

evident from the significant quantity of weapons, especially arrow and spear-heads, that were found on sixth- and seventh-century sites.⁴⁴ It is therefore possible that at least some of the evidence for destruction by fire, which sixth- to seventh-century sites in Romania, Moldova, and Ukraine occasionally produced, is the result of inter-group conflicts. After all, as the author of the *Strategikon* observed, in the Slavic “democracy”, “nobody is willing to yield to another.”⁴⁵

⁴⁴ *Strategikon* XI 4.30. It was often noted that “Slavic” settlements produced no weapons (e.g., Dolinescu-Ferche 1984:145). The archaeological evidence, however, gives a different picture. Arrows: Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:205 fig. 22/15; Rosetti 1934:212 fig. 7/4; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:322 fig. 18/9; Turcu and Ciuceanu 1992:200; Teodor 1980:fig. 31/8; Mitrea 1974-6:figs. 16/1 and 15/5 and 1994:328 fig. 27/5; Teodor 1984b:29 fig. 6/7; Dolinescu-Ferche 1986:fig. 22/21, 22; Székely 1974-6:pl. X/24 and 25; Toropu 1976:211; Rafalovich and Lapushnian 1974:133 fig. 10/15; Rafalovich 1968:96 fig. 29/8. Spears: Zirra and Cazimir 1963:60; Constantiniu 1965b:182; Székely 1992:pl. X/8; Vakulenko and Prikhodniuk 1984:68 fig. 38/1. For a battle-axe, see Vakulenko and Prikhodniuk 1984:68 fig. 39/9.

⁴⁵ *Strategikon* XI 4.14. Heavy destruction by fire of numerous buildings is evident at Bucharest-Măicănești and Kavetchina. By contrast, only two buildings of the large settlement at Davideni were destroyed by fire. The same is true for Seliște and Dulceanca III.

CONCLUSION: THE MAKING OF THE SLAVS

As its title suggests, the subject matter of this book is not the Slavs, but the process leading to what is now known as “the Slavs.” This process was a function of both ethnic formation and ethnic identification. In both cases, the “Slavs” were the object, not the subject. The preceding chapters have presented a series of perspectives on the history and archaeology of the Lower Danube area during the sixth and seventh centuries. Each approached a different aspect of the process of constructing a Slavic *ethnie* and each highlighted specific themes and arguments. This chapter will review those themes, but will also attempt to string them all together into a tripartite conclusion. In doing so, it will focus on the major issues presented in the introduction: the migration and the making of the Slavs. Though in agreement with those who maintain that the history of the Slavs began in the sixth century, I argue that the Slavs were an invention of the sixth century. Inventing, however, presupposed both imagining or labeling by outsiders and self-identification.¹

MIGRATION

A brief examination of the historiography of the “Slavic problem” yields an important conclusion: the dominant discourse in Slavic studies, that of “expert” linguists and archaeologists, profoundly influenced the study of the early Slavs. Though the evidence, both historical and archaeological, presented itself in a historical light, historians were expected merely to comb the written sources for evidence to match what was already known from the linguistic-archaeological model. Because this model was based on widely spread ideas about such critical concepts as culture, migration, and language, the basic assumptions on which the model was based were rarely, if ever, questioned. One such assumption was that

¹ Ivanov 1991c and 1993.

ethnies, like languages, originate in an *Urheimat* and then expand over large areas through migration. Migration was defined in the terms of the *Kulturkreis* school, as the relatively rapid spread of racial and cultural elements. This led many scholars to abandon a serious consideration of the historical evidence and to postulate instead a Slavic *Urheimat* located in the marshes of the Pripet river. Chased from their homeland in the North by the rigors of the harsh climate, the Slavs then inundated Eastern Europe. A Slavic homeland implied, however, that the history of the Slavs was older than the first Slavic raids known from historical sources. The cornerstone of all theories attempting to project the Slavs into prehistory was Jordanes' *Getica*. Jordanes equated the Sclavenes and Antes with the Venethi also known from much earlier sources, such as Pliny the Elder, Tacitus, and Ptolemy. This made it possible to claim the Venedi of Tacitus, Pliny, and Ptolemy for the Slavic history. It also provided a meaning to archaeological research of "Slavic antiquity." A Polish linguist, Tadeusz Lehr-Spławiński, first suggested that the archaeological culture of the Vistula basin during the first century BC to the first century AD, which was known as the Przeworsk culture, was that of Tacitus' Venedi. Soviet archaeologists argued that the Slavic Venethi were the majority of the population in the area covered by the Chernyakhov culture of the fourth century AD. They claimed that by AD 300, the Antes separated themselves from the linguistic and archaeological block of the Venedi, and were soon followed by the Sclavenes. More often than not, therefore, the task of the archaeologist was to illustrate conclusions already drawn from Jordanes' account of the Slavic Venethi.

Without any doubt, Jordanes had in mind contemporary concerns when describing barbarians living beyond imperial frontiers. He also used written, ancient sources regarding the regions under his scrutiny. When applying such sources, however, what was his concept of geography? What was he thinking about the ethnographic material provided by his sources in the light of what was known to him about recent developments in those same regions? Why did he use three different names for what was apparently one group of people? In Chapter 2, as well as elsewhere, I attempted to answer these questions while addressing issues of authorship and chronology of sources. My argument is that instead of being an eyewitness account, Jordanes' description of Sclavenes and Antes was based on two or more maps with different geographical projections, the imaginary space of which he filled with both sixth-century and much earlier ethnic names he found in various sources. This seriously diminishes the value of the most important piece of evidence invoked by advocates of both a considerable antiquity of the Slavs and their migration from the North. Moreover, no source dated before Justinian's reign

(527–65) refers to Slavs or Slavic Venethi. Despite some overlap in time-spans covered by Procopius' *Wars* and the chronicle of Marcellinus Comes (including the continuation to 548 added by another author), there is no mention of Slavs in the chronicle. Procopius, on the other hand, made it very clear that a "Slavic problem" arose, along with others, only during Justinian's reign.²

The Slavs did not migrate from the Pripet marshes because of hostile environmental conditions. Nor did they develop forms of social organization enabling them to cope with such conditions and presumably based on cooperation and social equality (*zadruga*). Niederle's thesis does not stand against the existing evidence and has at its basis an outdated concept of migration. That the migrationist model should be abandoned is also suggested by the archaeological evidence examined in Chapter 6. No class of evidence matches current models for the archaeological study of (pre)historic migration. More important, assemblages of the Lower Danube area, where, according to the migrationist model, the Slavs migrated from the Pripet marshes, long antedate the earliest evidence available from assemblages in the alleged *Urheimat*. Short-distance population movements, but not migration, must have accompanied the implementation of a form of "itinerant agriculture," which, though not based on the slash-and-burn method, may have encouraged settlement mobility.

That the Slavs were present on the northern bank of the Danube before the implementation of Justinian's building program in the mid-500s is demonstrated by their raids known from Procopius. It will probably remain unknown whether or not any of the groups arguably living in contemporary settlements excavated by Romanian archaeologists called themselves Sclavenes or Antes. This, however, was the region from which Romans recruited mercenaries for the war in Italy. This is also the region that produced the largest number of coins struck under Emperors Anastasius and Justin I, as well as during Justinian's early regnal years. A small number of hoards with last coins minted during this period was also found in this area. It is hard to judge from the existing evidence, but from what we have it appears that the Slavic raids mentioned by Procopius originated in this same region. This may also explain why Chilbudius' campaigns of the early 530s targeted against Sclavenes, Antes, and Cutrigurs were directed to a region not far from the Danube river.

We are fortunate to have first-hand sources of information for the late 500s and the early 600s, such as the *Strategikon*, and the campaign diary used by Theophylact Simocatta's Books VI–VIII. In both cases, our

² Procopius, *Secret History* 18.20–1.

knowledge, however restricted, of what was going on north of the Danube river is based, almost certainly, on eyewitness accounts. Neither Theophylact nor the author of the *Strategikon* knew any other area of Slavic settlements except that located north of the Danube frontier. Furthermore, no clear evidence exists of an outright migration of the Slavs (Sclavenes) to the regions south of the Danube until the early years of Heraclius' reign. Phocas' revolt of 602 was not followed by an irresistible flood of Sclavenes submerging the Balkans. In fact, there are no raids recorded during Phocas' reign, either by Sclavenes or by Avars. By contrast, large-scale raiding activities resumed during Heraclius' early regnal years. This is also confirmed by the archaeological evidence discussed in Chapter 4. Some forts along the Danube or in the interior were destroyed by fire at some point between Justinian's and Maurice's reigns. In many cases, however, restoration followed destruction and forts were abandoned at various dates without signs of violence. After Maurice's assassination, Phocas' army returned to the Danube and remained there at least until 605, if not 620. This is clearly attested by Sebeos and does not contradict in any way what we know from the archaeological and numismatic evidence. The earliest archaeological evidence of settlement assemblages postdating the general withdrawal of Roman armies from the Balkans is that of the 700s. This suggests that there was no "Slavic tide" in the Balkans following the presumed collapse of the Danube frontier. In addition, the archaeological evidence confirms the picture drawn from the analysis of written sources, namely that the "Slavs" were isolated pockets of population in various areas of the Balkans, which seem to have experienced serious demographic decline in the seventh century.

The discussion in Chapter 4 has been based on the concept that the disintegration of the military system in the Balkans, which Justinian implemented in the mid-500s, was the result not so much of the destruction inflicted by barbarian invasions, as of serious economic and financial problems caused both by the emperor's policies elsewhere and by the impossibility of providing sufficient economic support to his gigantic building program of defense. This conclusion is substantiated by the analysis of sixth-century Byzantine coin hoards, which suggest that inflation, not barbarian raids, was responsible for high rates of non-retrieval.

ETHNICITY AND *ETHNIE*: THE VIEW FROM THE INSIDE

After Chilbudius' death in 533, there was a drastic change in Justinian's agenda in the Balkans. From this moment until Maurice's campaigns of the 590s, no offensive strategy underpinned imperial policies in the area. Instead, Justinian began an impressive plan of fortification, of a size and

quality the Balkans had never witnessed before. The project, or at least the most important part of it, was probably completed in some twenty years. It was completed in its basic lines when Procopius finished Book IV of his *Buildings*. In addition, Justinian remodeled the administrative structure of the Balkans and created the *quaestura exercitus* in order to support both financially and militarily those border provinces which were most affected by his building program. He also shifted military responsibilities from army generals to local authorities, especially bishops (novel 11).

These measures were not taken in response to any major threat, for Roman troops were still in control of the left bank of the Danube, possibly through bridge-heads such as those of Turnu Severin (Drobeta) and Celei (Sucidava). This is shown by the edict 13, issued in 538, which clearly stated that troops were still sent (if only as a form of punishment) north of the Danube river, "in order to watch at the frontier of that place."

In addition to military and administrative measures, Justinian offered his alliance to the Antes (*foedus* of 545) and began to recruit mercenaries from among both Sclavenes and Antes for his war in Italy. All this suggests that Chilbudius' campaigns of the early 530s opened a series of very aggressive measures on the Danube frontier, which were meant to consolidate the Roman military infrastructure in the Balkans. It is during this period of aggressive intrusion into affairs north of the Danube frontier that Sclavenes and Antes entered the orbit of Roman interests. Justinian's measures were meant to stabilize the situation in *barbaricum*, which is why the *foedus* with the Antes was only signed after the end of the war between Antes and Sclavenes. Whether or not he intended to create a buffer zone between the Danube frontier and the steppe corridor to the northeast, Justinian's goal was only partially fulfilled. Two devastating invasions of the Cutrigurs, in 539/40 and 558/9, respectively, broke through both Justinian's system of alliances and his fortified frontier. None of the subsequent Slavene raids can be compared in either size or consequences to the Cutrigur invasions. However, knowing that the first recorded raid of the Sclavenes is in 545, it is possible that Slavene raiding was a response to Justinian's aggressive policies, with both the fortified frontier and his barbarian allies. The Sclavenes may have felt encouraged by the Cutrigur breakthrough of 540, but it is no accident that their first raid coincided with Justinian's alliance with the Antes.

The interruption of Slavene raids coincides with the completion of the building program. With the exception of Zabergan's invasion of 558/9, there were no raids across the Danube for twenty-five years. This is an indication of the efficiency of the defensive system, consisting of

three interrelated fortification lines, the strongest of which was not along the Danube, but along the Stara Planina. Later, this grandiose program was extended to the northwestern Balkans, following the defeat of the Ostrogoths and the conquest of Dalmatia. Along the Danube and in the immediate hinterland, forts were relatively small (less than 1 hectare of enclosed area). Each one may have been garrisoned by a *numerus* (*tagma*), the minimal unit of the early Byzantine army, with up to 500 men. This may explain why small armies of Sclavenes (such as those responsible for the raids in the late 540s and early 550s) had no problems taking a relatively large number of forts. It also explains why Sclavene or Avar armies, no matter how large, moved with remarkable speed after crossing the Danube, without encountering any major resistance. The excavation of forts and the estimation of the number of soldiers who may have manned these forts in the Iron Gates area indicate that the entire sector may have relied for its defense on forces amounting to some 5,000 men, the equivalent of a Roman legion.³ If, as argued in Chapter 7, the population of a Sclavene *χωρίον* was somewhat inferior in size to one or two bandons (400 to 800 men), we may be able to visualize the effort of mobilizing warriors for a successful raid across the Danube, which a great-man like Ardagastus may have faced. It is hard to believe that any chief was able to raise an army of 100,000, as maintained by Menander the Guardsman.⁴ The 5,000 warriors who attacked Thessalonica at some point before 586, nevertheless, is a likely figure. In any case, there is no reason to doubt the ability of Archbishop John, who may have been an eyewitness, to give a gross estimate of the enemy's force. If so, then this indicates that raids strong enough to reach distant targets, such as Thessalonica, usually aimed at mobilizing a military force roughly equivalent to a Roman legion. Furthermore, there is no evidence, until the early regnal years of Heraclius, of an outright migration of the Slavs (Sclavenes) to the region south of the Danube river.⁵ No evidence exists that Romans ever tried to prevent the crossing, despite the existence of a Danube military fleet. Moreover, all major confrontations with Sclavene armies or "throngs" took place south of the Stara Planina mountains.

