

Cambridge University Press

0521802024 - The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube

Region, c. 500-700

Florin Curta

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

Mein Freund, das ist Asien! Es sollte mich wundern, es sollte mich höchlichst wundern, wenn da nicht Wendisch-Slawisch-Sarmatisches im Spiele gewesen wäre.

(Thomas Mann, *Der Zauberberg*)

To many, Eastern Europe is nearly synonymous with *Slavic* Europe. The equation is certainly not new. To Hegel, the “East of Europe” was the house of the “great Slavonic nation,” a body of peoples which “has not appeared as an independent element in the series of phases that Reason has assumed in the World”.¹ If necessary, Europe may be divided into western and eastern zones along a number of lines, according to numerous criteria. Historians, however, often work with more than one set of criteria. The debate about the nature of Eastern Europe sprang up in Western historiography in the days of the Cold War, but despite Oskar Halecki’s efforts explicitly to address the question of a specific chronology and history of Eastern Europe, many preferred to write the history of Slavic Europe, rather than that of Eastern Europe.² Today, scholarly interest in Eastern Europe focuses especially on the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the period of nationalism. The medieval history of the area is given comparatively less attention, which often amounts to slightly more than total neglect. For most students in medieval studies, Eastern Europe is marginal and East European topics simply *exotica*. One reason for this historiographical reticence may be the uneasiness to treat the medieval history of the Slavs as (Western) European history. Like Settembrini, the Italian humanist of Thomas Mann’s *Magic Mountain*, many still point to the ambiguity of those Slavs, whom the eighteenth-century *philosophes* already viewed as “Oriental” barbarians.³ When Slavs

¹ Hegel 1902:363.

² Halecki 1950. Slavic Europe: Dvornik 1949 and 1956. Eastern Europe as historiographical construct: Okey 1992. ³ Wolff 1994.

Cambridge University Press

0521802024 - The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube

Region, c. 500-700

Florin Curta

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The making of the Slavs*

come up in works on the medieval history of Europe, they are usually the marginalized, the victims, or the stubborn pagans. In a recent and brilliant book on the “making of Europe,” the Slavs, like the Irish, appear only as the object of conquest and colonization, which shaped medieval Europe. Like many others in more recent times, the episodic role of the Slavs in the history of Europe is restricted to that of victims of the “occidentation,” the shift towards the ways and norms of Romano-Germanic civilization.⁴ The conceptual division of Europe leaves the Slavs out of the main “core” of European history, though not too far from its advancing frontiers of “progress” and “civilization.”

Who were those enigmatic Slavs? What made them so difficult to represent by the traditional means of Western historiography? If Europe itself was “made” by its conquerors and settlers, who made the Slavs? What were the historical conditions in which this ethnic name was first used and for what purpose? How was a Slavic ethnicity formed and under what circumstances did the Slavs come into being? Above all, this book aims to answer some of these questions. What binds together its many individual arguments is an attempt to explore the nature and construction of the Slavic ethnic identity in the light of the current anthropological research on ethnicity. Two kinds of sources are considered for this approach: written and archaeological. This book is in fact a combined product of archaeological experience, mostly gained during field work in Romania, Moldova, Hungary, and Germany, and work with written sources, particularly with those in Greek. I have conducted exhaustive research on most of the topics surveyed in those chapters which deal with the archaeological evidence. Field work in Sighișoara (1985–91) and Târgșor (1986–8) greatly contributed to the stance taken in this book. A study on the Romanian archaeological literature on the subject and two studies of “Slavic” bow fibulae were published separately.⁵ A third line of research grew out of a project developed for the American Numismatic Society Summer Seminar in New York (1995).⁶ With this variety of sources, I was able to observe the history of the area during the sixth and seventh centuries from a diversity of viewpoints. Defining this area proved, however, more difficult. Instead of the traditional approach, that of opposing the barbarian Slavs to the civilization of the early Byzantine Empire, I preferred to look at the Danube *limes* as a complex interface. Understanding transformation on the Danube frontier required understanding of almost everything happening both north and south of that frontier. Geographically, the scope of inquiry is limited to the area comprised between the Carpathian basin, to the west, and the Middle

⁴ Bartlett 1993:295.⁵ Curta 1994a and 1994b; Curta and Dupoi 1994–5.⁶ Curta 1996.

