**From Bronzization to ‘World System’: Globalization and Glocalization Across the Globe (2000 BCE–1500 CE) <a>**

**Introduction <b>**

The present chapter considers the ways in which pre-modern historians and archaeologists have, to date, engaged with glocalization. While it will become apparent that there has been some engagement, this is often subsumed within broader discussions about the application of concepts from globalization to the study of the past. In part, this may reflect the fact that discussions of globalization have become more nuanced. Earlier notions that saw globalization primarily (or exclusively) in terms of convergence, homogenization and universalizing trajectories have tended to be replaced by a more complex sense that such phenomena also generated localized responses, often in the form of adaption, resistance, rejection and amelioration (see Pitts, 2008, p. 494). As such, the ways in which glocalization may be more clearly distinguished and employed are considered here, as well as the concept’s potential utility when compared to other longer standing models, such as hybridity, creolization and World Systems Theory (henceforth WST). Beyond this, it is argued that the concept of material transculturality might be usefully integrated into glocalization or globalization thinking as a means of looking at individual instances of glocal responses to imported ‘foreign’ objects.

**Defining and applying glocalization in archaeology and history <b>**

Glocalization, like globalization, is a neologism – a fusion of the terms local and global (Barrett, in Barret et al., 2018, pp. 16–17; Roudometof, 2016, p. 1). Like globalization, there are a number of contested definitions, none of which is yet to achieve an overriding consensus (Editors in Barret et al., 2018, p. 12; Osterhammel, 2011, p. 90; Seland, 2008, p. 68). These varying (and potentially overlapping) definitions of glocalization include the view that it pertains to aspects of the ‘global’ penetrating into local (be it in the form of goods, ideas, technology, and so on) which is then reformulated into a fusion, or into something new and distinct, or into a refraction of globalization through the local (for slightly differing conceptions of the glocal and glocalization, see Ritzer, 2003, p. 193; Robertson, 1995; Roudometof, 2016, p. 79; Stek, 2014, p. 39).

One major point of contention is whether glocalization should be seen as conceptually independent (see Roudometof, 2016, pp. 1, 44), or indeed as a meta-concept (incorporating globalization and localization, see Salazar in Barret et al., 2018, p. 15), as opposed to the notion that it cannot be separated out from globalization (see Ritzer, 2003; Robertson, 1992). This lack of consensus is perhaps unsurprising. In part because, while the term *dochakuka* can be traced back to the 1960s, in connection to the adaptation of Christian practices, subsequently being modified in the 1980s as a Japanese marketing tool, it does not appear in its anglicized form until the 1990s, and then only really starts to see wider academic uptake from the mid-late 2000s (Dessì, 2013, p. 150; Nederveen Pieterse, 2009, p. 52; Pitts, 2008, p. 494; Roudometof, 2016, pp. 2-3, 24).

Inevitably, every discipline will adapt the parameters of glocalization to suit its own needs. In fact, Susan Sherrat (in Barret et al., 2018, p. 15) has questioned whether a ‘standardized definition that goes beyond the general’ is even possible and consequently whether it has much value as a heuristic tool. I am not quite as pessimistic, but do agree with the point that any definition will have to prove broadly satisfactory to those working in a particular discipline, and that in each study a specific set of parameters will need to be established, not least what constitutes the ‘global’ and the ‘local’ (Barrett, in Barret et al., 2018, p. 16).

In contrast to fields like marketing, urban studies and the social sciences (Roudometof, 2016, pp. 1, 27), the term glocalization has so far received a modest uptake in archaeology and history. It is notable in Victor Roudometof’s valuable *Glocalization: A Critical Introduction* (2016) that archaeology does not receive any direct mention nor is history much discussed. In Sebastian Conrad’s similarly useful work – *What is Global History?* – the term glocalization appears once in relation to a discussion of ‘[m]icro-histories of the global’; though the examples given pertain to early-modern to modern history (2016, pp, 129–32). However, in the last decade-and-a-half, increased signs of engagement are apparent. For example, as early as 2008, Martin Pitts touched upon the concept of glocalization in an article on social change in Roman Britain, while, more recently, a number of the contributors to *The Routledge Handbook of Archaeology and Globalization* (Hodos, 2017a) sought to deploy the concept. Additionally, in a 2018 volume of the *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* (Barrett et al., 2018)*,* space was provided for a cross-disciplinary dialogue on glocalization’s value to archaeology.

One reason why the employment of glocalization by pre-modern historians and archaeologists is a relatively recent phenomenon may be the continued popularity of potentially overlapping concepts like hybridization and creolization. The former relates to cultural blending that can lead to new forms, ideas, objects and practices (Hodos, 2017b, p. 5; though not necessarily to new cultures; on ‘personalized *bricolage*’ see Roudometof, 2016, p. 14), while the latter can be seen as a development of this cultural blending, when the fusion of various distinct cultural practices and forms leads to the foundation of new cultures (Roudometof, 2016, p. 13). As we shall see, however, these concepts have been variously critiqued.

