Human agency is difficult to capture for retrospective historical research – unless it is the deeds of a tiny elite. Elite historians kicked out women, working population, children, old-age people – unless kings or philosophers. It left them, according to recent studies of Carolingian and Ottonian society, with a mere 2 percent-version of a society’s story. After the intellectual springtime of 1968/the 1970s intense efforts were undertaken to understand his-stories and her-stories. This required a vastly larger amount of sources, some of which had to be recognized as useful first. Research and writing required time. For Habsburg-Austria both Ernst Bruckmüller’s new social history and Roman Sandgruber’s new economic history appeared only in 1995, for the German Reich in its multiple and fragmented forms and for Europe as a whole Michael Borgolte’s *Europa entdeckt seine Vielfalt* only in 2002, my own coedited *The Historical Practice of Diversity* in 2003.¹ Of course, a quarter century of specialized publications had preceded these magisterial syntheses. All (young) scholars, who from the 1970s took up the challenges, had to struggle against the establishment in their respective discipline to be able to include the agency of what for demographers is “the population” and for societal historians are acting men, women, and, it needs to be emphasized, children, who in their process of their socialization imbue patterns of thought, action, and spirituality – the codified as well as lived past – and, as next generation of adults, shape the transition from present to future.

Scarcity of sources, as in the history of Byzantium, requires using whatever can be found. An abundance of preserved written texts, as for modern history, easily results in mental shrinkage: loss of reading skills in visual and material sources. In fact, all sources are material. An orally transmitted idea, to be materialized and thus accessible to historians, undergoes a trajectory from

¹ Dirk Hoerder with Christiane Harzig and Adrian Shubert, eds., *The Historical Practice of Diversity: Transcultural Interactions from the Early Modern Mediterranean to the Postcolonial World* (New York, 2003), 177-200.
making of parchment – pen – ink to fixation as text, or – with different materials and tools – as fresco or icon, cooking or liturgical utensil, building or tent. Sources are frozen in time at the moment of their creation, they are objectified human labor as texts or food platters, they are frozen in the place of production. But scholars are searching for lifeways, trajectories and translations, for continuity rather than pieces of material. This demands combination of philological studies, craft studies (*Handwerksgeschichte*), food studies and many others. It demands multiplicity of sources and approaches, inter- or transdisciplinarity.

My assigned task is to present research methodologies on migration and mobility from the 19th century to the present to you as experts on the first millennium our counting. I will first discuss broad societal approaches to migration against the foil of narrow state-centered narrations. I will, second, summarize innovative approaches and their sources – not only textual ones – since the 1970s. Third, I will move back in time and take a perspective from the outside, from Noricum-Bavaria onto Syria-Constantinople.2

*Societal Approaches to Migration and Their Marginalization by Mainstream Storytellers*

In dynastic states people of many cultures had lived parallel or interactively unified as subjects in a realm of rule. In the last third of the 19th-century perspectives of economic, political, and academic elites on human beings and their agency changed. They were reconceptualized as mass workers in the Atlantic World and in the Global Plantation Belt, the factories in the fields, owned by European colonizer powers: this the industrialization approach (with colonization usually left out).3 These masses were told to have one single common culture, that of “their” nation-under-construction, scaffolding not yet removed: the nation-embodied-in-a-state approach. The working masses could be drilled into soldier-masses and sent into war – a kind of mass national honor killing, or in conquest of raw materials and raw labor power to be mobilized and shifted about: the empire and superior race approach. That human beings might act in their own interest

---


3 Eric Wolf, Carey McWilliams
and on their own was useful to “immigrant” receiving states’ labor reservoirs but it could be
dangerous to both their postulated racial purity as well as to immobile emigrant-generating old
regimes. Administrators thus decided to control borders against masses of inferior culture and
different, equally imposed national identity. This required exclusion legislation, relegation of
some to minority status, invention of the passport and visa regimes for crossing of borders,
nationalization campaigns whether Germanization, Russification, or Americanization.4

