives were moved, and evidence for the numbers of captives in small-scale societies in different parts of the world. I emphasize that captives, unlike other types of migrants, have no choice in their movement or where they will go. I use this understanding of captive movement to examine their impact on the boundaries of "archaeological cultures" and their role in the transmission of cultural practices and ideas. I enumerate the suite of methods that are currently being developed for identifying captives in the past, emphasizing the potentially transformative role of biomolecular techniques such as isotope analyses and ancient DNA (aDNA). I emphasize the new understandings of the past that we can develop if we broaden our understanding of migration to acknowledge that in the ancient societies we study, captives moved frequently across social boundaries and had significant effects on the societies they joined.

Migration and Archaeology

Migration was a fundamental concept in the development of the field of archaeology, emerging initially from 19th-century European nationalism and a preoccupation with ethnicity.[6] In the first half of the 20th century, the culture-historical approach became the dominant North American archaeological theory. This approach was based on the definition of the archaeological culture as a geographically and temporally restricted assemblage of prehistoric archaeological material. Two linked

[6] Bruce G. Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought*, Second Edition (Cambridge University Press 2006). For an overview of the history of migration studies in archaeology see Graciela Cabana, "The Problematic Relationship Between Migration and Culture Change," in *Rethinking Anthropological Perspectives on Migration* ed. G. S. Cabana, and J. J. Clark (University Press of Florida, 2011).

mechanisms, diffusion and migration, were employed to explain the distribution of archaeological traits. Diffusion was the spread of cultural traits through trade or emulation, migration the movement of people. When archaeologists identified a change in the material culture they found in a particular site or region, it would be attributed to either the migration of a new group of people with a new suite of material culture traits or the "diffusion" or spread of new cultural practices from nearby groups. As the culture-historical approach gave way to processual or "New Archaeology" in the 1960s, study of migration stalled. New archaeologists, with their focus on responses to environmental change within small regions (environmental "systems"), saw migration as a non-explanation, an evasion of scientific explanations of the past.

The concept of the archaeological culture was (and still is) fundamental to the identification of migration in the past and archaeological cultures indeed were (and often still are) conceived of as ethnic groups. Scholars today recognize that social groups can be fluid and that individuals construct their social identity to optimize their social position,[7] but those new understandings are rarely incorporated by archaeologists into studies of past migration. Archaeologists document migration in the past by looking for material culture "out of place." In essence, they have to make the dubious assumption that for human groups, genes and (material) culture are linked.[8] As developed below, recognition of the movement of captives across social boundaries and their incorporation into a variety of different statuses in the society of their captors, including as producers of captor material culture, contravenes the assumption that genes and material culture are coupled. While recognition that the

[7] Fredrik Barth, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference* (Waveland Press, 1998[1969]); Siân Jones, *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present* (Routledge Press, 1997); Murat Bayar, "Reconsidering Primordialism: an Alternative Approach to the Study of Ethnicity," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32, no.9 (2009): 1639-1657.

[8] For a critique see John H. Moore, "Putting Anthropology Back Together Again: The Ethnogenetic Critique of Cladistic Theory," *American Anthropologist* 96, no. 4 (1994): 925-948. For a critique of similar uses of aDNA see Martin Furholt, "Mobility and Social Change: Understanding the European Neolithic Period After the Archaeogenetic Revolution," *Journal of Archaeological Research* 29 (2021): 481-535.

boundaries of archaeological cultures are not as fixed as we once believed may trouble our easy recognition of population movement, it will also open an opportunity for us to better understand the nature of social formations in the past.

After nearly thirty years (~1960-1990) during which migration was largely ignored by archaeologists, the 1990s saw a renewed interest in the topic, and today, it is a major focus of archaeological research. This is especially true in the American Southwest where I have worked. The shift was started by David Anthony's "Baby and the Bathwater" article,[9] which urged archaeologists to understand migration as a structured process, not an event. He encouraged archaeologists to apply models from modern studies of migration developed by geographers and demographers to the past. Anthony especially emphasized the "push-pull" model of migration wherein "there are negative (push) stresses in the home region and positive (pull) attractions in the destination region, and the transportation costs between the two are acceptable."[10] Anthony suggested that certain patterns observed in modern migration could be applied to the past. For example, the structure of a migration often resembled a stream with migrants moving toward specific destinations along well-defined routes that had been created by scouts or earlier migrants. "Return migration" develops as migrants create a counter-stream back to their place of origin. Anthony also argued that the demographic structure of initial migrations was heavily weighted toward males, who were often sent as scouts.[11] These insights from modern migration, especially the push-pull model, have been productively used in the study of ancient migration in many times and places.[12] But as

[9] David W. Anthony, "Migration in Archaeology: The Baby and the Bathwater," *American Anthropologist* 92, no.4 (1990): 895-914.

[10] Anthony, "Migration in Archaeology," 899.

[11] Anthony "Migration in Archaeology," 905.

[12] For an example in the American Southwest, see Andrew I. Duff and Richard H. Wilshusen, "Prehistoric Population Dynamics in the Northern San Juan Region, A.D. 950–1300," *Kiva* 66, no. 1 (2000): 167-190; Jeffery J. Clark, "Disappearance and Diaspora: Contrasting Two Migrations in the Southern Southwest," in *Rethinking Anthropological Perspectives on Migration,* ed. G. S. Cabana, and J.J. Clark, (University Press of Florida, 2011); Linda S. Cordell, Carla R.

Anthony's quote demonstrates, the push-pull model of migration and its associated patterns emphasize information flow and the informed decision-making of potential migrants. For those reasons, it does not apply to the movement of captives who were uninformed, unable to acquiesce to their impending movement, and had no ability to select their destination.