In what ways might those in the fields of history and archaeology seek to employ glocalization? Why should we adopt the term at the expense of existing concepts like hybridization and creolization, or indeed, concepts such as WST? I do not offer a standardized approach here, but some thoughts on the way the concept could be applied are considered in the present chapter. In particular, it is suggested that a number of the hallmarks which Jennings (2011, 2017) identifies as key manifestations of globalization, like heterogeneity and the re-embedding of local culture, might fruitfully be studied under the rubric of glocalization. This is not intended to strip out these concepts from globalization, since glocalization is clearly interrelated with it. Instead, it is intended as a reflection of the fact that local variations to ‘global’ phenomena may sometimes be a more accessible avenue for analysis and conceptualisation of the past. It allows us to maintain a focus on how local or glocal developments fit into a wider global picture, perhaps with an eye to contrasting different globalizing or glocalizing trajectories across diverse regions.

**Why glocalization? <b>**

As has been made clear, concepts like hybridization, creolization and WST have been employed to explain a variety of phenomena. These include the construction of identity among groups like the Scordiscan (fourth to third centuries BCE; in what will become Illyricum) through a hybridizing of cultural influences from temperate Europe and the Mediterranean (as opposed to the Brennus model, see Džino, 2007). The appearance of Aegean-style bichrome pottery as an example of creolization in late Bronze Age Philistine (Killebrew, 2005, pp. 249–51). And WST as a possible means of analysing the power structures of the Roman Empire (Woolf, 1990). It might then be asked, why replace these notions with glocalization?

One reason is that these concepts may not always be suited to every context and certainly some criticisms have been levelled at them. In the case of hybridity, it can be argued that, in one way or another, everything is hybrid (on the ubiquitous use of this term to describe artefacts in Roman archaeology, see Pitts & Versluys, 2015b, p. 6; Versluys, 2014a, p. 8). Arguably, almost all historical societies have been influenced in some way or another by other cultures and, in any case, the hybrid may not necessarily contain a ‘local’ element (on the qualitative distinction between hybridity and glocalization see Roudometof, 2016, pp. 14–15). The concept of hybridity has also been critiqued for seeming to imply a sense of cultural ‘purity’ on the part of the contributing partners that passively develops without agency (Hodos, 2017b, p. 5; Webster, 2001, p. 212). Additionally, concepts like acculturation and hybridity can assume unequal power relations between different societies, with the ‘weaker’ culture being presumed to change more dramatically as a result of interaction and exchange (Barclay, 2005, p. 317; Ferraro, 2004, p. 388; acculturation has been particularly criticized for its assumption of passivity on the part of the ‘recipient culture’, see Hitchcock & Maeir, 2013; for a more general critique, Versluys, 2015, pp. 144–6). This may be true in certain cases, but it is much less suited to other areas of study such as pre-modern long-distance trade, where differentials in power dynamics played a limited role in the economic, social and cultural transformation which resulted from it (Cobb, forthcoming-a).

With regards to creolization, the term was initially coined to denote the merging of two languages into a new dialect, but became more broadly applied to describe the process in which cultural elements from the colonizer and colonized became blended (Roudometof, 2016, p. 13; Webster, 2001, pp. 217–19). Like some uses of hybridity and acculturation, it necessarily assumes an unequal power dynamic. However, while it may provide a means of nuancing issues of colonialism and imperialism, and of dominance and resistance, in early-modern to modern contexts, these precise dynamics do not necessarily hold good for most ancient and medieval empires (on these issues, see Gosden, 2004). Indeed, it has been suggested that this concept may, in fact, be a thinly veiled substitute for the term colonialism (Hitchcock & Maeir, 2013, p. 55) that is perhaps, in any case, unnecessary for analysing power dynamics (Woolf, 2014, pp. 48–9). Again creolization, while potentially useful as an analytic concept in imperial contexts, may not be so well-suited to analysing historical phenomena where differentiations of power have a much more limited role to play.

While some have regarded creolization and hybridization as essentially synonymous with glocalization (Nederveen Pieterse, 2009; Ritzer, 2003, for a critique of this see Roudometof, 2016, p. 142), to my mind, the latter term lacks the baggage that comes with these earlier concepts. Local agency in the context of ‘global’ influences is inherent to glocalization. However, unlike in the nativist turn that coincided with the rise of post-colonial perspectives, approaches to glocalization should not be accused of downplaying or potentially ignoring external (imperial, colonial or commercial) influences (on this accusation see Domínguez, 2012; Hodos, 2014, p. 29; Hodos, 2017b, p. 8; *contra* van Dommelen, 2014, p. 44). In fact, it implicitly situates local developments in a wider context. Additionally, it does not subscribe to the notion of a ‘culturally contained’ ethnic group (on the problems of ‘ethnic entities and cultural-container thinking’ see Pitts, forthcoming; Versluys, 2014a, p. 12; Versluys, 2015, pp. 145–6). By contrast, glocalization (and globalization) allows us to think more dynamically about the negotiation, adaptation, amelioration or rejection of / resistance to outside influences in a particular locality, as well as the reinforcement (or invention) of local cultural practices in response to wider ‘global’ influences (Hodos, 2017b, p. 8). Furthermore, as already noted, in certain contexts, like in the ancient and medieval (to use overly broad periodizations) Indian Ocean worlds, where concepts such as imperialism or centre–periphery dynamics may be less helpful, glocalization seems to offer a better explanatory model.