For migrants, individuals – families – larger clusters, this had multiple complicating
consequences: moves required papers, paperwork, and fees to pay the paper-workers or
administrators. Life in the receiving nation required “assimilation” and, for non-migrating non-
nationals, it meant discrimination as minority. Nation-state academics earned good salaries by
providing nations with a genealogy as they had done for dynasts before; by rationalizing why
“the Others” were inferior (and could never become academics); by obliterating emigrants from
the nation’s historical memory or describing immigrants as uncouth “barbarians” (using the
practice of the earlier Greek self-aggrandizing and mono-lingual culture). Arriving foreigners or
aliens had to be counted at entry gates, loss of border control equaled loss of national identity –
at least for the mono-cultured. Historians have used such statistics – and unwittingly moved into
a dead end. Since nations were constructed as fixed in territory, internal mobility could not exist
and thus no counting apparatus was established. Back to the data: From the 1870s more than
50 percent of Europe’s urbanites were in-migrants – long overlooked. Statisticians did better –
aware of a world beyond the nation, they accumulated worldwide comparative statistics.5

Many scholars lived at the margins of the male White Atlantic’s knowledge-production.6 In the
1880s a group of academically trained women in Chicago who worked with immigrants to
improve their lot focused on acculturation and proper legal provisions. They published major
empirical sociological and economic studies as well as normative ethical ones: the “urban
survey”, progressive reform, social work, and Christian social justice approaches. Only few of
them, now recognized as the Chicago Women’s School of Sociology, could become university

4 John Torpey
5 Willcox and Ferenczi
6 For a survey of all approaches: Christiane Harzig and Dirk Hoerder with Donna Gabaccia, What is Migration
History? (Cambridge, Polity, 2009), Chap. 1 and 3.
teachers and, if so, were limited to Social Work Departments attached to Divinity Schools. At the same time a migrant German scholar published equally empirical research on internal migrations in Great Britain, dealing with both gender and ethnic succession.

In 1887 another scholar left antisemitic German academia and emigrated to the United States, Franz Boas. Around him, from 1899, researchers coalesced at Columbia University and Barnard College for Women in New York: African-American, Mexican, female, immigrant and all located next to European immigrant Greenwich Village and African-American and Caribbean-African Harlem. They focused on immigrant interaction, cultural transfer, African and Latin-American cultures-of-origin. Boas studied immigrants’ physical features and found that dark-skinned Slavs and olive-skinned Mediterraneans would, within two generations, look like white Anglo-Americans. This seemed to spell a disaster, The Passing of the Great Race, as a book title of 1916 had it. To avoid this, the US government in 1917 passed the first major immigration restriction. The scholars at Columbia’s School of Anthropology and (other) Social Sciences, as I have called it, parallel to W.E.B Dubois’s sociology centered on African-Americans emancipated themselves from the majoritarian racist discourses (Clyde Kluckhohn). Three women, remembered only as dancers-choreographers and writers, used African-Caribbean dance as well as “folk-tales” as sources for their Ph.D. dissertations on cultural transfer through migration. All of these sophisticated findings did not find an audience.

One new method to collect sources was the (usually Social Christianity-inspired) Settlement House approach: Scholars settled in an impoverished neighbourhood and collected data as participatory observers. One of them, Caroline F. Ware (1899-1990) as student summer intern had realised that impoverished slum dwellers, labelled alien and racially different, were people like other Americans. In Greenwich Village, with a team of researchers with multiple language skills she analysed class, gender, and generation, Italian immigrants and their children, Irish
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longshoremen, truck-drivers, and politicians, Jewish shopkeepers, Spanish seamen, and a remnant of “staid old” American and German citizens. The newcomers, in Ware’s thoughtful comment, “were confronted by a social situation, not only foreign to their own social experience, but so lacking in coherence itself as to offer little guide to their adaptation” (1935). The migrants’ children had to achieve both intergenerational cultural transfer and acculturation. Would this have been different for migrants to Constantinople, Aleppo, or Anatolia’s smaller towns? Immersion into the remnants of a sixth-century building permits analysis of migrant or resident masons’ work and of craftswomen’s tapestries. It permits reflections on how they lived and fed themselves and fashioned their tools. Did, with the advance of Muslim armies, many-cultured peasant families move to cities for protection? Into what type of buildings?