Nevertheless, the efficiency of the fortified frontier, at least in its initial phase, cannot be doubted. During the last fifteen years of Justinian's reign, no Slavic raid crossed the Danube. The implementation of the for-

³ This figure may have been even smaller if, as suggested in Chapter 4, some forts were inhabited by soldiers with their families. ⁴ Menander the Guardsman, fr. 20,2.

⁵ Forts, at least those of medium and large size, were permanently occupied, but the number of soldiers actually manning these forts may have considerably varied in time. Judging from the general picture of military operations in the 500s, it is likely, however, that this number was often too small. By contrast, during the fourth century no less than 15,000 *milites ripenses* were in charge with the Danube frontier in Dobrudja. See Aricescu 1977:189.

tified frontier seems to have been accompanied by its economic "closure." This is shown by the absence of both copper and gold coins dated between 545 and 565 in both stray finds and hoards found in Romania. The economic "closure" was not deliberate, for it is likely that the strain on coin circulation, which is also visible in hoards found south of the Danube frontier, was caused by the very execution of Justinian's gigantic plan. Fewer coins were now withdrawn from circulation, and even fewer found their way into hoards. It is possible, however, that the implementation of the fortified frontier strained not only the coin circulation within and outside the Empire, but also economic relations between communities living north and south of the Danube frontier, respectively.

The evidence of hoards shows that most were equivalent to the cost of one or two *modii* of Egyptian wheat. We can speculate that hoards found north of the Danube were payments for small quantities of grain sold to soldiers in sixth-century forts south of the Danube. In any case, these hoards, which primarily consist of copper, testify to trading activity. Stray finds of coins struck for Justinian and his followers, some of which were found in settlement contexts, confirm the hypothesis that Byzantine coins were used for commercial and non-commercial transactions in communities living north of the Danube. Whether or not these coins were used as "primitive money," their very existence presupposes that copper coinage was of some value even outside the system which guaranteed its presumably fiduciary value. If so, the inflation delineated by the analysis of hoards found in the Balkans (south of the Danube river), which became visible especially after 550, as the purchasing power of the *folles* decreased drastically, as well as the economic strains on the general circulation of goods, may have affected also the owners of the Romanian hoards. It is interesting to note, therefore, that between 545 and 565 the coin circulation was interrupted both north and south of the Danube river. This interruption was most probably accompanied by a strong crisis in trading activities across the Danube and a subsequent scarcity of goods of Roman provenance, which may have been obtained by such means and played, as shown in Chapter 6, an important role as prestige goods.⁶ This may have increased the level of social competition and encouraged the rise of leaders whose basis of power was now warfare. It is most probably during this period that we can see the first signs of emblematic styles in the material culture changes described in Chapter 6. Great-men, like

⁶ It is important to note that trading activities signaled by stray finds and hoards found north of the Danube frontier did not cease after 602. Copper coins of Phocas and Heraclius continued to appear south and east of the Carpathians, which suggests that at that time the forts from which these coins were coming had not yet been abandoned.

Ardagastus, and big-men, like the leaders mentioned by Pseudo-Caesarius, represented different responses to these historical conditions. These two forms of power may not only have coexisted, but also have been used by the same individuals. One way or another, both forms implied access to prestige goods, the quantity of which, if we are to believe Menander the Guardsman, was considerable. It is because he knew that he would find the land of the Sclavenes "full of gold" that Bayan, the qagan of the Avars, decided to launch his punitive expedition against Dauritas and his fellow chiefs. It is because of prestige goods, such as gold, silver, horses, and weapons, that the Sclavene warriors of 581, according to John of Ephesus, were still ravaging the Balkan provinces in 584. Finally, the evidence of amphoras found on sites north of the Danube frontier, many of which are from the second half of the sixth century, points to the same direction. Olive oil, wine, or *garum* were as good for showing off as horses and weapons. However, Byzantium was not the only source of prestige goods. The study of "Slavic" bow fibulae in Chapter 6 highlighted multiple and very complicated networks for the procurement of such goods. Finally, the analysis of hoards of silver in Chapter 4 and that of silver and bronze in Chapter 5 suggests that around AD 600, this was by no means a unique phenomenon.

The majority of sites found next to the Danube frontier and in the neighboring regions of Romania, Moldova, and Ukraine produced a relatively large number of artifacts that indicate a date in the second half of the sixth century or in the early seventh century. Though many such sites may have come into existence at an earlier date, artifacts displaying emblematic styles, such as "Slavic" bow fibulae became popular only after c. 550. Such dress accessories point to long-distance relations with communities in Mazuria and Crimea, which may indicate gifts or matrimonial alliances. Specimens brought from such distant locations into the Lower Danube area were quickly imitated in less sophisticated ornamentation, apparently in an effort to respond to an increasing local demand of symbols of group identity. Since "Slavic" bow fibulae from Romania were primarily found in settlements and since there is always only one fibula per settlement, it is possible that these dress accessories were symbols of social identity, which served as markers of social status for the newly emerging elites. The analysis of the intrasite distribution of artifacts presented in Chapter 6 reveals the existence, on many socio-peetal sites, of a communal front region, which was both a locus of communal activities involving consumption of special foods (flat loaves of bread) and an arena of social competition, a "beyond-the-household" context for displays of leadership symbols. It is tempting to relate the results of this analysis, particularly the connection between bow fibulae and the

communal front region, to the evidence of Pseudo-Caesarius, who associated chiefs with feasting. The mechanisms by which some of the big-man-like leaders known from written sources may have reached power had probably to do with the orchestration of communal ceremonies, of feasts and assemblies, in which those leaders played a crucial role.

The earliest changes in material culture which can be associated with emblematic styles and arguably represent some form of group identity postdate by a few decades the first mention of Sclavenes and Antes in historical sources. Can we call (Slavic) ethnicity this identity constructed by material culture means? The analysis presented in Chapter 5 shows that material culture may have been and indeed was used for the construction of ethnicity. Despite intensive interaction across the "no man's land" between the Tisza and the Danube, clear material culture distinctions were maintained in a wide range of artifacts. Material culture contrasts were created and maintained in order to justify between-group competition. As a consequence, emblematic styles were particularly visible during the Lombard-Gepid wars of the mid-500s. Because group identity, and especially ethnicity, necessitated public displays of such styles, artifacts used for the construction of ethnicity were, more often than not, associated with the female apparel, in particular with that of aristocratic women. The same is true for hoards of silver and bronze in the Middle Dnieper area. In addition, hoards emphasize that an important route to social advancement was access to foreign goods, such as Byzantine silver plate. Finally, ethnicity, as defined in the first chapter, presupposes an orientation to the past, determined by charismatic entrepreneurs, who gather adherents by using familiar amalgamative metaphors. The inspiration for many ornamental patterns on "Slavic" brooches were fifth-century decorative patterns, such as the Gáva-Domolospusztá scrollwork, brooch forms of the Aquileia class, or pairs of bird heads. At least bird heads can be viewed as "citations" from the "heroic" past, for this decoration was typically associated with artifacts dated to the times of Attila's Hunnic Empire.⁷

To judge from the existing evidence, the rise of the local elites was coincidental with the dissemination of emblematic styles which may have represented some form of group identity. It is very likely that this is more than simple coincidence. Big-men and chiefs became prominent especially in contexts in which they embodied collective interest and responsibility. Chiefs like Dauritas and Samo "created" groups by speaking and taking action in the name of their respective communities. Political and military mobilization was the response to the historical conditions

⁷ See Werner 1956:72-3; Bierbrauer 1994:147; Kazanski 1993.

created by the implementation of the fortified frontier on the Danube. In this sense, the group identity represented by emblematic styles was a goal-oriented identity, formed by internal organization and stimulated by external pressure. The politicization of cultural differences is, no doubt, one of the most important features of ethnicity. Repeated production and consumption of distinctive styles of material culture may have represented ethnic identity. The construction of ethnicity was, however, linked to the signification of social differentiation. Changing social relations impelled displays of group identity. The adoption of the dress with bow fibulae was a means by which individuals could both claim their membership of the new group and proclaim the achievement and consolidation of elite status.⁸

Can we put the name "Slavic" to this (or these) ethnic identity(-ies)? As suggested in Chapter 3, the Sclavene ethnicity is likely to have been an invention of Byzantine authors, despite the possibility, which is often stressed by linguistically minded historians, that the name itself was derived from the self-designation of an ethnic group. It is interesting to note that this ethnic name (*slovene*) appeared much later and only on the periphery of the Slavic linguistic area, at the interface with linguistically different groups. Was language, then, as Soviet ethnographers had it, the "precondition for the rise of ethnic communities"?⁹ In the case of the Slavic *ethnie*, the answer must be negative, for a variety of reasons. First, contemporary sources attest the use of more than one language by individuals whom their authors viewed as Antes or Sclavenes. The "phoney Chilbudius" was able to claim successfully a false identity, that of a Roman general, because he spoke Latin fluently, and Perbundos, the "king" of the Rynchines, had a thorough command of Greek. In fact, language shifts were inextricably tied to shifts in the political economy in which speech situations were located.¹⁰ Just how complicated this political economy may have been is shown by the episode of the Gepid taken prisoner by Priscus' army, during the 593 campaign. He was close to the Sclavene "king" Musocius and communicated with him in the "king's language." Formerly a Christian, he betrayed his leader and cooperated with Priscus, presumably using Latin as the language of communication. Finally, both the Gepid traitor and Musocius' Sclavene subjects, who were lured into the ambush set by Roman troops, were accustomed to Avar songs, which were presumably in a language different from both Slavic and Latin.

⁸ For a slightly different interpretation of the "Slavic culture," see Corman 1998:109.

⁹ Kozlov 1974:79. Among the ethnic groups using *slovene* as a name were the Slovenes of Novgorod, the Slovincy (or Kashubians) of the Baltic area, the Slovaks, and the Slovenes of Slovenia. See Ivanov and Toporov 1980:14; Schramm 1995:199.

¹⁰ See Urciuoli 1995.

Second, Common Slavic itself may have been used as a *lingua franca* within and outside the Avar qaganate. This may explain, in the eyes of some linguists, the spread of this language throughout most of Eastern Europe, obliterating old dialects and languages. It may also explain why this language remained fairly stable and remarkably uniform through the ninth century, with only a small number of isoglosses that began to form before Old Church Slavonic was written down.¹¹ This is also confirmed by the fact that Old Church Slavonic, a language created on the basis of a dialect spoken in Macedonia, was later understood in both Moravia and Kievan Rus'. The same conclusion can be drawn from the episode of Raduald, duke of Benevento, reported by Paul the Deacon and discussed in Chapter 3. Raduald, who had previously been duke of Friuli, was able to talk to the Slavs who had invaded Benevento, coming from Dalmatia across the sea. Since the duchy of Friuli had been constantly confronted with Slavic raids from the neighboring region, we may presume that duke Raduald learned how to speak Slavic in Friuli. His Slavic neighbors in the north apparently spoke the same language as the Dalmatian Slavs.¹²

Slavic was also used as a *lingua franca* in Bulgaria, particularly after the conversion to Christianity in 865. It is only the association with this political development that brought Slavic into closer contact with other languages. This explains why, despite the presumed presence of Slavic-speaking communities in the Balkans at a relatively early date, the influence of Common Slavic on the non-Slavic languages of the area – Romanian,¹³

¹¹ See Lunt 1985:203; Birnbaum 1992:7 and 1993:359. Lunt (1997:36) believes that the migration of the Slavs forced "bands from different areas" of a relatively small homeland to adapt their language to further communication, each one giving up peculiarities and substituting equivalent characteristics of their neighbors or comrades. The closing of a more or less uniform development of Slavic is set at the approximate time of the "fall of the weak jers" (i.e., the disappearance of the reduced vowels *ь* and *ѣ* in certain well-defined positions) and the subsequent "vocalization of the strong jers" (i.e., the development of these reduced vowels to regular full vowels in other positions). See Birnbaum 1975:4. This sound shift cannot be dated earlier than c. 600 and some linguists argue that it should be dated to the tenth, if not twelfth, century. Another *terminus ad quem* for the late Common Slavic is the palatalization of velars, a phenomenon which, according to some scholars, did not take place before c. 600. Finally, the metathesis of the liquids began only after c. 750 and was complete before c. 900 (Birnbaum 1975:228 and 232). One of the most frequently cited arguments for a late date of Common Slavic is Charlemagne's name (Carolus), which presents in all modern Slavic languages (in which the name designates the "emperor") a similar and archaic phonetical treatment. See Ivanov 1976:44; Pătruț 1976:187.