On this latter point, it is worth noting that WST could be seen as an older alternative model to glocalization and globalization. This theory was developed by Immanuel Wallerstein as a means of explaining how the modern capitalist World System came into being. He never really intended for it to be applied prior to the sixteenth century (Wallerstein, 2011 [1974]). Nevertheless, it was popularly adapted by a number of historians and archaeologists interested in pre-modern societies (Frank & Gills, 1993). In particular, WST proved popular among a number of Indian Ocean specialists (on this, see Vink, 2007), as can be seen with the work of Abu-Lughod (1989), and more recently that of Beaujard (2005) and Fitzpatrick (2011).

One of the key tenets of this model is the core–periphery dynamic (or a series of cores and peripheries), in which the core extracts surpluses, often in the form of raw materials, from the periphery in an exploitative relationship that transforms both the economic and political situations in the regions concerned. Certainly, there is no reason to doubt that historically exploitative relationships existed, especially with regards to various empires and their subject territories. However, it has been rightly observed that projections of power in the ancient and medieval worlds were often limited by transportation hurdles, weak ‘state’ bureaucratic systems, and low intensity networks of exchange (Jennings et al., 2015, p. 64; Stein, 1999, pp. 55–62). Moreover, WST is often accused of failing to go beyond economic factors in explaining why ‘periphery’ societies might have engaged with the ‘centre’ (focusing on the macro-scale at the expense of localized responses to these wider processes), how this led to cultural changes and where the agency for this lay (Maran, 2011, pp. 282–3; Pitts, 2008, p. 493; Pitts & Versluys, 2015b, pp. 8–10; Woolf, 1990, p. 55). Indeed, as Middle Ground thinking has shown, even in situations of uneven power relations, other means besides coercion and economic imperatives were necessary for the development of elaborate social, cultural, commercial and political ties (Deloria, 2006; White, 2011). To my mind, glocalization and globalization provide a more neutral means with which one can address the issue of local agency in the context of wider global processes.

Having noted these critiques, it is worth stressing that glocalization (or globalization) need not be seen as automatically at odds with these theories or necessarily a ‘better’ alternative in every instance. In fact, certain older concepts, like transculturality (which derived from Fernando Ortiz’s 1940 study *Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y del azúcar*) may actually be fruitfully integrated into glocalization thinking. If glocalization offers us a tool for analysing how particular ‘local’ societies, or below that level, social groups, responded to conditions of increasing ‘global’ connectivity – often producing new cultural responses or outputs (creating manifestations of glocality) – I would suggest that transcultural theory may offer an even finer level of focus. What could be called micro-histories of the glocal, to modify Conrad’s terminology. It is tentatively suggested here that an adapted form of transcultural theory that focuses on individual material objects in ‘foreign’ contexts might provide an additional avenue for analysis (on more recent applications of transculturality, see Autiero, 2017, 2019; Vandkilde, 2014). Specifically, how an item produced in one location, and subsequently transmitted via networks of (long distance) exchange, became adopted, adapted, and re-interpreted in a different cultural context: what I would label material transculturality. This can take place within the context of wider globalizing and glocalizing processes (though this is not a prerequisite).

This concept allows us to go beyond simply considering issues of status display and conspicuous consumption (though such issues are important) that can typically be associated with the use of perceived exotic or foreign ‘luxury’ goods, and also consider the practical, ideological, aesthetic, philosophical and religious repurposing of a particular item, irrespective of what the original culture that produced such an object may have intended (what Swift, 2017, pp. 154–5, calls system function (the discrepant use of an object), as opposed to proper function (using the object as originally intended)). The potential value of adopting such a frame for analysis is that it incorporates both an economic and cultural assessment of why particular objects moved to certain locations (for more detailed discussion, see below). That is to say, it impacts our assessment of choice, demand and the selection of items for exchange. And, by corollary, practices of imitation, adaptation of styles and wider questions regarding identity.

**Globalization or glocalization? <b>**

It could be argued that the distinction between globalization and glocalization is one of scale. Both concepts having as their raison d'être an interest in the impacts of wider phenomena – economic and cultural – on various societies; the focus of the latter sometimes being on a specific locale (but, necessarily, keeping the wider picture in mind). These overlapping interests are apparent from Justin Jennings’s *Globalizations and the Ancient World* (2011), and his subsequent chapter in *The Routledge Handbook of Archaeology and Globalization* (2017). Jennings laid out eight criteria for identifying instances of globalization in pre-modern societies – not as part of a lineal process (with fits and starts) that ultimately led to ‘modern’ globalization – but rather as a cyclical process (Jennings, 2017, p. 12; for those that do adopt a more progressive or sequential approach to globalization see, for example, Rossi, 2008; also Hopkins, 2002 and 2010, who, in the latter work, suggests a more refined concept of overlapping sequences rather than stages). The eight hallmarks derive largely from discussions of modern globalization in the social sciences (such as the work of Tomlinson, 1999), and include ‘Time-Space Compression’, ‘Deterritorialization’, ‘Standardization’, ‘Unevenness’, ‘Homogenization’, ‘Heterogeneity’, ‘Re-embedding of local culture’ and ‘Vulnerability’.