Back to eastern Europe, where Poles, Jews and Germans, Bielo-Russians and Ukrainians lived parallel, some with a long history of emigration and diaspora. In the 1930s, young multi-lingual Polish anthropologists reflected Central European academic migratory circuits, trained at universities in Warsaw, Krakow, Vienna, Lwow/ Lviv/ Lemberg, Leipzig, Berlin, Paris, and, in some cases, London, the United States, or in exile in Siberia. They were part of the transcontinental and transatlantic community of migration scholars: Bronislaw Malinowski shared his questions with researchers at Columbia; Florian Znaniecky worked with W.I. Thomas in Chicago; Krystyna Duda-Dziewierz studied peasant families in Poland both as regards development of national culture and transnational aspects of migration: Which strata left, what socialization did they take with them, how did the village society change when migrants left or when they returned?

Perhaps the most sophisticated methodologies and theorizations emerged in 1940s Brazil, Cuba, and Canada. Sociologist Gilberto Freyre studied how the mixing (mestiçagem) of migrants from Europe and Africa with Natives Peoples established a new, culturally richer Brazilian
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12 Caroline F. Ware, Greenwich Village, 1920-1930: a comment on American civilization in the post-war years (Boston 1935), reedited with new 'Foreword' by Deborah Dash Moore, x-xxii (Berkeley 1994), quote 427.
13 Malinowski was a transmigrant himself, Polish-origin in the Habsburg Empire, Univ. of Leipzig and London School of Economics-educated, teaching at LSE and at Yale. Franz Boas, at Columbia University, was Jewish, German, and American.
people. Population planners and advocates of “race hygiene” of the time decried the “mongrelisation” of races constructed as pure. Under power and economic hierarchies, the lives of the slaves, the majority of Brazil’s population, and the Portuguese-background masters were inextricably linked. Freyre’s concept of a frontier society built by the powerless and the powerful, both immigrants, remains salient and suggests reflections on the Roman Empire’s many frontier societies.  

Fernando Ortiz analysed “transculturation” in Cuba as the economic, institutional, legal, ethical, religious, artistic, linguistic, psychological, sexual, and other interaction in people’s lives. He differentiated Native Peoples’, migrant Iberian and other European, and force-migrated Africans’ cultures into their components – Wolof, Catalanian, Genoese, Jewish, Ciboney, Cantonese. All created a new transcultural society and from their interactions Ortiz developed an empirically sound concept of fusion in power hierarchies. In Canada, at bi-cultural Montreal’s McGill University, Everett Hughes and Helen MacGill Hughes, argued that receiving societies, differentiated by region and often by language, provide no single model for acculturation.

Neither Byzantium, nor Carolingia, nor Iberia ever provided a single blueprint.

A further distinct development of the 1920s and 30s was the migration of students and intellectuals from the French colonies to France and from India to Great Britain. They conceptualized intercultural fusion and resistance in terms of colonizer power, mobility between metropoles and colonies, multiply layered interactions, and colonized subalterns’ strategies of subversion. This was a migration small in numbers but large in consequences – out of it came Aimé Césaire’s *Discours sur le colonialisme* (1950), the founding text for decolonization movements. Byzantinists know the pattern: Small in numbers and extremely influential had been the monks, fresco painters, and artisans migrating from Constantinople to Kiev and beyond. Out of it came what has been called the “Third Rome”.
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16 Fernando Ortiz, "Del fenómeno de la transculturación y su importancia en Cuba," *Revista Bimestre Cubana* 27 (1940), 273-278, transl. as *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar* by Harriet de Onís (1947; repr. Durham, 1995).

