Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought
Fourth Series

General Editor:
D. E. LUSCOMBE
Research Professor of Medieval History, University of Sheffield

Advisory Editors:
CHRISTINE CARPENTER
Reader in Medieval English History, University of Cambridge, and Fellow of New Hall

ROSAMOND McKITTERICK
Professor of Medieval History, University of Cambridge, and Fellow of Newnham College

The series Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought was inaugurated by G. G. Coulton in 1921; Professor D. E. Luscombe now acts as General Editor of the Fourth Series, with Dr Christine Carpenter and Professor Rosamond McKitterick as Advisory Editors. The series brings together outstanding work by medieval scholars over a wide range of human endeavour extending from political economy to the history of ideas.

For a list of titles in the series, see end of book.

THE MAKING OF THE SLAVS

History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, c. 500–700

FLORIN CURTA

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011–4211, USA
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, VIC 3166, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

http://www.cambridge.org

First published 2001

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Monotype Bembo 11/12pt *System* QuarkXPress™ [SE]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress cataloguing in publication data

Curta, Florin.
The making of the slavs: history and archaeology of the Lower Danube Region,
c. 500–700 / by Florin Curta.
p. cm. – (Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0 521 80202 4
1. Slavs – Danube River Region – History. 2. Slavs – Balkan Peninsula – History. 3. Danube River Region. – Antiquities, Slavic. 4. Slavs – Ethnicity. 5. Slavs – History. 6. Excavations (Archaeology) – Danube River Region. I. Title. II. Series.
DR49.26.C87 2001
949.6'01–dc21 00–052915

ISBN 0 521 80202 4 hardback

CONTENTS

FIGURES

TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In the process of researching and writing this book, I have benefited from the help and advice of many individuals. The following are just a few who contributed in the completion of this book. My deepest academic debt is to Radu Harhoiu from the Archaeological Institute in Bucharest, who guided my training as an archaeologist and encouraged me to think historically about artifacts. It is he who gave me the idea of studying the Slavs in the context of the sixth-century Barbaricum and called my attention to parallel developments in the Carpathian basin and the steppes north of the Black Sea. I am also grateful to Alan Stahl for his interesting criticism and excellent advice on the interpretation of hoards.

I wish to thank Deborah Deliyannis, Lucian Rosu, Allen Zagarell, and Speros Vryonis for their guidance and support. Among the individuals to whom I also owe personal debts of gratitude, I would like to acknowledge Igor Corman, Alexandru Popa, and Ioan Tentiuc from Chişinău, Anna Kharalambieva from Varna, Ioan Stanciu from Cluj-Napoca, Mihailo Milinković from Belgrade, Vasile Dupoi and Adrian Canache from Bucharest. They all generously gave me encouragement, suggestions, and access to unpublished material. I am also indebted to the American Numismatic Society for its financial assistance during the Summer Seminar of 1995 in New York. I also wish to acknowledge Genevra Kornbluth, Patrick Geary, Larry Wolff, Robert Hayden, and the participants in the University of Michigan conference on vocabularies of identity in Eastern Europe (1998), who expressed their interest in and encouraged me to continue research on the Slavic archaeology and its political use.

Finally, I am immeasurably indebted to my wife Lucia and my daughter Ana, who never let me give up. Without them, this book would not have existed.

ABBREVIATIONS

AAC	*Acta Archaeologica Carpathica* (Cracow, 1958–).
AAnt	*American Antiquity* (Menasha, 1935–).
AAnth	*American Anthropologist* (Washington, 1888–).
AClass	*Acta Classica* (Kaapstad, 1958–).
AClassDebrecen	*Acta Classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis* (Debrecen, 1965–).
ActaAntHung	*Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* (Budapest, 1951–).
ActaArchHung	*Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* (Budapest, 1951–).
Actes IX	*Actes du IX-e Congrès international d'études sur les frontières romaines, Mamaia 6–13 septembre 1972*. Ed. Dionisie M. Pippidi. Bucharest and Cologne: Editura Academiei RSR and Böhlau, 1974.
Actes X	*Actes du X-e Congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne. Thessalonique, 28 septembre – 4 octobre 1980*. 2 vols. Vatican and Thessaloniki: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana and Hetaireia Makedonikon Spoudon, 1984.
Actes XI	*Actes du XI-e Congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne. Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève et Aoste (21–28 septembre 1986)*. Ed. Noël Duval. 3 vols. Rome: Ecole Française de Rome, 1989.
*Actes XII*a	*Actes du XII-e Congrès international d'études byzantines (Ochride, 10–16 septembre 1961)*. 2 vols. Belgrade: Comité Yougoslave des Etudes Byzantines, 1963.
*Actes XII*b	*Actes du XII-e Congrès international des sciences préhistoriques et protohistoriques, Bratislava, 1–7 septembre 1991*. Ed. Juraj Pavuj. 4 vols. Bratislava: VEDA, 1993.

Actes XIV	*Actes du XIV-e Congrès international des études byzantines, Bucarest, 6–12 septembre 1971*. Ed. Mihai Berza and Eugen Stănescu. 3 vols. Bucharest: Editura Academiei RSR, 1974–6.
AE	*American Ethnologist* (Washington, 1974–).
AEMA	*Archivum Eurasiae Medii Aevi* (Wiesbaden, 1975–).
AJA	*American Journal of Archaeology* (New York, 1885–).
Akten 11	*Limes. Akten des 11. internationalen Limeskongresses Székesfehérvár 30.8–6.9. 1976*. Ed. Jenő Fitz. Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó, 1977.
Akten 13	*Studien zu den Militärgrenzen Roms III. 13. internationaler Limeskongreß Aalen 1983. Vorträge*. Stuttgart: Konrad Theiss, 1986.
Akten 14	*Akten des 14. internationalen Limeskongresses 1986 in Carnuntum*. Ed. Hermann Vetters and Manfred Kandler. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1990.
AM	*Arheologia Moldovei* (Bucharest, 1961–).
AMN	*Acta Musei Napocensis* (Cluj, 1964–).
AMT	*Archaeological Method and Theory* (Tucson, 1989–93).
Anthropology	*The Anthropology of Ethnicity. Beyond "Ethnic Groups and Boundaries."* Ed. Hans Vermeulen and Cora Govers. The Hague: Het Spinhuis, 1994.
Approaches	*Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*. Ed. Stephen Shennan. London, Boston, and Sydney: Unwin Hyman, 1989.
ARA	*Annual Review of Anthropology* (Palo Alto, 1972–).
ArchBulg	*Archaeologia Bulgarica* (Sofia, 1997–).
ArchÉrt	*Archaeologiai Értesitö* (Budapest, 1881–).
ArchIug	*Archaeologia Iugoslavica* (Belgrade, 1954–).
ArchMéd	*Archeologie Médiévale* (Paris, 1971–).
ArchPol	*Archaeologia Polona* (Wrocław, 1958–).
ArchRoz	*Archeologické Rozhledy* (Prague, 1949–).
Argenterie	*Argenterie romaine et byzantine. Actes de la table ronde, Paris 11–13 octobre 1983*. Ed. Noël Duval, François Baratte, and Ernest Will. Paris: De Boccard, 1988.
ASGE	*Arkheologicheskii Sbornik Gosudarstvennogo Ermitazha* (Leningrad, 1959–).
ASSAH	*Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* (Oxford, 1979–).
AT	*Antiquité Tardive* (Paris, 1993–).
AV	*Arheološki Vestnik* (Ljubljana, 1950–).

Avari	*Gli Avari. Un popolo d'Europa*. Ed. Giàn Carlo Menis. Udine: Arti Grafiche Friulane, 1995.
Awarenforschungen	*Awarenforschungen*. Ed. Falko Daim. 2 vols. Vienna: Institut für Ur- und Frühgeschichte der Universität Wien, 1992.
Balcanica	*Balcanica Posnaniensia* (Poznań, 1984–).
Baltic	*From the Baltic to the Black Sea. Studies in Medieval Archaeology*. Ed. David Austin and Leslie Alcock. London: Unwin Hyman, 1990.
Barbaren	*Das Reich und die Barbaren*. Ed. Evangelos Chrysos and Andreas Schwarcz. Vienna and Cologne: Böhlau, 1989.
BCH	*Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* (Athens and Paris, 1877–).
BE	*Balkansko ezikoznanie* (Sofia, 1959–).
Berichte	*Berichte über den II. internationalen Kongreß für slawische Archäologie. Berlin, 24.-28. August 1970*. Ed. Joachim Herrmann and Karl-Heinz Otto. 2 vols. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973.
BHR	*Bulgarian Historical Review* (Sofia, 1973–).
BJ	*Bonner Jahrbücher des Rheinischen Landesmuseums in Bonn und des Vereins von Altertumsfreunden im Rheinlande* (Bonn, 1842–).
BMGS	*Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* (Oxford, 1975–).
BMIM	*Bucureşti. Materiale de istorie şi muzeografie* (Bucharest, 1964–).
BS	*Balkan Studies* (Thessaloniki, 1960–).
BSAF	*Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France* (Paris, 1871–).
BSNR	*Buletinul Societăţii Numismatice Române* (Bucharest, 1904–).
Bucureşti	*Bucureştii de odinioară în lumina săpăturilor arheologice*. Ed. I. Ionaşcu. Bucharest: Editura Ştiinţifică, 1959.
Bulgaria	*Ancient Bulgaria. Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Ancient History and Archaeology of Bulgaria, University of Nottingham, 1981*. Ed. Andrew G. Poulter. Nottingham: University of Nottingham, 1983.
BV	*Bayerische Vorgeschichtsblätter* (Munich, 1921–).
ByzF	*Byzantinische Forschungen* (Amsterdam, 1966–).
ByzZ	*Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (Munich, 1892–).