Migration is a topic of enormous concern today because of the large numbers of people throughout the world moving across political boundaries for economic and security reasons. Not surprisingly, scholars studying modern migration have distinguished between voluntary and forced movement, but then argued that there is enough overlap between the two that it is not really useful to distinguish between them.[13] de Haas argues that even voluntary migrants have constraints on where, when, and how they move, and forced migrants "have some level of agency as, otherwise, they would not be able to move in the first place."[14] While it might seem appropriate to include captive-taking in the category of "forced migrants," it is clear that scholars studying forced migration assume some level of choice in the movement. This is emphatically untrue of the captives in the small-scale societies that I have studied who were violently dragged from their homes, conveyed (by foot, boat, horse) to another community where they generally entered at the lowest end of the social ladder. Their future life might or might not offer some opportunity for improving their situation, but at the moment of migration, they had no control of their situation.

Van West, Jeffrey S. Dean, and Deborah A. Muenchrath, "Mesa Verde Settlement History and Relocation: Climate Change, Social Networks, and Ancestral Pueblo Migration," *Kiva* 72, no. 4. (2007): 379-405; William D. Lipe, "Lost in Transit: The Central Mesa Verde Archaeological Complex," in *Leaving Mesa Verde: Peril and Change in the Thirteenth-Century Southwest*, ed. Timothy A. Kohler, Mark D. Varien, and Aaron M. Wright (University of Arizona Press, 2010).

[13] Dawn Chatty, "Forced Migration," in *The Encyclopedia of Global Human Migration*, ed. Immanuel Ness, Wiley On-Line Library (2013): https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444351071.wbeghm236; Hein de Haas, "A Theory of Migration: the Aspirations-Capabilities Framework," *Comparative Migration Studies* 9, no. 8 (2021): 1-35.

[14] de Haas "A Theory of Migration," 16.

In the past 30 years, archaeologists studying ancient migration have made great progress in understanding many aspects of migration as a process (as proposed by Anthony). They have explored the causes of migration, how migrants might be identified in the archaeological record, the size and structure of the groups that moved, the pace and duration of the relocation, the social consequences of migration, the effect of migrants on host populations, and more.[15] In spite of this progress, they have tended to focus on only one part of the continuum of human movement: the long-distance movement of significant numbers of people. Of course, these are the sorts of movements that are most likely to leave a visible trace in the archaeological record. They are also the types of movements in which migrants are assumed to engage in logical decision-making about migrating and where to go. However, at the other end of the continuum of human movement, captives are not in control of their movement or destination. As the following sections show, models developed for the former are not appropriate for the latter.

Captives in Small-Scale Societies

I began a global study of captive-taking in small-scale societies to explore their role in cultural transmission.[16] The study opened my eyes to an entire world of people that I (along with most archaeologists) did not previously know existed.[17] I collected dozens of ethnohistoric, ethnographic, early historic, and occasionally archaeological accounts of warfare and captive taking from around the world. I read captive narrative accounts (usually by Europeans) of their experiences of being captured and held in a small-scale society. I was astonished at the similar

[15] Scott G. Ortman and Catherine M. Cameron, "A Framework for Controlled Comparisons of Ancient Southwestern Movement," in *Movement, Connectivity, and Landscape Change in the Ancient Southwest*, ed. Margaret Nelson and Colleen Strawhacker (University Press of Colorado, 2011); Barbara J. Mills, "Themes and Models for Understanding Migration in the Southwest," in *Movement, Connectivity, and Landscape Change in the Ancient Southwest,* ed. Margaret Nelson and Colleen Strawhacker (University Press of Colorado, 2011).

[16] Cameron, "Captives and Culture Change," 169-209

[17] Cameron, *Captives: How Stolen People Changed the World.*

patterns I saw in the process of captive-taking, regardless of geographic region. The majority of the accounts I found came from North and South America, Africa, Europe, and Southeast Asia. In general, I was not accessing primary sources, but the work of authors who had made detailed explorations of primary sources in particular parts of the world. While I did not focus on captive-taking in state-level societies, I could not help but encounter the vast literature on post-colonial enslavement in the New World and on ancient enslavement in Greece and Rome. Many of the captives taken into small-scale societies became enslaved, and I soon learned that slavery is one end of the continuum of statuses that captives could occupy. As a result, at times, I use the terms *captive* and *slave* somewhat interchangeably.

I attempted to use the earliest accounts from each region I studied, before European colonization impacted the practices of the small-scale societies I hoped to understand. Colonization frequently intensified warfare and captive-taking, changing long-established interactions among indigenous neighbors. The evidence I recovered convinced me, however, that warfare and captive-taking were pre-colonial practices and not colonial introductions. In the following sections, I use the accounts I compiled to describe the origin of captives in raiding, warfare, and kidnapping, the types of individuals targeted, the distances they were moved (including their post-capture trade to other groups), and evidence of the surprising numbers of captives in small-scale societies around the world. After briefly describing these different aspects of the process, I consider the implications of the movement of captives and their presence in the societies of their captors.

The Process of Captive-Taking:

In many small-scale societies, warfare was endemic, and captives were a common product of warfare and raiding; kidnapping, often opportunistic,

was also common. The antiquity of warfare in small-scale societies has been much debated, with some arguing that warfare was introduced by Europeans[18] or that it was absent prior to the development of agriculture.[19] However, archaeologists have produced extensive evidence of inter-group violence extending back millennia.[20] One aspect of the debate focuses on the causes of warfare, with some seeing aggression as an innate human behavior[21] and others as a result of conflict over resources, increasing, of course, as humans had more resources over which to compete. While the debate over the causes of warfare is ongoing, archaeologists have demonstrated that inter-group violence has been a common human behavior for a very long time.[22]

In the ethnohistoric accounts I encountered, warfare was an accepted practice, and there was an unambiguous cause. The members of many groups explained their raids and warfare as revenge for perceived slights, yet it was clear that success in war was the major avenue (perhaps the only avenue) for males to achieve status.[23] The warrior who returned from battle with many captives and loot was much acclaimed. The ideal warrior

---

[18] R. Brian Ferguson, and Neil L. Whitehead, eds., *War in the Tribal Zone: Expanding States and Indigenous Warfare*, 2nd (School of American Research Press, 1999).