All of these authors, outside of the white Atlantic’ core of knowledge production, were not heard at their time, their empirically based analyses and theoretizations which challenged the ideology of nation-state homogeneity could not prevail against the masters’ narratives. Freyre’s and Ortiz’s studies were available in English by 1946 and 1947. Many of the authors, at Columbia in particular, were women, Jews, Blacks, some even radicals. All were bi-cultural as immigrants or had migration experience.

Instead Chicago University’s Men’s School of Sociology of 1920s and Harvard University’s Oscar Handlin in the 1940s (in the German-language segment Max Weber on Poles in the early 1900s) established a North or white Atlantic-centered narrative of disorganized and uprooted migrants lacking capabilities for rational agency. Their constructions coincided and supported policy-makers’ views and the resident public’s perceptions of migrants as people in limbo in-between cultures.

Such marginalization of scholarship not fitting majoritarian interests is purposefully done in many contexts. When around 1500 a new western European scholarship emerged and its proponents needed a genealogy to heroic past times of their own, they announced a “Europe proper” with Rome-in-Italy ancestry. And the memory of the Roman-Empire-transmigrated-eastward? Hieronymus Wolf (1516-1580) obliterated it but renaming it “Byzantium” and, like the regions ranging from Persia-Egypt to Africa and Iberia, these Roman people and peoples were relegated to the lands were orchids grow, to an Orchideenfach. Real heroes, dynasties, nations derived from the Italian-Roman legions. That these were many-cultured the ideologues conveniently overlooked.

>>> At one point we need a Vienna Dialogue treating Mediterranean, Carolingian, East Roman, and Russian Europe at a par.

New Questions, New Sources on Migration from the 1970s

Scholars of my generation might have built on the achievements and broad theoretizations since the 1880s, on Caroline Ware’s call that social scientists need “a genuine respect for the people”.
But we did not know them, our teachers did not mention them, a mainstream *damnatio memoriae*. In the Atlanto-centric and male master narrative of the time, migrants made one-way, one-directional, one-time moves and changed from persons with identity to disoriented ones the moment they crossed the border and betrayed their nation. Wimmer and Schiller, 2002,\(^\text{18}\) critiqued this “methodological nationalism” and, in medieval and ancient history we might call the reification of imperial elites an equally distorting “methodological elitism”. The scholars on the margins, whose work I have discussed, pursued “methodological comprehensiveness”. This we all need to do. One problem, of course is sources: many historians rely on texts produced by elites only. To what degree such sources may be surpassed has been proved by Robert Knapp, *Invisible Romans* (2011).

The new 1970s approaches began with quantification as simple counting: How many moved? Since each nation’s bureaucrats collected statistical data only at international borders, internal migration we could not study – Sweden, with wonderful parish registers, being the exception. Historians began a search for other data sets. The Atlantic shipping companies’ records showed, surprisingly, that – on average – one third of all migrants returned. This made North America a guestworker rather than an immigrant country. The Ellis Island records – the major entry station to the US after 1892 – showed that, seemingly, 94 percent of all arriving men and women went to a particular location where information-providing kin and friends lived. Local-to-local.

Second, scholars reassessed bordered geographies: Under methodological nationalism a move from Switzerland to nearby Luxemburg was international, from distant and rural Galicia to metropolitan Vienna internal. For those moving, distance does matter in terms of cost and duration of the trip. The fixed geography of continents and their borders migrants had to translate into their own mental maps. A tedious leg on foot, donkey, or cart appeared as endless distance; from the port of Naples speedy ship travel. The Mediterranean was vast: port after port with fascinating impressions on their minds, then – just behind Gibraltar – New York, in between no impressions, nothing but water, the Atlantic was small and boring. The ship with its electricity and machines appeared as modernity – that their trajectory would end at a disassembly line in a

Kansas City slaughterhouse came, kind of, unexpectedly. Was not industry “modernity”? It was gruesome labor worse than the “old world” – their previous lifeworld – that they were aiming to improve. They realized that they had cared for their irreplaceable draft animals and milk cows or goats but that their capitalist employers did not care for them as mass-human labor, replaceable human beings.