There is not the scope in this chapter to give full treatment to each of these hallmarks. However, as noted in the introduction, earlier conceptions of globalization as principally converging, homogenizing and universal are inadequate, and individuals and groups engage with ‘global’ phenomena, often adapting, resisting, rejecting or ameliorating it for their own purposes. Arguably, those who are interested in the glocal can focus their attention on particular phenomena, like heterogeneity (the adaptations, modifications and transformations of products and practices from elsewhere), re-embedding of local culture (reacting to perceived negative external influences, often (selectively) reasserting local traditions (or reinventing them) in response to global influences), and deterritorialization (the potential for people to feel connections with those at a great distance, and not only with their immediate neighbours).

Why take these concepts and place them under the rubric of glocalization? One reason is that it allows us to examine the impact of ‘global’ interconnections on various ‘local’ societies, without having to necessarily determine whether ‘globalized’ is a label applicable in every instance. It may perhaps be easier to identify process of glocalization in many pre-modern societies. As Jennings (2017, p. 14) acknowledges, identifying instances of globalization in past societies, especially pre-literate ones, is particularly challenging. Not least because it often requires a qualitative assessment of evidence across different regions. There is likely to be uneven levels of archaeological work, preservation and recording of material (especially the wider the geographic scope one is dealing with). This certainly makes any quantitative assessment of the evidence extremely challenging. For example, it is doubtful whether one could reliably assess the intensity of contact and trade experienced between different regions of the Indian Ocean periphery based on the quantity of archaeological material in different areas due to the aforementioned issues (Cobb, 2018, pp. 26, 180, 216–18).

Of course, setting a high bar for determining whether a given society (or interacting societies) meets the threshold to warrant the label globalized makes sense. If all that was required to achieve this label is for a society to have interacted with other societies over the short, medium and long distance, then pretty much every historical polity would meet the mark. It is notable, however, that those entities Jennings identifies as globalized (like Uruk-Warsa, Cahokia, Wari and the Chavin), and for that matter the Roman Empire (relatively recently discussed in a monograph on *Globalisation and the Roman World*, Pitts & Versluys, 2015), are quite regionally bounded. As Knappett (2017, p. 32) notes, those cultures which Jennings examines seem to encompass an area of around 1000 kilometres – consequently, raising the question ‘is there a particular scale for ancient globalizations’?

In my own work examining the usefulness of globalization for analysing the ancient Indian Ocean world (late centuries BCE into the mid-first millennium CE), it has become apparent that identifying all eight of the hallmarks set out by Jennings in a satisfactory, coherent and consistent manner across various interconnected societies is far from straightforward (Cobb, forthcoming-a). Of course, part of the problem, as noted above, relates to the range and nature of the evidence. Different regions stretching from East Africa to Southeast Asia have received varying and uneven levels of archaeological work, recording and preservation. Moreover, dealing with such a wide range of societies with differing levels of literacy (literary and documentary), or no literacy whatsoever, adds a further degree of complication.

Admittedly, it is often noted that globalization is experienced in an uneven manner across the globe, including in the modern world (Conrad, 2016, pp. 95–7; Hodos, 2017b, p. 4; Nederveen Pieterse, 2009, pp. 32–4; Pitts & Versluys, 2015b, p. 14), and, therefore, it could be argued that it is not necessary to identify all eight hallmarks universally, but only broadly across all the interconnected regions. In any case, to my mind we should be less concerned about trying to apply globalization or glocalization as a label (as a descriptor), but more about the heuristic value of these concepts for analysing global, local and glocal phenomena. This is not only in terms of the existence of networks of exchange and what moved along them (goods, peoples, ideas), but also the very real impacts (economic, political, cultural, psychological) that these exchanges had on various societies. Globalization and glocalization have the advantage of avoiding some of the problems noted above with regards to issues of agency and unequal power relations. This is not to deny that globalization, in particular, has had its share of problematic baggage that required shedding. However, earlier notions that it could be seen as largely synonymous with Westernization (or MacDonaldization), only applicable in a post-sixteenth century context, and primarily concerned with processes of standardization and homogenization (to the exclusion of local variations), have been cogently challenged in recent decades (see Hodos, 2017b, pp. 3–4).

**Glocalization and pre-modern history <b>**

The premise has been set out that certain of the aforementioned hallmarks – notably heterogeneity, re-embedding local culture and deterritorialization – can be discussed under the rubric of glocalization. One such reason for this is it allows us to examine ‘local’ responses to ‘global’ phenomena without the need to determine whether we should speak of a wider process of globalization taking place. That is to say, regardless of whether the particular culture is experiencing a phase of globalization, as might be suggested by Jennings’ criteria. Consequently, it is worth considering in further detail some examples where we can identify manifestations of glocalization. It is not possible to be exhaustive in this short chapter, but a few examples from across the globe relating to the period 2000 BCE to 1500 CE are considered.