Cambridge University Press

0521802024 - The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube

Region, c. 500-700

Florin Curta

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Introduction

Dnieper region, to the east. To the south, the entire Balkan peninsula is taken into consideration in the discussion of the sixth-century Danube *limes* and of the Slavic migration. The northern limit was the most difficult to establish, because of both the lack of written sources and a very complicated network of dissemination of “Slavic” brooch patterns, which required familiarity with the archaeological material of sixth- and seventh-century cemeteries in Mazuria. The lens of my research, however, was set both south and east of the Carpathian mountains, in the Lower Danube region, an area now divided between Romania, Moldova, and Ukraine.

My intention with this book is to fashion a plausible synthesis out of quite heterogeneous materials. Its conclusion is in sharp contradiction with most other works on this topic and may appear therefore as argumentative, if not outright revisionist. Instead of a great flood of Slavs coming out of the Pripet marshes, I envisage a form of group identity, which could arguably be called ethnicity and emerged in response to Justinian’s implementation of a building project on the Danube frontier and in the Balkans. The Slavs, in other words, did not come from the north, but became Slavs only in contact with the Roman frontier. Contemporary sources mentioning Sclavenes and Antes, probably in an attempt to make sense of the process of group identification taking place north of the Danube *limes*, stressed the role of “kings” and chiefs, which may have played an important role in this process.

The first chapter presents the *Forschungsstand*. The historiography of the subject is vast and its survey shows why and how a particular approach to the history of the early Slavs was favored by linguistically minded historians and archaeologists. This chapter also explores the impact on the historical research of the “politics of culture,” in particular of those used for the construction of nations as “imagined communities.” The historiography of the early Slavs is also the story of how the academic discourse used the past to shape the national present. The chapter is also intended to familiarize the reader with the anthropological model of ethnicity. The relation between material culture and ethnicity is examined, with a particular emphasis on the notion of style.

Chapters 2 and 3 deal with written sources. Chapter 2 examines issues of chronology and origin of the data transmitted by these sources, while Chapter 3 focuses on the chronology of Slavic raids. Chapter 4 considers the archaeological evidence pertaining to the sixth-century Danube *limes* as well as to its Balkan hinterland. Special attention is paid to the implementation of Justinian’s building program and to its role in the subsequent history of the Balkans, particularly the withdrawal of the Roman armies in the seventh century. A separate section of this chapter deals

Cambridge University Press

0521802024 - The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube

Region, c. 500-700

Florin Curta

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The making of the Slavs*

with the evidence of sixth- and seventh-century hoards of Byzantine coins in Eastern Europe, which were often used to map the migration of the Slavs. A new interpretation is advanced, which is based on the examination of the age-structure of hoards. Chapter 5 presents the archaeological evidence pertaining to the presence of Gepids, Lombards, Avars, and Cutrigurs in the region north of the Danube river. Special emphasis is laid on the role of specific artifacts, such as bow fibulae, in the construction of group identity and the signification of social differentiation. The archaeological evidence examined in Chapter 6 refers, by contrast, to assemblages found in the region where sixth- and seventh-century sources locate the Sclavenes and the Antes. Issues of dating and use of material culture for marking ethnic boundaries are stressed in this chapter. The forms of political power present in the contemporary Slavic society and described by contemporary sources are discussed in Chapter 7. Various strands of evidence emphasized in individual chapters are then brought into a final conclusion in the last chapter.

As apparent from this brief presentation of the contents, there is more than one meaning associated with the word ‘Slav.’ Most often, it denotes two, arguably separate, groups mentioned in sixth-century sources, the Sclavenes and the Antes. At the origin of the English ethnic name ‘Slav’ is an abbreviated form of ‘Sclavene,’ Latin *Sclavus*. When Slavs appear instead of Sclavenes and Antes, it is usually, but not always, in reference to the traditional historiographical interpretation, which tended to lump these two groups under one single denomination, on the often implicit assumption that the Slavs were the initial root from which sprung all Slavic-speaking nations of later times. Single quotation marks are employed to set off a specific, technical, or, sometimes, specious use of ethnic names (e.g., Slavs, Sclavenes, or Antes) or of their derivatives, either by medieval authors or by modern scholars. Where necessary, the particular use of these names is followed by the original Greek or Latin. With the exception of cases in which the common English spelling was preferred, the transliteration of personal and place names follows a modified version of the Library of Congress system. The geographical terminology, particularly in the case of archaeological sites, closely follows the language in use today in a given area. Again, commonly accepted English equivalents are excepted from this rule. For example, “Chernivtsi” and “Chişinău” are always favored over “Cernăuți” or “Kishinew,” but “Kiev” and “Bucharest” are preferred to “Kyïv” and “Bucureşti.” Since most dates are from the medieval period, “AD” is not used unless necessary in context. In cases where assigned dates are imprecise, as with the numismatic evidence examined in Chapter 4, they are given in the form 545/6 to indicate either one year or the other.