Fixed political geography formed the basis for departure and arrival statistics: from Germany to “America” – of all the Americas this meant the United States. In mental constructions the impressive “America” became a signifier of modernity and dynamism: in the Ruhr mining region drilling a new shaft fast was labelled “doing it the American way”. America, Canada, Argentina were labels that people without differentiated knowledge could understand; “from Bugiarno to the iron mine camp”, in contrast, nobody would even know that the one was in Lombardy, the other in Missouri. Actual social and emotional and filling-the-stomach relations extended from space of socialization to a space were bread could be earned – “to bread” was the goal of migrants of many languages.

Through such statistical and place-name sources our perspective is shifting from data and political frames to social spaces and individuals in them, to human agency – world-wide agency.\(^{19}\) **SLIDE** In the 19th century, 1815 to 1914-1930s about 150 million (or more) women and men migrated across international borders in the five large migrations systems across the globe: 150 million individual decisions and preparations for the move; in assumed families of four 450 million close relatives consulted and left behind. How many moved and were left behind when Constantinople or Caesarea attracted men and women?

The quest for new sources led to texts but since historians looking “from the bottom up” still considered illiterate people “the inarticulate” they focused on archives of text-producing organizations, like trade unions, or control organizations, like policing forces: “methodological
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organization” or “control organ centeredness”. Police archives provided information not only on criminal acts in a modern sense but also on theft of bread, other groceries, broader acts of resistance. George Rudé used such archives to reconstruct agency in the French Revolution, my dissertation research on crowd action in the American Revolution was based on the keyword “riot” in written sources. From the late 19th century such control organ sources became tools of migration research since, fearful of returning radicals, European police chiefs formed a “police international”, headquartered in Berlin, sent agents to the US, summarized and mimeographed the reports and distributed them to all participating police forces.20 A poor source: the spies understood very little about workers and their political ideas.

Scholars interested in agency then quickly moved to migrant-generated texts. Since the vast majority of the transatlantic migrants were workers and those from particularly oppressive regions – thou shalt not eat from the tree of knowledge and thou shalt not learn to read and write – were illiterate, we first looked for “group-produced” texts, labor newspapers by in-migrants in the in-migrants’ languages.21 These needed to be “unearthed” like shards in an archeological site, since the masters of the narrative had buried them under layers of elite history. The texts provided information on working conditions, on (fledgling) organization by class and craft, on struggles to improve exploitative frames. In one of the cultures of origin, the Correspondenzblatt der Generalkommission der Gewerkschaften Deutschlands (since 1891) on its first page railed against emigration, “the struggle for better lives is fought here”; on its last page, union members on their way to a job in North America posted their good-bye notes to friends. Organizations take a long-time perspective, members have only one life-time and many want to act in it and on their own for their and their children’s future.

By the late 1970s, those historians willing to depart from the confines of “methodological elitism” and “nationalism” had understood that the underclasses were highly articulate – in gendered ways. Social scientists just could not hear them. Sources to recapture the missing sound tracks were material objects. If the volume of a pyramid could be computed and the time of working the stones and building the sophisticated structures be reconstructed, then the number of

20 |Ho Plutokraten
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in-migrant workers could be estimated. Or, in another segment of the globe, merchants, captains, sailors, craftsmen, and transport workers developed the Southern China-Southeast Asia diaspora from the 15th century on. Merchant ledgers, travelers’ accounts, and material sources, whether coins or bamboo products provided information. No Egyptian stonemason, no Chinese craftsperson would in-migrate, unpack his or her tools, and set to work immediately. All began with building accommodations, if modest ones, and getting food – food palatable to their cultural preferences. Arrival of migrants begins with what has been labeled “reproductive” work – and this again labeled “women’s” work. Migration is gendered. My hunch is that the label-producing centers were male-staffed and non-migrant.