CAB	*Cercetări Arheologice în Bucureşti* (Bucharest, 1963–).
CAH	*Communicationes Archaeologicae Hungariae* (Budapest, 1981–).
CAnth	*Current Anthropology* (Chicago, 1960–).
CCARB	*Corso di Cultura sull'Arte Ravennate e Bizantina* (Ravenna, 1955–).
Christentum	*Das Christentum in Bulgarien und auf der übrigen Balkanhalbinsel in der Spätantike und im frühen Mittelalter*. Ed. Vasil Giuzelev and Renate Pillinger. Vienna: Verein "Freunde des Hauses Wittgenstein," 1987.
CIG	*Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*
CIL	*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
City	*City, Towns, and Countryside in the Early Byzantine Era*. Ed. Robert L. Hohlfelder. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
Conference 18	*Ethnicity and Culture. Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Conference of the Archaeological Association of the University of Calgary*. Ed. Réginald Auger et al. Calgary: University of Calgary Archaeological Association, 1987.
Congress 8	*Roman Frontier Studies 1969. Eighth International Congress of Limesforschung*. Ed. Eric Birley, Brian Dobson, and Michael Jarrett. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1974.
Constantinople	*Constantinople and its Hinterland. Papers from the Twenty-Seventh Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, April 1993*. Ed. Cyril Mango and Gilbert Dagron. Aldershot: Variorum, 1995.
Corinthia	*The Corinthia in the Roman Period Including the Papers Given at a Symposium Held at the Ohio State University on 7–9 March, 1991*. Ed. Timothy E. Gregory. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series, 1993.
CPh	*Classical Philology* (Chicago, 1906–).
CRAI	*Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (Paris, 1857–).
CSSH	*Comparative Studies in Society and History* (London and New York, 1958–).
Development	*Development and Decline. The Evolution of Sociopolitical Organization*. Ed. Henri J. M. Claessen, Pieter van de Velde, and M. Estellie Smith. South

	Hadley: Bergin and Garvey, 1985.
Dnestr	*Slaviane na Dnestre i Dunae. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov*. Ed. V. D. Baran, R. V. Terpilovskii, and A. T. Smilenko. Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1983.
Dokladi	*Vtori mezhdunaroden kongres po bălgaristika, Sofiia, 23 mai–3 iuni 1986 g. Dokladi 6: Bălgarskite zemi v drevnostta. Bălgariia prez srednovekovieto*. Ed. Khristo Khristov et al. Sofia: BAN, 1987.
Donau	*Die Völker an der mittleren und unteren Donau im fünften und sechsten Jahrhundert*. Ed. Herwig Wolfram and Falko Daim. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1980.
DOP	*Dumbarton Oaks Papers* (Washington, 1941–).
Drevnosti	*Rannesrednevekovye vostochnoslavianskie drevnosti. Sbornik statei*. Ed. P. N. Tret'iakov. Leningrad: Nauka, 1974.
DS	*Đerdapske Sveske* (Belgrade, 1980–).
EAZ	*Ethnographisch-archäologische Zeitschrift* (Berlin, 1960–).
EB	*Etudes Balkaniques* (Sofia, 1964–).
EH	*Etudes Historiques* (Sofia, 1960–).
Eirene	*From Late Antiquity to Early Byzantium. Proceedings of the Byzantinological Symposium in the 16th International Eirene Conference*. Ed. Vladimír Vavřínek. Prague: Academia, 1985.
EME	*Early Medieval Europe* (Harlow, 1992–).
ERS	*Ethnic and Racial Studies* (London and New York, 1978–).
FA	*Folia Archaeologica* (Budapest, 1939–).
Familie	*Familie, Staat und Gesellschaftsformation. Grundprobleme vorkapitalistischer Epochen einhundert Jahren nach Friedrich Engels' Werk, "Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigentums und des Staates"*. Ed. Joachim Herrmann and Jens Köhn. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1988.
Festschrift	*Studien zur vor- und frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie. Festschrift für Joachim Werner zum 65. Geburtstag*. Ed. Georg Kossack and Günter Ulbert. 2 vols. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1974.
FO	*Folia orientalia* (Cracow, 1959–).
FS	*Frühmittelalterliche Studien* (Berlin, 1967–).

Germanen	*Germanen, Hunnen und Awaren. Schätze der Völkerwanderungszeit.* Ed. Gerhard Bott and Walter Meier-Arendt. Nuremberg: Germanisches Nationalmuseum, 1987.
GMSB	*Godishnik na muzeite ot Severna Bălgariia* (Varna, 1975–).
Gosudarstva	*Rannefeodal'nye gosudarstva i narodnosti (iuzhnye i zapadnye slaviane VI–XII vv.).* Ed. G. G. Litavrin Moscow: Nauka, 1991.
GOTR	*Greek Orthodox Theological Review* (Brookline, 1954–).
GZMBH	*Glasnik Zemaljskog Muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarajevu* (Sarajevo, 1967–).
Historiographie	*Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter.* Ed. Anton Scharer and Georg Scheibelreiter. Vienna and Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 1994.
Hommes	*Hommes et richesses dans l'Empire byzantin.* Ed. Gilbert Dagron et al. 2 vols. Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1989–91.
Iatrus	*Iatrus-Krivina. Spätantike Befestigung und frühmittelalterliche Siedlung an der unteren Donau.* 5 vols. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1979–95.
IBAI	*Izvestiia na Bălgarskiia Arkheologicheskiia Institut* (after 1950: *Izvestiia na Arkheologicheskiia Institut*) (Sofia, 1921–).
IBID	*Izvestiia na Bălgarskoto Istorichesko Druzhestvo* (Sofia, 1905–).
Identity	*Cultural Identity and Archaeology. The Construction of European Communities.* Ed. Paul Graves-Brown et al. London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
IIAK	*Izvestiia Imperatorskoi Arkheologicheskoi Kommissii* (St. Petersburg, 1901–14).
IIBI	*Izvestiia na Instituta za Bălgarska Istoriia* (after 1957: *Izvestiia na Instituta za Istoriia*)(Sofia, 1951–).
INMV	*Izvestiia na Narodniia Muzei Varna* (Varna, 1965–).
Interaktionen	*Interaktionen der mitteleuropäischen Slawen und anderen Ethnika im 6.–10. Jahrhundert. Symposium Nové Vozokany, 3.–7. Oktober 1983.* Ed. Bohuslav Chropovský. Nitra: Archäologisches Institut der Slowakischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1984.
Issledovaniia	*Arkheologicheskie issledovaniia srednevekovykh pamiatnikov v Dnestrovsko-Prutskom mezhdurech'e.* Ed. P. P. Byrnia. Kishinew: Shtiinca, 1985.

Istoriia	*Problemi na prabălgarska istoriia i kultura.* Ed. Rasho Rashev. Sofia: BAN, 1989.
IZ	*Istoricheskii zhurnal* (Moscow, 1931–45).
JAA	*Journal of Anthropological Archaeology* (New York, 1982–).
JGO	*Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas* (Breslau and Wiesbaden, 1936–).
JIES	*Journal of Indo-European Studies* (Washington, 1973–).
JMV	*Jahresschrift für mitteldeutsche Vorgeschichte* (Berlin, 1902–).
JÖB	*Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* (Vienna, 1969–).
JRA	*Journal of Roman Archaeology* (Ann Arbor, 1988–).
JRGZ	*Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums* (Mainz, 1954–).
Karta	*Etnokul'turnaia karta territorii Ukrainskoi SSR v I tys. n. e..* Ed. V. D. Baran, R. V. Terpilovskii, and E. V. Maksimov. Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1985.
KJVF	*Kölner Jahrbuch für Vor- und Frühgeschichte* (Berlin, 1955–).
KSIA	*Kratkie Soobshcheniia Instituta Arkheologii AN SSSR* (Moscow, 1952–).
Kul'tura	*Slavianskie drevnosti. Etnogenez. Material'naia kul'tura drevnei Rusi. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov.* Ed. V. D. Koroliuk. Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1980.
Limes	*Der Limes an der unteren Donau von Diokletian bis Heraklios. Vorträge der internationalen Konferenz, Svištov, Bulgarien (1.–5. September 1998).* Ed. Gerda von Bülow and Alexandra Milcheva. Sofia: NOUS, 1999.
MAA	*Macedoniae Acta Archaeologica* (Prilep, 1975–).
MAIET	*Materialy po Arkheologii, Istorii i Etnografii Tavrii* (Simferopol, 1990–).
MAIUAW	*Mitteilungen des Archäologischen Instituts der Ungarischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Budapest, 1972–).
Mathematics	*Mathematics and Information Science in Archaeology: A Flexible Framework.* Ed. Albertus Voorrips. Bonn: Holos, 1990.
MCA	*Materiale şi Cercetări de Arheologie* (Bucharest, 1955–).

MEFRA	*Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire de l'Ecole Française de Rome* (Paris, 1881–).
Mélange	*Zbornik posveten na Boško Babić. Mélange Boško Babić 1924–1984*. ed. Mihailo Apostolski. Prilep: Institut des recherches scientifiques de la culture des anciens Slaves, 1986.
MemAnt	*Memoria Antiquitatis* (Piatra Neamţ, 1969–).
MGH: AA	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Auctores Antiquissimi*
MGH: Epistolae	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Epistolae*
MGH: SRM	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum*
MGH: SS	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in Usum Scholarum Separatim Editi*
Nikopolis	*Nikopolis I. Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Nikopolis (23–29 September 1984)*. Ed. Evangelos Chrysos. 2 vols. Preveza: Demos Prevezas, 1987.
Noblesse	*La noblesse romaine et les chefs barbares du IIIe au VIIe siècle*. Ed. Françoise Vallet and Michel Kazanski. Saint-Germain-en-Laye: Association Française d'Archéologie Mérovingienne and Musée des Antiquités Nationales, 1995.
NZ	*Novopazarski Zbornik* (Novi Pazar, 1971–).
Obrazovaniia	*Slaviane nakanune obrazovaniia Kievskoi Rusi*. Ed. Boris A. Rybakov. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1963.
P&P	*Past and Present* (Oxford, 1952–).
PA	*Památky Archeologické* (Prague, 1914–).
Palast	*Palast und Hütte. Beiträge zum Bauen und Wohnen im Altertum von Archäologen, Vor- und Frühgeschichtlern*. Ed. Dietrich Papenfuss and Volker Michael Strocka. Mainz: Philipp von Zabern, 1982.
PG	*Patrologiae cursus completus. Series Graeca*
Pliska	*Pliska-Preslav. Prouchvaniia i materiali*. Ed. Zhivka Văzharova. 3 vols. Sofia: BAN, 1979–81.
Praveké	*Praveké a slovanské osídlení Moravy. Sborník k 80. narozeninám Josefa Poulíka*. Ed. Vladimír Nekuda. Brno: Muzejní a vlastivedná společnost v Brne and Archeologický ústav Československé Akademie Ved v Brne, 1990.
Prilozi	*Prilozi Instituta za Arheologiju u Zagrebu* (Zagreb, 1983–).

Probleme	*Ausgewählte Probleme europäischer Landnahmen des Früh- und Hochmittelalters*. Ed. Michael Müller-Wille and Reinhard Schneider. 2 vols. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1993.
Problemi	*Problemi seobe naroda u Karpatskoj kotlini. Saopštenja sa naučkog skupa 13.-16. decembre 1976*. Ed. Danica Dimitrijević, Jovan Kovačević, and Zdenko Vinski. Belgrade: Matica Srpska, 1978.
Problemy	*Problemy etnogeneza slavian. Sbornik nauchnykh trudov*. Ed. V. D. Baran. Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1978.
RA	*Rossiiskaia Arkheologiia* (Moscow, 1992–).
Rapports	*Rapports du III-e Congrès international d'archéologie slave. Bratislava 7–14 septembre 1975*. Ed. Bohuslav Chropovský. 2 vols. Bratislava: VEDA, 1979–81.
RBPH	*Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* (Brussels, 1922–).
Recherches	*Recherches sur la céramique byzantine*. Ed. V. Déroche and J.-M. Spieser. Athens and Paris: Ecole Française d'Athènes and De Boccard, 1989.
RESEE	*Revue des Etudes Sud-Est Européennes* (Bucharest, 1963–).
RM	*Revista Muzeelor* (after 1974: *Revista Muzeelor şi Monumentelor*)(Bucharest, 1964–).
RP	*Razkopki i Prouchvaniia* (Sofia, 1948–).
RRH	*Revue Roumaine d'Histoire* (Bucharest, 1962–).
Rus'	*Drevniaia Rus' i slaviane*. Ed. T. V. Nikolaeva. Moscow: Nauka, 1978.
RVM	*Rad Vojvodanskih Muzeja* (Novi Sad, 1952–93).
SA	*Sovetskaia Arkheologiia* (Moscow, 1933–).
Sbornik	*Sbornik v chest na akad. Dimităr Angelov*. Ed. Velizar Velkov et al. Sofia: BAN, 1994.
SBS	*Studies in Byzantine Sigillography* (Washington, 1987–).
Schwarzmeerküste	*Die Schwarzmeerküste in der Spätantike und im frühen Mittelalter*. Ed. Renate Pillinger, Anton Pülz, and Hans Vetters. Vienna: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1992.
SCIV	*Studii şi Cercetări de Istorie Veche* (after 1974: *Studii şi Cercetări de Istorie Veche şi Arheologie*) (Bucharest, 1950–).
SCN	*Studii şi Cercetări de Numismatică* (Bucharest, 1957–).
SF	*Südost-Forschungen* (Leipzig, 1936–).