**Bronzization <c>**

The concept of Bronzization has gained in popularity in the last few years (Vandkilde, 2016, 2017). It denotes a form of pre-modern globalization that spanned much of Eurasia from the Atlantic to China and from Scandinavia to North Africa (Vandkilde, 2017, p. 511; on the spuriousness of insisting that globalization must encompass the entire globe, see Conrad, 2016, pp. 95–7; Knappett, 2017, p. 29; Pitts, forthcoming). One key drive for necessitating widespread connectivity, especially during the period 2000–1200 BCE, was the need for tin (something more sparsely sourced) as a component of bronze alloy (Vandkilde, 2016, p. 105). However, this went beyond exchange at local, regional and transregional levels, with the metal finding a vast array of uses in societies across Eurasia. Its demand created increasing dependencies, technological adaptation and the generation of a range of glocal material culture (‘neither imports nor genuinely indigenous’) (Vandkilde, 2016, pp. 510–12). The conceptual adaptation of Bronzization itself has inspired an interest in more regionally bounded variants, such as Minoanization and Mycenaeanization (Knappett, 2017). These also seek to deploy many of the concepts from globalization and glocalization, albeit privileging the Minoan or Mycenaean perspective.

One important contribution to this debate is Maran’s (2011) study of Mycenaean cultural responses in a context of engagement with Minoan Crete. Maran argues that the various cultural expressions, particularly manifested in material culture connected to the elite (mid-second millennium BCE), could best be explained in terms of glocalization, where ‘material and immaterial traits coming from outside are reinterpreted and merged to form new syntheses’ (Maran, 2011, pp. 283–5). For example, certain objects arriving to the ‘Mainland’ world through gift-exchange became incorporated into a new funerary context (where an aggressive militaristic identity was often emphasized) as part of a local or glocal expression of identity; by contrast, in their original Cretan context, they seem to have had religious significance and were normally stored in public treasuries, and not private funerary contexts (Maran, 2011, p.289).

**The Roman Empire <c>**

The Roman Empire might seem like an obvious candidate for the application of competing, distinct theories like WST and creolization. In the case of the former theory, it could be characterized (in generalized terms) as having (originally) consisted of a core polity that was able to expand its territorial influence quite substantially, subordinating a range of multi-ethnic peoples in an exploitative relationship (although to purely characterize it in those terms would be reductive). With regards to the latter theory, the economic and cultural interactions resulting from imperial expansion saw a diverse range of social responses in the provinces (and Italy) which some have characterized as a form of creolization (for example, Webster, 2001).

However, the aforementioned issues raised with WST and creolization have led a number of Romanists over the past 15 to 20 years to explore the concept of globalization as an alternative tool for analysis (Hingley, 2005; Pitts, forthcoming; Pitts & Versluys, 2015a; Witcher, 2000, 2017). Indeed, the term itself has seeped into wider (undefined) usage (on the latter, see Witcher’s (2017, p. 634) critique of Panella (2012)). Similarly, glocalization has received some attention over the last 15-odd years. For example, as a means of understanding social change in Roman Britain, particularly through material culture (Pitts, 2008), as well as glocal variations in the performance of the *pro* *salute Imperatoris* ritual (a vow for the safety of the imperial family) (van Alten, 2017). This has occurred in the context of a continued desire to find better alternatives to the grand narrative of Romanization, which has proved so controversial since the late-twentieth century (Pitts, 2008, p. 494; Pitts & Versluys, 2015b, pp. 5–6; van Dommelen, 2014, pp. 43–4). Romanization stands accused of overlooking local variations (Editors in Barrett et al., 2018, p. 12), which the adoption of models like hybridity and creolization were intended to counter. While some have seen the potential to modify Romanization (2.0) through the use of globalization theory (Versluys, 2014a, 2014b), others are more doubtful about its potential to be revived (Hingley, 2014, p. 23; Woolf, 2014, pp. 48–9).

Witcher (2017, p. 635) suggests that the concept of globalization can not only help us *de*-centre Rome, but also allows us to consider how ‘early Rome itself’ was a ‘glocalization of Greek culture on the periphery of an East Mediterranean network’. Greek literature, iconography, art, mythology and religious practices became increasingly influential in Rome, but this did not lead to the Romans becoming Greek; instead, there was a new glocal adaption, amelioration and transformation that fed into the continued development of Roman identity (Vlassopoulos, 2013; Witcher, 2017, p. 643). In fact, the Roman Empire was not globalized primarily because of the scale of its economic activity or the extent of its road networks, but because of its ‘symbolic exchange’: rituals (imperial cult), social practices (for example, bath complexes), iconography (for example, imagery of the emperor on coins), and bureaucratic demands (such as paying taxes, conducting censuses); these aspects themselves being subject to their own glocal responses across the provinces (Witcher, 2017, pp. 644–8).

**Glocalization in the Americas <c>**

Many of the case studies that Jennings discusses as instances of past globalization relate to pre-Columbian societies in the Americas, such as the Cahokia (Mississippi region), Wari (south-central Andes) and Chavin (northern Andean highlands) cultures. As argued above, a number of the local or glocal responses to global interconnectivity, which Jennings discusses in terms of heterogeneity and re-embedding local identities, could also be examined within the framework of glocalization. Indeed, Jennings and his co-authors note as much when discussing aspects of heterogeneous development in Peru’s Middle Horizon Period (600–1000 CE). For example, in relation to the creation of Wari-esque objects at the Tenahaha and La Real sites (particularly *tupus* or bronze clothing pins) that represent local or glocal adaptations of Wari prestige objects; that is to say an adaptation of styles and technologies in the face of interregional interaction (Jennings et al., 2015, pp. 63–72).