¹² Paul the Deacon, *Historia Langobardorum* IV 39 and 44.

¹³ The greater part of Slavic loans in Romanian seem to be of literary origin (Church literature, charters, and popular literature). See Nandriș 1939. Only fifteen words can be attributed to a Common Slavic influence on the basis of their phonetical treatment. For a complete list and discussion, see Mihăilă 1973:16; Duridanov 1991:15. All fifteen words appear in all Romanian dialects, both north and south of the Danube river. See Mihăilă 1971:355. One of the earliest loans is *șchiau* (pl. *șchei*), a word derived from the Slavic ethnic name (Latin *Sclavus*), which is commonly applied to Bulgarians. See Hurdubețiu 1969; Petrovics 1987. No other word of a very long

Albanian,¹⁴ and Greek¹⁵ – is minimal and far less significant than that of Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian, and Macedonian. The absence of a significant influence of Common Slavic in the Balkans is also evident from the small number of Balkan place names of Slavic origin, which could be dated on phonetical grounds, with any degree of certainty, before c. 800.¹⁶

As with material culture emblematic styles, the Slavic language may have been used to mark ethnic boundaries. The emblematic use of Slavic, however, was a much later phenomenon and cannot be associated with the Slavic *ethnie* of the sixth and seventh centuries.¹⁷ Slavs did not become Slavs because they spoke Slavic, but because they were called so by others.

THE SLAVIC ETHNIE: THE VIEW FROM THE OUTSIDE

All written sources of the sixth century and some of the seventh use exclusively Sclavenes and/or Antes to refer to groups living north of the Lower Danube. Though the author of the *Strategikon* specifically mentioned that there were many “kings,” which suggests more than one political and, presumably, ethnic, identity, there are no other names besides Sclavenes and Antes.¹⁸ Moreover, despite the fact that the Antes were since 545 the allies of the Empire, the author of the *Strategikon* listed them among potential enemies. By contrast, the first tribal names (Drugubites, Sagudates, Belegezites, etc.) appear almost concomitantly in Book II of the *Miracles of St Demetrius* and in Fredegar. In both cases, the difference between *ethnies* was important, because of differing political

Footnote 13 (cont.)

list of Slavic loans in Romanian can be dated earlier than the ninth century. See Bărbulescu 1929; Pătruț 1968, 1971, and 1974:104–5, 121, and 241; Mańczak 1988. For a statistics of Slavic loans in Romanian, see Rosetti 1954:12; Pătruț 1971:301 with n. 10. Some phonological and morphological features, such as pre-iotization or the vocative case, may indeed be the result of Slavic language contact, but there is no way of establishing a chronological framework for these phenomena. See Petrucci 1999:53, 56–7, 105–8, 118, and 130. Moreover, phonological features long considered to have been borrowed from Common Slavic proved to be segments that developed internally. See Petrucci 1995.

¹⁴ As in Romanian, the transformation of /n/ into /r/ (a linguistic phenomenon known as rotacization) ended before the largest number of Slavic loans entered Albanian. See Brăncuș 1989. Only three words have been identified as certainly Common Slavic loans. See Hamp 1970; Ylli 1997. As in Romanian, the word *Shqâ* in the Geg dialect of northern Albania refers to any Slavic-speaking group of the Orthodox faith, particularly to Bulgarians. See Mihăilă 1973:16; Schramm 1995:192.

¹⁵ Among all non-Slavic languages in the Balkans, Greek has the smallest number of Slavic loans. Gustav Meyer (1894) identified only 273 words of Slavic origin. See also Popović 1959:718; Bornträger 1989. The majority of Slavic loans seems to have entered Greek between the eighth and the eleventh century. The number of Common Slavic features, however, is comparatively higher in place names. See Malingoudis 1985 and 1987. ¹⁶ Schramm 1981:160.

¹⁷ See Eastman and Reese 1981.

¹⁸ The same is true for the contemporary source used by Theophylact Simocatta for his account of Priscus' and Peter's campaigns north of the Danube river in the 590s.

interests linked with various ethnicities. Some of the tribes described in Book II of the *Miracles of St Demetrius* were among those besieging Thessalonica. They were viewed as savage, brutish, and heathen. Others, like the Belegezites, were friendly and, at times, potential and important allies, who were able to supply the besieged city with food. To Fredegar, the Wends were different from the rest of the Slavs because of their successful revolt against the Avars, and, more important, because of their role in the demise of Dagobert's power. The same is true for Theophanes' account of the Bulgar migration. The two Slavic groups mentioned in connection with the conquest by Asparuch's warriors of northeastern Bulgaria have specific tribal names, because they were treated differently by both Byzantium and the conquering Bulgars. The Severeis were resettled on the frontier between the Bulgar qaganate and Byzantium, while the ἑπτὰ γυνεαί,¹⁹ who until then had probably been clients of the Byzantine emperor, were moved on the western frontier against the Avars.

In all those cases, ethnicity was a function of power in a very concrete and simple way. *Ethnies* were not classified in terms of language or culture, but in terms of their military and political potential. Names were important, therefore, because they gave meaning to categories of political classification. If this is true, however, then “Antes” were also a similar example, since from 545 to 602, they played a completely different role for imperial policies on the Danube frontier than the Sclavenes. The Antes were constantly allies of the Romans, while Sclavenes always appeared on the side of their enemies. A different Antian ethnicity may thus have existed irrespective of the common, “utterly barbarous,” language, which, according to Procopius, both *ethnies* used.²⁰ Emperor Maurice's campaigns of the late 500s against all potential and true enemies (Avars and Sclavenes) may have blurred this difference or at least made it negligible. In the eyes of the author of the *Strategikon*, the Sclavenes and the Antes not only had the same customs, weapons, and tactics, but both were treated as potential enemies.

In the light of these remarks, the very nature of a Slavene ethnicity needs serious reconsideration. Procopius and later authors may have used this ethnic name as an umbrella-term for various groups living north of the Danube frontier, which were neither “Antes,” nor “Huns” or “Avars”. Jordanes did the same, though unlike others, he chose an ancient name, the Venethi, probably because he believed that the contemporary configuration of *gentes* beyond the limits of the Empire was a conse-

¹⁹ Whether or not this was the real name of this group or simply a phrase employed by Theophanes for some sort of tribal confederation, he made it clear that they were a category separate from the Severeis. ²⁰ Procopius, *Wars* VII 14.26.

quence, if not a reincarnation, of that described by ancient authors such as Tacitus or Ptolemy. To him, in other words, the barbarians of the sixth century, unless touched by the course of Gothic history, were frozen in time and space, basically the same and in the same places as viewed by the ancient authors. That no Slavic ethnicity existed in the eyes of any sixth- or seventh-century Byzantine author, which could be compared to the modern concept of ethnicity, is shown by Pseudo-Caesarius' usage of the term "Sclavenes". To him, the opposite of "Sclavenes" is 'Ρωμαῖοι, which was not an *ethnie*, but a name for the inhabitants of the Roman province of Dacia Ripensis.²¹ The contrast is that between a group living north and another living south of the Danube frontier, to which Pseudo-Caesarius referred by the biblical name Phryson. His focus was on the specific location, within one and the same climate, of groups supposedly different in customs and religious life. The same is true for the author of the *Strategikon*. If Sclavenes were discussed in a different chapter than Avars, it is because, in his eyes, they had radically different social and political systems and, as a consequence, different forms of warfare. Roman generals, therefore, ought to learn how to fight them differently. Nevertheless, when it comes to real raids, the evidence discussed in Chapter 3 reveals that many authors were not at ease pinning down who exactly was ravaging Thrace in the 580s and who, at the same time, was in Greece.

This, I must emphasize, is in sharp contrast to other authors' concepts of Slavic ethnicity.²² That to our sixth- and seventh-century authors, ethnicity was an instrument to differentiate between enemies and allies is also shown by Theophylact Simocatta's episode of the Gepid captured by Priscus' army in 593. To the author of the *Feldzugsjournal* used by Theophylact as a source for Priscus' campaign, this "Gepid" was different from "Sclavenes," even if he had chosen to live among them and was a friend, if not a subject, of "king" Musocius. His "Gepid" ethnicity became apparent and important only when it became necessary to make a difference between him, a former Christian, and the other, "Sclavene" prisoners, who refused to reveal the location of their chief's village. Unlike them, the "Gepid" deserter would become a key factor for the successful conclusion of Priscus' campaign. Viewed from this perspective,

²¹ For a different, but unconvincing, interpretation of 'Ρωμαῖοι, see Dragojlović 1972–1973.

²² See Pohl 1988:107–8. In relation to the Slavic raids of the 580s, and especially to the evidence of the *Chronicle of Monemvasia*, Walter Pohl believed that the reason for which many authors muddled Avars and Slavs was the fluidity of the early medieval concept of ethnicity. Those who viewed themselves politically closer to the Avars, chose to leave at the end of the raid, together with the qagan. Those who presumably remained and settled in Greece, became Slavs. The analysis presented in Chapter 3 shows, however, that this interpretation does not stand against the existing evidence.

ethnicities were just labels attached to various actors in historically determined situations. Like all labels, they were sometimes misleading. The author of the *Strategikon* warns against those still claiming to be "Romans" (Ρωμαῖοι), but who "have given in to the times," forgot "their own people," and preferred "to gain the good will of the enemy," by luring Roman armies into ambushes set by the Sclavenes. To the experienced soldier who wrote the *Strategikon*, any ethnicity, including a Roman one, should be treated with extreme suspicion, if not backed by a politically correct affiliation.²³

Byzantine authors seem to have used "Sclavenes" and "Antes" to make sense of the process of group identification which was taking place under their own eyes just north of the Danube frontier. They were, of course, interested more in the military and political consequences of this process than in the analysis of Slavic ethnicity. Chiefs and chief names were more important than customs or culture. When customs and culture came to the fore, as in the case of the *Strategikon*, it was because its author believed that they were linked to the kind of warfare preferred by Sclavenes and Antes. A similar concept may have guided Procopius in writing his Slavic *excursus*. It is because of their military skills that the Sclavenes and the Antes caught the attention of the Roman authors. As early as 537, Sclavene mercenaries were fighting in Italy on the Roman side. The first Sclavene raid recorded by Procopius predates by only five or six years the publication of the first seven books of the *Wars*. In his work, Procopius viewed the Sclavenes and the Antes as "new" and their presence in the Lower Danube region as recent. Although he constantly referred to Sclavenes in relation to Huns or other nomads, there is no indication that he believed them to have recently *come* from some other place. That he considered them to be "new" can only mean that they had not, until then, represented a political force worth being treated like the Lombards, the Gepids, the Cutrigurs, and other "allies" surrounding the Empire. It is because he thought the Sclavenes and the Antes were not politically important (or, at least, not as important as Lombards, Gepids, or Cutrigurs) that Procopius failed to record any chief names. To be one of Justinian's ἐνοπλιονδοί, one needed first to have a "king." The irony behind the episode of the "phoney Chilbudius," with its plot setting imitating that of a neo-Attic comedy, is that the Antes, who eventually became Justinian's ἐνοπλιονδοί, did not have a true leader, for they had "lived from old under a democracy."

The making of the Slavs was less a matter of ethnogenesis and more one of invention, imagining and labeling by Byzantine authors. Some

²³ *Strategikon* XI 4.31.

form of group identity, however, which we may arguably call ethnicity, was growing out of the historical circumstances following the fortification of the Danube *limes*. This was therefore an identity formed in the shadow of Justinian's forts, not in the Pripet marshes. There are good reasons to believe that this identity was much more complex than the doublet "Sclavenes-Antes" imposed by the Byzantine historiography. Book II of the *Miracles of St Demetrius* and Fredegar's chronicle give us a measure of this complexity. That no "Slavs" called themselves by this name not only indicates that no group took on the label imposed by outsiders, but also suggests that this label was more a pedantic construction than the result of systematic interaction across ethnic boundaries. The first clear statement that "we are Slavs" comes from the twelfth-century *Russian Primary Chronicle*.²⁴ With this chronicle, however, the making of the Slavs ends and another story begins: that of their "national" use for claims to ancestry.

²⁴ Cross and Sherbowitz-Wetzor 1953:63.

Appendix A

LIST OF SETTLEMENT FEATURES USED IN
THE SERIATION BY CORRESPONDENCE
ANALYSIS

Abbreviations used in the following list are those of fig. 33.

Bacău-6: Bacău-Royal Court, sunken building 6; Mitrea and Artimon 1971:236; 242 fig. 13/1; 249 fig. 19/5/6.

Bacău-7: Bacău-Royal Court, sunken building 7; Mitrea and Artimon 1971:236, 239; 229 fig. 4; 242 fig. 13/3-4; 245 fig. 15/6; 246 fig. 16/7-8; 250 fig. 20/3, 4, 6.

Bacău-9: Bacău-Royal Court, sunken building 9; Mitrea and Artimon 1971:239; 230 fig. 5; 242 fig. 13/5-6; 243 fig. 14/1, 4, 6; 246 fig. 16/1-3, 9; 247 fig. 17/1-2; 248 fig. 18/2, 5; 249 fig. 19/3-4; 250 fig. 20/7-8.