Simpozijum	*Simpozijum "Predslavenski etnički elementi na Balkanu u etnogenezi južnih Slovena", održan 24–26. oktobra 1968 u Mostaru*. Ed. Alojz Benac. Sarajevo: Akademija Nauka i Umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, 1969.
Sitzungsberichte	*Sitzungsberichte der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse (Vienna, 1848–1918).*
SlA	*Slavia Antiqua* (Warsaw, 1948–).
Slavi	*Gli Slavi occidentali e meridionali nell'alto medioevo*. Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1983.
Slavianite	*Slavianite i sredizemnomorskiiat sviat VI-XI vek. Mezhdunaroden simpozium po slavianska arkheologiia. Sofiia, 23–29 april 1970*. Ed. Stamen Mikhailov, Sonia Georgieva, and Penka Gakeva. Sofia: BAN, 1973.
SlovArch	*Slovenská Archeológia* (Bratislava, 1952–).
Sosedi	*Drevnie slaviane i ikh sosedi*. Ed. Iu. V. Kukharenko. Moscow: Nauka, 1970.
Soviet	*Soviet Ethnology and Anthropology Today*. Ed. Julian V. Bromley. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1974.
SovS	*Sovetskoe Slavianovedenie* (after 1992: *Slavianovedenie*)(Moscow, 1960–).
SP	*Starohrvatska Prosvjeta* (Zagreb, 1949–).
Starozhitnosti	*Slov'iano-rus'ki starozhitnosti*. Ed. V. I. Bydzylia. Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1969.
Stepi	*Stepi Evrazii v epokhu srednevekov'ia*. Ed. Svetlana A. Pletneva. Moscow: Nauka, 1981.
Struktura	*Etnosocial'naia i politicheskaia struktura rannefeodal'nykh slavianskikh gosudarstv i narodnostei*. Ed. G. G. Litavrin. Moscow: Nauka, 1987.
Studien	*Studien zum 7. Jahrhundert in Byzanz. Probleme der Herausbildung des Feudalismus*. Ed. Helga Köpstein and Friedhelm Winckelmann. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1976.
Svod	*Svod drevneishikh pis'mennykh izvestii o slavianakh*. Ed. L. A. Gindin et al. 2 vols. Moscow: Nauka and "Vostochnaia literatura" RAN, 1991/5.
T&MByz	*Travaux et Mémoires du Centre de Recherches d'Histoire et Civilisation Byzantines* (Paris, 1965–).
Trudy	*Trudy V Mezhdunarodnogo Kongressa arkheologov-slavistov, Kiev 18–25 sentiabria 1985*. Ed. Vladimir D. Baran. 4 vols. Kiev: Naukova Dumka, 1988.
Typology	*Essays in Archaeological Typology*. Ed. Robert Whallon and James A. Brown. Evanston: Center for American Archaeological Press, 1982.
Uses	*The Uses of Style in Archaeology*. Ed. Margaret W. Conkey and Christine A. Hastorf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
VAHD	*Vjesnik za Arheologiju i Historiju Dalmatinsku* (Split, 1878–).
VAMZ	*Vjesnik Arheološkog Muzeja u Zagrebu* (Zagreb, 1958–).
VDI	*Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (Moscow, 1937–).
Verhältnisse	*Ethnische und kulturelle Verhältnisse an der mittleren Donau vom 6. bis zum 11. Jahrhundert*. Ed. Darina Bialeková and Jozef Zábojník. Bratislava: VEDA, 1996.
Villes	*Villes et peuplement dans l'Illyricum protobyzantin. Actes du colloque organisé par l'Ecole française de Rome (Rome, 12–14 mai 1982)*. Rome: Ecole Française de Rome, 1984.
Vizantii	*Iz istorii Vizantii i vizantino-vedeniia. Mezhvuzovskii sbornik*. Ed. G. L. Kurbatov. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo Universiteta, 1991.
Völker	*Die Völker Südosteuropas im 6. bis 8. Jahrhundert*. Ed. Bernhard Hänsel. Berlin: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft, 1987.
Voprosy	*Voprosy etnogeneza i etnicheskoi istorii slavian i vostochnykh romancev*. Ed. V. D. Koroliuk. Moscow: Nauka, 1976.
VPS	*Vznik a Počátky Slovanů* (Prague, 1956–72).
VV	*Vizantiiskii Vremennik* (Moscow, 1947–).
WA	*World Archaeology* (London, 1968–).
WMBHL	*Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen des bosnich-herzegowinischen Landesmuseum* (Sarajevo, 1971–).
WZRostock	*Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock* (Rostock, 1950–75).
Zbirnyk	*Starozhytnosti Rusi-Ukrainy. Zbirnyk naukovykh prac'*. Ed. P. P. Tolochko et al. Kiev: Kiivs'ka Akademyia Evrobyznesu, 1994.
ZC	*Zgodovinski Časopis* (Ljubljana, 1947–).
ZfA	*Zeitschrift für Archäologie* (Berlin, 1967–).
ZfS	*Zeitschrift für Slawistik* (Berlin, 1956–).
ZNM	*Zbornik Narodnog Muzeja* (Belgrade, 1964–).
ZRVI	*Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta* (Belgrade, 1961–).

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 Sclavonic 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.

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 Sighişoara (1985–91) and Târgşor (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.

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

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 "Cernăuţi" 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.

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.

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.

Šafařik (1795– 1861) derived from Herder the inspiration and orientation that would influence subsequent generations of scholars. To Šafařik, 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, Šafařik claimed the Venedi for the Slavic history. He incriminated Tacitus for having wrongly listed them among groups inhabiting Germania. The Venedi, Šafařik 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]

Šafařik 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] Schafarik 1844:I, 40. Šafařik, 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] Schafarik 1844:I, 75 and 78. There is still no comprehensive study on the influence of Šafařik's ideas on modern linguistic theories of Common Slavic. These ideas were not completely original. Before Šafařik, 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 Julius Słowacki's famous tragedy, *Lilla Weneda* (1840).

[6] Schafarik 1844:I, 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.

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 Šafařik.[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.

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 interwar 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" signalized 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 Schraníl, 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

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 Kukharenko 1955:36–8 and 1960:112; Rusanova 1958:33–46; Petrov 1963a:38; Rusanova 1970:93.

protection.[23] The "Prague-Korchak type," as this pottery came to be known, became a sort of symbol, the main and only indicator of Slavic ethnicity in material culture terms. Soviet archaeologists now delineated on distribution maps two separate, though related, cultures. The "Prague zone" was an archaeological equivalent of Jordanes' Sclavenes, while the "Pen'kovka zone" was ascribed to the Antes, fall-out curves neatly coinciding with the borders of the Soviet republics.[24]

The new archaeological discourse did not supersede the old search for the prehistoric roots of Slavic ethnicity. In the late 1970s, Valentin V. Sedov revived Šafařik's old theories, when suggesting that the ethnic and linguistic community of the first century BC to the first century AD in the Vistula basin was that of Tacitus' Venedi. According to him, the Venedi began to move into the Upper Dniester region during the first two centuries AD. By the fourth century, as the Chernyakhov culture emerged in western and central Ukraine, the Venedi formed the majority of the population in the area. As bearers of the Przeworsk culture, they assimilated all neighboring cultures, such as Zarubinec and Kiev. By 300 AD, the Antes separated themselves from the Przeworsk block, followed, some two centuries later, by the Sclavenes. The new ethnic groups were bearers of the Pen'kovka and Prague-Korchak cultures, respectively. Sedov's theory was used by others to push the Slavic ethnogenesis back in time, to the "Proto-Slavo-Balts" of the early Iron Age, thus "adjusting" the results of linguistic research to archaeological theories. The impression one gets from recent accounts of the Slavic ethnogenesis is that one remote generation that spoke Indo-European produced children who spoke Slavic.[25]

[23] For Czechoslovakia, see Poulík 1948:15–9; Klanica 1986:11. In the 1960s, Borkovský's idea that the Slavs were native to the territory of Czechoslovakia surfaced again. See Budinský-Krička 1963; Bialeková 1968; Chropovský and Ruttkay 1988:19. For a different approach, see Zeman 1968 and 1979; Jelínková 1990. For Poland, see Lehr-Spławinski 1946; Hensel 1988. In the late 1960s, Jozef Kostrzewski, the founder of the Polish archaeological school, was still speaking of the Slavic character of the Bronze-Age Lusatian culture; see Kostrzewski 1969. Kostrzewski's ideas die hard; see Sulimirski 1973; Hensel 1994. For the final blow to traditional views that the Slavs were native to the Polish territory, see more recently Parczewski 1991 and 1993. For a survey of the Romanian literature on the early Slavs, see Curta 1994a. For Yugoslavia, see Karaman 1956; Korošec 1958a; Čorović-Ljubinković 1972; Kalić 1985. For Bulgaria, see Văzharova 1964; Milchev 1970; Vasilev 1979.

[24] Fedorov 1960:190; Rafalovich 1972a; Prikhodniuk 1983:60–1. For an attempt to identify the Slavic tribes mentioned in the *Russian Primary Chronicle* with sixth- and seventh-century archaeological cultures, see Smilenko 1980.

[25] Lunt 1992:468. For Sedov's theory, see Sedov 1979, 1994, and 1996. For the Zarubinec, Kiev, and other related cultures of the first to fourth centuries AD, see Baran, Maksimov, and Magomedov 1990:10–97; Terpilovskii 1992 and 1994. For the association between the respective results of the linguistic and archaeological research, see Lebedev 1989. Russian linguists still speak of Slavs as "the sons and products of the marsh." See Mokienko 1996.