Indeed, one of the cultures which Jennings (2017, pp. 19–22) identifies as *not* an example of globalization, the so-called Hopewell Interaction Sphere, could, nevertheless, be discussed in the context of glocalization. That is to say ‘global’ (or rather interregional) interconnections that did not necessarily represent an instance of pre-modern globalization, but nevertheless reveal how the local could develop into something ‘glocal’. During the Middle Woodland Period (150 BCE–450 CE) there is evidence for long-distance links across eastern North America and some degree of migration, as well as the phenomenon where peoples came together (often from hundreds of kilometres away) at ‘ritually charged locations’ to bury the dead, make offerings and build monumental earthen-works (Jennings, 2017, p. 19). Jennings argues that there may be ‘pale echoes of globalization in the tensions between stylistic homogeneity and heterogeneity and attempts to re-embedded local traditions’, but he feels it falls short of a ‘global culture’ (Jennings, 2017, p. 22). It might instead be thought of in terms of complex connectivities that fall short of globalization (on this, see Hodos, 2017b; Tomlinson, 1999). That said, the development of local artefacts, often using local materials, but in styles drawing upon both local and interregional influences, seems like a good candidate for an instance of glocalization.

**Long-distance trade in ancient and medieval Afro-Eurasia** <c>

The Indian Ocean is an example par excellence of interconnectivity across the pre-modern world. Goods, peoples and ideas travelled along various routes connecting East Africa, the Mediterranean and western Asia with South, Southeast and East Asia. This was a complex system of networks spanning various regions, operating alongside more localised networks (like hinterland and emporia links). As has been stressed, however, it is not the existence of widespread connectivity alone that matters, but also the resultant impacts (economic, political, cultural and psychological) on, and transformation within, various societies which took place. Jennings’s hallmarks having proved particularly popular as a benchmark for archaeologists and pre-modern historians in making such an assessment. Applying these criteria to the pre-modern Indian Ocean world is far from straightforward, although some attempts have been made to engage with the concept of globalization more generally (see, for example, Seland, 2008, on the concept of oikoumenization; for a critique of this term, see Hodos, 2014, pp. 26–7).

In the Indian Ocean, the consistent summer and winter monsoon winds determined sailing schedules in the Arabian Sea, Bay of Bengal and South China Sea (technically part of the Pacific). But localised winds and currents, and factors like shoals and tidal bores needed to be taken account of as well (Chaudhuri, 1985, pp. 126–8, 133, divides the Indian Ocean into six regional yet interconnected seas; see also Vink, 2011, p. 406). Abu-Lughod (1989, pp. 251–3; see also Beaujard, 2005, p. 413) characterized these as three interlocking circuits – Arabian Sea, Indian Ocean, and South China Sea – with merchants largely confining themselves to a particular zone (this is discussed in relation to the early second millennium CE, but is applicable to earlier periods as well, see Cobb, 2018, pp. 170–8). We do see some historical exceptions, such as during the latter first millennium CE, when Persian and Arab merchants sailed as far as Guangzhou (Canton), in southern China; however, this practice fell into abeyance around the tenth to eleventh centuries, with southern India and the Malay Peninsula continuing to act as vital intermediary points of exchange (Daryaee, 2003; Hourani, 1995).

The existence of networks that interwove these various zones inevitably raises a geographic question: do we attempt to identify particular instances of pan-Indian Ocean (including the South China Sea) globalization that linked the wider Afro-Eurasia world together or more regionally bounded instances of globalization, such as in the Arabian Sea region? Alternatively, do we assess this in terms of multiscalar processes across the wider Indian Ocean and within specific (sub)regions?

A similar question may be raised about the intensity with which goods circulated. While connectivity alone is not enough to establish globalization, do these exchanges need to achieve a sufficient scale of exchange (in terms of volume, value and impact on wider economic activities)? Does distance compensate for lesser intensity (on the importance of ‘weak’ ties, see Knappett, 2017, pp. 31–2)? Belich et al. (2016, p. 5) suggest a range of categories for differing levels of exchange, from ‘contact’(occasional and indirect trade), ‘interaction’ (regular and ongoing contact, which they suggest is exemplified by luxury trade), ‘circulation’ (bulk trade), and finally ‘integration’ (at least part of the global system is mutually dependent, forming part of a single economic or cultural whole). While I would argue that previous characterizations of the Indian Ocean trade as one of luxuries is far too simplistic, and that we do see many instances of ‘circulation’ and perhaps even ‘integration’ (Cobb, forthcoming-a), does this achieve a sufficient threshold to be classed as evidence for globalization? Can we see globalizing forces in action, but with varying levels of strength in parts of these wider networks?