[19] Douglas P. Fry, *The Human Potential for Peace: An Anthropological Challenge to Assumptions about War and Violence* (Oxford University Press, 2006).

[20] Elizabeth N. Arkush and Mark W. Allen, eds, *The Archaeology of Warfare: Prehistories of Raiding and Conquest* (University Press of Florida, 2006); Mark Allen, "Hunter-Gatherer Conflict: The Last Bastion of the Pacified Past?" in *Violence and Warfare Among Hunter-Gatherers*, ed. Mark W. Allen and Terry L. Jones (Routledge, 2014); Meghan Buchanan, *Life in a Mississippian Warscape: Common Field, Cahokia, and the Effects of Warfare* (University of Alabama Press, 2022); Lawrence H. Keeley, *War Before Civilization: The Myth of the Peaceful Savage* (Oxford University Press, 1996); Nam C. Kim and Marc Kissel, *Emergent Warfare in Our Evolutionary Past* (Routledge, 2018); M. Mirazón Lahr, F. Rivera, R. Power, et al. "Inter-group violence among early Holocene hunter-gatherers of West Turkana, Kenya," *Nature* 529 (2016): 394-398; Richard Wrangham and Dale Peterson, *Demonic Males: Apes and the Origins of Human Violence* (Houghton Mifflin, 1996).

[21] And therefore ancient; Wrangham and Peterson, "*Demonic Males*."

[22] Keeley, *War Before Civilization*; Kim and Kessel, *Emergent Warfare*; Steven A. LeBlanc, *Prehistoric Warfare in the American Southwest* (University of Utah Press, 1999).

[23] Richard J. Chacoan and Rubén G. Mendoza, eds., *North American Indigenous Warfare and Ritual Violence* (The University of Arizona Press, 2007); David H. Dye, "Art, Ritual, and Chiefly Warfare in the Mississippian World," in *Hero, Hawk, and Open Hand: American Indian Art of the Ancient Midwest and South,* ed. R. V. Sharp (The Art Institute of Chicago and Yale University Press, 2004); Pekka Hämäläinen, *The Comanche Empire* (Yale University Press, 2008); Laura Junker, "The Impact of Captured Women on Cultural Transmission in Contact Period Philippine Slave-Raiding Chiefdoms," in *Invisible Citizens: Captives and their Consequences*, ed. Catherine. M. Cameron (University of Utah Press, 2008)**;** Keeley, *War Before Civilization;* Santos-Granero, *Vital Enemies*.

was celebrated in group ideology and oral history in many small-scale societies, which reinforced their elevated status.[24]

In many cases, even the ability to marry depended on being a successful warrior. For example, the taking of captives and horses was essential to the status of young Comanche men.[25] The Comanche dominated the Southern Plains of North America during the 18th and early 19th centuries. The Comanche stole, raised, and traded vast herds of horses. They also captured people and often kidnapped young male shepherds who could act as tenders for their horse herds. A strong impetus to raiding was the fundamental need for men to acquire honor through bravery in warfare, essentially compelling young men to go to war or face a marginal and impoverished existence. For a young Comanche man to marry and become a fully functioning member of society, he had to acquire a herd of horses. He might spend years joining raids, but because of his low status, he got to keep only a few of the horses that were captured. Marriage was a symbol of masculine honor, and until a young man was wealthy enough to gain a wife, he was essentially a servant to older and more prosperous men. Comanche society was quite stratified. Not only was there a class of poor, unmarried men, there was also a stratum of vastly wealthy elite men who each might own more than 1000 horses.

A major goal of raids in many, perhaps most, of the small-scale societies I explored was the capture of women and children. Men were generally killed, as they posed risks of violence or escape when they were being transported home. Most importantly, women were desired as wives or concubines and children as wives-to-be or slaves. For most small-scale societies, control of people, rather than territory, was fundamental (in Africa, termed "wealth in people").[26] Captive women not only added to the

[24] e.g. Junker "The Impact of Captured Women," 118-119.

[25] Hämäläinen, *The Comanche Empire,* 266-269.

[26] Jane I. Guyer and Samuel M. Eno Belinga, "Wealth in People, Wealth in Knowledge: Accumulation and Composition in Equatorial Africa," *Journal of African History* 36 (1995): 91-120.

number of people a male controlled, but they were also able to produce children, further adding to the population.

Captive Numbers:

Ethnohistoric accounts of captive-taking in small-scale societies make it clear that captives made up a significant proportion of these groups. Large numbers of captives moving across social boundaries have major implications for the spread of genetic and cultural material across prehistoric landscapes and require that we rethink some fundamental archaeological concepts. As Classical scholars know, estimating slave populations is difficult, even for societies such as Rome where textual data exists.[27] It is perhaps even more difficult for small-scale societies where it is often necessary to rely on traveler's impressions, although in some cases, ethnographic or even occasionally census-like data is available. The following discussion presents the estimated proportion of captive/slaves found in a number of small-scale societies around the world. These estimates are, of necessity, derived from post-contact sources. As noted above, warfare and likely captive-taking increased as European exploration and colonization pushed into indigenous homelands. But the numbers of captives documented in the accounts presented here suggest that, even accounting for post-contact effects, captives were a common social being in small-scale societies of the past.