More often than not, archaeology was merely used to illustrate conclusions already drawn from the analysis of the linguistic material. The exceptional vigor of the linguistic approach originated in the fact that, after Herder, language was viewed as the quintessential aspect of ethnicity. As depository of human experiences, languages could thus be used to identify various "historical layers" in "fossilized" sounds, words, or phrases. In this ahistorical approach, human life and society was viewed as a palimpsest, the proper task for historians being that of ascribing various "fossils" to their respective age. It was an approach remarkably compatible with that of the culture-historical archaeologists, described further in this chapter. This may also explain why so many archaeologists working in the field of Slavic studies were eager to adopt the views of the linguists, and rarely challenged them. The current discourse about the Slavic homeland has its roots in this attitude. Though the issue at stake seems to be a historical one, historians were often left the task of combing the existing evidence drawn from historical sources, so that it would fit the linguistic-archaeological model. Some recently pointed out the danger of neglecting the historical dimension, but the response to this criticism illustrates how powerful the Herderian equation between language and *Volk* still is.[26] Ironically, historians became beset by doubts about their ability to give answers, because of the considerable time dimension attributed to linguistic and archaeological artifacts. With no Tacitus at hand, archaeologists proved able to explore the origins of the Slavs far beyond the horizon of the first written sources.

Together with language, the search for a respectable antiquity for the history of the Slavs showed two principal thrusts: one relied on the interpretation of the historical sources as closely as possible to the linguistic-archaeological argument; the other located the Slavic homeland in the epicenter of the modern distribution of Slavic languages. The former began with the affirmation of trustworthiness for Jordanes' account of the Slavic Venethi, an approach which ultimately led to the claim of Tacitus', Pliny's, and Ptolemy's Venedi for the history of the Slavs. The cornerstone of this theory is Šafařik's reading of Jordanes as an accurate description of a contemporary ethnic configuration. Šafařik's interpretation is still widely accepted, despite considerable revision, in the last few decades, of traditional views of Jordanes and his *Getica*. The explanation

[26] Ivanov 1991c and 1993. For the vehement response to Ivanov's claim that the ethnic history of the Slavs begins only in the 500s, see Vasil'ev 1992; Cheshko 1993. Though both Ivanov and his critics made extensive use of archaeological arguments, no archaeologist responded to Ivanov's challenge in the pages of *Slavianovedenie*. Before Ivanov, however, a Czech archaeologist advocated the idea that "as a cultural and ethnic unit, in the form known from the sixth century AD on, [the Slavs] did not exist in antiquity." See Váňa 1983:25.

of this extraordinary continuity is neither ignorance, nor language barriers. Jordanes' Venethi have become the key argument in all constructions of the Slavic past primarily based on linguistic arguments. Like Šafařik, many would show condescension for Tacitus' "mistake" of listing Venethi among groups living in Germania, but would never doubt that Jordanes' account is genuine. Archaeological research has already provided an enormous amount of evidence in support of the idea that the Venethi were Slavs. To accept this, however, involves more than a new interpretation of *Getica*. Jordanes built his image of the Slavs on the basis of earlier accounts and maps, without any concern for accurate description. It also means to give up evolutionary models created for explaining how the early Slavic culture derived from earlier archaeological cultures identified in the area in which Tacitus, Pliny, and Ptolemy apparently set their Venedi. A considerable amount of intellectual energy was invested in this direction between the two world wars and after 1945, and to question the theoretical premises of this approach is often perceived as denying its utility or, worse, as a bluntly revisionist coup. It is not without interest that claims that the Slavic ethnicity is a sixth-century phenomenon were met with the reaffirmation of Sedov's theory of Slavic culture originating from the Przeworsk culture, which is often identified with the Venethi.

The more radical the reaffirmation of Slavic antiquity becomes, the more writing about the history of the Slavs takes on the character of a mere description of the history of humans living since time immemorial in territories later inhabited by the Slavs. Pavel Dolukhanov opens his recent book on the early Slavs by observing that "the succeeding generations of people who lived in the vast spaces of the Russian Plain" without being noticed and recorded in any written documents cannot be ascribed to any ethnic group. "They had no common name, whether it was 'Slavs' or anything else." Yet, like the Soviet historians of the 1940s, Dolukhanov believes that "the origins and early development of peoples known as Slavs could be rightly understood only if viewed from a wide temporal perspective." This, in his description of Slavic history, means that the proper beginning is the Palaeolithic.[27]

But the diagnosis comes easier than the remedy. Historians and archaeologists dealing with the progress of the migration of the Slavs outside their established *Urheimat* have, at times, correctly perceived the contradictions and biases ingrained in the current discourse about the origins of the Slavs. But they still work within a framework defined by the concept of migration. The discrepancy between the efforts of Romanian

[27] Dolukhanov 1996:ix–x; see Derzhavin 1944:3–4; Mavrodin 1945:15.

archaeologists, who argue that the Slavs reached the Danube by the end of the sixth century and did not wait too long for crossing it *en masse*, and those of Bulgarian and Yugoslav archaeologists, who strive to demonstrate an early sixth-century presence of the Slavs in the Balkans, has prompted some to voice reservations and objections to both the dominance and the perceived accuracy of the archaeological view of Slavic history. Yet focusing on numismatic, rather than archaeological, data did not banish the concept of migration outright. Just as with pots, the invasions of the Slavs could nevertheless be traced by plotting finds of coins and coin hoards on the map.[28]

Modifying the linguistic-archaeological view of Slavic history seems a better alternative than negating it. Even in America, where this view was most seriously challenged, scholars speak of the Slavs at the Roman frontiers as "the first row of countless and contiguous rows of Slavic, Venedic, and Antic peoples who spread from the Danube to the Dnieper and to the Elbe" and of Proto-Slavs as forerunners of the Zhitomir or Prague cultures. Indeed, in their work of historiographical revision, historians still acknowledge the link between ethnicity and language. Either as "cumulative mutual Slavicity" or as Sclavene military units organized and controlled by steppe nomads, the idea that the Slavs became Slavs by speaking Slavic is pervasive.[29]

WHAT IS ETHNICITY?

No other term in the whole field of social studies is more ambiguous, yet more potent, than ethnicity. In English, the term "ethnic" has long been used in its New Testament sense, as a synonym for "gentile," "pagan," or "non-Christian," a meaning prevailing until the nineteenth century. The current usage of "ethnicity" goes back to 1953, as the word was first used to refer to ethnic character or peculiarity. We now speak of ethnicity as a mode of action and of representation. Some twenty years ago, however, no definition seemed acceptable. Ethnicity was "neither culture, nor society, but a specific mixture, in a more or less stable equilibrium, of both culture and society." As a consequence, attempts to define ethnicity were remarkably few.[30]

Today, ethnicity is used to refer to a decision people make to depict

[28] Romanian archaeologists: Nestor 1973:30; Teodor 1972:34; Diaconu 1979:167. Bulgarian and Yugoslav archaeologists: Milchev 1975:388; Angelova 1980:4; Čremošnik 1970:58–9 and 61; Ljubinković 1973:182. See also Barišić 1969:25–6. Numismatic evidence for the invasions of the Slavs: Kovačević 1969; Popović 1980:246.

[29] Bačić 1983:201; Milich 1995:49 and 204; see Pritsak 1983:423–4.

[30] The term "ethnicity": Fortier 1994. Ethnicity as both culture and society: Nicolas 1973:107. Definitions of ethnicity: Isajiw 1974:111; Parsons 1975:53.

themselves or others symbolically as bearers of a certain cultural identity. It has become the politicization of culture. Ethnicity is not innate, but individuals are born with it; it is not biologically reproduced, but individuals are linked to it through cultural constructions of biology; it is not simply cultural difference, but ethnicity cannot be sustained without reference to an inventory of cultural traits. One anthropologist defined ethnicity as the "collective enaction of socially differentiating signs." Others argue that ethnicity is a relatively recent phenomenon, resulting from dramatic historical experiences, notably escape from or resistance to slavery. According to such views, ethnic groups grow out of "bits and pieces, human and cultural, that nestle in the interstices" between established societies. Diasporas of exiles in borderlands coalesce around charismatic entrepreneurs, who gather adherents by using familiar amalgamative metaphors (kinship, clientelism, etc.), and also spiritual symbolism, such as ancestral aboriginality or other legitimizing events.[31]

Ethnicity may therefore be seen as an essential orientation to the past, to collective origin, a "social construction of primordiality." Some scholars believe that ethnicity is just a modern construct, not a contemporary category, and that examinations of "ethnic identity" risk anachronism when the origins of contemporary concerns and antagonisms are sought in the past. Although ethnic groups constantly change in membership, ethnic names used in early medieval sources, such as *Gothi* or *Romani*, cannot usefully be described as ethnic groups, because the chief forces of group cohesion were not ethnicity, but region and profession. Others claim that ethnicity is only the analytical tool academics devise and utilize in order to make sense of or explain the actions and feelings of the people studied.[32] But ethnicity is just as likely to have been embedded in sociopolitical relations in the past as in the present. What have changed are the historical conditions and the idiomatic concepts in which ethnicity is embedded.

In Eastern Europe, particularly in the Soviet Union, the study of ethnicity (especially of Slavic ethnicity) was dominated until recently by the views of the Soviet ethnographer Julian Bromley. According to him, ethnicity was based on a stable core, called *ethnos* or *ethnikos*, which persisted through all social formations, despite being affected by the prevailing economic and political conditions. Soviet scholars laid a strong emphasis

[31] Cohen 1993:197; see also Verdery 1994:42. Ethnicity and the inventory of "cultural traits": Williams 1992. Ethnicity and collective enaction: Eriksen 1991:141. Ethnicities as recent phenomena: Chappell 1993:272.

[32] Ethnicity and primordiality: Alverson 1979:15. The orientation to the past, however, may also be associated with other forms of group identity, such as class; see Ganzer 1990. Ethnicity as a modern construct: Geary 1983:16; Amory 1994:5 and 1997:317. Ethnicity as a scholarly construct: Banks 1996:186.

on language. As the "precondition for the rise of many kinds of social organisms, including ethnic communities," the language "received and developed in early childhood, is capable of expressing the finest shades of the inner life of people," while enabling them to communicate.[33] The association between language and ethnicity, so tightly bound in the Soviet concept of ethnicity, is no accident. For a long period, the literature concerning ethnic phenomena was completely dominated by Stalin's definition of nation and by N. Ia. Marr's ideas. Marr (1864–1934) was a well-trained Orientalist who had made valuable contributions to Armenian and Georgian philology, and became interested in comparative linguistics and prehistory. He adopted the view that language was part of the ideological superstructure depending upon the socioeconomic basis and therefore developing in stages like Marx's socioeconomic formations. Marr treated ethnicity as something of a non-permanent nature, as ephemeral, and discounted "homelands" and "proto-languages." Instead, he argued that cultural and linguistic changes were brought by socioeconomic shifts. Marr's theories were a reaction to the nineteenth-century approach of the culture-historical school based on Herderian ideas that specific ways of thought were implanted in people as a result of being descended from an ancestral stock, the *Volksgeist*.[34]

Despite its revolutionary character, Marrism was gradually abandoned, as Stalin adopted policies to force assimilation of non-Russians into a supranational, Soviet nation. He called for a "national history" that would minimize, obfuscate, and even omit reference to conflict, differences, oppression, and rebellion in relations between Russians and non-Russians. Instead, historians were urged to combat actively the fascist falsifications of history, to unmask predatory politics toward the Slavs, and to demonstrate the "real" nature of Germans and their culture. By 1950, Soviet anthropologists completely abandoned the stadial theory, as Stalin

[33] Bromley and Kozlov 1989:431–2; Kozlov 1974:79. To be sure, all ethnic identity is often associated with the use of a particular language. But language itself is only one of the elements by which access to an ethnic identity is legitimized in a culturally specific way. It is by means of an "associated language" that language and ethnicity are related to each other; see Eastman and Reese 1981:115. It is also true that much of what constitutes identity, including its ethnic dimension, takes form during the individual's early years of life. Recent studies insist that the family contributes in a fundamental way to the formation of ethnic identity and recommend that family-based studies become the methodological strategy of future research on ethnic identity. See Keefe 1992:43.