A third issue that can be raised is one of temporality: if we want to avoid seeing globalization as part of a lineal progression towards ‘modern globalization’, which I would agree with Jennings we should avoid, how do we go about establishing periodization for the Indian Ocean world? This is an even more complicated matter when dealing with a diverse range of societies across Afro-Eurasia. There were no fixed, static networks of exchange. Political-military or cultural transformations might lead to the alteration and decline of certain networks and the creation of new ones, but this on its own may not be enough to identify an ‘epochal change’. Possibly the rise of Islam might represent a distinct break between the ‘ancient’ and ‘medieval’ Indian Ocean, due to the profound cultural, religious, political and economic consequences that would permeate the wider Afro-Eurasian world. I have deployed the term ancient and medieval Indian Ocean trade as a label of convenience, but it is a highly artificial means of referring to the period stretching from the latter first millennium BCE to 1500 CE. Identifying sub-periods across the various regions of the Indian Ocean world is eminently more complex.

Clearly there are a number of challenges involved when applying globalization to the study of the pre-modern Indian Ocean world, but arguably utilizing concepts from this can help refine our analysis and provide better explanatory frameworks than other models like WST have hitherto done. I would suggest that we might find it productive to also consider whether we can identify processes of glocalization taking place, and instances of glocality, in different societies linked together by wider Indian Ocean networks of exchange. This has the advantage of allowing regional specialists to consider the societies they study in a global context, and how these interconnections impacted on their ‘local’ culture, perhaps with an eye to comparing different gloc/globalizing trajectories across regions of the Indian Ocean. This creates scope for multi-disciplinary global historical research, which if done individually, would be a daunting task (on the challenges raised by trans-regional studies, such as potential information overload and miscomprehension due to discrepant disciplinary methodology and terminology, see Darley, 2015, pp. 61–2).

That glocalization and globalization seem to offer better alternatives to WST for the study of the pre-modern Indian Ocean world can be seen from a recent attempt to apply the former model in relation to Roman engagement with Indian Ocean trade networks. Fitzpatrick has argued that the Empire was essentially a periphery that ‘lacked the capacity to act as the “core” of the global economy’ and that it leached out a portion of its surplus (in the form of the export of gold and silver coins) to Axumite Africa, Arabia and India (Fitzpatrick, 2011, pp. 48, 53). While the attempt to avoid a Romano-centric perspective is laudable, the dynamic of surplus extraction by a core (or cores), often taken in the form of raw materials (utilised for the core’s own production of goods), does not appropriately reflect the complex range of crafted items (metal-wares, glass-wares, terracottas, ceramics, beads, textiles, perfumes, and so on) and ‘raw materials’ (plant products, (semi-)precious stones, pearls, and so on) that were exchanged. The patterns we see belie any simple identification of producer or ‘manufacturing’ regions and peripheries that merely supplied raw materials (see Cobb, 2018; Seland, 2014); the movement of textiles being an excellent example of this, with a broad range of varying quality items being exchanged in all directions (see Seland, 2016). Also, the often repeated notion that Rome haemorrhaged gold and silver ‘bullion’ to places like India is grossly simplistic to say the least (see, Cobb, 2015; Darley, 2015, pp. 68–75). Furthermore, the differentials in power dynamics do not really play out if one imagines, for example, a large territorial empire like that of Rome serving as the periphery to the small polities of the Tamilakam (southern India). This critique is not intended to deny the possibility that WST could be employed at a more scaled-down level to consider relationships between certain hinterlands and the polities that exploited them: Ptolemaic hunting activity (third to second centuries BCE) along the African coastlines of the Red Sea and Gulf of Aden might be one such example. But when considering wider Indian Ocean networks of exchange, it is clearly less suitable.

By contrast, a brief examination of those hallmarks – heterogeneity, re-embedding local culture, and deterritorialization – which fall under the rubric of glocalization (and globalization), demonstrate how they can provide a more flexible means of analysing the social consequences of exchange across the wider Indian Ocean world. I provide here three examples of broad chronological and geographic scope. The first example relates to re-embedding local culture, specifically the importation of incense (frankincense, myrrh, and related products from Arabia and East Africa) into the Roman Empire as a result of trade links with ports like Qana’/Qāni’ (ancient Kane, see Salles & Sedov, 2010) and Khor Rori (ancient Sumhuram/Moscha Limen, see Avanzini, 2016) in the southern Arabian Peninsula. Incense arrived as a result of ‘global’ (Afro-Eurasian) trade networks and became embedded into an array of Roman social practices and acts of consumption, ranging from its use in perfumes and medicine, to religious and funerary rituals (Cobb, 2013). While in reality various forms of incense had a long history of use in societies across the Mediterranean world, early Imperial writers like Ovid and Pliny (late first century BCE to first century CE), who were acutely conscious of the more interconnected world in which they lived, could present its employment in religious rituals as a novelty (Plin. *HN* 12.41.18; Ov. *Fast*. 1.337–42). This was all part of a discourse harkening back to supposed traditions of simplicity and self-reliance, where cheaper, local offerings like spelt grain were to be regarded as preferable to exotic, expensive imports.

The second example relates to the hallmark of heterogeneity. In the Java Sea Shipwreck, dated to the thirteenth century CE, a range of ceramics produced in China and (possibly) Thailand have been found. However, these show numerous Middle Eastern and Central Asian inspirations in terms of form and design. For example, *kendis* (pouring vessels), likely made in southern Thailand, show clear similarities with Indian-style pottery, while a ceramic box evidently adapted its lattice design from those found in Islamic art and architecture (Niziolek & Respess, 2017, pp. 797–9).