The ethnohistoric record for the Northwest Coast of North America begins in the late 18th century when sustained contact with Europeans commenced. The Northwest Coast had a rigid system of slavery; captives became slaves with no possibility of a change in status. Estimates of slave populations here come from generally brief historical and ethnographic

[27] Kyle Harper, and Walter Scheidel, "Roman Slavery and the Idea of 'Slave Society,'" In *What Is a Slave Society?: The Practice of Slavery in Global Perspective*, eds. Noel Lenski and Catherine M. Cameron (Cambridge University Press 2018), 95-103.

accounts, but also from systematic attempts by the Hudson's Bay Company and the Russian navy to create censuses of particular Northwest Coast groups.[28] Slaves were common in most communities but numbers seem to have varied depending on the settlement examined and the point in time when data was available. As estimated in 1845, the proportion of slaves in the Stikine Tlingit subcommunities ranged from 5 to 25%. Further south along the Greater Lower Columbia River, slaves may have comprised 20-24% of the population of communities there.[29] Perhaps most strikingly, even the tiny Tutchone bands who lived far inland from the Northwest Coast in small family groups dispersed over a huge territory (population density <1 person per 100 square kilometers) also kept slaves who made up approximately 10% of the population.[30]

In the Northeast part of North America, the Iroquois in the seventeenth century engaged in violent "mourning wars" that killed many people. The Iroquois captured and sometimes adopted many of the enemy in an effort to replenish their numbers.[31] In the 1660s, a missionary estimated that in many Iroquois villages only one-third of the residents were native-born Iroquois people and the remaining two-thirds had been captured.[32] In Tropical America, Santos-Granero made a detailed study of six slave-holding societies using data from ethnohistoric accounts and found that proportions of slaves ranged from 5 to 15% of the population of these groups.[33] Santos-Granero did not consider societies who took captives but did not enslave them; if he had, the number of captives in these groups would have been even larger. Among the Yanamamö, an Amazonian

[28] Leland Donald, *Aboriginal Slavery on the Northwest Coast of North America* (University of California Press, 1997), 182-197.

[29] Kenneth M. Ames, "Slavery, Household Production, and Demography on the Southern Northwest Coast: Cables, Tacking, and Ropewalks," *in Invisible Citizens: Captives and Their Consequences*, ed. Catherine. M. Cameron (The University of Utah Press, 2008), 150.

[30] Dominique Legros, "Wealth, Poverty, and Slavery Among 19th century Tutchone Athapaskans," *Research in Economic Anthropology* 7 (1985): 37-64.

[31] D.K Richter, "War and Culture: The Iroquois Experience," *The William and Mary Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (1983): 541.

[32] Donald, Aboriginal Slavery on the Northwest Coast, 262.

[33] Santos-Granero, *Vital Enemies.*

group, between 12% and 17% of wives were captives who had been taken in raids.[34]

The fifth century CE break-up of the Roman Empire created numerous small-scale societies. After the mid-fifth century, the Germanic Law Codes reveal slaves and semi-slaves mentioned in between one-quarter to one third of chapters, suggesting that slaves were a significant element of the society of these tribal groups.[35] In Britain, the Domesday Book census of 1086 CE reports a slave population of 5 to 25% depending on the region.[36] "Slaves were an integral and numerically important part of English society throughout the Anglo Saxon period" (fifth to eleventh centuries).[37] Early law in Norway suggests they may not have been quite as common there.[38]

In several Southeast Asian groups, slaves were a majority of the population during the 17th and 18th centuries;[39] the nineteenth-century Sulu sultanate used slave labor for as much as 50% of the agricultural and craft workforce.[40] Coastal chiefdoms in the Philippines likely held fewer slaves, yet chiefs in these communities often held hundreds of slaves, making up a significant portion of the population.[41] The proportion of slaves in small-scale societies in Africa ranged from 1 to 50% of the population, depending on the level of complexity of the group and access

[34] Napoleon A. Chagnon, *Yanomano: The Last Days of Eden* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992), 106-107.

[35] Noel Lenski, "Captivity, Slavery, and Cultural Exchange Between Rome and the Germans from the First to the Seventh Century CE.," in *Invisible Citizens: Captives and Their Consequences*, ed. C. M. Cameron, (University of Utah Press, 2008).

[36] John McDonald and G. D. Snooks, *Domesday Economy: A New Approach to Anglo-Norman History* (Oxford University Press, 1986).

[37] David A.E. Pelteret, "Slave raiding and Slave Trading in Early England," in *Anglo Saxon England*, ed P. Clemoes (Cambridge University Press, 1981): 99.

[38] Ruth M. Karras, R. M., *Slavery and Society in Medieval Scandinavia* (Yale University Press,1988), 78-80.

[39] Anthony Reid, "Introduction: Slavery and Bondage in Southwest Asian History," in *Slavery, Bondage, and Dependency in Southeast Asia*, ed. Anthony Reid with the assistance from Jennifer Brewster (St. Martin's Press, 1983), 29-31.

[40] Junker "The Impact of Captured Women," 118.

[41] Junker "The Impact of Captured Women," 118.

to trade routes.[42] Of course, the African continent was significantly affected by both the Atlantic and Islamic slave trade.

The Landscape of Captive-Taking:

Warfare in small-scale societies was most common among neighbors, especially where there was a difference in size or societal scale; larger, more complex societies attacked their smaller and less complex neighbors. Where groups lived along navigable rivers or an ocean, longer distance raids were made, with raiders often traveling hundreds of kilometers to attack their enemies and return with captives. An ethnohistoric study of captive-taking in North and South America found that captives were generally taken from beyond the regions where men normally looked for wives.[43] These distances were usually greater than 50 km, but could exceed 1000 km. Moving captives away from their homelands lessened the chance that they would try to escape or that their kin would attempt a rescue.[44]

In the Northwest Coast of North America, warfare was conducted primarily for revenge due to perceived slights, for protection of status, and in order to acquire and enslave captives.[45] Northwest Coast warriors attacked their neighbors, but might also undertake long-distance raids of more than 600 km along the coast seeking revenge and slaves. The same was true of the riverine populations of Amazonia in South America. The Conibo who lived along the Ucayali Basin in Peru mounted large raids with many canoes and perhaps as many as one hundred warriors who regularly

[42] Igor Kopytoff and Suzanne Miers "Introduction: African 'Slavery' as an Institution of Marginality," in *Slavery in Africa: Historical and Anthropological Perspectives*, ed. S. Miers and I. Kopytoff (University of Wisconsin Press, 1977), 60-61.

[43] Warren DeBoer, "Wrenched Bodies," in *Invisible Citizens: Captives and Their Consequences*, ed. Catherine M. Cameron (University of Utah Press, 2008).