[34] Bruche-Schulz 1993:460; Slezkine 1996. According to Marr's ideas, meaning was attached to thought processes which were characteristic for a given social formation. The lesser or lower production stages produced lower or "primitive" forms of thought and language. Bruche-Schulz 1993:462. While denying the permanency of ethnicity, Marr viewed class as a structure inherent to human nature, an idea well attuned to the Bolshevik ideology of the 1920s and to the policies of the Comintern. See Szynkiewicz 1990:3; Taylor 1993:725; Shnirel'man 1995:122.

himself was now inflicting the final blow when denouncing Marrism as "vulgar Marxism."[35]

In the late 1960s, a "small revolution" (as Ernest Gellner called it) was taking place in Soviet anthropology. The tendency was now to treat ethnic identity as a self-evident aspect of ethnicity, though, like all other forms of consciousness, ethnic identity was still viewed as a derivative of objective factors. Soviet anthropologists now endeavored to find a place for ethnicity among specifically *cultural* phenomena, as opposed to social structure. To them, ethnic specificity was the objective justification for a subjective awareness of affiliation to a given *ethnos*. Despite considerable divergence as to what exactly constituted the "objective factors" of ethnicity (for some, language and culture; for others, territory or common origin), Soviet anthropologists viewed ethnicity as neither eternal, nor genetic, but as socially real and not a mystified expression of something else.[36]

To many Soviet scholars of the 1960s and 1970s, ethnicity appeared as a culturally self-reproducing set of behavioral patterns linked to collective self-identity, which continued through different modes of production. Issues of continuity and discontinuity among ethnic entities and of their transformation were thus given theoretical and empirical attention as ethnic-related patterns of collective behavior. Ethnohistory became a major field of study and ethnogenesis, the process of formation of ethnic identity, replaced social formation as the main focus. This new concept of ethnicity was closely tied in to the ideology of ethno-nationalism, a politics in which ethnic groups legitimized their borders and status by forming administrative units or republics. The classification of "ethnic types" (tribe, *narodnost'*, and nation) involving Bromley's conceptual categorizations justified the administrative statehood granted to "titular nationalities," those which gave titles to republics.[37] Paradoxically, the Soviet approach to ethnicity could be best defined as primordialistic, despite its admixture of Marxist–Leninist theory. By claiming that ethnicities, once formed through ethnogeneses, remained essentially unchanged through history, Soviet anthropologists suggested that ethnic groups were formulated in a social and political vacuum. According to them, ethnicity was thus a given, requiring description, not explanation. To contemporary eyes, the academic discourse of ethno-nationalism in Eastern Europe in general and in the former Soviet Union, in particular,

[35] Stalin's concept of national history: Velychenko 1993:20; Shnirel'man 1995:130. Abandonment of Marrist theories: Klejn 1977:13; Dolukhanov 1996:5; Slezkine 1996:852–3.

[36] Gellner 1988:135; Bromley and Kozlov 1989:427; Dragadze 1980:164.

[37] Shanin 1989:413; Klejn 1981:13; Sellnow 1990; Tishkov 1994:444.

appears as strikingly tied to political rather than intellectual considerations. This may well be a consequence of the romanticization and mystification of ethnic identity, which is viewed as rooted in the ineffable coerciveness of primordial attachments.[38]

The *communis opinio* is that the emergence of an instrumentalist approach to ethnicity is largely due to Fredrik Barth's influential book,[39] which ironically coincides in time with Bromley's "small revolution" in the Soviet Union. Ethnicity, however, emerged as a key problem with Edmund Leach's idea that social units are produced by subjective processes of categorical ascription that have no necessary relationship to observers' perceptions of cultural discontinuities. Before Barth, Western anthropologists had limited their investigation to processes taking place within groups, rather than between groups. All anthropological reasoning has been based on the premise that cultural variation is discontinuous and that there were aggregates of people who essentially shared a common culture, and interconnected differences that distinguish each such discrete culture from all others. Barth shed a new light on subjective criteria (ethnic boundaries) around which the feeling of ethnic identity of the member of a group is framed. Barth emphasized the *transactional* nature of ethnicity, for in the practical accomplishment of identity, two mutually interdependent social processes were at work, that of internal and that of external definition (categorization). By focusing on inter-ethnic, rather than intragroup social relations, Barth laid a stronger emphasis on social and psychological, rather than cultural-ideological and material factors. His approach embraced a predominantly social interactionist perspective, derived from the work of the social psychologist Erving Goffman. Objective cultural difference was now viewed as epiphenomenal, subordinate to, and largely to be explained with reference to, social interaction. Barth's followers thus built on concepts of the self and social role behavior typified by a dyadic transactional (the "we vs. them" perspective) or social exchange theory.[40]

Because it was a variant of the general social psychological theory of self and social interaction, Barth's approach led to a high degree of predictability and extensibility to new contexts and situations, which, no doubt, was a primary determinant of its popularity. To be sure, the subjective approach to ethnicity, which is so often and almost exclusively attributed to Barth, long precedes him. Both Weber and Leach were aware of its significance. Another important, but notably ignored, scholar is the German historian Reinhard Wenskus. Eight years prior to the

[38] Banks 1996:186; Jones 1994:48. [39] Barth 1969.

[40] Barth 1994:12. For the process of categorization, see also Jenkins 1994:198–9. For the relation between Barth's and Goffman's works, Buchignani 1987:16.

publication of Barth's book, Wenskus published a study of ethnic identity in the early Middle Ages, which would become the crucial breakthrough for studies of ethnicities in historiography. Wenskus' approach was based on the ideas of the Austrian anthropologist Wilhelm Mühlmann, himself inspired by the Russian ethnographer S. M. Shirogorov, the first to have used the concept of "subjective ethnicity." In a Weberian stance, Wenskus claimed that early medieval *Stämme* were not based on a biologically common origin, but on a strong *belief* in a biologically common origin. His approach, much like Barth's, focused on the subjective side of ethnic belonging and he specifically attacked the concept of ethnogenesis (as understood at that time by Soviet anthropologists) and the model of the family-tree in ethnohistory. He pointed out that "kernels of tradition" were much more important factors in making early medieval ethnic groups, for tradition also played an important political role, as suggested by the conceptual pair *lex* and *origo gentis,* so dear to medieval chroniclers.[41] Wenskus' approach is congenial with the more recent studies of the British sociologist Anthony Smith and was followed by some major contemporary medievalists.[42] Though never clearly delineating its theoretical positions in regards to anthropology (though Wenskus himself has been more open to contemporary debates in the field), this current trend in medieval history quickly incorporated concepts readily available in sociological and anthropological literature. Patrick Geary, for instance, used the concept of "situational ethnicity" coined by Jonathan Okamura. He might have found it extremely useful that the structural dimension of situational ethnicity pointed to the essentially *variable* significance of ethnicity as an organizing principle of social relations. More recently, Walter Pohl cited Smith's concept of *mythomoteur* as equivalent to Wenskus' "kernel of tradition."[43]

Both Barth and Wenskus tried to show that ethnic groups were socially constructed. According to both, it was not so much the group which

[41] Wenskus 1961:14–18, etc. See also Jarnut 1985; Pohl 1994:11.

[42] Smith 1984; 1986; 1995. See also Wolfram 1988; Pohl 1988; Heather 1996.

[43] Okamura 1981; Geary 1983; Pohl 1991a:41. For the *mythomoteur* as the constitutive myth of the ethnic polity, see Smith 1986:15. Smith typically views ethnicity as "a matter of myths, symbols, memories, and values. They are 'carried' by forms and genres of artifacts and activities which change very slowly. Therefore, an *ethnie*, once formed, tends to be exceptionally durable under 'normal' vicissitudes" (1986:16 and 28). Smith also argues that "without a *mythomoteur* a group cannot define itself to itself or to others, and cannot inspire or guide effective action" (1986:25). There is, however, no attempt to explain the association between a particular "myth-symbol" complex and an *ethnie*, for Smith characteristically lists among the latter's components, "a distinctive shared culture" (1986:32). He thus seems to reproduce the general fallacy of identifying ethnic groups with discrete cultural units. More important, though recognizing that artifacts could provide a rich evidence of cultural identity, Smith argues that they "cannot tell anything [about] how far a community felt itself to be unique and cohesive" (1986:46).

endured as the *idea* of group. They both argued that ethnic groups existed not in isolation, but in contrast to other groups. Unlike Wenskus, however, Barth does not seem to have paid too much attention to self-consciousness and the symbolic expression of ethnic identity. Enthusiasm for a transactional model of social life and for viewing ethnicity as process was accompanied in both cases by an interpretation of social relations as rooted in reciprocation, exchange and relatively equitable negotiation. In most cases, activation of ethnic identity was used to explain contextual ethnic phenomena, but this very ethnic identity, since it was not directly observable, had to be derived from the actor's "ethnic behavior." Barth's model of social interaction is so general that there is virtually nothing theoretically unique about ethnic phenomena explained through reference to it, for the model could be as well applied to other forms of social identity, such as gender. Despite its strong emphasis on ethnic boundary processes, Barth's approach does not, in fact, address issues concerning objective cultural difference (subsistence patterns, language, political structure, or kinship).

The instrumentalist approach received its new impetus from Abner Cohen, one of the important figures of the Manchester School, who published his *Custom and Politics in Urban Africa* in 1969 (the same year in which Barth's book was published). Cohen's approach was more pragmatic. His main point was that political ethnicity (such as defined by Wenskus' students) was goal-directed ethnicity, formed by internal organization and stimulated by external pressures, and held not for its own sake but to defend an economic or political interest. To him, such ethnicity needed to be built upon some preexisting form of cultural identity rather than be conjured up out of thin air. Cohen's approach thus came very close to Wenskus' idea of ethnicity as constructed on the basis of a "kernel of tradition," or to Smith's concept of *mythomoteur*. Unlike them, however, Cohen concentrated on changes in corporate identification (not individual identification) and on the politicization of cultural differences in the context of social action. He paid attention to ethnicity as a social liability and thus opened the path for modern studies of ethnicity as a function of power relations.[44] Many students of ethnicity now concentrate on ethnicity as an "artifact," created by individuals or groups to bring together a group of people for some common purpose. They are increasingly concerned with the implications of ethnic boundary construction and the meaning of boundary permeability for when, how, and, especially, why groups selectively fashion "distinctive trait inventories,"

[44] Cohen 1969. For the study of ethnicity as a function of power relations, see McGuire 1982:171 and 173; Roosens 1989:158; Eriksen 1991:129.

symbolize group unity and mobilize members to act for economic or political gain, and "invent" traditions. Scholars now struggle with the counterfactual qualities of cultural logics that have made *ethnic* the label of self- and other-ascription in modern nation-states.[45]

The emphasis of the post-Barthian anthropology of ethnicity has tended to fall on processes of group identification rather than social categorization.[46] Ethnicity as ascription of basic group identity on the basis of cognitive categories of cultural differentiation, is, however, very difficult to separate from other forms of group identity, such as gender or class. Moreover, both primordialist and instrumentalist perspectives tend to be based on conflicting notions of human agency manifested in an unproductive opposition between rationality and irrationality, between economic and symbolic dimensions of social practice. It has been noted that cultural traits by which an ethnic group defines itself never comprise the totality of the observable culture but are only *a combination* of some characteristics that the actors ascribe to themselves and consider relevant. People identifying themselves as an ethnic group may in fact identify their group in a primarily prototypic manner. Recognizable members may thus share *some* but not all traits, and those traits may not be equally weighted in people's minds.[47] How is this specific configuration constructed and what mechanisms are responsible for its reproduction?