Many of the articulate migrants either could write, had friends or kin write for them, or used professional street-corner scribes. At the destination of the letters literate friends read the texts publicly in inns, so that all neighbors could share the information. Source-preservation was related to public attitudes to emigration: Swedish and Swedish-American communities provided a place for migrants in public historical memory, scholars collected letters and published them. In Germany and Austria emigration was exorcised from memory, a “conspiracy of silence”; Austrian schoolbooks even today do not mention emigration. In Germany, in the 1980s, Wolfgang Helbich at Bochum University began a letter collection, which quickly grew to the thousands. From the many findings I can mention only a few: the writers provided accurate information since any rosy picture would have brought kin and neighbors to their doorsteps expecting help; in periods of economic expansion letter writers discussed job options but hardly ever counselled a particular person to come: “let him decide for himself”. This – it seems to me – was gendered, women would call for a particular sister or female friend to come, relational aspects rather than mere jobs counted. Statistics, since the founding of the Universal Postal Union in 1874, indicate that millions of emigrant letters crossed the Atlantic each year. Their information made migration self-sustaining. In the hierarchized European class societies peasants and workers distrusted any information from above as well as “emigrant guides” of well-travelled authors. The letters also lend themselves to philological studies of acculturation and change: when do English words appear – often to describe tasks not done in this way in the society of origin. Letters were local-to-local, “national” only in emphasis on more open societal conditions in the receiving society. In the European nations-under-construction they reached
“homes”, “Heimat”, in economic disaster zones and, given landlord-tenant relations, social disaster regimes. Oral information came from return migrants. In the steamship period from the 1870s, every eighth passenger going “to America” had been there before. Similar information transmission occurred under India’s kangani system and in South China’s regions of out-migrations – where orally transmitted information was, it seems, more important than written calls from emigrant merchants in need of additional craftspeople or servants.

Life-writings, in addition to letters, comprise diaries, memoirs, and autobiographies. Diaries usually serve communication-reflection with oneself; letters serve communication with known others, kin, neighbors, friends; memoirs – often compilations of assorted memorabilia – and autobiographies – usually composed for children or grandchildren and not for publication to a wider audience – provide, ideally, a continuous story (which letter series might also do) and give sense to a life-course. Thus they may gloss over jarring experiences like racist slurs or breaks in an author’s life course when plans did not work out. Comparing the life stories of immigrants to Canada with those of migrants from Burgenland to Vienna in the late 19th century juxtaposes narrations of hard work and achievements, perhaps with setbacks or strokes of luck, to consistently negative narrations of hunger, difficulties to make ends meet, exploitative work. The elites’ favorite pastime from the 1880s to 1914, building a nation on a laboring population lacking the basics of life, required an immense amount of identitarian ideology and propaganda.22

In the 1980s, SLIDE still in the frame of emigration rather than multiple migrations, of local-to-local rather than glocal, I attempted to develop a comprehensive approach to migrants’ agency based on textual sources.23

[explain graph: societal frame, locality- microregion, trajectory, societies changed by migration]

22 [“Damit es nicht vergessen wird” edited by Vienna colleagues]
A Model of Migration and Acculturation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culture of Origin</th>
<th>Migration Process</th>
<th>Receiving Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>specific local form</td>
<td>individual/group</td>
<td>industrialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pre-migration characteristics and conditions¹</td>
<td>urbanization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>decision to migrate</td>
<td>social stratification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intervening obstacles and inducements</td>
<td>demographic characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- emigration regulations</td>
<td>political situation and developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- cost/spONSorship²</td>
<td>educational system, beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- information³</td>
<td>ethnic composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>immigration regulations</td>
<td>religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>migration</td>
<td>internal or short-distance migration traditions⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>previous migration experience</td>
<td>specific local form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intended length of stay</td>
<td>acculturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obj.⁴/subjective⁵ factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>individual/group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>segmented labor markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>post-migration characteristics and conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ethnic communities and enclaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>receiving culture modified by in-migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>return migration</td>
<td>influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Exp. educational and technical training, demographic characteristics, prior migration and acculturation experience, individual social ties, expectations.
2. This includes psychic "cost" support by relatives or friends emotionally, by pre-paid tickets, upon arrival.
3. Information may come from the society of origin ("realist" version when sent by prior migrants) or from myths or printed guides in the society of origin ("nonrealist" variant).
4. The specific political, social, cultural, economic conditions into which a migrant (group) moves.
5. The personal and/or collective satisfaction or disappointment and resulting identification or rejection as well as readiness for internalization.
6. These categories are overlapping.
SLIDE [explain: experienced and reported societies]
Both graphs are simplified – they do not take into account migration in stages, multiple migrations, changed perspectives about the duration of migration.