Bahna-7: Izvoare-Bahna, sunken building 7; Mitrea 1978:207; 231 fig. 1/2; 236 fig. 6/4-12; 237 fig. 7/1-3, 5-6, 10; 238 fig. 8/4, 10, 14-16.

Bahna-8: Izvoare-Bahna, sunken building 8; Mitrea 1978:207-8; 231 fig. 1/3; 236 fig. 6/1-2.

Bahna-20: Izvoare-Bahna, sunken building 20; Mitrea 1983:429, 433; 430 fig. 1/1; 431 fig. 2/1-3; 432 fig. 3/1-5.

Bako-22: Bakota, sunken building 22; Vinokur 1980:870 and fig. 3.

Bako-35: Bakota, sunken building 35; Vinokur 1980:870; 872 fig. 5A.

Bane-1: Bucharest-Băneasa, sunken building 1; Constantiniu 1965a:89, 89-90, 92.

Bane-2: Bucharest-Băneasa, sunken building 2; Constantiniu 1965a:90.

Bane-3: Bucharest-Băneasa, sunken building 3; Constantiniu 1965a:79, 90-1; 83 fig. 8; 87 fig. 12/2.

Bane-4: Bucharest-Băneasa, sunken building 4; Constantiniu 1965a:89, 91-3; 80 fig. 3; 81 fig. 4; 93 fig. 19/1-6.

Bane-5: Bucharest-Băneasa, sunken building 5; Constantiniu 1965a:79, 92.

Bane-8: Bucharest-Băneasa, sunken building 8; Constantiniu 1965a:79, 93-4.

Bane-12: Bucharest-Băneasa, sunken building 12; Constantiniu 1965a:79, 94.

Bane-15: Bucharest-Băneasa, sunken building 15; Constantiniu 1965a:79, 85; 83 fig. 7.

Bane-20: Bucharest-Băneasa, sunken building 20; Constantiniu 1965a:79, 95.

Appendix A

Bors-1: Borșeni, sunken building 1; paper presented by Ioan Mitrea and Gh. Dumitroaia at the 29th National Conference of Romanian Archaeology, Cluj-Napoca, May 11-14, 1995.

Bors-2: Borșeni, sunken building 2; paper presented by Ioan Mitrea and Gh. Dumitroaia at the 29th National Conference of Romanian Archaeology, Cluj-Napoca, May 11-14, 1995.

Bors-4: Borșeni, sunken building 4; paper presented by Ioan Mitrea and Gh. Dumitroaia at the 29th National Conference of Romanian Archaeology, Cluj-Napoca, May 11-14, 1995.

Boto-1: Botoșana, sunken building 1; Teodor 1984a:22-4, 52-4; 83 fig. 3 a; 84 fig. 5/1; 96 fig. 17/3; 103 fig. 24/8; 104 fig. 25/7; 107 fig. 28/1; 108 fig. 29/1, 4; 109 fig. 30/4, 10; 110 fig. 31/1, 5, 7; 111 fig. 32/3; 113 fig. 34/5; 114 fig. 35/1, 4, 5, 7; 117 fig. 38/1; 122 fig. 43/1; 128 fig. 49/8.

Boto-2: Botoșana, sunken building 2; Teodor 1984a:24-5; 82 fig. 3/6; 96 fig. 17/4.

Boto-4: Botoșana, sunken building 4; Teodor 1984a:25-6; 82 fig. 3 d; 98 fig. 19/3; 101 fig. 22/3; 109 fig. 30/6; 117 fig. 38/3; 123 fig. 44/4; 124 fig. 45/7.

Boto-5: Botoșana, sunken building 5; Teodor 1984a:26; 83 fig. 4 a; 84 fig. 5/3; 96 fig. 17/2; 104 fig. 25/2; 117 fig. 38/4; 124 fig. 45/2.

Boto-6: Botoșana, sunken building 6; Teodor 1984a:26-7; 83 fig. 4 b; 103 fig. 24/9; 117 fig. 38/6.

Boto-7: Botoșana, sunken building 7; Teodor 1984a:27; 83 fig. 4 c; 84 fig. 5/4; 104 fig. 25/1; 105 fig. 26/3; 124 fig. 45/5.

Boto-8: Botoșana, sunken building 8; Teodor 1984a:28; 85 fig. 6; 103 fig. 24/3; 109 fig. 30/5; 123 fig. 44/7.

Boto-9: Botoșana, sunken building 9; Teodor 1984a:28-9; 85 fig. 6; 95 fig. 16/1; 96 fig. 17/1; 101 fig. 22/3; 108 fig. 29/2; 111 fig. 32/15; 112 fig. 33/2, 8; 113 fig. 34/1, 7; 114 fig. 35/2; 115 fig. 36/4, 7; 117 fig. 38/2, 5, 7; 122 fig. 43/7; 124 fig. 45/1; 125 fig. 46; 126 fig. 47.

Boto-10: Botoșana, sunken building 10; Teodor 1984a:29-30; 83 fig. 4 d; 84 fig. 5/6; 104 fig. 25/3; 107 fig. 28/6; 127 fig. 48/4.

Boto-12: Botoșana, sunken building 12; Teodor 1984a:30-1; 86 fig. 7 b; 87 fig. 8/2; 98 fig. 19/1; 101 fig. 22/6; 102 fig. 23/6; 105 fig. 26/5; 111 fig. 32/4; 118 fig. 39/1; 127 fig. 48/2.

Boto-13: Botoșana, sunken building 13; Teodor 1984a:31; 86 fig. 7 c; 98 fig. 19/2; 101 fig. 22/1; 103 fig. 24/5; 109 fig. 30/1, 3; 110 fig. 31/6; 119 fig. 40/1-3; 127 fig. 48/3; 128 fig. 49/1, 3.

Boto-14: Botoșana, sunken building 14; Teodor 1984a:31-2; 86 fig. 7 d; 96 fig. 17/10; 97 fig. 18/3; 98 fig. 19/9; 101 fig. 22/2; 103 fig. 24/6; 108 fig. 29/3; 110 fig. 31/2; 114 fig. 35/6; 115 fig. 36/2-3; 119 fig. 40/4-6; 123 fig. 44/2; 128 fig. 49/7.

Boto-15: Botoșana, sunken building 15; Teodor 1984a:32-3; 88 fig. 8/3; 95 fig. 16/3; 104 fig. 25/8; 107 fig. 28/3; 122 fig. 43/5.

Boto-16: Botoșana, sunken building 16; Teodor 1984a:33-4; 87 fig. 8/4; 88 fig. 9 a; 96 fig. 17/7; 98 fig. 19/7; 95 fig. 16/2; 102 fig. 23/3; 120 fig. 41/2; 122 fig. 43/8; 123 fig. 44/3.

Appendix A

Boto-17: Botoșana, sunken building 17; Teodor 1984a:34; 84 fig. 25/6; 87 fig. 8/5; 88 fig. 9 c; 96 fig. 17/5; 97 fig. 18/8; 98 fig. 19/3; 101 fig. 22/4; 103 fig. 24/2; 116 fig. 37/3, 6; 127 fig. 48/6.

Boto-18: Botoșana, sunken building 18; Teodor 1984a:35; 87 fig. 8/6; 88 fig. 9 d; 96 fig. 17/6; 98 fig. 19/10; 99 fig. 20/6; 105 fig. 26/2; 123 fig. 44/1; 122 fig. 43/4.

Boto-19: Botoșana, sunken building 19; Teodor 1984a:35-6; 89 fig. 10 d; 91 fig. 12/1; 97 fig. 18/5; 103 fig. 24/4; 104 fig. 25/4; 112 fig. 33/7; 115 fig. 36/1; 120 fig. 41/1.

Boto-20: Botoșana, sunken building 20; Teodor 1984a:36-7; 89 fig. 10 a; 91 fig. 12/2; 98 fig. 19/14; 99 fig. 20/2, 4-5; 100 fig. 21/2; 112 fig. 33/5; 116 fig. 37/5; 120 fig. 41/3-4; 127 fig. 48/1; 105 fig. 26/1; 109 fig. 30/2.

Boto-22: Botoșana, sunken building 22; Teodor 1984a:37-8; 89 fig. 10 b; 91 fig. 12/4; 98 fig. 19/5; 102 fig. 23/1; 106 fig. 27/1; 107 fig. 28/5; 123 fig. 44/5.

Boto-23: Botoșana, sunken building 23; Teodor 1984a:38-9; 90 fig. 11 a; 91 fig. 12/5; 97 fig. 18/4; 98 fig. 19/2; 106 fig. 27/4-5; 108 fig. 29/5; 109 fig. 30/9, 11; 110 fig. 31/3; 111 fig. 32/1-2; 121 fig. 42/3; 122 fig. 43/6.

Boto-25: Botoșana, sunken building 25; Teodor 1984a:39-40; 90 fig. 11 b; 98 fig. 19/6; 99 fig. 20/3; 103 fig. 24/7; 112 fig. 33/1, 3; 115 fig. 36/6; 121 fig. 42/1; 122 fig. 43/3; 127 fig. 48/5.

Boto-26: Botoșana, sunken building 26; Teodor 1984a:40; 92 fig. 13 a; 94 fig. 15/1; 107 fig. 28/4.

Boto-27: Botoșana, sunken building 27; Teodor 1984a:40-1; 92 fig. 13 b; 94 fig. 15/2; 97 fig. 18/7; 99 fig. 20/1; 100 fig. 21/1 a-c; 102 fig. 23/5; 109 fig. 30/7; 121 fig. 42/4.

Boto-28: Botoșana, sunken building 28; Teodor 1984a:41-2; 92 fig. 13 c; 94 fig. 15/3; 97 fig. 18/2; 98 fig. 19/8; 106 fig. 27/6; 108 fig. 29/6; 110 fig. 31/4; 121 fig. 42/2; 123 fig. 44/6.

Boto-30: Botoșana, sunken building 30; Teodor 1984a:42-3; 93 fig. 14 b; 94 fig. 15/5; 96 fig. 17/9; 98 fig. 19/11; 102 fig. 23/4; 105 fig. 26/4; 106 fig. 27/2-3; 113 fig. 34/2-3, 8; 115 fig. 36/5; 116 fig. 37/4; 128 fig. 49/2, 6.

Boto-31: Botoșana, sunken building 31; Teodor 1984a:43-4; 93 fig. 14 c; 94 fig. 15/6; 95 fig. 16/6; 96 fig. 17/8; 97 fig. 18/1, 6; 102 fig. 23/2; 113 fig. 34/4, 6; 116 fig. 37/1-2; 121 fig. 42/5.

Brat-O2: Bratei, oven 2; Bârză 1994-5:268; 278 fig. 4/4.

Brat-P1: Bratei, pit 1; Bârză 1994-5:268.

Brat-P16: Bratei, pit 16; Bârză 1994-5:268; 292 fig. 18/1; 294 fig. 20/1; 295 fig. 21/1.

Brates: Brăteștii de Sus; Tudor and Chicideanu 1977:136-7; 146; 138 fig. 8; 148 fig. 15; 149 fig. 16/8-15.

Budeni: Budeni, pit 1; Teodor 1978:147; 159 fig. 11.

Cernat-1: Cernat, sunken building 1; Székely 1992:281; 282 fig. 23/B1.

Cernat-2: Cernat, sunken building 2; Székely 1992:281; 282 fig. 23/B2.

Cernat-3: Cernat, sunken building 3; Székely 1992:281; 283 fig. 24.

Cernat-4: Cernat, sunken building 4; Székely 1992:281; 285 fig. 26/B 4.