A relatively recent attempt to answer this question resurrected the idea that ethnic groups are bounded social entities internally generated with reference to commonality rather than difference.[48] Bentley dismisses instrumentality by arguing that people live out an unconscious pattern of life, not acting in a rational, goal-oriented fashion. His approach draws heavily from Pierre Bourdieu's theory of habitus. Habitus is produced by the structures constitutive of a particular type of environment. It is a system of durable, transposable dispositions, "structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures."[49] Those durable dispositions are inculcated into an individual's sense of self at an early age and can be transposed from one context to another. Habitus involves a form of socialization whereby the dominant modes of behavior and representation are internalized, resulting in certain dispositions which operate largely at a pre-conscious level. Ethnicity is constituted at the intersection of habitual dispositions of the agents concerned and the social conditions existing in a particular historical context. The content of ethnic

[45] Banks 1996:39; Williams 1992:609. [46] Horowitz 1975:114.
[47] Jones 1994:42 and 61; Roosens 1989:12; Mahmood and Armstrong 1992:8.
[48] Bentley 1987. For a critique of Bentley's approach, see Yelvington 1991. For an earlier suggestion that ethnic identity may be the result of a learning process, see also Horowitz 1975:119.
[49] Pierre Bourdieu, cited by Bentley 1987:28.

identity is therefore as important as the boundary around it. An important issue, resulting from this approach, is that of the reproduction of identity on the level of interaction. The praxis of ethnicity results in multiple transient realizations of ethnic difference in particular contexts. These realizations of ethnicity are both structured and structuring, involving, in many instances, the repeated production and consumption of distinctive styles of material culture. The very process of ethnic formation is coextensive with and shaped by the manipulation of material culture. Bentley suggested that the vector uniting culture and ethnicity ran through daily social practice. He emphasized the cultural character of the process of ethnic identity creation, which provided a key reason for the emotional power associated with it. On this basis, the creation of ethnic identities should have repercussions in terms of the self-conscious use of specific cultural features as diacritical markers, a process which might well be recorded in material culture. Bentley's thrust coincides in time with an independent line of research inspired by Edmund Husserl and stressing ethnicity as a phenomenon of everyday life (*Alltagsleben*). Routine action, rather than dramatic historical experiences, foodways, rather than political action, are now under scrutiny. As the idea of ethnicity turns into a mode of action in the modern world, it becomes more relevant to study the very process by which the ethnic boundary is created in a specific social and political configuration.[50]

WHAT IS *ETHNIE*?

"Ethnicity" derives from the Greek word ἔθνος, which survives as a fairly common intellectual word in French, as *ethnie*, with its correlate adjective *ethnique*. The possible noun expressing what it is you have to have in order to be *ethnique* is not common in modern French. In English, the adjective exists as "ethnic" with a suffix recently added to give "ethnicity." But the concrete noun from which "ethnicity" is apparently derived does not exist. There is no equivalent to the ἔθνος, to the Latin *gens*, or to the French *ethnie*. Until recently, such a term was not needed, for it was replaced in the intellectual discourse by "race," a concept which did not distinguish very clearly, as we do today, between social, cultural, linguistic, and biological classifications of people, and tended to make a unity of all these.[51] "Ethnicity," therefore, is an abstract noun, derived by non-vernacular morphological processes from a substantive

[50] Creation of ethnic identities: Jones 1996:72; Shennan 1989:16–7. Ethnicity and everyday life: Greverus 1978:97–8; Räsänen 1994:17–18; Tebbetts 1984:83 and 87; Tvengsberg 1991:17; Keefe 1992.

[51] Chapman, McDonald, and Tonkin 1989:12; Jones 1997:40– 51. See also Johnson 1995:12.

that does not exist. It makes sense only in a context of relativities, of *processes* of identification, though it also aspires, in modern studies, to concrete and positive status, as an attribute and an analytical concept. Ethnicity is conceptualized as something that inheres in every group that is self-identifying as "ethnic," but there is no specific word for the end product of the process of identification. When it comes to designate the human group created on the basis of ethnicity, "ethnic group" is the only phrase at hand.

More recently, in an attempt to find the origins of modern nations, Anthony Smith introduced into the scholarly discourse the French term *ethnie*, in order to provide an equivalent to "nation" for a period of history in which nations, arguably, did not yet exist. Smith argues that ethnicity, being a matter of myths and symbols, memories and values, is carried by "forms and genres of artifacts and activities."[52] The end product is what he calls an *ethnie*. The *ethnie* is a human group, a concrete reality generated by the meaning conferred by the members of that group over some generations, on certain cultural, spatial, and temporal properties of their interaction and shared experiences. Smith identifies six components of any *ethnie*: a collective name; a common myth of descent; a shared history; a distinctive shared culture; an association with a specific territory; and a sense of solidarity. He argues that in some cases, the sense of ethnic solidarity is shared only by the elite of a given *ethnie*, which he therefore calls a "lateral" or aristocratic *ethnie*. In other cases, the communal sense may be more widely diffused in the membership, such an *ethnie* being "vertical" or demotic. One can hardly fail to notice that to Smith, the *ethnie* is just the "traditional" form of the modern nation. His list of traits to be checked against the evidence is also an indication that, just as with Bromley's "ethnosocial organism," there is a tendency to reify ethnic groups and to treat ethnicity as an "it," a "thing" out there to be objectively measured and studied, albeit by means of ancestry myths rather than by language.[53]

No scholar followed Smith's attempt to find a concrete noun to be associated with the more abstract "ethnicity." Terminology, however, does matter; it shapes our perceptions, especially of controversial issues. The use of Smith's *ethnie* in this book is simply a way to avoid confusion between the ethnic group and the phenomenon it supposedly instantiates (ethnicity). More important, if viewed as a result of a process of differentiation and identity formation, the use of *ethnie* suggests that ethnic groups are not "born," but made.

[52] Smith 1986:16.

[53] Smith 1986:22, 32, 76–7, and 28, and 1984:29. For ethnic groups as "fiduciary associations," see Parsons 1975:61–2.

ETHNICITY, MATERIAL CULTURE AND ARCHAEOLOGY

It has become common knowledge that the foundations of the culture-historical school of archaeology were laid by the German archaeologist Gustaf Kossinna. Today, both archaeologists and historians attack Kossinna's tenets and, whenever possible, emphasize his association with Nazism and the political use of archaeology. No book on nationalism, politics, and the practice of archaeology could avoid talking about Kossinna as the archetypal incarnation of all vices associated with the culture-historical school. Kossinna's own work is rarely cited, except for his famous statement: "Sharply defined archaeological culture areas correspond unquestionably with the areas of particular peoples or tribes."[54] Kossinna linked this guiding principle to the retrospective method, by which he aimed at using the (ethnic) conditions of the present (or the historically documented past) to infer the situation in prehistory. The two together make up what he called the "settlement archaeological method" (*Siedlungsarchäologie*). It has only recently been noted that in doing so, Kossinna was simply using Oskar Montelius' typological method, which enabled him to establish time horizons for the chronological ordering of the material remains of the past.[55] Kossinna also stressed the use of maps for distinguishing between distribution patterns, which he typically viewed as highly homogeneous and sharply bounded cultural provinces. This method, however, was nothing new. Before Kossinna, the Russian archaeologist A. A. Spicyn had used the map to plot different types of earrings found in early medieval burial mounds in order to identify tribes mentioned in the *Russian Primary Chronicle*. Like Spicyn, Kossinna simply equated culture provinces with ethnic groups and further equated those groups with historically documented peoples or tribes. Attempts to identify ethnic groups in material culture date back to Romanticism, and represent correlates of linguistic concerns with finding *Ursprachen* and associating them to known ethnic groups. Many German archaeologists before Kossinna used the concept of culture province. Though not the first to attempt identifying archaeological cultures with ethnic groups, Kossinna was nevertheless the first to focus exclusively on this idea, which

[54] "Streng umrissene, scharf sich heraushebende, geschlossene archäologische Kulturprovinzen fallen unbedingt mit bestimmten Völker- und Stammesgebiete" (Kossinna 1911:3 and 1936:15). For the association between Gustaf Kossinna and the culture-historical approach in "Germanophone" archaeology, see Amory 1997:334 with n. 10. Amory deplores the influence of "Continental archaeologists" working in the ethnic ascription tradition. See Amory 1997:335–6.

[55] Klejn 1974:16; Veit 1989:39. To Kossinna, the concept of closed-find (introduced into the archaeological discourse by the Danish archaeologist Christian Jürgensen Thomsen and of crucial importance to Oskar Montelius) and the stratigraphic principle were less important than mere typology. See Trigger 1989:76, 78, and 157.

became his *Glaubenssatz*. He was directly inspired by the Romantic idea of culture as reflecting the national soul (*Volksgeist*) in every one of its elements.[56]

The Berlin school of archaeology established by Kossinna emerged in an intellectual climate dominated by the Austrian *Kulturkreis* school. The roots of biologizing human culture lie indeed not in Kossinna's original thought, but in the theory of migration developed by Fr. Ratzel and F. Graebner. According to Graebner, there are four means for determining whether migration (*Völkerwanderung*) caused the spread of cultural elements. First, one should look for somatic similarities possibly coinciding with cultural parallels. Second, one should check whether cultural and linguistic relationships coincide. Third, one should examine whether certain cultural elements are *schwerentlehnbar*, i.e., whether there are any obstacles to their transfer, in accord to Vierkandt's idea of readiness and need. If positive, the result may indicate that those cultural elements were carried by migrating groups. And finally, one should investigate whether two cultures occur entire (not fragmented or simplified) at two widely separated locations. This last argument gains strength with distance and also to the extent that the set of culture elements occurs in closed form. Wilhelm Schmidt, the founder of the journal *Antropos*, tended to speak of a *Kulturkreis* even when only one element was present, for this was to him a clue of the earlier presence of other elements.[57]

The concept of a philosophically derived nationalism, acquired in an intellectual context molded by Herder's and Fichte's ideas applies therefore to Graebner, as well as to Kossinna. It is, however, a mistake to speak of Kossinna's blatant nationalism as causing his *Herkunft der Germanen*, for the first signs of his nationalistic views postdate his famous work. Though often viewed as Kossinna's main opponent, Carl Schuchhardt shared many of his ideas, including that of identifying ethnic groups by means of archaeological cultures. Wenskus was certainly right in pointing out that Kossinna's mistake was not so much that he aimed at an ethnic interpretation of culture, than that he used a dubious concept of ethnicity, rooted in Romantic views of the *Volk*.[58] It is not the overhasty equation between archaeological cultures and ethnic groups that explains the extraordinary popularity the culture-historical paradigm enjoyed even among Marxist historians. Of much greater importance is the concept of *Volk* and its political potential. It is therefore no accident that after World

[56] For Spicyn, see Formozov 1993:71. For Romanticism, *Ursprachen*, and ethnic ascription, see Brachmann 1979:102. For the use of the concept of culture province before Kossinna, see Klejn 1974:13. For Kossinna's *Glaubenssatz*, see Eggers 1950:49.