Cambridge University Press

0521802024 - The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube

Region, c. 500-700

Florin Curta

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Introduction

The statistical analyses presented in Chapters 4, 5, and 6 were produced using three different softwares. For the simple “descriptive” statistics used in Chapter 4, I employed graphed tables written in Borland Paradox, version 7 for Windows 3.1. More complex analyses, such as cluster, correspondence analysis, or seriation, were tested on a multivariate analysis package called MV-NUTSHELL, which was developed by Richard Wright, Emeritus Professor at the University of Sydney (Australia). The actual scattergrams and histograms in this book were, however, produced using the Bonn Archaeological Statistics package (BASP), version 5.2 for Windows, written in Borland Object Pascal 7 for Windows by Irwin Scollar from the Unkelbach Valley Software Works in Remagen (Germany). Although the final results were eventually not included in the book for various technical reasons, the study of pottery shape described in Chapter 6 enormously benefited from estimations of vessel volume from profile illustrations using the Senior-Birnie Pot Volume Program developed by Louise M. Senior and Dunbar P. Birnie from the University of Arizona, Tucson.⁷

⁷ Senior and Birnie 1995.

Cambridge University Press

0521802024 - The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, c. 500-700

Florin Curta

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Chapter 1*SLAVIC ETHNICITY AND THE *ETHNIE* OF THE
SLAVS: CONCEPTS AND APPROACHES

Our present knowledge of the origin of the Slavs is, to a large extent, a legacy of the nineteenth century. A scholarly endeavor inextricably linked with forging national identities, the study of the early Slavs remains a major, if not the most important, topic in East European historiography. Today, the history of the Slavs is written mainly by historians and archaeologists, but fifty or sixty years ago the authoritative discourse was that of scholars trained in comparative linguistics. The interaction between approaches originating in those different disciplines made the concept of (Slavic) ethnicity a very powerful tool for the “politics of culture.” That there exists a relationship between nationalism, on one hand, and historiography and archaeology, on the other, is not a novel idea.¹ What remains unclear, however, is the meaning given to (Slavic) ethnicity (although the word itself was rarely, if ever, used) by scholars engaged in the “politics of culture.” The overview of the recent literature on ethnicity and the role of material culture shows how far the historiographical discourse on the early Slavs was from contemporary research in anthropology and, in some cases, even archaeology.

THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF SLAVIC ETHNICITY

Slavic studies began as an almost exclusively linguistic and philological enterprise. As early as 1833, Slavic languages were recognized as Indo-European.² Herder’s concept of national character (*Volksgeist*), unalterably set in language during its early “root” period, made language the perfect instrument for exploring the history of the Slavs.³ Pavel Josef

¹ See, more recently, Kohl and Fawcett 1995; Díaz-Andreu and Champion 1996.

² Bopp 1833. See also Niederle 1923:4; Sedov 1976:69.

³ Herder 1994a:58. Herder first described the Slavs as victims of German warriors since the times of Charlemagne. He prophesied that the wheel of history would inexorably turn and some day, the industrious, peaceful, and happy Slavs would awaken from their submission and torpor to reinvigorate the great area from the Adriatic to the Carpathians and from the Don to the Moldau rivers (Herder 1994b:277–80). For Herder’s view of the Slavs, see Wolff 1994:310–15; Meyer 1996:31.

Cambridge University Press

0521802024 - The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, c. 500-700

Florin Curta

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Concepts and approaches*

Šafářik (1795–1861) derived from Herder the inspiration and orientation that would influence subsequent generations of scholars. To Šafářik, the “Slavic tribe” was part of the Indo-European family. As a consequence, the antiquity of the Slavs went beyond the time of their first mention by historical sources, for “all modern nations must have had ancestors in the ancient world.”⁴ The key element of his theory was the work of Jordanes, *Getica*. Jordanes had equated the Sclavenes and the Antes to the Venethi (or Venedi) also known from much earlier sources, such as Pliny the Elder, Tacitus, and Ptolemy. On the basis of this equivalence, Šafářik claimed the Venedi for the Slavic history. He incriminated Tacitus for having wrongly listed them among groups inhabiting Germania. The Venedi, Šafářik argued, spoke Slavic, a language which Tacitus most obviously could not understand.⁵ The early Slavs were agriculturists and their migration was not a violent conquest by warriors, but a peaceful colonization by peasants. The Slavs succeeded in expanding all over Europe, because of their democratic way of life described by Procopius.⁶