Appendix A

- Chepa-2: Chepa, sunken building 2; Kotigoroshko 1977:87-8; 83 fig. 3/6; 91 fig. 9/34; 92 fig. 10/8, 9.
- Chern-5: Chernovka, sunken building 5; Timoshchuk, Rusanova, and Mikhailina 1981:91 and figs. 7-8.
- Ciur-1A: Bucharest-Ciurel, sunken building 1A; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:185; 201-5; 186 fig. 1; 187 fig. 2; 188 fig. 3.
- Ciur-1B: Bucharest-Ciurel, sunken building 1B; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:185-8, 207, 209; 208 fig. 25/H 1B; 193 fig. 8; 194 fig. 9.
- Ciur-2A: Bucharest-Ciurel, sunken building 2A; Morintz 1961:659-60, 661; 660 fig. 2-3; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:185 and 206-7; 189 fig. 4; 190 fig. 5; 191 fig. 6; 192 fig. 7.
- Ciur-3: Bucharest-Ciurel, sunken building 3; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:191-4, 210, 216; 208 fig. 25/H 3; 195 fig. 11; 196 fig. 12.
- Ciur-4: Bucharest-Ciurel, sunken building 4; Morintz and Roman 1962:766; 759 fig. 4/2, 3, 5, 10-11; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:194-6, 210-11; 208 fig. 25/H 4; 197 fig. 13; 198 fig. 14; 199 fig. 15/1.
- Ciur-5: Bucharest-Ciurel, sunken building 5; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:196, 211-12; 208 fig. 25/H 5; 200 fig. 16; 201 fig. 17.
- Ciur-6: Bucharest-Ciurel, sunken building 6; Morintz 1961:662; 661 fig. 4; Morintz and Roman 1962:759 fig. 4/9; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:196, 212; 208 fig. 25/H 6; 199 fig. 15/2-13.
- Ciur-7: Bucharest-Ciurel, sunken building 7; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:196-8, 212-13, 216; 202 fig. 18; 203 fig. 19.
- Ciur-8: Bucharest-Ciurel, sunken building 8; Morintz and Roman 1962:766; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:198-200, 213-15, 216; 203 fig. 20; 204 fig. 21; 205 fig. 22.
- Corpa: Corpaci, sunken building; Tel'nov 1985:104-5.
- Dama: Bucharest-Dămăroaia, kiln; Rosetti 1934:211-12; 207 fig. 1/6-9; 210 fig. 5/1-4; 211 fig. 6; Morintz and Rosetti 1959:33-4; pl. xxxi/6.
- Cuco-2: Cucorăni, sunken building 2; Teodor 1975:151, 154; 152 fig. 18/a; 198 fig. 59/1, 3; 199 fig. 60/12, 16; 200 fig. 61/4-7; 201 fig. 62/6.
- Cuco-4: Cucorăni, sunken building 4; Teodor 1975:151; 152 fig. 18b; 198 fig. 59/4, 6; 200 fig. 61/3, 16.
- Cuco-17: Cucorăni, sunken building 17; Teodor 1975:151; 153 fig. 19/a; 198 fig. 59/8; 199 fig. 60/5-6, 13; 200 fig. 61/10, 12; 201 fig. 62/7.
- Cuco-19: Cucorăni, sunken building 19; Teodor 1975:151-2; 153 fig. 19/b; 198 fig. 59/5; 199 fig. 60/3-4, 7-9, 11, 16; 200 fig. 61/1, 8, 9, 14, 15; 201 fig. 62/3-5.
- Cuco-20: Cucorăni, sunken building 20; Teodor 1975:152; 154 fig. 20; 198 fig. 59/2, 7; 199 fig. 60/1-2, 10, 15, 17; 200 fig. 61/11, 13; 201 fig. 62/1-2.
- Danc-1: Dănceni, sunken building 1; Rafalovich and Golceva 1981:128-31; 128 fig. 3; 129 fig. 4; 130 fig. 5/1, 2; 131 fig. 6.
- Danc-78: Dănceni, sunken building 78; Dergachev, Larina, and Postică 1983:130; 129 fig. viii/9.

Appendix A

- David-3: Davideni, sunken building 3; Mitrea 1974-6:66, 76-7; figs. 5/3, 7-8; 10/1.
- David-5: Davideni, sunken building 5; Mitrea 1974-6:67, 69, 73, 79; figs. 6/1, 4, 11; 7/2; 10/4; 17/1; 19/1.
- David-8: Davideni, sunken building 8; Mitrea 1974-6:67, 70; figs. 5/5-6; 7/4, 6; 12/6; 16/8, 9; 19/5, 11.
- David-9: Davideni, sunken building 9; Mitrea 1974-6:67, 73-5, 77; figs. 6/2, 8; 7/5; 8/4; 9/2; 11/11.
- David-10: Davideni, sunken building 10; Mitrea 1974-6:67, 73, 76, 78; figs. 6/9, 12; 8/3, 5, 8; 10/7, 8; 13/6; 14/7; 17/2, 3, 7; 19/2, 3.
- David-13: Davideni, sunken building 13; Mitrea 1974-6:67, 70, 73-4, 77-9, 83; figs. 4/9; 5/4, 5; 11/11-13; 12/7; 15/5; 17/4, 12.
- David-14: Davideni, sunken building 14; Mitrea 1974-6:66, 69-70, 77-8; figs. 11/4-6; 13/4, 7; 14/18; 17/11.
- David-16: Davideni, sunken building 16; Mitrea 1974-6:66, 69, 74, 88; figs. 9/2; 11/3; 13/3; 14/1, 14; 15/3; 17/8; 19/6, 10.
- David-17: Davideni, sunken building 17; Mitrea 1974-6:69, 82; figs. 15/5-6; 16/2-4; 19/7, 13.
- David-21: Davideni, sunken building 21; Mitrea 1974-6:66, 69, 73-4; figs. 8/7-8; 9/8, 10, 11/16.
- David-25: Davideni, sunken building 25; Mitrea 1992:204-5; figs. 2; 3/1; 6/1-2, 4; 7/1-3; 8/1-6; 11/1-4, 7.
- David-27: Davideni, sunken building 27; Mitrea 1992:209-11; figs. 3/2; 4; 9/1-3, 5-7; 10/1-6; 12/2-4, 7, 9, 11, 12; 13/2, 5, 8, 11-13; 14/1-4.
- David-28: Davideni, sunken building 28; Mitrea 1992:211-12; figs. 5/1; 9/1; 12/1, 5, 8, 10; 13/1, 3, 4, 6, 10; 14/6, 7.
- David-30: Davideni, sunken building 30; Mitrea 1994:281, 283; 282 fig. 2; 300 fig. 11/1; 304 fig. 13/1; 306 fig. 14/21, 33, 36; 310 fig. 16/13; 312 fig. 17/2.
- David-31: Davideni, sunken building 31; Mitrea 1994:283, 285; 284 fig. 3/1; 300 fig. 11/2; 304 fig. 13/15; 329 fig. 28/2, 5, 7.
- David-33: Davideni, sunken building 33; Mitrea 1994:285, 287, 289; 284 fig. 3/3; 304 fig. 13/9, 14, 27; 306 fig. 14/26; 308 fig. 15/1, 2, 7, 13; 310 fig. 16/1, 2; 312 fig. 17/11; 314 fig. 18/4; 318 fig. 20/2; 329 fig. 28/3, 4, 6; 330 fig. 29/3, 7.
- David-35: Davideni, sunken building 35; Mitrea 1994:291, 293; 284 fig. 3/4; 306 fig. 14/2-4, 6, 13, 19-20, 29, 37; 308 fig. 15/14; 310 fig. 16/3, 8, 10-12, 14; 312 fig. 17/5, 8; 318 fig. 20/4; 329 fig. 28/1; 330 fig. 29/5, 8-10.
- David-36: Davideni, sunken building 36; Mitrea 1994:293, 295; 286 fig. 4/1; 304 fig. 13/2, 3, 6, 10, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28; 306 fig. 14/7, 8, 11, 14, 39; 308 fig. 15/6, 8; 310 fig. 16/6, 7, 9; 312 fig. 17/1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9; 314 fig. 18/1, 2, 5, 6; 318 fig. 20/3, 8; 329 fig. 28/8, 9; 330 fig. 29/1, 4.
- David-37: Davideni, sunken building 37; Mitrea 1994:295, 297; 286 fig. 4/2; 304 fig. 13/4-5, 7, 18, 19, 25; 306 fig. 14/1, 5, 24, 25, 31, 32, 35, 41, 42; 312 fig. 17/12; 314 fig. 18/7; 318 fig. 20/1, 5, 6; 330 fig. 29/6.
- David-38: Davideni, sunken building 38; Mitrea 1994:299, 301, 303; 288 fig. 5; 294

Appendix A

- fig. 8; 304 fig. 13/3; 316 fig. 19/1, 4; 320 fig. 21/7; 321 fig. 22/5; 325 fig. 25/1, 5; 328 fig. 27/1, 3, 5, 7.
- David-41: Davideni, sunken building 41; Mitrea 1994:305, 307; 290 fig. 6; 294 fig. 8; 304 fig. 13/22; 320 fig. 21/1, 3; 321 fig. 22/1, 4, 7-9; 322 fig. 23/5, 8; 324 fig. 24/3; 325 fig. 25/3, 4; 326 fig. 26/1, 3, 4.
- David-42: Davideni, sunken building 42; Mitrea 1994:307, 309, 311; 290 fig. 6; 296 fig. 9/1; 304 fig. 13/23; 322 fig. 23/1, 2, 4, 6, 7; 324 fig. 24/1, 5, 8; 326 fig. 26/5, 6.
- David-46: Davideni, sunken building 46; Mitrea 1994:315, 317; 292 fig. 7/3.
- David-58: Davideni, sunken building 58; Mitrea 1994-5:446 and fig. 1/2.
- Dod-1: Dodești, sunken building 1; Teodor 1984b:22-3; 27 fig. 5/a; 31 fig. 8/1, 2, 5; 33 fig. 9/2; 34 fig. 10/1; 37 fig. 11; 42 fig. 15/3, 6; 46 fig. 18/1-2, 4, 6; 47 fig. 19/1-4, 7.
- Dod-2: Dodești, sunken building 2; Teodor 1984b:23; 27 fig. 5/b; 33 fig. 9/5; 34 fig. 10/3; 42 fig. 15/2, 4-5; 46 fig. 18/3, 5.
- Dod-3: Dodești, sunken building 3; Teodor 1984b:23-4; 27 fig. 5/c; 29 fig. 6/7, 9; 33 fig. 9/1; 34 fig. 10/4; 39 fig. 13/1-5; 42 fig. 15/1; 43 fig. 16/1-2, 6.
- Dod-4: Dodești, sunken building 4; Teodor 1984b:24-5; 27 fig. 5/d; 29 fig. 6/1-3, 10-11; 30 fig. 7; 31 fig. 8/3, 6, 7; 33 fig. 9/3, 4; 40 fig. 14/3-4; 43 fig. 16/3, 5.
- Dul-II1: Dulceanca III, sunken building 1; Dolinescu-Ferche 1992:128; 129 fig. 2/1; 136 fig. 5; 137 fig. 6; 138 fig. 7.
- Dul-II2: Dulceanca II, sunken building 2; Dolinescu-Ferche 1986:124, 130-2, 150; 125 fig. 2/2; 135 fig. 8.
- Dul-II3: Dulceanca II, sunken building 3; Dolinescu-Ferche 1986:124; 130-2, 150; 125 fig. 2/3; 136 fig. 9/1-2, 4-10; fig. 24/1.
- Dul-II4: Dulceanca III, sunken building 4; Dolinescu-Ferche 1992:128; 129 fig. 2/2; 139 fig. 8.
- Dul-II5: Dulceanca III, sunken building 5; Dolinescu-Ferche 1992:128, 130; 130 fig. 3/1; 141 fig. 10; 142 fig. 11; 143 fig. 12/1-2.
- Dul-II6: Dulceanca II, sunken building 6; Dolinescu-Ferche 1986:124, 130-2; 126 fig. 3/4; 137 fig. 10; 138 fig. 11.
- Dul-II7: Dulceanca II, sunken building 7; Dolinescu-Ferche 1986:124, 130-2, 150; 126 fig. 3/3; 139 fig. 12.
- Dul-II8: Dulceanca II, sunken building 8; Dolinescu-Ferche 1986:124, 130-2, 150; 126 fig. 3/2; 140 fig. 13; 141 fig. 14/1-14, 17; fig. 24/10.
- Dul-II9: Dulceanca II, sunken building 9; Dolinescu-Ferche 1986:124, 130-2, 150; 127 fig. 4/1; 142 fig. 15.
- Dul-II10: Dulceanca II, sunken building 10; Dolinescu-Ferche 1986:124, 130-2, 150; 127 fig. 4/3; 143 fig. 16.
- Dul-II11: Dulceanca III, sunken building 11; Dolinescu-Ferche 1992:131; 132 fig. 4/6; 144 fig. 13/16-24.
- Dul-II12: Dulceanca II, sunken building 12; Dolinescu-Ferche 1986:124, 130-2, 150; 127 fig. 4/2; 144 fig. 17.

Appendix A

- Dul-II13: Dulceanca II, sunken building 13; Dolinescu-Ferche 1986:128, 130-2, 150; 127 fig. 4/5; 145 fig. 18.
- Dul-II14: Dulceanca II, sunken building 14; Dolinescu-Ferche 1986:128, 130-2; 129 fig. 5/1; 146 fig. 19/1-15; fig. 24/8.
- Dul-II17: Dulceanca III, sunken building 17; Dolinescu-Ferche 1992:131, 133; 132 fig. 4/1; 146 fig. 15; 147 fig. 16.
- Dul-II18: Dulceanca II, sunken building 18; Dolinescu-Ferche 1986:128-9; 129 fig. 5/3; 138 fig. 11/15.
- Dul-II19: Dulceanca II, sunken building 19; Dolinescu-Ferche 1986:128; 129 fig. 5/4; 149 fig. 22; 150 fig. 23/1-5.
- Dul-II20: Dulceanca III, sunken building 20; Dolinescu-Ferche 1992:133; 132 fig. 4/5; 148 fig. 17.
- Dul-II22: Dulceanca III, sunken building 22; Dolinescu-Ferche 1992:133; 129 fig. 2/4; 149 fig. 18.
- Dulc-I-1: Dulceanca I, sunken building 1; Dolinescu-Ferche 1974:81, 83; figs. 83-8; 91/1-4; 92; fig. 115/7.
- Dulc-I-2: Dulceanca I, sunken building 2; Dolinescu-Ferche 1974:83, 85-7; figs. 93 and 115/5; figs. 94-106.
- Dulc-K: Dulceanca I, kiln; Dolinescu-Ferche 1974:73-6; figs. 68-73; 115/4.
- Dulc-O6: Dulceanca III, oven 6; Dolinescu-Ferche 1992:130-1; 130 fig. 3/2; 143 fig. 12/3-19.
- Dulc-P2: Dulceanca III, pit 2; Dolinescu-Ferche 1992:128; 132 fig. 4/4; 140 fig. 9.
- Dulc-P15: Dulceanca II, pit 15; Dolinescu-Ferche 1986:128; 141 fig. 14/16.
- Duna-O15: Dunaújváros, sunken building 15; Bóna 1973:22-3; 23 fig. 1/3-6; pl. 32/9.
- Duna-O18: Dunaújváros, sunken building 18; Bóna 1973:25-6; pls. 1/16-22; 19/6; 21/1; 29/5; 32/7, 13; 35/3.
- Duna-O25: Dunaújváros, sunken building 25; Bóna 1973:30; pl. 2/5-8.
- Duna-O30: Dunaújváros, sunken building 30; Bóna 1973:33; pls. 3/6; 28/1, 4, 5, 8; 32/3.
- Duna-O32: Dunaújváros, sunken building 32; Bóna 1973:34; pl. 3/7-11.
- Duna-O38: Dunaújváros, sunken building 38; Bóna 1973:37; pls. 4/6-11; 14/5; 32/18.
- Duna-O39: Dunaújváros, sunken building 39; Bóna 1973:38; pls. 4/12-18; 26/2; 29/4, 6; 32/6; 35/5, 6.
- Duna-O42: Dunaújváros, sunken building 42; Bóna 1973:39-40; pls. 5/3, 5-11; 23/1-4; 30/4; 32/2; 33/5.
- Duna-O46: Dunaújváros, oven 46; Bóna 1973:42.
- Duna-O56: Dunaújváros, sunken building 56; Bóna 1973:48-9; pls. 7/15-16; 25/5; 35/10.
- Duna-O57: Dunaújváros, sunken building 57; Bóna 1973:49-50; pls. 8/1-10; 25/6-8; 28/7; 29/1, 3; 30/3; 32/4-5.