[57] For the *Kulturkreis* school, see Lucas 1978:35–6.

[58] Wenskus 1961:137. Kossinna's political views: Smolla 1979–80:5.

War II, despite the grotesque abuses of Kossinna's theories under the Nazi regime, this concept remained untouched. It was Otto Menghin, one of the main representatives of the prehistoric branch of the *Kulturkreislehre*, who began replacing the term *Volk* by the presumably more neutral and less dubious term "culture." Kossinna's post-war followers passed over in silence the fundamental issue of equating *Völker* and cultures.

Like Kossinna, Vere Gordon Childe used the concept of culture to refer to an essence, something intrinsically natural that preceded the very existence of the group, provoked its creation, and defined its character. But he began using the phrase "archaeological culture" as a quasi-ideology-free substitute for "ethnic group," and the very problem of ethnic interpretation was removed from explicit discussion. The standard demand now was a strict division between the arguments used by various disciplines studying the past, in order to avoid "mixed arguments." This latter error derived, however, from considering culture as mirroring the national soul. Since all cultural elements were imbued with *Volksgeist*, this organicist concept of culture allowed one to use information about one cultural element to cover gaps in the knowledge of another. "March separately, strike together" became the slogan of this attempt at "purifying" science and keeping apart the disciplines studying ethnicity.[59] In order to understand why and how Kossinna's ideas continued to be extremely popular in post-war Europe, we need to examine briefly the situation in a completely different intellectual environment, that of Soviet Russia.

We have seen that a culture-historical approach was used by Spicyn some ten years before Kossinna. Much like in Germany, Spicyn and his colleagues' endeavors to unearth the national past had a great impact on pre-1917 Russian historiography.[60] Some of Spicyn's students became major figures of the Soviet school of archaeology. Marr's theories and the cultural revolution, however, drastically altered this intellectual configuration. In the early 1930s, such concepts as "migration" and "archaeological cultures" were literally banned, being replaced by a bizarre concept of ethnic history, in which stages of development were equated to certain historically attested ethnic groups. Marxism in its Stalinist version was brutally introduced in archaeology and the culture-historical paradigm

[59] For Vere Gordon Childe's concept of "archaeological culture," see Díaz-Andreu 1996:48. For the separation of disciplines, see Klejn 1981:20; Veit 1989:43.

[60] Some of Kliuchevskii's students (Iu. V. Got'e, S. K. Bogoiavlevskii, N. P. Miliukov) participated in excavations of burial mounds. Kliuchevskii's successor at the chair of Russian history at the University of Moscow opened his course not with Kievan Rus', but with the Palaeolithic (Formozov 1993:71). This approach is remarkably similar to Dolukhanov's recent book on the early Slavs (1996:ix–x).

was replaced with internationalism that required scholars to study only global universal regularities that confirmed the inevitability of socialist revolutions outside Russia. Closely following Marr, Soviet archaeologists now stressed the association between migrationist concepts and racism, imperialism, and territorial expansionism. But following the introduction of Stalinist nationalist policies of the late 1930s, this new paradigm quickly faded away. As Stalin had set historians the task to combat actively the fascist falsifications of history, the main focus of archaeological research now shifted to the prehistory of the Slavs. Archaeologists involved in tackling this problem have, however, been educated in the years of the cultural revolution and were still working within a Marrist paradigm. Mikhail I. Artamonov first attempted to combine Marrism and Kossinnism, thus recognizing the ethnic appearance of some archaeological assemblages, which rehabilitated the concept of "archaeological culture." The attitude toward migration and diffusion also changed from prejudice to gradual acceptance, though the general philosophical principles on which Soviet archaeology was based remained the same. As a consequence of this strange alliance, Soviet archaeologists tended to focus on two main issues: isolating archaeological cultures and interpreting them in ethnic terms; explaining the qualitative transformations in culture.[61]

The culture-ethnic concept was thus rehabilitated. A. Ia. Briusov believed that archaeological cultures reflected groups of related tribes in their specific historic development, while Iu. M. Zakharuk equated archaeological cultures not simply with ethnic groups, but also with linguistic entities. Finally, M. Iu. Braichevskii claimed that no assemblage could be identified as culture, if it did not correspond to a definite ethnic identity. After 1950, Soviet archaeologists completely abandoned Marrist concepts and Soviet archaeology became of a kind that would have been easily recognizable to Kossinna and which would have been amenable to the kind of culture-historical *Siedlungsarchäologie* he developed. Mikhail I. Artamonov, the main artisan of this change, claimed that ethnicity remained unchanged through historical change, which could not alter its specific qualities. Russians living under Peter the Great's rule were just those of Kievan Rus' in a different historical environment. One can hardly miss the striking parallel to Bromley's idea of *ethnikos*. Indeed, Bromley's theories made a great impression on Soviet archaeologists. On the basis of this alliance with the theory of *ethnos*, archaeology now became the "science about ethnogenesis." Indeed,

[61] Shnirel'man 1995:124; Ganzha 1987:142; Klejn 1977:14.

continuity of material culture patterning was now systematically interpreted as ethnic continuity.[62]

The culture-historical approach made extensive use of the concept of culture. This concept carried many assumptions which were central to nineteenth-century classifications of human groups, in particular an overriding concern with holism, homogeneity, and boundedness. Traditionally, the archaeological culture was defined in monothetic terms on the basis of the presence or absence of a list of traits or types, which had either been derived from the assemblages or a type site, or were intuitively considered to be most appropriate attributes in the definition of the culture. In practice, no group of cultural assemblages from a single culture ever contains all of the cultural artifacts, a problem first acknowledged by Vere Gordon Childe. Childe's response was to discard the untidy information by demoting types with discontinuous frequency from the rank of diagnostic types, thus preserving the ideal of an univariate cultural block. Culture-historical archaeologists regarded archaeological cultures as actors on the historical stage, playing the role for prehistory that known individuals or groups have in documentary history. Archaeological cultures were thus easily equated to ethnic groups, for they were viewed as legitimizing claims of modern groups to territory and influence. The first criticism against the equivalence of archaeological cultures and ethnic groups came from within the framework of culture-history, but critiques usually consisted of cautionary tales and attributed difficulties to the complexity and incompleteness of the artifactual record, without calling into question the assumption of an intrinsic link between artifacts and groups. The general response in the face of such problems was therefore a retreat into the study of chronology and typology as ends in themselves, and the emergence of debates concerning the meaning of archaeological types, in particular whether such types represent etic categories imposed by the archaeologist or emic categories of their producers.[63]

The processualist approach associated with the American-based school of thought known as the New Archaeology never seriously tackled this

[62] Briusov 1956; Artamonov 1971. See also Shennan 1989: 29; Klein 1993:43. To Wenskus (1961:113 with n. 1), these new trends in Soviet archaeology appeared in 1961 as "curiously" similar to Kossinna's approach. Bromley's theories are cited by Irina P. Rusanova in the introduction to a recent collection of studies dedicated to Proto-Slavic cultures. Rusanova (1993:5) believes that, since there are no two ethnic groups (*naroda*) with the same culture, it is worth trying to identify the Slavs by archaeological means.

[63] Klejn 1974:225 and 1981:18; Jones 1994:29 and 82; Hides 1996:26. For the earlier criticism of the idea that archaeological cultures were equivalent to ethnic groups, see Wahle 1941. For Childe's views, see Childe 1956:33 and 124. For similar views in the Soviet archaeology of the early 1960s, see Ganzha 1987:147–8.

problem.[64] Instead of answering the normative question "What do cultures relate to?", American archaeologists of the 1960s and the early 1970s simply took away the emphasis from such questions, as they now concentrated on the adaptive role of the components of cultural systems. According to the New Archaeology, culture is not shared; it is participated in. However, though criticizing the idea that all material culture distributions represent variation in the ideational norms of different ethnic groups, processualist archaeologists continued to accept the idea that some bounded archaeological distributions (if only in the domain of stylistic variation) correlate with past ethnic groups. Nor did Barth's ideas change this perspective too much, for the social interaction model rests on the assumption that stylistic characteristics will diffuse or be shared among social entities to an extent directly proportional to the frequency of interactions between these entities, such as intermarriage, trade, or other forms of face-to-face communication.[65]

In order to verify this assumption, the British archaeologist Ian Hodder chose East Africa as a suitable place for an ethnoarchaeological study of how spatial patterning of artifacts relates to ethnic boundaries. In his study of ethnic boundaries in the Baringo district of Kenya, Hodder found that, despite interaction across tribal boundaries, clear material culture distinctions were maintained in a wide range of artifact categories. He argued that distinct material culture boundaries were foci of interaction, not barriers. Hodder showed that material culture distinctions were in part maintained in order to justify between-group competition and negative reciprocity, and that such patterning increased in time of economic stress. However, not all cultural traits were involved in such differentiation, since, typically, interaction continued between competing groups. Boundaries did not restrict movement of all traits and the between-group interaction and the diffusion of cultural styles was sometimes used to disrupt the ethnic distinctions. Hodder thus suggested that the use of material culture in distinguishing between self-conscious ethnic groups would lead to discontinuities in material culture distributions which may enable the archaeologist to identify such groups. The form of intergroup relations is usually related to the internal organization of social relationships within the group. In the case of the Baringo, between-group differentiation and hostility was linked to the internal

[64] For the history and basic tenets of the New Archaeology school, see Trigger 1989:289–328; Flannery 1982. For the processualist approach to ethnicity, see Hodder 1982:5; Hegmon 1992:528; Jones 1994:83.