Though based on years of research, to avoid theorizing over the heads of mobile men and women, I decided to test this model by using immigrants’ autobiographical writings in Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific Coast. I could locate about 300 for a 150-year period – two documents a year seems to resemble Byzantine source density. Unexpectedly, they were so rich that I could write a whole history of Canada, Creating Societies (1999), from the bottom up. Cook books and the major mail order department store’s annual catalogue SLIDE provided additional texts and illustrations: the store sold tools for any trade, images of all of them in the catalogue, and it sold anything from a button to a house for self-assembly. It was opened in the 1850s by an Irish immigrant and, like the letters, provided exact information and a, meticulously kept, money-back guarantee. SLIDE Priests, by the way, were not short-changed. I know, Byzantinists care about religion – if in its orthodox version.

Different yet similar textual sources are the correspondence of South China Seas – Indian Ocean migrant-resident merchant families (“settled strangers”, mediating families, middlemen) and, for their specific trade, samplers of fabrics, for example. In a way, the equivalent source for Roman history is a ship sunk with its cargo, for example the 4th-century ship in Comacchio with the captain’s writing utensils still in place.

Methodological Comprehensiveness in Medieval and Late Ancient Times

What 19th-century catalogues presented as text and image, 9th-century people had in their minds as words, concepts, pictures. I am grappling with the issue on how to reconstruct their agency in a project about migration and cultural contact in Celtic Dürrnberg-Roman Iuvavum-Agilolfingian Bavaria-Salzburg from about 1000 BCE to 1500 CE. Texts in the Salzburg’s archbishoprics archive do not mention men and women, neither their faith nor their labor. SLIDE In contrast, Roman friezes did show artisanal producers and women as shopkeepers.24 So did wall paintings

in Pharaonic times. Salzburg’s elite was merely concerned with gifts and exchange of real estate, the borders of which record keepers had in their minds in surprising detail. Local historians were ensconced in “methodological elitism”, in fact merely “methodological real estatism”. The deeds yield far less information than, for example, hagiographies or euchologia do. Agricultural and artisanal producers as well as traders, men and women, vanished from visual representations with the slow expansion and codification as well as, literally, ossification of Christianity and its relics.

In the region’s medieval Christian texts neither the work nor the migrations of common people appear. The clerical chroniclers imposed a *damnatio memoriae*. Studies by Jörg Drauschke and Falko Daim prove that in Merovingian and Carolingian times, objects from Constantinople and beyond were carried to Salzburg and beyond, one grave of a Dürrnberg saltmine manager before our time contained an ornamental shell from the Indian Ocean. Material culture, the topic of the next Vienna Dialogues in November 2016, thus does provide clues about connectivity along routes on which humans travelled with their goods, spirituality, practical knowledges. Methodological comprehensiveness seems difficult to reach if sources are fragmentary. But, as a Canadian scholar demanded, “accurate imagination” is needed to fill gaps – other renowned scholars have called for “sociological imagination” (Noam Chomsky) or “historical imagination” (Louise Tilly). I would slightly rephrase this: gaps between data may be filled by pertinent questions and resulting accurate assumptions.