[44] Peter Robertshaw and William L. Duncan, "African slavery: Archaeology and Decentralized Societies," in *Invisible Citizens: Captives and Their Consequences*, ed. Catherine M. Cameron (University of Utah Press, 2008).

[45] Kenneth M. Ames and Herbert D.G. Maschner, *Peoples of the Northwest Coast: Their Archaeology and Prehistory* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1999); Donald, *Aboriginal Slavery on the Northwest Coast.*

attacked their demographically smaller and less powerful neighbors who lived along the tributaries of the Ucayali.[46] Like the raiders of the Northwest Coast, Conibo warriors often traveled hundreds of kilometers. The purpose of Conibo raids was to capture women and children; women and girls for wives and boys for slaves. Warriors also returned with valuable booty. Similarly, in Island Southeast Asia coastal chiefdoms in the Philippines raided smaller interior groups for slaves and loot, but also undertook long-distance slave raids. As in other small-scale societies, slave raiding was a fundamental part of male prestige.[47]

Once acquired, captives often became highly valuable items of trade, which might increase the distance they moved from their original home. Early explorers in North America encountered a vast landscape of slaves that moved individuals across the continent. In the late 17th century, while camped on the Upper Mississippi River, French explorer Robert de La Salle was gifted a Native boy by the Michigamea tribe, who lived nearby.[48] The boy had been born somewhere west of the Missouri River, had been captured as a child by an enemy group, and then either captured, traded, or sold east by three other tribes before reaching de La Salle's camp. From his conversations with the slave boy, De La Salle was able to document the broad geographic scope of the pre-contact Indigenous slave trade.

The trade in slaves across North America was not unusual. In Island Southeast Asia, maritime societies raided for slaves and traded them across vast expanses of ocean beginning at least by the twelfth century CE.[49] For example, female captives from the Philippines might be traded as far away as Vietnam, Thailand, and Sumatra. In Europe, the "Germanic tribes" that lived north of the Roman Empire battled with each other and

[46] Warren R. DeBoer, "Pillage and production in the Amazon: A view through the Conibo of the Ucayali Basin, Eastern Peru," *World Archaeology* 18, no.2 (1986): 231-246.

[47] Junker "The Impact of Captured Women," 118-119; James F. Warren, *The Sulu Zone 1768-1898* (New Day Publishers, 1985).

[48] Carl J. Ekburg, *Stealing Indian Women: Native Slavery in the Illinois Country* (University of Illinois Press, 2007), 12.

[49] Junker, "The Impact of Captured Women," 114-117; Reid "Introduction," 31-32.

took captives. They also raided Roman settlements. Roman texts document an active trade in slaves among these groups.[50] During the medieval period, after the fall of the Roman Empire (fifth century C.E.), raiding, captive-taking, enslavement, and an extensive slave trade were widespread throughout the Mediterranean world.[51] Slave trade routes "…ran from Bohemia through Bavaria and Alemannia to Venice or across Carolingian Francia, from the Elbe to Koblenz and the Moselle to Verdun, then to Lyon, Arles, and Spain."[52] British slaves acquired during wars in Britain were sold in slave markets in Gaul.[53] From the 8th to the 11th centuries, Vikings raided throughout the North Atlantic, into the Mediterranean, and east into Russia, trading slaves throughout the areas they raided.[54]

The Selectivity of Captive-Taking:

Raiding and warfare might appear tumultuous and chaotic, but in spite of the chaos, captive-taking was a selective process. Captives came from the lowest social strata as defined by gender, age, and social standing. Women and children were most commonly taken captive, and adult men were killed, a process not unlike that of the treatment of livestock where unruly males are killed, and reproductive-aged females are retained.[55] Men were a danger to their captors, whom they might try to overpower in an attempt to escape. For most small-scale societies, power lay in the control of people, not territory, and captive-taking increased the number of

[50] Lenski "Captivity, Slavery, and Cultural Exchange," 90-92.

[51] Pierre Bonnassie, *From Slavery to Feudalism in Southwestern Europe* (Cambridge University Press, 1991), 32; Pelteret, "Slave raiding and Slave Trading in Early England"; David A.E. Pelteret, *Slavery in Early Mediaeval England: From the Reign of Alfred Until the Twelfth Century* (The Boydell Press, 1995).

[52] Karras, *Slavery and Society*, 14

[53] Bonnassie, *From Slavery to Feudalism*, 33.

[54] Neil Price, *Children of Ash and Elm: A History of the Vikings* (Basic Books, 2020); Ben Raffield, Neil Price, and Mark Collard, "Male-biased Operational Sex Ratios and the Viking Phenomenon: An Evolutionary Anthropological Perspective on Late Iron Age Scandinavian Raiding," *Evolution and Human Behavior* 38 (2017): 315-324.

[55] DeBoer, "Wrenched Bodies," 250.

followers a captor controlled.[56] Women's reproductive abilities added to those followers. In small-scale horticultural societies, women were economically beneficial as they often did the majority of the field labor.[57] The children who were taken were generally those who could be readily transported (infants were often killed). Children were desired because they could be easily enculturated, eventually forgetting their origin.

The capture of women was especially tied to the status-striving of young males. For example, Viking raiding has been argued to have resulted from elite males in Scandinavia monopolizing reproductive-aged females through concubinage and polygyny.[58] Males who felt they had few prospects for marriage or advancement (younger sons, those of low status) were motivated to join raids where they might acquire women who could become their wives or concubines. Similarly, senior men among the Conibo of the Amazon monopolized reproductive-aged Conibo women, obliging young men to acquire wives through raiding.[59] Captive women among the Conibo were set to horticultural and beer producing tasks, allowing their captors to host beer-drinking parties that greatly enhanced their captor's status.