The third example relates to deterritorialization. This can be seen particularly in relation to merchant diaspora communities, where individuals established themselves in distant places in order to facilitate the movement of goods between their present location and their homeland (potentially as part of wider family networks or business consortia). One such instance of this is the Arab merchants who set themselves up at Rhapta, an emporium somewhere near the coast of Tanzania, in the early centuries CE. They had intermarried with the local community and learnt the language, but clearly maintained social and commercial bonds with their homeland (*Periplus* 16; see also Claud. Ptol. *Geog*. 4.7.12). A further example of this phenomenon is the south Indian Jewish diaspora community (early second millennium CE) who maintained links with associates back in Egypt, as seen from the Geniza archive (Goitein, 1980).

**Material transculturality in the ancient Indian Ocean world <c>**

Glocalization and globalization thinking provide useful concepts for analysing the movements of people, goods and ideas across the Indian Ocean and the cultural, political, economic and psychological impacts resulting from this connectivity. Below this level, it can be argued that material transculturality allows for a more focused examination of particular objects or classes of objects in ‘new’ locations; a means of providing greater depth of analysis for those interested in long-distance trade, globalization, glocalization and global history.

A number of useful case studies can be gleaned from studying objects produced in the Roman world, which became adopted and adapted in a South Asia (for examples of transcultural analysis, with and without specific reference to this terminology, see Autiero, 2017, 2019; Cobb & Mitchell, 2019; Darley, 2015; De Saxcé, 2015, 2018). One such example relates to an alabaster figurine of young male child laying inside half an egg (cut longitudinally), that was found near Junnar (Deccan region), and has usually been interpreted as a representation of the god Eros (Dhavalikar, 1992). The prevailing assumption has been that this object was bought as a personal souvenir by a merchant travelling from Alexandria who had come to the Deccan region (Dhavalikar, 1992, p. 326–7). However, its ownership prior to its final disposition is far from clear. It is just as plausible that this object could have been obtained by someone indigenous to the region. There were long-standing Indian cosmological traditions regarding the creation of the universe from an egg (Mitchell, 2019). Thus, regardless of the object’s original meaning (proper function), possibly a representation of the birth of Eros, it was feasible for it to be invested with new meaning in a different geographical and cultural context (system function). Ultimately, there is no definitive answer on how this object should be interpreted, but the adoption of a transcultural perspective allows us to divest ourselves of the immediate assumption that its presence in India must be attributable to a foreign resident (Cobb & Mitchell, 2019).

A second example relates to figurines of the god Bes (an ancient Egyptian protector god, usually represented as a long-haired, bearded dwarf) that were produced in Egypt and found their way to the Deccan region in India (as part of the movement of other Hellenistic to Imperial Roman era terracotta figurines from the Mediterranean world to South Asia, see Brancaccio, 2005). The imagery and form of these Bes figurines was adapted as a means of representing local *ganas* or *yakshas* (nature spirits), likely because, as Autiero suggests, the grotesque and exotic features of these figurines made them ideal for representing the liminal *yakshas* (Autiero, 2017).

A third example concerns Roman gold (aurei) and silver (denarii) coins that found their way to South Asia. Frequently discussed en masse in terms of bullion exports to the East and issues of ‘balance of trade’, we actually find many individual instances of adaptation, modification and repurposing, which clearly need to be understood in cultural as well as economic terms. One such transcultural adaptation is the piercing of Roman coins (genuine and imitations made of precious and base metals) to make *kasumala*-style jewellery, as well as various slashes and countermarked symbols on some of these coins, like *svastikas* and dots, that were done for reasons that are not entirely clear (see Darley, 2015; Suresh, 2004). These coins also frequently appear in connection to gift-giving rituals and donations of Buddhist sanctuaries, in some instances even being valued above their metallic content, suggesting they had more than bullion value (De Romanis, 2006). A transcultural analysis of these objects allows us to realise that interpreting them primarily as bullion and explaining their export based on factors within the Roman Empire alone (due coin reforms) is highly inadequate (see Cobb, forthcoming-b); cultural dynamics must be considered alongside the economic.

**Summary <b>**

Glocalization, like globalization, is a valuable tool for historians and archaeologists. A useful analytical framework for examining particular societies in a ‘global’ context and how such interconnections impacted them economically, culturally, politically and psychologically. The concept of glocalization also has the advantage of allowing us to assess such phenomena without having recourse to assumption about core–periphery dynamics or to avoid some of the critiques that have been made of other concepts like creolization and hybridity. Moreover, the litany of examples just discussed demonstrates that regardless of whether a society is thought to meet the threshold necessary to be classed as globalized (based on Jennings’s eight hallmarks) – arguably a secondary issue in any case (possibly useful for conceptual clarity, but immaterial to its heuristic use) – it is often possible to identify local responses and adaptions to wider ‘global’ phenomena that resulted in glocality. Glocalization, therefore, may have particular value for those who wish to focus on more specific or regional responses to global phenomena, potentially also as a means of contrasting globalizing or glocalizing trajectories in different societies. Below this level, material transculturality may provide a useful means of analysing particular instances of ‘local’ adoption and adaptation of ‘foreign’ material objects or classes of objects (which can be understood as feeding into wider social processes of glocalization or globalization).
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