[65] The assumption that propinquity produces stylistic (cultural) homogeneity forms the basis of the so-called "Deetz-Longacre hypothesis." See Braun and Plog 1982:509; Roe 1995:51–2.

differentiation of age sets and the domination of women and young men by old men.[66]

Hodder provided another example of the way in which individuals may manipulate ethnic identity for their own goals. The Maasai sometimes "became" Dorobo in order to escape drought, raiding, or government persecution. But, though the Dorobo had a real separate existence in the conscious thoughts of those who called themselves by this name, there was no symbolic expression of any differences between Dorobo and Maasai. Different groups may manipulate material culture boundaries in different ways depending upon the social context, the economic strategies chosen, the particular history of the socioeconomic relations, and the particular history of the cultural traits which are actively articulated within the changing system.[67]

Hodder's study suggests that the symbolic status and cultural meaning of material items determine the morphology and distribution of those items within and beyond a single society. Though ethnicity may involve certain aspects of culture, the choice of distinctive cultural styles is not arbitrary, for the signification of self-conscious identity is linked to the generative structures which infuse all aspects of cultural practice and social relations characterizing a particular way of life. Hodder observed, for instance, that though there were no zooarchaeological indications of ethnicity *per se*, meat-eating, the division of the carcass, or the dispersal of bones always had a symbolic content behind which there was a conceptual order. This seems to come very close to Bentley's point that the cultural practices and representations which become objectified as symbols of ethnicity are derived from, and resonate with, the habitual practices and experiences of the agents involved, as well as reflect the instrumental contingencies of a particular situation. Thus, the ethnic differences are constituted in the mundane as well as in the decorative, for the "tribal" distinctions and negative reciprocity become acceptable and are "naturalized" by their continual repetition in both public and private.[68]

There is a problematic circularity in Hodder's definition of culture, as

[66] Hodder 1982:27, 31, 35, 85, 187, and 205; Jones 1994:90–1; Watson 1995:91. Roy Larick's more recent ethnoarchaeological research in Kenya corroborates Hodder's conclusions. In Loikop communities studied by Larick, spears, which play an important role in the construction of ethnicity, are constantly appropriated in the signification of age differentiation among the male population. See Larick 1986 and 1991. [67] Hodder 1982:104. See also Lyons 1987:108.

[68] Hodder 1982:56 and 161; Jones 1994:98 and 104. For faunal remains and ethnicity, see Crabtree 1990:181; Hesse 1990:198. Recently, it has been argued that the roomsize pattern may be related to the proxemic values of the ethnic group that produced the space. On an individual level, this proxemic system is shaped to a great extent during enculturation as a child. Conformity to external social constraints brings in the role of the dwelling as a symbol. See Baldwin 1987:163 and 169; Kobyliński 1989:309.

artifacts actively manipulated in the negotiation of identities based on age, gender, or ethnicity. The meaning of the artifact is derived from its context, and its context is defined by those associated artifacts which give it meaning. Moreover, material culture is not primarily semiotic in character. Its structure is not essentially syntactical, but rather consists of "constellations" of knowledge, which inhere in the immanent relation between actor and material. The "meaning" of artifacts is not primarily semantic, in that artifacts do not communicate about anything. Their "meaning" inheres in and through their use and their design for use. Material objects instantiate cognition in that they embody practices. They record a now-extinct relationship between an actor and the material world. Material culture is therefore fundamentally social: an artifact embodies a transaction, its manufacture represents the transfer of action from its maker to its users or, in the case of the exchange of artifacts, the transfer of use between actors. Artifacts are thus rendered "appropriate" for use *only* in social context. Decisions about the use of artifacts are, however, embodied in artifacts themselves in terms of the conventions of culture. Artifacts are not properties of a society, but part of the life of that society. They cannot and should not be treated as "phenotypic" expressions of a preformed identity. Ethnic identity, therefore, represents a kind of polythesis. What should concern archaeologists is not so much what people do, what kind of pots they make, what shape of houses they build, but the "way they go about it."[69]

ETHNICITY AND STYLE

The common notion that style is primarily expressive assumes that the primary use of material culture is to reinforce ethnic boundaries. Style may indeed be used to express ethnic identity, but convention is effectively the vocabulary from which expressive style is drawn. This is why most archaeologists expect material correlates of ethnically specific behaviors to be better and more frequently represented in the archaeological record than the material symbols of ethnic identification.[70]

The basic point of contention in recent debates about style is the question whether style symbolizes ethnicity, because it is intended by artisans to do just that or because it just happens to do so for other, perhaps less purposeful, reasons. Another controversial issue is whether style resides

[69] Graves-Brown 1996:90–1; Graves 1995:165.

[70] McGuire 1982:163; Giardino 1985:17 and 22. It is therefore wrong to take *a priori* individual pottery types or decoration, ceramic design elements, design layout, surface treatment, etc., as ethnic indicators. See Kleppe 1977:39; Esse 1992:102–3; Kobyliński 1989:306–7; Cordell and Yannie 1991:98–9.

in particular sorts of artifacts which have a social rather than a practical function or in all sorts of artifacts, from ceramics to tools, along with other qualities such as function.

The traditional approach borrowed from art history held that each group had its own style, which it had preserved through history, for it was assumed that cultures were extremely conservative. In their criticism of this culture-historical approach, processualist archaeologists argued that style is a "residue," properties of material culture not accounted for in *prima facie* functional terms. They also argued that material mediation is primarily practical and only secondarily expressive. As a consequence, style must be treated as a form of social status communication, which reduces style to a particular form of practical mediation, since no matter what meaning style may have "said" or had for its producers, its "real" cause is founded on the adaptive advantage it granted to its users. Moreover, this function of style is realized over a long period of time, beyond the life experience of any particular generation. Thus, its consequences are outside the awareness of the actors and always work "behind their backs."[71]

But style and function are not distinct, self-contained, mutually exclusive realms of form in themselves, but instead complementary dimensions or aspects of variation that coexist within the same form. If both style and function are simultaneously present in the artifactual form, then the question is how can we tell when, and to what extent, the observed makeup of an assemblage reflects ethnicity and when, and to what extent, it reflects activity? James Sackett attempted to make a radical break with the residual view of style by invoking isochrestic variation, which he defined as the practical or utilitarian variation in objective properties of material culture things that makes no functional mediation difference. As a consequence, isochrestic variation grounds style and style is an intrinsic, rather than an added-on, or adjunct, function. In Sackett's view, style is thus a "built-in." Isochrestic variation permeates all aspects of social and cultural life and provides the means by which members of a group express their mutual identity, coordinate their actions, and bind themselves together. It could thus be viewed as idiomatic or diagnostic of ethnicity. Such views seem to be rooted in those assumptions of holism, homogeneity, and boundedness, which, as shown above, characterize the nineteenth-century concept of culture.[72]

In contrast, Polly Wiessner argued that style is a form of nonverbal communication through doing something in a certain way that

[71] Franklin 1989:278; Pasztory 1989:17; Byers 1991:3; David, Sterner, and Gavua 1988:365 and 378–9. [72] Sackett 1985, 1986, and 1990. See also Byers 1991:10: Hegmon 1994:172.

communicates about relative identity. Her approach is inspired by the information-exchange theory, which emphasizes that differences in stylistic behavior result more from social constraints on the choosing of alternative decorative options during the act of decoration than from the social context in which a person learned his/her decorative repertoire. Max Wobst first proposed the idea that style operates as an avenue of communication. Wobst was working within a functionalist, system-theory paradigm and he argued that since style is a relatively expensive form of communication, stylistic information exchange will only be used in certain contexts so as to maximize efficiency. Wiessner attacked this position by rightly pointing out that in identity displays efficiency of message is not a major concern. On the contrary, identity displays are often extravagant, the resources and effort expended being an index of ability and worth. Moreover, stylistic messages need not be clear or uniform, and in fact a certain amount of ambiguity may help achieve the desired effect.[73]

Wobst has raised another important problem. By stressing the communicative role of style he implied that not *all* material culture variation should be viewed as style. Rather style is only that part of material culture variation which conveys information about relative identity. Style is an *intentional*, structured system of selecting certain dimensions of form, process or principle, function, significance, and affect from among known, alternate, possibilities to create variability within a behavioral-artifactual corpus. Polly Wiessner even argued that one could differentiate between "emblemic style," which has a distinct referent and transmits a clear message to a defined target population about conscious affiliation or identity, and "assertive style," which is personally based and carries information supporting individual identity. Because emblemic style carries a distinct message, it should undergo strong selection for uniformity and clarity, and because it marks and maintains boundaries, it should be distinguished archaeologically by uniformity within its realm of function.[74]

Style may be viewed as the pattern we make around a particular event, recalling and creating similarities and differences. It only exists in these repetitions and contrasts. But variation expressed in material items is multireferential, as Wiessner suggested, which implies that style is likely to be heavily invested with multiple levels of symbolic coding. When used as a tool in social strategies, style provides the potential for the control of the meaning and thus for power. Recent studies demonstrate

[73] Wiessner 1983:257, 1985:161, and 1990:107. For style as a form of communication, see Wobst 1977. See also Braun and Plog 1982:510; Hegmon 1992:521. [74] Wiessner 1983:257–8.

that emblemic style appears at critical junctures in the regional political economy, when changing social relations would impel displays of group identity. It has been argued, on the other hand, that with the initial evolution of social stratification and the rise of chiefdoms, considerable stylistic variability may exist between communities in clothing and display items. At the regional level, however, iconography and elite status become important to legitimize and "naturalize" the inherent inequality in these systems. Extensive interchiefdom trade and shared political ideology serve to deliver rare and foreign objects linked symbolically to universal forces.[75]

CONCLUSION

Understanding ethnicity in the past presents a particular challenge. The sweeping survey of the most relevant literature on ethnicity and material culture reveals that both topics have undergone considerable re-evaluation in recent years, with many older assumptions being questioned. The increased interest in ethnicity, in general, and in the use of material culture for its construction, in particular, means that the old questions can be now looked at in new ways. Early medieval ethnicities are one of the most lively areas of current research.[76] The large volume of new material generated analytical advances of the first importance. Clearly it is misleading, if not impossible, to generalize over so wide an area and so eventful a chronological span. But modern historiography abounds in confident value-judgments about early medieval *ethnies*, many of which still rest on unacknowledged assumptions about what ethnicity is and how it works.

As a conclusion to this chapter, therefore, it might be helpful to state clearly the assumptions on which this study is based. Its premise is that early medieval ethnicity was embedded in sociopolitical relations just as modern ethnicity is. Ethnicity was socially and culturally constructed, a form of social mobilization used in order to reach certain political goals. Then, just as now, an *ethnie* was built upon some preexisting cultural identity, in a prototypic manner. But ethnicity is also a matter of daily social practice and, as such, it involves manipulation of material culture. Since material culture embodies practices, "emblemic style" is a way of communicating by non-verbal means about relative identity. Because it carries a distinct message, it is theoretically possible that it was used to mark and maintain boundaries, including ethnic ones. But ethnicity is also a function of power relations. Both "emblemic style" and "tradition"

[75] Hodder 1990:45–6; Macdonald 1990:53; McLaughlin 1987; Earle 1990:74–5. See also Byers 1991:12; Pasztory 1989:36. [76] Pohl 1988; Wood 1995; Heather 1996; Amory 1993 and 1997.

become relevant particularly in contexts of changing power relations, which impel displays of group identity. In most cases, both symbols and "tradition" will entail a discussion of the power configuration in the Slavic society, with an emphasis on the political forces which may have been responsible for the definition of symbols, their organization and hierarchization. In asking what developments in material culture accompanied the making of a Slavic *ethnie*, I will therefore alternate the focus between power and style.