For the small-scale societies that I study, kinship was the basic organizing principle. Captives, however, were thrust into a society where they had no kin and their captors were free to determine what social position they would occupy.[60] Social locations ranged from complete exclusion through rigid systems of slavery to inclusion through adoption or marriage. These positions were somewhat flexible. With time and initiative a slave might gain some rights in their captor's society; conversely, a captive incorporated through marriage or adoption might nevertheless retain the stigma of an outsider. Although in most cases, captives were people

[56] Cameron, *Captives: How Stolen People Changed the World*, 83.

[57] For Africa, see Robertshaw and Duncan, "African slavery;" for Amazonia, see Santos-Granero, *Vital Enemies*.

[58] Raffield et al., "Male-biased Operational Sex Ratios"

[59] DeBoer, "Wrenched Bodies"; Santos-Granero, *Vital Enemies.*

[60] Cameron, *Captives: How Stolen People Changed the World*, 83.

without kin, in some areas, they might be visited by their natal kin creating useful relations of trade and interaction between former foes.[61] Still, few captives, even those adopted or incorporated through marriage, ever achieved full group membership but remained liminal members of the society.

Finding Captives in the Past:

The foregoing demonstrates that captives were present in many, perhaps most, small-scale societies in the past. Swanepoel[62] argues that archaeologists should consider the presence of captives a "social fact" for small-scale societies; their presence to be assumed and investigated, rather than considered a special topic of research. I wholeheartedly agree. I am also encouraged by the many methods that archaeologists have recently developed to identify captives in the archaeological record.

Biomolecular techniques are opening new avenues for exploring ancient population movement. aDNA, notably whole genome studies, have been used to propose large population expansions, especially in Eurasia during the Neolithic and Bronze Ages.[63] Isotope analyses, especially strontium isotopes, provide a more fine-scale analysis of human movement than aDNA, often allowing scholars to track the movement of individuals in the past.[64] aDNA studies have been criticized for their tendency to assume that

[61] Patricia Albers, "Symbiosis, Merger, and War: Contrasting Forms of Intertribal Relationship Among Historic Plains Indians," in *The Political Economy of North American Indians*, ed. J. H. Moore (University of Oklahoma Press, 1993).

[62] Natalie Swanepoel, "Comment on: Captives and Culture Change: Implications for Archaeologists," *Current Anthropology* 52, no. 2 (2011): 200-201.

[63] Wolfgang Haak, Iosif Lazaridis, Nick Patterson, et al., "Massive migration from the steppe was a source for Indo-European languages in Europe," *Nature* 522 (2015): 207-211; Iñigo Olalde, Selina Brace, Morten E. Allentof, et al., "The Beaker Phenomenon and the Genomic Transformation of Northwest Europe," *Nature* 555 (2018): 190-196; Iosif Lazaridis, Dani Nadel, Gary Rollefson, et al. "Genomic insights into the origin of farming in the ancient Near East," *Nature* 536 (2016): 419-426; Kristian Kristiansen, Morten E. Allentoft, Karin Frei, et al., "Re-theorising mobility and the formation of culture and language among the Corded Ware Culture in Europe," *Antiquity* 91, no.356 (2017): 334-347.

[64] Alexander R. Bentley, T. Douglas Price, Jens Lüning, Detlef Gronenborn, Joachim Wahl, and Paul D. Fullagar, "Strontium Isotopes from the Earth to the Archaeological Skeleton: A Review," *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 13, no. 3 (2006): 135-187.

genetic data can be equated with cultural groups in the past, akin to the ways that culture historical archaeologists used material culture to define archaeological cultures. In response, scholars argue that we need to develop socially based interpretative models of biomolecular data and specifically to focus on the multiple scales at which movement occurred.[65] The study of captives and their patterns of movement provides one such interpretative model.

While biomolecular methods are opening new ways to find and study captives in the archaeological record, other methods are also important. At a fundamental level, evidence of warfare (defensive sites, "no-man's land," weapons of war, etc.) strongly suggest the taking of captives.[66] The most unambiguous lines of evidence come from studies of human remains. Captives can be identified through marks of trauma on their bodies, including cranial trauma, lower arm trauma (an arm thrown up to protect from a blow), evidence of repeated beatings and more.[67] Archaeologists have attributed skewed sex ratios in burial populations to captive-taking.[68] More females than expected might suggest a settlement

[65] Stefan Burmeister, "Archaeological Research on Migration as a Multidisciplinary Challenge," *Medieval Worlds* No. 4 (2016): 42-64; Martin Furholt, "Re-integrating Archaeology: A Contribution to aDNA Studies and the Migration Discourse on the 3rd Millennium BC in Europe," *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* 85 (2019): 115-129; Martin Furholt, "Mobility and Social Change: Understanding the European Neolithic Period After the Archaeogenetic Revolution," *Journal of Archaeological Research* 29 (2021): 481-637; Omer Gokcumen, "The Conceptual Impacts of Genomics to the Archaeology of Movement," in *Homo Migrans: Modeling Mobility and Migration in Human History*, ed. Megan J. Daniels, IEMA Proceedings, Volume 11 (State University of New York Press, 2022); L. S. Klejn, et al., "Discussion: Are the origins of Indo-European languages explained by the migration of the Yamnaya culture to the west?" *European Journal of Archaeology* 21 (2018): 3–17.

[66] Keeley, *War Before Civilization;* Steven A. LeBlanc with Katherine E. Register, *Constant Battles: Why We Fight* (St. Martin's Press, 2003).

[67] Ryan P. Harrod, "Centers of Control: Revealing Elites Among the Ancestral Pueblo During the 'Chaco Phenomenon,'" *International Journal of Paleopathology* 2, no. 2–3 (2012): 123-135; See especially Table 7.1 in Ryan P. Harrod, and Debra L. Martin, "Signatures of captivity and subordination on skeletonized human remains: a bioarchaeological case study from the ancient Southwest," in *Bioarchaeological and Forensic Perspectives on Violence: How Violent Death is Interpreted from Skeletal Remains*, ed. Debra L. Martin and Cheryl Anderson (Cambridge University Press, 2014); Debra Martin, "Ripped Flesh and Torn Souls: Skeletal Evidence for Captivity and Slavery from the La Plata Valley, New Mexico (AD 1100-1300)," in *Invisible Citizens: Captives and Their Consequences*, ed. Catherine M. Cameron (University of Utah Press, 2008); Debra L. Martin, Ryan P. Harrod, and Ventura R. Pérez, *The Bioarchaeology of Violence* (University Press of Florida, 2012).