Appendix A

- Duna-O61: Dunaújváros, sunken building 61; Bóna 1973:58; pl. 11/1-3.
 Duna-O62: Dunaújváros, oven 62; Bóna 1973:59; pl. 11/4-18.
 Duna-O66: Dunaújváros, sunken building 66; Bóna 1973:60; pl. 12/17-23.
 Filia-1: Filiaș, sunken building 1; Székely 1974-6:43; pls. 1/1-5; 11/4, 7-9.
 Filia-7: Filiaș, sunken building 7; Székely 1974-6:37-8; pls. 1V/1, 1a, 4-11; V/12; VI/10, 14, 15, 17; VII/11, 12, 14, 16-18.
 Filia-15: Filiaș, sunken building 15; Székely 1974-6:38; pls. 11/1; V/1, 4-6, 8, 13-15; VII/4, 7, 9; IX/1, 7, 8, 11, 12; X/6.
 Filia-21: Filiaș, sunken building 21; Székely 1974-6:39; pl. V/2, 3.
 Filia-22: Filiaș, sunken building 22; Székely 1974-6:39; pls. VIII/1-23; X/2-3, 17, 24.
 Filia-23: Filiaș, sunken building 23; Székely 1974-6:39-40; pl. X/10.
 Filia-25: Filiaș, sunken building 25; Székely 1974-6:40.
 Filia-30: Filiaș, sunken building 30; Székely 1974-6:40; pls. III/7, 9; X/5, 11, 19, 20.
 Filia-31: Filiaș, sunken building 31; Székely 1974-6:40.
 Filia-32: Filiaș, sunken building 32; Székely 1974-6:41.
 Filia-33: Filiaș, sunken building 33; Székely 1974-6:41; pl. 1/12.
 Filia-34: Filiaș, sunken building 34; Székely 1974-6:41.
 Filia-36: Filiaș, sunken building 36; Székely 1974-6:41; pls. 11/3-5; III/10; VI/1-2, 6-8.
 Filia-37: Filiaș, sunken building 37; Székely 1974-6:41-2; pls. III/3; IV/1, 3; X/15-16.
 Filia-38: Filiaș, sunken building 38; Székely 1974-6:42; pl. III/5, 11.
 Filia-41: Filiaș, sunken building 41; Székely 1974-6:42; pl. III/6.
 Ghiv-3: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street, sunken building 3; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:299, 302; 301 fig. 6; 302 fig. 7.
 Ghiv-5: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street, sunken building 5; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:297, 303-5, 319-20; 306 fig. 8; 319 fig. 16/7 a-b.
 Ghiv-8: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street, sunken building 8; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:305, 307; 309 fig. 9.
 Ghiv-10: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street, sunken building 10; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:293-4, 297, 307, 309, 311, 318-23; 310 fig. 10; 312 fig. 11; 319 fig. 16/1-3, 5; 321 fig. 17/16; 322 fig. 18/7, 9, 12-13; 323 fig. 19/1.
 Ghiv-11: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street, sunken building 11; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:293-4, 297, 311, 319; 298 fig. 4/4; 300 fig. 5/1-3; 319 fig. 16/6.
 Ghiv-12: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street, sunken building 12; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:293-4, 297, 311, 313, 324; 296 fig. 3/5; 298 fig. 4/7; 314 fig. 12; 323 fig. 20.
 Ghiv-13: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street, sunken building 13; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:293, 297, 313, 317; 296 fig. 3/3; 300 fig. 5/8; 315 fig. 13; 316 fig. 14; 318 fig. 15.
 Gord-1: Gordinești, sunken building 1; Tel'nov 1985:91-2.

Appendix A

- Gord-2: Gordinești, sunken building 2; Tel'nov 1985:92-3; 94 fig. 1; 95 fig. 2.
 Gord-4: Gordinești, sunken building 4; Tel'nov 1985:94-5; 96 fig. 3; 97 fig. 4.
 Gord-6: Gordinești, sunken building 6; Tel'nov 1985:99-100; 101 fig. 6; 102 fig. 7.
 Gore-21: Gorecha, sunken building 21; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:85 pl. 36/9-17.
 Grodz-1: Grodzisko Dolne, sunken building 1; Podgórska-Czopek 1991:17-18; 17 fig. 6; pls. XIX-XXII.
 Grodz-2: Grodzisko Dolne, sunken building 2; Podgórska-Czopek 1991:18-19; 19 fig. 7; pls. XXII-XXVI.
 Grodz-P1: Grodzisko Dolne, pit 1; Podgórska-Czopek 1991:15-17; 15 fig. 5; pls. V-XVII.
 Gut-2: Gutinaș, sunken building 2; Mitrea, Eminovici, and Momanu 1986-7:221-2; 235 fig. 2/2; 236 fig. 3/2; 243 fig. 12/1, 2, 4; 244 fig. 11/1, 2, 4; 245 fig. 12/1, 2, 4; 248 fig. 15/1, 2, 4.
 Gut-3: Gutinaș, sunken building 3; Mitrea, Eminovici, and Momanu 1986-7:222-3; 238 fig. 5/1; 245 fig. 12/5, 8; 247 fig. 14/2, 3, 6; 247 fig. 14/2, 3, 6; 250 fig. 17/5.
 Gut-5: Gutinaș, sunken building 5; Mitrea, Eminovici, and Momanu 1986-7:224-5; 237 fig. 4/1; 239 fig. 6; 245 fig. 12/3, 7; 246 fig. 13/4, 6; 247 fig. 14/1, 5; 249 fig. 16/4; 250 fig. 17/2, 6.
 Gut-6: Gutinaș, sunken building 6; Mitrea, Eminovici, and Momanu 1986-7:225-7; 240 fig. 7/1; 241 fig. 8; 243 fig. 10/3; 244 fig. 11/3; 246 fig. 13/8-9; 248 fig. 15/3, 6; 250 fig. 17/3, 12-14.
 Gut-7: Gutinaș, sunken building 7; Mitrea, Eminovici, and Momanu 1986-7:227-8; 240 fig. 7/2; 242 fig. 9; 246 fig. 13/1-3, 5, 7, 10; 248 fig. 15/5; 249 fig. 16/2, 6; 250 fig. 17/4, 7-11.
 Hans-1: Hansca, sunken building 1; Rafalovich 1973:145-6; 145 fig. 6.
 Hans-10: Hansca, sunken building 10; Tel'nov and Riaboi 1985:109; 110 fig. 2.
 Hans-11: Hansca, sunken building 11; Tel'nov and Riaboi 1985:114, 117; 116 fig. 6; 117 fig. 7.
 Hans-24: Hansca, sunken building 24; Rafalovich 1973:151.
 Hans-26: Hansca, sunken building 26; Rafalovich 1973:153; 154 fig. 11/7-12; I. A. Rafalovich, "Otchet o polevykh rabotakh Reutskoi rannesrednevekovoi arheologicheskoi ekspedicii v 1970 g.," archaeological report in the archives of the Institute of Ancient History and Archaeology, Chișinău, 1972, fig. 17/9, 11.
 Hlin-1: Hlincea, sunken building 1; n.a. 1953a:326-7; 324 fig. 11.
 Horo-P2: Horodok, pit 2; Timoshchuk and Prikhodniuk 1969:75; 74 fig. 3/6.
 Iasi-1: Iași-Crucea lui Ferent, sunken building 1; Teodor 1971:120; 127 fig. 3/2; 128 fig. 4/1-3, 5-6, 11-12, 15.
 Ivan-1: Ivancea, sunken building 1; Vlasenko 1985:146-7; 142 fig. 1/7, 8-10, 14, 15, 17; 144 fig. 3/1.
 Ivan-P1: Ivancea, pit 1; Vlasenko 1985:145; 142 fig. 1/2; 144 fig. 3/4.

Appendix A

- Kav-2: Kavetchina, sunken building 2; Vakulenko and Prikhodniuk 1984:62, 75; 46 fig. 21; 64 fig. 37/10, 15; 66 fig. 38/4, 8, 31, 34, 40.
- Kav-7: Kavetchina, sunken building 7; Vakulenko and Prikhodniuk 1984:76-7; 49 fig. 24; 64 fig. 37/9, 11.
- Kav-9: Kavetchina, sunken building 9; Vakulenko and Prikhodniuk 1984:77-8; 64 fig. 37/6; 66 fig. 38/5, 16-17, 20, 26.
- Kav-11: Kavetchina, sunken building 11; Vakulenko and Prikhodniuk 1984:78; 66 fig. 38/33.
- Kav-12: Kavetchina, sunken building 12; Vakulenko and Prikhodniuk 1984:78; 51 fig. 26; 66 fig. 38/6.
- Kav-13: Kavetchina, sunken building 13; Vakulenko and Prikhodniuk 1984:78-9; 52 fig. 27; 66 fig. 38/3, 14, 15, 28, 41.
- Kav-18: Kavetchina, sunken building 18; Vakulenko and Prikhodniuk 1984:80; 61 fig. 34; 66 fig. 38/7, 23.
- Kav-25: Kavetchina, sunken building 25; Vakulenko and Prikhodniuk 1984:81; 56 fig. 31; 64 fig. 37/14; 66 fig. 38/10, 12, 13, 21, 22, 25.
- Kav-27: Kavetchina, sunken building 27; Vakulenko and Prikhodniuk 1984:82; 57 fig. 32; 66 fig. 38/38; 68 fig. 39/4, 5, 8, 9.
- Kav-29: Kavetchina, sunken building 29; Vakulenko and Prikhodniuk 1984:82; 58 fig. 33; fig. 37/4; 66 fig. 38/39; 68 fig. 39/1-3, 7.
- Kav-P20: Kavetchina, pit 20; Vakulenko and Prikhodniuk 1984:85; 62 fig. 35/16; 66 fig. 38/2.
- Kiev-8: Kiev-Obolon', sunken building 8; Shovkoplias and Gavritukhin 1993:54; 55 fig. 2/1-5.
- Kiev-26: Kiev-Obolon', sunken building 26; Shovkoplias and Gavritukhin 1993:54; 55 fig. 2/6-12; 56 fig. 3.
- Kod-1: Kodyn II, sunken building 1; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:53; 78 pl. 22/1-2.
- Kod-2: Kodyn II, sunken building 2; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:54; 78 pl. 22/3-7.
- Kod-3: Kodyn I, sunken building 3; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:46 and 22; 73 pl. 13/1-7.
- Kod-4: Kodyn I, sunken building 4; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:22 and 54; 73 pl. 13/6; 78 pl. 23/1-6.
- Kod-5: Kodyn I, sunken building 5; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:54; 18 fig. 13/3; 78 pl. 23/7-10.
- Kod-7: Kodyn I, sunken building 7; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:55; 18 fig. 12/2; 20 fig. 16/8; 78 pl. 23/12-21.
- Kod-10: Kodyn I, sunken building 10; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:22, 48; 21 fig. 19/2; 74 fig. 14/5-18.
- Kod-11: Kodyn I, sunken building 11; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:29, 48-9; 20 fig. 16/5; 74 fig. 15/1-12.