Šafářik bequeathed to posterity not only his vision of a Slavic history, but also a powerful methodology for exploring its Dark Ages: language. It demanded that, in the absence of written sources, historians use linguistic data to reconstruct the earliest stages of Slavic history. Since language, according to Herder and his followers, was the defining factor in the formation of a particular culture type and world view, reconstructing Common Slavic (not attested in written documents before the mid-ninth century) on the basis of modern Slavic languages meant reconstructing the social and cultural life of the early Slavs, before the earliest documents written in their language. A Polish scholar, Tadeusz Wojciechowski (1839–1919), first used place names to write Slavic history.⁷ Using river names, A. L. Pogodin attempted to identify the *Urheimat* of the Slavs and put forward the influential suggestion that the appropriate homeland for the Slavs was Podolia and Volhynia, the two

⁴ Šafářik 1844:1, 40. Šafářik, who opened the All-Slavic Congress in Prague in June 1848, shared such views with his friend, František Palacký. See Palacký 1868:74–89. For the Manifesto to European nations from Palacký’s pen, which was adopted by the Slavic Congress, see Pech 1969:133. For Palacký’s image of the early Slavs, see Zacek 1970:84–5.

⁵ Šafářik 1844:1, 75 and 78. There is still no comprehensive study on the influence of Šafářik’s ideas on modern linguistic theories of Common Slavic. These ideas were not completely original. Before Šafářik, the Polish historian Wawrzyniec Surowiecki (1769–1827) used Pliny’s *Natural History*, Tacitus’ *Germania*, and Ptolemy’s *Geography* as sources for Slavic history. See Surowiecki 1964 (first published in 1824). On Surowiecki’s life and work, see Szafran-Szadkowska 1983:74–7. Surowiecki’s ideas were shared by his celebrated contemporary, Adam Mickiewicz (1798–1855), and his theory of the Slavic Venethi inspired at least one important work of Polish Romantic literature, namely Juliusz Słowacki’s famous tragedy, *Lilla Weneda* (1840).

⁶ Šafářik 1844:1, 42 (see also II, 17). These ideas were not new. The “dove-like Slavs,” in sharp contrast with the rude Germans, was a common stereotype in early nineteenth-century Bohemia. See Sklenář 1983:95. ⁷ Wojciechowski 1873. See Szafran-Szadkowska 1983:115.

Cambridge University Press

0521802024 - The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, c. 500-700

Florin Curta

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The making of the Slavs*

regions with the oldest river names of Slavic origin.⁸ A Polish botanist, J. Rostafiński, pushed the linguistic evidence even further. He argued that the homeland of the Slavs was a region devoid of beech, larch, and yew, because in all Slavic languages the words for those trees were of foreign (i.e., Germanic) origin. By contrast, all had an old Slavic word for hornbeam, which suggested that the *Urheimat* was within that tree's zone. On the basis of the modern distribution of those trees, Rostafiński located the *Urheimat* in the marshes along the Pripet river, in Polesie.⁹ Jan Peisker (1851–1933) took Rostafiński's theory to its extreme. To him, “the Slav was the son and the product of the marsh.”¹⁰

Despite heavy criticism, such theories were very popular and can still be found in recent accounts of the early history of the Slavs.¹¹ The rise of the national archaeological schools shortly before and, to a greater extent, after World War II, added an enormous amount of information, but did not alter the main directions set for the discipline of Slavic studies by its nineteenth-century founders. Lubor Niederle (1865–1944), who first introduced archaeological data into the scholarly discourse about the early Slavs, endorsed Rostafiński's theory. His multi-volume work is significantly entitled *The Antiquities of the Slavs*, like that of Šafařík.¹² Niederle believed that climate and soil shape civilization. Since the natural conditions in the Slavic *Urheimat* in Polesie were unfavorable, the Slavs developed forms of social organization based on cooperation between large families (of a type known as *zadruga*), social equality, and

⁸ Pogodin 1901:85–111. For Pogodin's theories, see Sedov 1976:70. A recent variant of these theories is Jürgen Udolph's attempt to locate the Slavic *Urheimat* on the basis of river-, lake-, and moor-names. According to Udolph, Galicia was the area in which the Indo-Europeans first became proto-Slavs. See Udolph 1979:619–20.