I will first use the very few visual sources. Organized Latin Christian religion’s prohibition of almost all tasks that peasant families in view of upcoming thunderstorms or craftsmen and -women in view of their daily sustenance might want to do on the holy Sun-day led to imagery of all forbidden utensils and tools. [SLIDE] Their usage would hurt Jesus, the Christ, as the Roman soldiers’ instruments of torture had done. One priests’ so-called *Feiertags*—Church feast-day—*Christus* almost resembles Timothy Eaton’s catalogue. His texts or spoken sermons have not
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come down to us. His ban included trade mobility, here a load of wine being carried uphill. His religion’s texts – I differentiate between organized religion and people’s spirituality – elevated the Sun-God’s day to holy day. Both the worship of the Sun-God and the Christian God came from Syria and even feather-light ideas do not fly but are moved by humans in their minds. Many men and women moved – we do not have the data but the results, the objectification of their mobility, spirituality, and daily labor.

I will take one individual, a “case” in terminological objectification, to illustrate the entwined aspects of the migration of humans, objects, and ideas. According to what we “know”, i.e. assume to be as close to what happened as we can retrospectively assert, a young man – a “son” in terms of relationships – from a wealthy Italian family decided to expand his socialization by learning ascetic ways of life. Since teachers lived in Syria and Egypt he migrated east and, with his new adopted lifeways, turned west perhaps via Constantinople and along the Danube. In Noricum Severin (c. 410-482) became known for his capability give advice, to negotiate with war-faring men (labelled Germanic “tribes”), and to raise support from wealthy Roman women. Given the increasing raids over the Danube, he asked those who appreciated his ascetic ways, pragmatic capabilities, and spiritual authority to take his bones after his impending death with them when they would flee across the Alps to Italy. So they did: his bones were migrated and, more important for those living, their systemically posited power of salvation. All of this we derive from a life-story, a hagiographic text. Centuries later, believers in search of a genealogy, had an expensive, sumptuous sarcophagus built for his bones by luxury craftsmen. His chosen asceticism was – intentionally – lost in the trans-latio. Damnatio memoriae and legend, interest-driven narration. Stories have both, fixity and mobility, of their own.

Over the preceding centuries, other migrants had travelled the routes and carried with them belief systems focused on the Magna Mater or on male Mithras or on God and his son Christ or the Sun-God. Around 200 CE an army officer had moved east-west-east with numerous side trips.

---

27 In a rare, perhaps singular, early case – the Salzburg calendariurn of 818 – rural labor, rather than being done by months, “May cuts the grass”, was actually depicted as human work.

He commanded the legions stationed along the Danube and, while in the region, was or had himself acclaimed emperor. Septimius Severus (*146, r. 193-211) and his first wife (†186) “originated”, i.e. were socialized, in the Province of Africa. His second wife, empress Julia Domna (170-217), came from the family of the High Priests of Elagabalus, the God of the Mountain, in western Syria (Emesa, today Homs). Together with the mobile intellectuals and courtiers and military officers around them, the imperial couple unified Mountain God and undefeatable Roman Sol Invictus into one: a highly successful organic “shape-shifting”. [Native NA concept] Julia Domna’s métissage of belief systems had far more impact than men’s ephemeral battlefield victories or defeats. From this perspective, the African-Danubian-Syrian actors processually shifted the mental-spiritual-textual-and-material imperial core east at the turn from 2nd to 3rd century. The processual tans-latio was fixed in place when another highly mobile Emperor, Constantine, relocated the capital city east. Historians, recently Ward-Perkins, interrupted the continuity by positing the fall of the empire and fixing the transfer of the seat of power as disruptive date: Constantine – kind of – cemented the Empire’s eastward migration. An accurate imagination adds the tens of thousands of in-migrating artisan men and women who built the city and preceded Constantine by several years. The had to translate craft practices: mortar, for example, binds faster in warmer environments. Constantine and his advisors fused aspects of Christianity with the worship of Sol Invictus. A migrant diaspora of self-named Christians spread the fusion until a millennium later a Christian and authoritarian priest had the Feiertagschristus painted. “Cultures in contact”, my favorite topic – as is “methodological comprehensiveness”. The worlds emerging from countless moves were macro-regionally transcultural in many micro-regional incarnations and practices.