Appendix A

- Kod-12: Kodyn II, sunken building 12; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:36, 56; 18 fig. 12/3; 32 fig. 23/2; 69 pl. 6/3-5; 80 pl. 26/1-4.
- Kod-13: Kodyn I, sunken building 13; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:49; 12 fig. 7/4; 15 fig. 11/1; 75 pl. 16.
- Kod-14: Kodyn I, sunken building 14; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:49-50; 20 fig. 17/6; 74 pl. 15/12-16.
- Kod-19: Kodyn II, sunken building 19; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:40, 58; 20 fig. 16/2; 39 fig. 28/2; 71 pl. 9/3; 81 pl. 28/8-18.
- Kod-20: Kodyn I, sunken building 20; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:34, 51; 20 fig. 17/3; 21 fig. 18/1, 5; 76 pl. 18/2-9.
- Kod-21: Kodyn I, sunken building 21; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:30, 51, 22; 18 fig. 12/4; 21 fig. 19/2; 76 pl. 18/10-14.
- Kod-23: Kodyn I, sunken building 23; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:51-2; 39 fig. 28/1; 71 pl. 9/1; 76 pl. 19/5-11.
- Kod-27: Kodyn II, sunken building 27; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:59; 82 pl. 30/8-11.
- Kod-28: Kodyn II, sunken building 28; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:59-60; 21 fig. 18/4; 82 pl. 30/12.
- Kod-29: Kodyn I, sunken building 29; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:17, 53; 21 fig. 18/2, 6.
- Kod-31: Kodyn II, sunken building 31; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:60; 20 fig. 17/1; 29 fig. 21; 69 pl. 6/3-4; 82 pl. 31/1-3.
- Kod-36: Kodyn II, sunken building 36; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:61; 18 fig. 15/3-4; 83 pl. 33/5-7.
- Kod-45: Kodyn II, sunken building 45; Rusanova and Timoshchuk 1984:30 and 62; 84 pl. 35/4-11.
- Lug-I-1: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 1; Berezovec 1963:157-8; Prikhodniuk 1980:50 fig. 28/1-2.
- Lug-I-2: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 2; Berezovec 1963:158.
- Lug-I-5: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 5; Berezovec 1963:160; figs. 8/3; 9/4; 27/1; Prikhodniuk 1980:50 fig. 28/6,7.
- Lug-I-6: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 6; Berezovec 1963:160-1; fig. 27/2; Prikhodniuk 1980:52 fig. 29.
- Lug-I-7: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 7; Berezovec 1963:161, 163; figs. 10/11; 27/3; Prikhodniuk 1980:53 fig. 30.
- Lug-I-10: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 10; Berezovec 1963:164; fig. 27/6.
- Lug-I-12: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 12; Berezovec 1963:164-5; fig. 27/8; Prikhodniuk 1980:33 figs. 11-12.
- Lug-I-13: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 13; Berezovec 1963:165; fig. 27/9; Prikhodniuk 1980:34 fig. 13.
- Lug-I-16: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 16; Berezovec 1963:165-6; figs. 10/4, 5, 12; 28/1, 4; Prikhodniuk 1980:62 fig. 39/3-10.

Appendix A

- Lug-I-17: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 17; Berezovec 1963:166; figs. 2/2; 28/2; Prikhodniuk 1980:63 fig. 40.
- Lug-I-18: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 18; Berezovec 1963:166-7; figs. 12/8; 13/4; 28/3; Prikhodniuk 1980:35 fig. 14.
- Lug-I-19: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 19; Berezovec 1963:167; fig. 9/10; Prikhodniuk 1980:36 fig. 15.
- Lug-I-20: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 20; Berezovec 1963:167-9; fig. 28/6; Prikhodniuk 1980:64 fig. 41.
- Lug-I-21: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 21; Berezovec 1963:169; fig. 28/5; Prikhodniuk 1980:55 fig. 32.
- Lug-I-25: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 25; Berezovec 1963:171; figs. 14/1, 7; 29/4; Prikhodniuk 1980:65 fig. 42/1-5, 7, 8, 10.
- Lug-I-26: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 26; Berezovec 1963:171-2; figs. 14/6; 29/5; Prikhodniuk 1980:65 fig. 42/6, 9, 11, 12.
- Lug-I-27: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 27; Berezovec 1963:172; fig. 29/6; Prikhodniuk 1980:65 fig. 43/1-3.
- Lug-I-29: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 29; Berezovec 1963:172-3; figs. 2/3; 15/2; 29/3; Prikhodniuk 1980:65 fig. 43/4-8.
- Lug-I-30: Pen'kyvka-Lug I, sunken building 28; Berezovec 1963:173; figs. 10/18; 29/2; Prikhodniuk 1980:65 fig. 43/9-10.
- Lug-II-1: Pen'kyvka-Lug II, sunken building 1; Berezovec 1963:178; figs. 2/4; 16/1.
- Lug-II-2: Pen'kyvka-Lug II, sunken building 2; Berezovec 1963:178; fig. 17/10, 11.
- Lug-II-3: Pen'kyvka-Lug II, sunken building 3; Berezovec 1963:178; figs. 16/4; 17/12; 18/3, 4.
- Lug-II-4: Pen'kyvka-Lug II, sunken building 4; Berezovec 1963:178-9; figs. 17/1; 31/1.
- Lug-II-7: Pen'kyvka-Lug II, sunken building 7; Berezovec 1963:180; figs. 16/2, 5; 17/4; Prikhodniuk 1980:56 fig. 33.
- Lug-II-9: Pen'kyvka-Lug II, sunken building 9; Berezovec 1963:181; figs. 31/5; 16/3; 17/14.
- Lunca: Bucharest-Lunca-Văcărești, oven 3; Sandu 1992:190-1; 184 pl. XIV/5-8, 10.
- Makar-5: Pen'kyvka-Makaryv Ostryv, sunken building 5; Linka and Shovkoplias:240; fig. 5/3.
- Makar-6: Pen'kyvka-Makaryv Ostryv, sunken building 6; Linka and Shovkoplias:240; fig. 2/1-9.
- Mihai-5: Mihăilești, sunken building 5; Turcu 1992b:234 and 236; 232 pl. II/2; 235 pl. IV; 237 pl. VI/6-8.
- Milit-3: Bucharest-Militari, sunken building 3; Zirra and Cazimir 1963:56, 60; 66 fig. 14/2.
- Milit-4: Bucharest-Militari, sunken building 4; Zirra and Cazimir 1963:56, 60, 63; 69 fig. 17/1-2, 6-7.

Appendix A

- Milit-5: Bucharest-Militari, sunken building 5; Zirra and Cazimir 1963:56, 60, 62-3; 69 fig. 17/1-2, 4-5, 8; Turcu 1992a:fig. XIV.
- Milit-6: Bucharest-Militari, sunken building 6; Zirra and Cazimir 1963:56, 60, 63; 64 fig. 12/1, 2; 69 fig. 17/3; Sgîbea-Turcu 1963:373, 378-80; 379 pl. II/1.
- Milit-P8: Bucharest-Militari, pit 8; Turcu 1992a:50.
- Obu-6: Obukhyv, sunken building 6; Abashina 1986:80 and 82; 79 fig. 6/1; 81 fig. 7/6, 17, 25; 82 fig. 82/3, 4.
- Olt-2: Olteni, sunken building 2; Dolinescu-Ferche 1973:205 and 206 fig. 3; 207 fig. 4/1-3, 9; 208 fig. 5.
- Pastyr-1: Pastyr's'ke, sunken building; Braichevskii 1955:69-70; 72 fig. 5/1, 2.
- Pastyr-2: Pastyr's'ke, sunken building; Braichevskii 1955:70-1; 72 figs. 5/3, 4; 6.
- Poian-5: Poian, sunken building 5; Székely 1992:251; 252 fig. 5/B5; 253 fig. 6; 254 fig. 7/B5.
- Poian-8: Poian, sunken building 8; Székely 1992:259.
- Poian-13: Poian, sunken building 13; Székely 1992:261.
- Poian-17: Poian, sunken building 17; Székely 1992:263; 264 fig. 13/B17.
- Poian-18: Poian, sunken building 18; Székely 1992:263; 265 fig. 14.
- Poian-19: Poian, sunken building 19; Székely 1992:263, 266, 268; 266 fig. 15; 267 fig. 16.
- Poian-20: Poian, sunken building 20; Székely 1992:263; 269 fig. 17.
- Poian-21: Poian, sunken building 21; Székely 1992:268; 262 fig. 12/B21.
- Poian-23: Poian, sunken building 23; Székely 1992:268, 271; 270 fig. 18/B23.
- Poian-24: Poian, sunken building 24; Székely 1992:271; 272 fig. 19/B24.
- Poian-29: Poian, sunken building 29; Székely 1992:274.
- Poian-30: Poian, sunken building 30; Székely 1992:274.
- Sam-II: Samchincy, house II; Khavliuk 1963:346; figs. 4/10, 11; 13/3; 14/7, 8.
- Sam-13: Samchincy, sunken building 13; Khavliuk 1961:197-8; 198 fig. 9; 199 fig. 10/8; Khavliuk 1963:345; fig. 14/10.
- Sel-1: Seliște, sunken building 1; Rafalovich 1972b:130-1; 124 fig. 2/2; 130 fig. 6/1, 3, 4.
- Sel-2: Seliște, sunken building 2; Rafalovich 1972b:131, 133, 134; 132 figs. 7-8; 133 fig. 9; 133 fig. 10/8, 13.
- Sel-4: Seliște, sunken building 4; Rafalovich 1972b:134-5.
- Sel-5: Seliște, sunken building 5; Rafalovich 1972b:135, 137; 133 fig. 10/14; 136 fig. 11; 137 fig. 12/2.
- Sel-6: Seliște, sunken building 6; Rafalovich 1972b:137-9; 130 fig. 6/6; 136 fig. 11; 137 fig. 12/1; 138 fig. 13/1.
- Sel-7: Seliște, sunken building 7; Rafalovich 1972b:139-40; 138 fig. 13/1, 4; 139 fig. 14; 140 fig. 15/1, 2.
- Sel-8: Seliște, sunken building 8; Rafalovich and Lapushnian 1971:362; Rafalovich 1973:138-9.

Appendix A

- Sel-9: Seliște, sunken building 9; Rafalovich and Lapushnian 1971:362; Rafalovich 1973:139-140; 40 fig. 3/3.
- Sel-10: Seliște, sunken building 10; Rafalovich and Lapushnian 1973:129-30; 130 fig. 8/1; 131 fig. 9/3, 9.
- Sel-13: Seliște, sunken building 13; Rafalovich and Lapushnian 1973:133-4; 130 fig. 8/3; 133 fig. 10/5.
- Sel-15 Seliște, sunken building 15; Rafalovich and Lapushnian 1974:130-1 and 133; 131 fig. 10; 132 fig. 11.
- Sem-I: Semenki, sunken building I; Khavliuk 1961:188; 190 fig. 3/1-4.
- Sem-VI: Semenki, sunken building VI; Khavliuk 1963:335-6; figs. 6/8; 13/8; 14/3, 4.
- Sem-VII: Semenki, sunken building VII; Khavliuk 1963:336, 338; 195 fig. 6/9; 332 fig. 12/1; 338 fig. 17/4.
- Sem-VIII: Semenki, sunken building VIII; Khavliuk 1974:207; 202 fig. 11/1, 2.
- Sem-15: Semenki, sunken building 15; Khavliuk 1974:199; 198 fig. 9/15; 199 fig. 10/5, 10.
- Sem-20: Semenki, sunken building 20; Khavliuk 1974:204; 198 fig. 9/20; 202 fig. 11/22.
- Sem-21: Semenki, sunken building 21; Khavliuk 1974:204; 203 fig. 12/7.
- Sem-22: Semenki, sunken building 22; Khavliuk 1974:204; 198 fig. 9/22; 202 fig. 11/3, 20.
- Sem-29: Semenki, sunken building 29; Khavliuk 1974: 207; 202 fig. 11/11, 13.
- Sfint: Sfîntești, sunken building 1; Dolinescu-Ferche 1967:127-31; 128 fig. 1; 129 fig. 2; 130 fig. 3; 131 fig. 4; 131 fig. 5.
- Skib-1: Skibincy, sunken building 1; Khavliuk 1974:188-9; 189 fig. 5/12.
- Skib-2: Skibincy, sunken building 2; Khavliuk 1974:189-90; 189 fig. 5/1, 3, 5, 6.
- Skib-3: Skibincy, sunken building 3; Khavliuk 1974:190; 189 fig. 5/2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11-13; 191 fig. 6/1.
- Skib-4: Skibincy, sunken building 4; Khavliuk 1974:190; 191 fig. 6/2.
- Spin: Spinoasa, sunken building 5; Nițu, Zaharia, and Teodoru 1960:532-3; 533 fig. 2; 534 fig. 3/2; 534 fig. 4/1, 10-13.
- Stec-3: Stecyvka, sunken building 3; Petrov 1963b:214; 215 fig. 2/2.
- Stec-5: Stecyvka, sunken building 5; Petrov 1963b:214; 215 fig. 2/4.
- Stec-8: Stecyvka, sunken building 8; Petrov 1963b:216; 217 fig. 3/3.
- Stec-9: Stecyvka, sunken building 9; Petrov 1963b:216, 218; 221 fig. 4/1; 223 fig. 5/1, 2, 4; 224 fig. 6/2.
- Stec-10: Stecyvka, sunken building 10; Petrov 1963b:218; 221 fig. 4/2.
- Stec-11: Stecyvka, sunken building 11; Petrov 1963b:218; 221 fig. 4/3; 222 fig. 6/6; 223 fig. 8; Prihodniuk 1980:57 fig. 34.
- Strau-8: Bucharest-Străulești, sunken building 8; Constantiniu 1965b:174, 176, 184, 187; 178 fig. 85/2-3.