⁹ Rostafiński 1908. For Rostafiński's “beech argument,” see Kostrzewski 1969:11; Sedov 1976:71; Szafran-Szadkowska 1983:105; Gołab 1992:273–80. Pogodin's and Rostafiński's arguments were couched in the theory of Indo-European studies. A growing field in the early 1900s, this theory attempted to reconstruct the original language (*Ursprache*) of the original people (*Urvolk*) in their homeland (*Urheimat*), using the method of the “linguistic paleontology” founded by Adalbert Kuhn. See Mallory 1973; Anthony 1995:90.

¹⁰ Peisker 1926:426; see Peisker 1905. For Peisker's life and work, see Šimák 1933. Peisker's ideas are still recognizable in the work of Omeljan Pritsak, who recently argued that the Sclavenes were not an ethnic group, but amphibious units for guerilla warfare both on water and on land. See Pritsak 1983:411.

¹¹ Many scholars took Rostafiński's argument at its face value. See Dvornik 1956:59; Gimbutas 1971:23; see also Baran 1991; Dolukhanov 1996. For good surveys of the most recent developments in Slavic linguistics, in which the “Indo-European argument” refuses to die, see Birnbaum 1986 and 1993.

¹² Niederle 1911:37–47, 1923:21, and 1925:iii. A student of Jaroslav Goll, the founder of the Czech positivist school, Niederle was a professor of history at the Charles University in Prague. His interest in archaeology derived from the idea that ethnography was a historical discipline, capable of producing evidence for historical constructions based on the retrogressive method. For Niederle's life and work, see Eisner 1948; Zasterová 1967; Tomás 1984:39; Gojda 1991:4. For Niederle's use of the linguistic evidence, see Dostál 1966:7–31 and 1967:147–53.

Cambridge University Press

0521802024 - The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, c. 500-700

Florin Curta

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Concepts and approaches*

the democracy described by Procopius, which curtailed any attempts at centralization of economic or political power.¹³ This hostile environment forced the early Slavs to migrate, a historical phenomenon Niederle dated to the second and third century AD. The harsh climate of the Pripet marshes also forced the Slavs, whom Niederle viewed as *enfants de la nature*, into a poor level of civilization. Only the contact with the more advanced Roman civilization made it possible for the Slavs to give up their original culture entirely based on wood and to start producing their own pottery.¹⁴

Others took the archaeological evidence much further. Vykentyi V. Khvoika (1850–1914), a Ukrainian archaeologist of Czech origin, who had just “discovered” the Slavs behind the Neolithic Tripolye culture, was encouraged by Niederle’s theory to ascribe to them finds of the fourth-century cemetery at Chernyakhov (Ukraine), an idea of considerable influence on Slavic archaeology after World War II.¹⁵ A Russian archaeologist, A. A. Spicyn (1858–1931), assigned to the Antes mentioned by Jordanes the finds of silver and bronze in central and southern Ukraine.¹⁶ More than any other artifact category, however, pottery became the focus of all archaeological studies of the early Slavic culture. During the inter-war years, Czech archaeologists postulated the existence of an intermediary stage between medieval and Roman pottery, a ceramic category Ivan Borkovský (1897–1976) first called the “Prague type” on the basis of finds from several residential areas of the Czechoslovak capital. According to Borkovský, the “Prague type” was a national, exclusively Slavic, pottery.¹⁷ After World War II, despite Borkovský’s political agenda (or, perhaps, because of it), the idea that the “Prague type” signaled the presence of the Slavs was rapidly embraced by many archaeologists in Czechoslovakia, as well as elsewhere.¹⁸

¹³ Niederle 1923:26 and 1926:173.

¹⁴ Niederle 1923:49, 1925:513, and 1926:1–2 and 5. For Niederle’s concept of Slavic homeland, see Zasterová 1966:33–41.

¹⁵ Baran, Gorokhovskii, and Magomedov 1990:33; Dolukhanov 1996:4. On Khvoika’s life and work, see Bakhmat 1964; Lebedev 1992:260–2.

¹⁶ Spicyn 1928:492–5. See also Prikhodniuk 1989:65. On Spicyn, see Lebedev 1992:247–52.

