Dolukhanov et al. 2005: The chronology of Neolithic dispersal in Central and Eastern Europe

* Use radio carbon dating of cooking pottery to estimate a timeline of ag development in Europe
* Pottery spread faster through Eastern Europe than the resolution of carbon dating can detect, meaning that pottery spread faster than 4 km/yr
* Eastern Europe saw slower rates, around 1.6 km/yr
* The signature of the Neolithic period is the transition from hunter-gather societies to agro-pastoral farming.
* Generally support the idea of dispersal driven diffusion of ideas.

Holden 2001: Bantu language trees reflect the spread of farming across sub-Saharan Africa: a maximum-parsimony analysis

* Make a Bantu language tree and then use that tree to infer agricultural origins
* Applying the methods from Gray and Jordan (2000) Austronesian language to the Bantu languages
* Argue that farming was responsible for the spread of Bantu languages because its spread corresponds to the timing and spatial patterning.

Bellwood 2001: Early Agriculturalist Population Diasporas? Farming, Languages, and Genes

-

Bellwood 1996: Phylogeny and reticulation in prehistory

* Describes two competing models assign different mechanisms of the structure in modern cultural patterns.
* Phylogenetic commonality (bifurcating hierarchy) is contrasted with reticulated commonality (network structure)
* A number of geneticists have recently presented evidence which they believe indicates a relatively close relationship between language families and genetic geography on a world scale (Cavalli- Sforza *et al.* 1988; 1994;Ruiz-Linares *et al.* 1995; Chen *et al.* 1995)
* Phylogenetic models, stressing common- ality of descent, imply dispersal by culturally and linguistically related populations from common origins in circumscribed homeland regions.
* Reticulate models, as recently, presented by anthropologists and archaeologists, stress the importance of continuing processes of interaction between contemporary commu- nities.
* the existence of truly phylogenetic relationships within an array of cultures and languages *must* imply some form of migration/dispersal trajectory at source. Simi- larities resulting from interaction alone are phenotypic, not phylogenetic.
* Of course, there is a danger of circular reasoning here - traces of phylogeny are stated to imply movement from an ancestral source, and traces of such movements imply phylo- genetic relationships.
* A differentiation, albeit with overlap, between large scale ‘phylum-form- ing’ and small-scale ‘ethnic group-forming’ processes surely lies at the heart of the issue under debate.
* The essential question addressed here is whether these major language families have developed
  + 1  through linguistic diffusion alone amongst relatively unmoving human populations  (i.e. by convergence) NO SUPPORT
  + **2**have spread through language shift by populations previously speaking unrelated languages (often get language sharing or bilingualism rather than expansion of one language at the expense of the other)
  + **3** have spread through dispersal of actual *speakers* of ancestral languages within these families. (evidence in the spread of English into unoccupied areas rather than into densely packed areas like India or China)

Of these three processes, only the third requires actual population dispersal -the first two involve only diffusion. Naturally, all three processes work to some degree hand-in-hand, but it is unreasonable to assume that all three have worked in even proportions in all historical situations.
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