Appendix A

- Strau-9: Bucharest-Străulești, sunken building 9; Constantiniu 1963:83-4; 83 fig. 6.
- Strau-17: Bucharest-Străulești, sunken building 17; Constantiniu 1963:84, 96; 85 fig. 7b.
- Strau-21: Bucharest-Străulești, sunken building 21; Constantiniu 1965b:174, 176, 182, 186; 180 fig. 87/4.
- Suce-2: Suceava-Șipot, sunken building 2; Matei 1962:151-8; 152 fig. 2; 156 figs. 4-5; 157 fig. 6.
- Suce-4: Suceava-Șipot, sunken building 4; Teodor 1970:381-2; 380 fig. 5.
- Targ-5: Târgșor, sunken building 5; Constantinescu 1960:168-72; 169 pl. 1; 170 fig. 2; 171 fig. 3; 173 fig. 4.
- Tere-21: Teremcy, sunken building 21; Baran 1988a:72; 73 fig. 33.
- Ude-P2: Udești, pit 2; Matei and Rădulescu 1973:274-5, 277; 274 fig. 7/1,3,4; 275 fig. 8/2.
- Vana-2: Vânători-Neamț, sunken building 2; Corman 1994:302, 307; 303 fig. 2/L 2; 304 fig. 3/1-4, 6; 305 fig. 4/1-4, 6-7; 306 fig. 5.
- Vaca: Bucharest-Văcărești, sunken building 3; Turcu and Ciuceanu 1992:199-200; 198 pl. 1/10, 11 a-b.

Appendix B

HANDMADE AND WHEELMADE POTS USED FOR SHAPE ANALYSIS

Abbreviations used in the following list are those of figs. 65 and 66.

- Bacău-1: Bacău (Romania), sunken building 1; Mitrea and Artimon 1971:241 fig. 12/1.
Bacău-2a: Bacău (Romania), sunken building 2; Mitrea and Artimon 1971:241 fig. 12/2.
Bacău-2b: Bacău (Romania), sunken building 2; Mitrea and Artimon 1971:241 fig. 12/4.
Bacău-4: Bacău (Romania), sunken building 4; Mitrea and Artimon 1971:241 fig. 12/3.
Bane: Bucharest-Băneasa (Romania), settlement find; Constantiniu 1965a:90 fig. 15.
Bist-30: Bistrița (Romania) grave 30; Gaiu 1992:117 fig. 2/23.
Bist-47: Bistrița (Romania), grave 47; Gaiu 1992:119 fig. 4/1.
Boto-1: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 1; Teodor 1984a:117 fig. 38/1.
Boto-5: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 5; Teodor 1984a:117 fig. 38/4.
Boto-9a: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 9; Teodor 1984a:117 fig. 38/2.
Boto-9b: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 9; Teodor 1984a:117 fig. 38/5.
Boto-9c: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 9; Teodor 1984a:117 fig. 38/7.
Boto-9d: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 9; Teodor 1984a:125 fig. 46.
Boto-12: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 12; Teodor 1984a:111 fig. 32/4.
Boto-16: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 16; Teodor 1984a:120 fig. 41/2.
Boto-19: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 19; Teodor 1984a:120 fig. 41/1.

Appendix B

- Boto-20a: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 20; Teodor 1984a:127 fig. 48/1.
Boto-20b: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 20; Teodor 1984a:99 fig. 20/4.
Boto-23a: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 23; Teodor 1984a:111 fig. 32/1.
Boto-23b: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 23; Teodor 1984a:121 fig. 42/2.
Boto-25: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 25; Teodor 1984a:121 fig. 42/1.
Boto-27: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 27; Teodor 1984a:121 fig. 42/4.
Boto-31: Botoșana, Suceava district (Romania), sunken building 31; Teodor 1984a:121 fig. 42/5.
Bozieni: Bozieni, Buzău district (Romania), settlement find; Teodorescu 1971:128 fig. 4/4.
Capi: Capidava, Constanța district (Romania) stray find; Scorpan 1968:fig. 22b.
Ciur-1Aa: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 1A; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:186 fig. 1/5.
Ciur-1Ab: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 1A; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:187 fig. 2/3.
Ciur-1B: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 1B; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:193 fig. 8/3.
Ciur-2Aa: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 2A; Morintz 1961:660 fig. 2/1.
Ciur-2Ab: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 2A; Morintz 1961:660 fig. 2/2.
Ciur-2Ac: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 2A; Morintz 1961:660 fig. 2/3.
Ciur-2Ad: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 2A; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:191 fig. 6/1.
Ciur-2B: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 2B; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:194 fig. 10.
Ciur-3a: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 3; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:196 fig. 12/1.
Ciur-3b: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 3; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:195 fig. 11/1.
Ciur-3c: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 3; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:195 fig. 11/6.
Ciur-3d: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 3; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:195 fig. 11/11.
Ciur-4a: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 4; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:198 fig. 14/1.

Appendix B

Ciur-4b: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 4; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:199 fig. 15/1.
 Ciur-4c: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 4; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:197 fig. 13/13.
 Ciur-5a: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 5; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:201 fig. 17/1.
 Ciur-5b: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 5; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:200 fig. 17/1.
 Ciur-6: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 6; Morintz and Roman 1962:759 fig. 4/6.
 Ciur-8a: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 8; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:205 fig. 22/1.
 Ciur-8b: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), sunken building 8; Dolinescu-Ferche 1979:203 fig. 20/1.
 Ciurel 1: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), settlement find; Comşa 1972:10 fig. 1/10.
 Ciurel 2: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), settlement find; Comşa 1972:11 fig. 2/2.
 Ciurel 3: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), settlement find; Teodor 1972:32 fig. 3/7.
 Ciurel 4: Bucharest-Ciurel (Romania), settlement find; Morintz and Roman 1962:765 fig. 4/1.
 Craiova: Craiova (Romania), stray find; Toropu 1976:209.
 Cuco-4a: Cucorăni, Botoşani district (Romania), sunken building 4; Teodor 1975:198 fig. 59/6.
 Dămă-1: Bucharest-Dămăroaia (Romania), settlement find; Rosetti 1934:210 fig. 5/1.
 Dămă-2: Bucharest-Dămăroaia (Romania), settlement find; Rosetti 1934:210 fig. 5/4.
 Davi-12: Davideni, Neamţ district (Romania), sunken building 12; Mitrea 1974-6:fig. 11/1.
 Davi-26: Davideni, Neamţ district (Romania), sunken building 26; Mitrea 1992:fig. 7/4.
 Davi-39a: Davideni, Neamţ district (Romania), sunken building 39; Mitrea 1994:316 fig. 19/1.
 Davi-39b: Davideni, Neamţ district (Romania), sunken building 39; Mitrea 1994:316 fig. 19/4.
 Davi-40: Davideni, Neamţ district (Romania), sunken building 40; Mitrea 1994:316 fig. 19/3.
 Dod-1: Dodeşti, Vaslui district (Romania), sunken building 1; Teodor 1984b:42 fig. 15/6.
 Dod-3: Dodeşti, Vaslui district (Romania), sunken building 3; Teodor 1984b:42 fig. 15/1.
 Gheor: Sfântu Gheorghe-Iernut, Mureş district (Romania), settlement find; Vlassa et al. 1966:405 fig. 6/9.

Appendix B

Ghiv-4a: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania), sunken building 4; Constantiniu and Dolinescu-Ferche 1981:103 fig. 2/7.
 Ghiv-4b: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania), sunken building 4; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:103 fig. 2/9.
 Ghiv-7a: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania), sunken building 7; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:298 fig. 4/6.
 Ghiv-7b: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania), sunken building 7; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:298 fig. 4/9.
 Ghiv-7c: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania), sunken building 7; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:298 fig. 4/2.
 Ghiv-11a: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania), sunken building 11; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:298 fig. 4/4.
 Ghiv-11b: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania), sunken building 11; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:300 fig. 5/3.
 Ghiv-12: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania), sunken building 12; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:298 fig. 4/7.
 Ghiv-14: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania), sunken building 14; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:298 fig. 4/8.
 Ghiv-16a: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania), sunken building 16; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:300 fig. 5/5.
 Ghiv-16b: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania), sunken building 16; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:300 fig. 5/4.
 Ghiv-16c: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania), sunken building 16; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:298 fig. 4/1.
 Ghiv-16d: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania), sunken building 16; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:300 fig. 5/6.
 Ghiv-16e: Bucharest-Soldat Ghivan Street (Romania), sunken building 16; Dolinescu-Ferche and Constantiniu 1981:298 fig. 4/10.
 Horga: Horga, Vaslui district (Romania), sunken building; Coman 1971b:fig. 2/2.
 Iaşi: Iaşi-Crucea lui Ferent (Romania), sunken building 1; Teodor 1971:128 fig. 4/11.
 Kor-1: Korchak IX, Zhytomyr region (Ukraine), sunken building 1; Rusanova 1973b:pl. 8/7.
 Kor-4a: Korchak IX, Zhytomyr region (Ukraine), sunken building 4; Rusanova 1973b:pl. 8/17.
 Kor-4b: Korchak IX, Zhytomyr region (Ukraine), sunken building 4; Rusanova 1973b:pl. 8/18.
 Kor-5: Korchak IX, Zhytomyr region (Ukraine), sunken building 5; Rusanova 1973b:pl. 9/1.
 Kor-7: Korchak IX, Zhytomyr region (Ukraine), sunken building 7; Rusanova 1973b:pl. 9/16.
 Kor-M: Korchak IX, Zhytomyr region (Ukraine), grave; Rusanova 1973b:pl. 9/20.

Appendix B

Malu-1: Malu Roșu-Fierbinți, Ialomița district (Romania), sunken building; Filipescu 1984:130 pl. 1/1.

Malu-2: Malu Roșu-Fierbinți, Ialomița district (Romania), sunken building; Filipescu 1984:130 pl. 1/2.

Mili-1: Bucharest-Militari, settlement find; Teodor 1972:36 fig. 5/10.

Mili-2: Bucharest-Militari (Romania), settlement find; Teodor 1972:30 fig. 1/3.

Mili-3: Bucharest-Militari (Romania), settlement find; Zirra and Cazimir 1963:67 fig. 15/1.

Rash-13: Rashkov III, Chernivtsi region (Ukraine), sunken building 13; Baran 1988a:151 pl. xxx/9.

Rash-22: Rashkov III, Chernivtsi region (Ukraine), sunken building 22; Baran 1988a:151 pl. xxxiii/3.

Rash-25: Rashkov III, Chernivtsi region (Ukraine), sunken building 35; Baran 1988a:152 pl. xxxv/1.

Rash-30: Rashkov III, Chernivtsi region (Ukraine), sunken building 30; Baran 1988a:152 pl. xxvi/1.

Sărat-1: Sărata-Monteoru, Buzău district (Romania), cemetery find; n.a. 1955b:510 fig. 11/1.

Seli-1: Seliște, Orhei district, settlement find (Moldova); Rafalovich and Lapushnian 1973:114 fig. 2/1.

Seli-2: Seliște, Orhei district, settlement find (Moldova); Rafalovich and Lapushnian 1973:133 fig. 10/1.

Seli-3: Seliște, Orhei district, settlement find (Moldova); Rafalovich and Lapushnian 1973:133 fig. 10/2.

Seli-4: Seliște, Orhei district, settlement find (Moldova); Rafalovich and Lapushnian 1973:133 fig. 10/3.

Seli-5: Seliște, Orhei district, settlement find (Moldova); Rafalovich 1974:126 fig. 8/1.

Seli-12a: Seliște, Orhei district, sunken building 12 (Moldova); archaeological report in the archives of the Archaeological Institute in Chișinău.

Seli-12b: Seliște, Orhei district, sunken building 12 (Moldova); archaeological report in the archives of the Archaeological Institute in Chișinău.

Seli-12c: Seliște, Orhei district, sunken building 12 (Moldova); archaeological report in the archives of the Archaeological Institute in Chișinău.

Seli-16a: Seliște, Orhei district, sunken building 16 (Moldova); Rafalovich 1974:126 fig. 8/2.

Seli-16b: Seliște, Orhei district, sunken building 16 (Moldova); Rafalovich 1974:126 fig. 8/3.

Seli-P73: Seliște, Orhei district, pit 73 (Moldova); Rafalovich 1974:126 fig. 8/4.

Strău 1: Bucharest-Străulești (Romania), settlement find; Teodor 1972:fig. 4/1.

Strău 2: Bucharest-Străulești (Romania), settlement find; Teodor 1972:fig. 32/2.

Strău 3: Bucharest-Străulești (Romania), settlement find; Teodor 1972:fig. 32/3.

Appendix B

Strău 4: Bucharest-Străulești (Romania), settlement find; Teodor 1972:fig. 32/4.

Strău 5: Bucharest-Străulești (Romania), settlement find; Teodor 1972:fig. 32/6.

Strău 6: Bucharest-Străulești (Romania), settlement find; Teodor 1972:fig. 32/8.

Uzhho: Uzhhorod-Halaho, Zakarpatska region (Ukraine), sunken building; Peniak 1980:34 fig. 10/2.

Uzhho-1: Uzhhorod-Halaho, Zakarpatska region (Ukraine), grave 1; Peniak 1980:34 fig. 10/1.