¹⁷ Borkovský 1940:25 and 34–5. Emanuel Šimek (1923) first called this pottery the “Veleslavín type.” Niederle’s successor at the Charles University in Prague, Josef Schranil, suggested that this type derived from the Celtic pottery, an idea further developed by Ivan Borkovský. Borkovský argued that when migrating to Bohemia and Moravia, the Slavs found remnants of the Celtic population still living in the area and borrowed their techniques of pottery production. For the history of the “Prague type,” see Preidel 1954:56; Zeman 1966:170.

¹⁸ Borkovský’s book was published shortly after the anti-German demonstrations in the protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia under Nazi rule (October 1939). The idea that the earliest Slavic pottery derived from a local variant of the Celtic, not Germanic, pottery was quickly interpreted as an attempt to claim that the Czechs (and not the Germans) were natives to Bohemia and Moravia. Borkovský’s work was thus viewed as a reaction to Nazi claims that the Slavs were racially

The making of the Slavs

Following Stalin's policies of fostering a Soviet identity with a Russian cultural makeup, the Slavic ethnogenesis became the major, if not the only, research topic of Soviet archaeology and historiography, gradually turning into a symbol of national identity.¹⁹ As the Red Army was launching its massive offensive to the heart of the Third Reich, Soviet historians and archaeologists imagined an enormous Slavic homeland stretching from the Oka and the Volga rivers, to the east, to the Elbe and the Saale rivers to the west, and from the Aegean and Black Seas to the south to the Baltic Sea to the north.²⁰ A professor of history at the University of Moscow, Boris Rybakov, first suggested that both Spicyn's "Antian antiquities" and the remains excavated by Khvoika at Chernyakhov should be attributed to the Slavs, an idea enthusiastically embraced after the war by both Russian and Ukrainian archaeologists.²¹ The 1950s witnessed massive state investments in archaeology and many large-scale horizontal excavations of settlements and cemeteries were carried out by a younger generation of archaeologists. They shifted the emphasis from the Chernyakhov culture to the remains of sixth- and seventh-century settlements in Ukraine, particularly to pottery. Initially just a local variant of Borkovský's Prague type, this pottery became the ceramic archetype of all Slavic cultures. The origins of the early Slavs thus moved from Czechoslovakia to Ukraine.²² The interpretation favored by Soviet scholars became the norm in all countries in Eastern Europe with Communist-dominated governments under Moscow's

Footnote 18 (*cont.*)

and culturally inferior. As a consequence, the book was immediately withdrawn from bookstores and Borkovský became a sort of local hero of the Czech archaeology. Nevertheless, the concept of Prague-type pottery was quickly picked up and used even by German archaeologists working under the Nazi regime. See Brachmann 1983:23. For the circumstances of Borkovský's book publication, see Preidel 1954:57; Sklenář 1983:162–3. For the "politics of archaeology" in the protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia under Nazi rule, see Mastny 1971:130–1.

¹⁹ For the political and cultural circumstances in which the academic discourse in the Soviet Union adopted the Slavic ethnogenesis as its primary subject matter, see Velychenko 1992; Aksenova and Vasil'ev 1993; Shnirel'man 1993 and 1995.

²⁰ E.g., Derzhavin 1944:46; Mavrodin 1945:15.

²¹ Rybakov 1939 and 1943. For the influence of Rybakov's theories, see Liapushkin 1965:121; Shchukin 1980:399; Baran, Gorokhovskii, and Magomedov 1990:35–6. Despite heavy criticism in recent years, these theories remain popular. See Sedov 1972:116–30; Dolukhanov 1996:158 ("indisputable archaeological evidence proving that the peoples who made up the bulk of the agricultural population of the east Gothic 'state' were Slavs"). For Rybakov's political activity after the war, see Novosel'cev 1993; Hösler 1995:25–6.

²² For excavations in Polesie in the 1950s, see Rusanova 1976:12–13; Baran 1985:76 and 1990:59–60; Baran, Maksimov, and Magomedov 1990:202. During the 1960s and 1970s, the center of archaeological activities shifted from Polesie to the basins of the Dniester and Prut rivers, not far from the Ukrainian–Romanian border. See Baran 1968. For the "Zhitomir type," a local variant of the Prague type, and its further development into the archetype of all Slavic cultures, see Kukharensko 1955:36–8 and 1960:112; Rusanova 1958:33–46; Petrov 1963a:38; Rusanova 1970:93.