[68] Jerome S. Cybulski, "Human Biology," in *Northwest Coast, Handbook of North American Indians*, *Vol. 7*, ed. Wayne Suttles, W. C. Sturtevant, general editor, (Smithsonian Institution Press, 1990); Keeley, *War Before Civilization*, 68;

that engaged in captive-taking, a settlement with more men than expected, a settlement from which women had been taken. Ancient iconography records the taking of captives in many parts of the world,[69] although captives depicted in iconography tend to be men, as the capture of an enemy warrior is far more consequential. Language provides another line of evidence. Words for captives or slaves in indigenous languages that are not loanwords demonstrate the antiquity of captive-taking.[70]

Gender-linked artifacts can suggest raiding for women. Using a material culture survey of western Amazonia produced in the early twentieth century,[71] archaeologist Warren DeBoer[72] looked at the presence or absence of material goods, including ornaments, clothing, weapons, utility objects, and objects used for body modification among groups living along the Ucayali River and its tributaries. While most objects were less frequent the further they were found from their original place of manufacture, certain female-linked objects occurred in widely separated tributaries of the Ucayali, far from where they would have been expected to be made. These were not localities that would likely exchange marriage partners, DeBoer suggests, instead, it indicates a consistent pattern of raiding for women. In other words, captive women introduced cultural practices they had learned in their original homes.

Timothy A. Kohler and Kathryn K. Turner, "Raiding for Women in the Pre-Hispanic Northern Pueblo Southwest?" *Current Anthropology* 47 no. 6 (2006): 1035-1045.

[69] Donald, *Aboriginal Slavery*, Figs 2, 3 (compare with Science vol 187-4172 cover); Dye, "Art, Ritual, and Chiefly Warfare"; Timothy Taylor, "Ambushed by a Grotesque: Archaeology, Slavery, and the Third Paradigm," in *Warfare, Violence, and Slavery in Prehistory: Proceedings of a Prehistoric Society Conference at Sheffield University,* ed. Michael Parker Pearson and I.J.N. Thorpe (Archaeopress, 2005).

[70] Julia Averkieva, *Slavery Among the Indians of North America*, trans. G. R. Elliot (Victoria College, 1966 [1941]); Brett Rushforth, *Bonds of Alliance: Indigenous and Atlantic Slaveries in New France* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2012); William A. Starna and Ralph Watkins, "Northern Iroquoian Slavery," *Ethnohistory* 38 no. 1 (1991): 34-47.

[71] Günter Tessmann, *Die Indianer Nordost-Perus* (De Gruyter and Company, 1930).

[72] Warren DeBoer, "Deep Time, Big Space: An Archaeologist Skirts the Topic at Hand," in *Ethnicity in Ancient Amazonia*, ed. Alf Hornborg and Jonathan. D. Hill (University Press of Colorado, 2011).

Rethinking Migration

The archaeological culture has long been a fundamental unit of analysis and interpretation. As discussed above, a migration is observed archaeologically when material culture traits representative of an archaeological culture are found outside of a bounded geographic area. Acknowledging that captives moved frequently across these boundaries forces us to question the assumption that bounded ethnic groups can be traced across time and space and especially the implicit assumption that genes and material culture practices travel as a package.[73] While we might assume that the influx of a number of captives into a particular society would transform or blur material culture boundaries–or be obvious in a change in the distribution of material culture–my study of captives found that this was not necessarily the case.

A wide range of factors affect whether novel material culture practices were introduced by captives into the society of their captors and we have only begun to explore these factors.[74] Captives generally enter captor society in low status positions, often despised as alien enemies. This was especially true when they were incorporated as kinless slaves, rather than into the kinship system as wives or adoptees. Their low status was one element that actually helped to maintain the boundaries of captor culture. Any social group defines itself in contrast to others who do things differently. It is almost certainly true that the boundaries of the archaeological cultures that we study were maintained as much by negative criteria as positive. As ethnohistorian Theda Perdue explained in her study of Cherokee slavery, "The *atsi nahsa'i* [slaves] also functioned as deviants in Cherokee society. Deviance is a logical and necessary element in all societies because it confirms common values and group identity."[75] Similarly, the Tukano people of the eastern Amazon Basin, saw the Makú

[73] Furholt, "Mobility and Social Change;" Moore, "Putting Anthropology Back Together Again."
[74] Cameron, *Invisible Citizens;* Cameron, *Captives*; DeBoer, "Deep Time, Big Space."
[75] Theda Perdue, *Slavery and the Evolution of Cherokee Society, 1540-1866* (The University of Tennessee Press, 1979), 17.

whom they frequently raided, as completely opposite to themselves and not quite human–short, ugly, poorly dressed, unclean. All of which contrasted with the clean, well-dressed bodies, and sensible habits of the Tukano.[76] In other words, captives, simply by their presence, could strengthen the boundaries of small-scale societies.[77]

Captives, while often helpless at the time of their abduction, could respond to their captivity in a range of ways that variably affected captor cultural practices. They might be forcibly compelled to replicate exactly captor cultural practices, with the alternative being violence or death. Instead of being coerced by their captors, they might actively and intentionally adhere to captor practices because of a longing for acceptance[78] or in order to create a more comfortable life for themselves or their children. Furthermore, they could perform their duties in their new home with a variety of levels of effort and attitudes, as has been found among slaves in the American South.[79]

While captors might force captives to closely follow cultural practices, there is good evidence that captors were also open to learning from their captives. Archaeologists have tended to conceive of small-scale societies as conservative and slow to change. My study found, however, that captors were eager to learn from their captives and often pushed them to share useful information concerning foodways, technologies, curing practices, or religious practices. For example, Mary Rowlandson was living in the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1676 when she was captured by Native Americans. The family she lived with and others sought her out to make garments for them, including knitted stockings, shirts, caps, and other things. These items, made with European methods, were apparently

[76] Santos-Granero, *Vital Enemies*, 113-115.

