It is intended to analyse the various ways nations and effects on a system of change in two populations confronted as the result of an invasion/migration. The areas in which change is potentially observable and those in which change has occurred using documented examples will be discussed, though the emphasis will be placed on the components of invasion/migration in order to isolate various theoretical configurations rather than on the analysis of historic examples.

**TERMINOLOGY**

- invasion - act of making a hostile inroad into place, country
- migration - move from one to another intrusion - thrust forcefully into
- incursion - hostile invasion, sudden attack on
- infiltration - gradual unobserved influence upon
- imposition - exact influence upon

**OBSERVABLES**

- areas in which it is claimed that change might be observed
  - physical type
  - settlement type
  - artifact type
  - continuity and change of site location and distribution
  - language

**FACTORS**

- governing the choice of terminology and form in which such activities manifest themselves in the archaeological record
  - intention - measured by reciprocal relationship between the extremes of pure military aggression and peaceful settlement
  - scale - the size of native and incoming populations
  - time - length of time over which such activities take place
  - structure - social structure of native and incoming populations

**THE ROLE OF REDISTRIBUTION IN THE STUDY OF SOCIETAL DEVELOPMENT**

During the past 20 years the works of Polanyi, Fried, and Service have provided a model of social evolution which identified the presence of reciprocity with egalitarian societies and redistribution with ranked societies. This model has been used by other anthropologists and archaeologists and has been elaborated, especially by Service, into the 'Obolomkin model-Redistribution-Specification model'. Settlement location in diverse microenvironments necessitates redistribution. According to Service, "certain geographic circumstances will favor the development of redistribution, and when combined with embryonic leadership like the big-man system, will tend to promote leadership toward a status hierarchy with an institutionalized system of central power." (Service, 1975:175)

However, at least 2 recent works have seriously challenged the Polanyi-Fried-Service model. Both studies (Earle, 1977; Peebles, 1977) use the ethnoarchaeological evidence for chiefdoms in Hawaii to demonstrate that ecological diversity is not present; that exchange of subsistence level products is not an essential part of the food procurement system; and that what exchange there is takes the form of balanced reciprocity conducted at the boundaries of dispersed settlement units and not at central places. Nevertheless, redistribution does occur, but provides only the elite with benefits, primarily primitive valuables. Redistribution, therefore, does not seem to be the dominant mode of economic exchange as predicted by the above model.

One of the results of these 2 studies is that redistribution is now seen to be one of the effects rather than as the cause of societal development. Abandoning redistribution as an indicator of the shift from egalitarian to ranked society, some archaeologists (e.g., Peebles, 1977; Wright and Johnson, 1975) have formulated cybernetic models studying the development of hierarchically arranged regulators which alter the ability of the society to process energy and information. Redistribution may then be studied as one form of regulator.

To do this, however, the various forms of redistribution will need to be considered and defined more fully. Earle (1977) has gone some way to achieving this by creating a general typology of redistributational mechanisms. They are: 1. Leveling mechanisms (e.g., counteracting-wealth accumulation, central leadership not essential). 2. Institutional mechanisms characterized by central leadership. This 2nd mechanism is subdivided into A) Householding etc., B) Share-out, etc., 'profit sharing', and C) Mobilization, etc., 'tribute extraction' for the benefit of a group not coterminous with the contributors.

In this brief paper there is only time to consider briefly of what value, if any, is the concept of redistribution. Should it be dismissed, ignored, or redefined?


what subsistence strategies are, why they came about, how they
effect, or are affected by, other 'processes' (technological development,
external stimuli, etc) or in general terms, what does the recognition of
a particular subsistence strategy of series of strategies tell us about
the people involved? These are all questions which can be related to
any people under study.

When dealing with agriculturalists, as opposed to hunter-
gatherers, the situation is often made more complex due to increased
general complexities of cause and effect factors. I will be putting
forward a situation concerning the interpretation of 'subsistence
strategies' in theoretical terms, but based on ideas concerned with
approaching this topic in Shetland.

Instead of an indigenous population developing or receiving
'agricultural stimuli', or indeed the gradual spread of agriculturalists
into an area, there is the possibility that, on islands, an already
developed agricultural system is implanted onto a region that is more or
less suited to the system as introduced. If, however, the imported
strategy 'works', even if it is not the 'best' strategy for the region
will it still be maintained? Might not such considerations override
our contemporary view of what a 'best' strategy might be, which centres on
efficiency, least effort etc? Can such concepts as increased perception
of the environment help, or mislead?

This aspect, which might be termed the effect of the 'mental
template' is present in most situations, but the effect is difficult to
measure in complex societies. My choosing areas where such effects may
be highlighted the contribution of the 'past' as viewed by the people we
are studying can be assessed as well as factors of adaptability,
responsiveness etc.

Alan Vince: The interpretation of Pottery Distributions.
This paper takes as its theme the extraction of data concerning economic
organisation from studies of pottery from archaeological contexts. The
major factors governing pottery distribution are seen to be craft-specialisation
demand for pottery, means of transport, features of the natural and man-made
landscape and the distribution of raw materials. These factors seem to be
largely independent of the social and economic organisation of the society,
which are the areas in which our primary interest lies. There does not
appear to be any way of circumventing this problem, by choosing variables
which only reflect this social and economic pattern and it is suggested that
we have to approach the problem in stages. Firstly modelling the fitness
distribution process in selected modern ethnographic and archaeological
examples (where the social and economic variables are known from cultural
sources) and secondly applying these models to examples from prehistoric
or proto-historic societies.

The possible methods of analysis appropriate to such a study are discussed.
Of the various methods of quantifying the relative proportions of vessel
types in an assemblage only sherd counts and weight counts can be performed
on total collections. Estimated vessel equivalents are based on the rim
and base sherd only and can therefore only be used for large collections.
With small collections both sherd and weight counts can be deceptive and
minimum collection sizes below which quantification is meaningless will have to be designated. (Ian Hodder has used 30 sherds on a threshold while Clive Orton has suggested 100 sherd). The basic technique
for distribution studies is regression analysis and Hodder has used this
method to document several of the factors discussed above (notably transport
routes). To apply regression analysis to some of the problems of local trade
will require the collection of data in a different manner to that normally practiced, probably through intensive area surveys linked
with studies of the settlement hierarchy in the area.

Aspects of Wealth

David A. Hinton

Attitudes to personal ornament vary from society to society;
to what extent are documentary sources misleading about such
attitudes, at to what extent is archaeological material
representative? These questions will be considered in relation
to Anglo-Saxon and English Medieval evidence.
We start with data and a problem; we then suggest that the problem can be more profitably approached by a more general consideration of similar phenomena. The data are the rich graves of Eastern France and Southern Germany in Hallstatt D; the problem is the explanation of their appearance, and more particularly, their disappearance. The various explanations for their rise and fall are briefly reviewed, and are found wanting.

It is suggested that one useful approach is to consider the role of rich graves in social development, and other comparable phenomena from European prehistory are assessed. All are short-lived, and societies depositing such graves can be seen as in an unstable or transitional state. Two groups can be distinguished: one where such graves accompany the development of early states, the other where no significant social development is apparent, but there is reversion to the previous state. In both cases the graves presumably reflect exploitation of local resources, and underline the role of trade in social development.

By contrast, the Hallstatt D graves and the associated sites show some signs of state formation, albeit impermanent, and the structure of society which ensues is very different from what went before.