[77] Cameron *Captives*, 111-115

[78] Olivier Gosselin, "Comment on: Captives and Culture Change: Implications for Archaeologists, *Current Anthropology* 52, no. 2 (2011): 197.

[79] James C. Scott, *Domination and the Art of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts* (Yale University Press, 1990).

valued by her indigenous captors.[80] In Africa, oral histories collected in northern Sierra Leone document that blacksmiths were especially targeted by raiders because of the high value placed on their skills; female potters were also targeted.[81] The Yanamamö of the Amazon captured an eleven-year-old Portuguese girl named Helena Valero in the 1930s and demanded that she show them how to make metal tools; they were angry when she said she did not know how.[82] When the ship carrying armorer John Jewitt was attacked by the Mowachahts Indians along the Northwest Coast of North America, Jewitt's life was spared because the Mowachahts had earlier seen him working metal; after the attack, they enslaved him and forced him to craft metal objects for the tribe.[83]

Captives could affect the societies of their captors in other ways. Captives were generally culturally different from their captors and they often came with useful linguistic skills. They could serve as intermediaries between their natal group and that of their captors. When they were traded from group to group, they might become multilingual, facilitating connections among numerous groups, like the Native boy that the explorer de La Salle was given. In these roles, they could function as social channels that linked different groups together, bypassing cultural boundaries. In the Great Plains, anthropologist Patricia Albers has noted that captive women and children might be visited by their birth families, starting cycles of gift giving and trade among groups who might otherwise be enemies.[84] In other words, captives could open avenues for cooperation that might be useful for both groups. The same was true in the Amazon where in Eastern Tukanoan groups all wives were foreigners, some forcibly abducted, others the result of a prearranged abduction ritual. These foreign wives

[80] Frances Roe Kestler, *The Indian Captivity Narrative: A Woman's View* (Garland Press, 1990).

[81] Christopher R. DeCorse, "Material Aspects of Limba, Yalunka, and Kuranko Ethnicity: Archaeological Research in Northeastern Sierra Leone," in *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*, ed. S. Shennan (Unwin Hyman, 1989).

[82] Ettore Biocca, *Yanoáma: The Story of Helena Valero, a Girl Kidnapped by Amazonian Indians* (Kodansha International 1996[1965]).

[83] Hilary Stewart, *The Adventures and Sufferings of John R. Jewitt: Captive of Maquinna* (University of Washington Press, 1987).

[84] Albers, "Symbiosis, Merger, and War."

brought new horticultural techniques to their affinal families, as well as new food preparation methods. Importantly, they "...opened crucial channels for trade and diplomacy between distant settlements."[85]

Current migration theory, such as push-pull models, migration streams, and reverse migration, are a poor fit for understanding the movement of captives because these models assume informed and agentive individuals. We need to develop new models and theory that will allow us to understand the effect of captives on material culture in the societies of their captors; in other words, their effect on the archaeological cultures that are so fundamental to our understanding of the past. Central to this task is a far more refined understanding of the nature of cultural learning.[86] Almost a decade and a half ago, the late Warren DeBoer described the sorts of understanding with regard to captives, their captors, and the learning process that we currently lack:

> "...much research sensitive to cross-cultural variability remains to be done. For example, knowledge of the developmental schedule by which various sorts of cultural knowledge are acquired is limited. Likewise, the effects of trauma, both at demographic and personal levels, on cultural transmission and acquisition are poorly understood, as is the human capacity to 'unlearn' old and learn new cultural information at various life stages."[87]

In other words, we must develop new understandings of the situations in which migrants were able to bring their material and cultural practices with them or were forced to change those practices when they arrived at their captor's home. In this section, I have only suggested some of the factors that may have been at play in this process. Captives, especially low-status people, may have been particularly subject to coercive efforts

[85] Janet M. Chernela, "Comment on: Captives and Culture Change: Implications for Archaeologists," *Current Anthropology* 52, no. 2 (2011): 196.
[86] Cameron, *Captives*, 140-145.
[87] DeBoer, "Deep Time, Big Space," 95.

by their captors to change or modify their cultural knowledge and practices. Their different ways of doing things may have been despised and reviled. However, at times, they may have been able to introduce especially useful practices to their captors. The study of captives and their effects on the material culture of their captors is fundamental to the understanding of migration processes in the past. It underscores the importance of considering cultural transmission as a "bottom-up" process, countering the old acculturation models that saw cultural transmission as the imposition of cultural practices from a dominant (often colonial) society to a subordinate (often indigenous) group.

Conclusions

I argue that archaeologists have focused on one aspect of migration—the long-distance and generally intentional movement of significant numbers of people—while overlooking the large numbers of captives who were unwillingly moved, as individuals or small groups, between the settlements of small-scale societies. Ethnohistoric accounts demonstrate that captive-taking was common in small-scale societies and that captives often formed a significant proportion of the population among these groups. Recognizing captives as a common form of migrant forces us to rethink fundamental archaeological concepts, especially our conception of archaeological cultures and their boundaries. Generations of archaeologists have used "out of place" material culture to document the movement of people in the past, but we are only beginning to explore the role of captives in the transmission of cultural practices to their captor's society.[88] In other words, we must acknowledge that while captives certainly blurred the genetic boundaries of populations, we know little about how they might have impacted the material culture of the societies they joined. Biomolecular methods and a wide range of archaeological

[88] Cameron "Captives and Culture Change;" Cameron "How People Moved;" Cameron "Captives."

data now allow for the identification of captives in the past. The next step will be to develop models of migration that incorporate the "social fact" of captives into our interpretations of the past.