

LITERATUROZNAWSTWO. FOLKLOR*Georgios Kardaras*

Institute of Historical Research,

National Hellenic Research Foundation, Athens

**SCLAVENI AND ANTES.
SOME NOTES
ON THE PECULIARITIES BETWEEN THEM*****Склавины и анты: некоторые замечания об их особенностях**

ABSTRACT: The paper attempts to approach some peculiarities of the two branches of the early Slavs (Sclaveni and Antes), as the Byzantine sources of the sixth and early seventh centuries present them as being similar. Within this context the following are examined: a) the origin and ethnic identity of the Sclaveni and the Antes, taking into account certain historiographical models on the early Slavs, as well as the controversial issue of the ethnic identity of the Antes (Slavic or Iranian) and the etymology of their name; b) the material culture: under consideration are the Prague and Penkovka cultures, identified with the Sclaveni and the Antes respectively, their common elements and peculiarities, their mutual influences as well as influences from other cultures; c) the political and social organization: the internal structures of the Sclaveni and the Antes, taking into account the testimony of Jordanes, Procopius and Maurice, the references in other sources to the titles of chieftains, or a kind of genealogy into the early Slavic society, as well as the treaty of Byzantium with the tribal union of the Antes are under scrutiny. The paper draws the conclusion that the Sclaveni and the Antes shared similarities, but actually were not one and the same at all, as it appears in the Byzantine sources. Furthermore, the peculiarities that appear the political-social organization and the material culture of the Antes, due to their historical and cultural evolution, are not of a degree that could dispute their Slavic ethnic and cultural identity.

KEYWORDS: early Slavs, Sclaveni, Antes, Eastern Europe, ethnogenesis

* It has to be noted that the research for the present paper has been implemented at the Institute for Advanced Study at Moscow State Pedagogical University, 1/1, M. Pirogovskaya St. Moscow 11991, Russian Federation.

Investigating the history and culture of the early Slavs, scholars deal with two peoples referred to in the sources as the Sclaveni and the Antes. The sources of the sixth and early seventh century (Jordanes, Procopius, *Strategikon* of Maurice) attribute common origin and features to both of them. However, there is a lack of a comparative approach to the features of these peoples, who were the two branches of the early Slavs, which could promote certain peculiarities and specific characteristics to the image of similarity provided by the ethnographic accounts of Procopius and Maurice. Within this context, we could closely examine three main issues:

A) Origin and ethnic identity

As the Antes disappeared from the written sources in 602, the name *Sclaveni* became a synonym to the early Slavs while the Antes remained for long time a “neglected people” in literature.¹ A view typical of historiography is the identification of the Sclaveni with the Western Slavs and the Antes with the Eastern (or Eastern and Southern) Slavs. This idea was introduced in the 19th c. (J.-K. Zeuss, P.-J. Šafarik) and has been maintained by modern scholars.² However, the ethnic identity of the Antes remains a very controversial issue. Although it is widely accepted that after their formation the Antes were a Slavic people – as mentioned in the written sources – discussion continues as to their Slavic or Caucasian origin – namely either Circassian or Iranian (Ossetian/Alanic) – considering also the etymology of the name *Antes*. The view on the Iranian origin was promoted by many scholars, such as N. Županić, G. Vernadsky, R. Werner, G. Schramm, O. Bubenok, etc.³ Besides this, the German origin of the Antes was supported

¹ See recently B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes: Eastern ‘Brothers’ of the Sclavenes?* [in:] F. Curta (ed.), *Neglected Barbarians*, Turnhut: Brepols 2010, pp. 53–82; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes. Ιστορία και πολιτισμός (4ος-8ος αι.)*, Athens: EIE/ΠΕ, 2016.

² See D.A. Mačinskij, *Die älteste zuverlässige urkundliche Erwähnung der Slawen und der Versuch, sie mit den archäologischen Daten zu vergleichen*, “Ethnologia Slavica” 1974, nr 6, p. 57; R. Werner, *Zur Herkunft der Anten. Ein ethnisches und soziales Problem der Spätantike*, [in:] W. Eck, H. Galsterer, H. Wolff (eds.), *Studien zur Antiken Sozialgeschichte. Festschrift F. Vittinghoff*, Köln – Wien: Böhlau 1980, p. 582; A.M. Schenker, *The Dawn of Slavic. An Introduction to Slavic Philology*, New Haven – London: Yale University Press 1996, p. 9; C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit des Ostslaventums*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1992, pp. 11–12; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 53–54. G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, p. 19.

³ N. Županić, *Der Anten Ursprung und Name*, [in:] A. Orlandos (ed.), *Actes du III^e Congrès International des Études Byzantines (Athènes, Octobre 1930)*, Athens: Hestia 1932, pp. 331–339; idem, *Boz, rex Antorum. Historično-etnološki donesek k prvemu zgodovinskemu dejanju Slovanov*, “Situla” 1961, nr 4, pp. 101, 118; G. Vernadsky, *On the Origins of Antae*, “Journal of the American Oriental Society” 1939, nr 59, pp. 56–66; R. Werner, *Herkunft*, pp. 583–590; G. Schramm, *Venedi, Antes, Sclaveni, Sclavi: Frühe Sammelbezeichnungen für slawische Stämme und ihr geschichtlicher*

by B. Strumins'kiy, who assumed that the etymology of certain known Antic anthroponyms (Dabragezas, Kelagastos, Mezameros and Usigardos) is related to Ostrogothic influences. On the other hand, the names Idarizios and Chilbudius are thought to be Iranian, Slavic or Germanic.⁴ According to R. Werner's point of view about the coexistence of Alans and Slavs, those anthroponyms prove that the ruling class of the Antes had either Iranian (Mezameros, Idarizios) or Slavic (Dabragezas, Kelagastos) names.⁵ The name of the Antic king Boz is also considered to be Slavic or Iranian.⁶ Furthermore, in historiography we remark the interrelation of the Antes either with the Kievan Rus'⁷ or with the modern-day Ukrainians.⁸ In the study of the Ukrainian scholar M. Braychevs'kiy a theory was developed, though without significant impact, that the Antes in *Strategikon* of Maurice (early sixth/early seventh c.) are not identical with those in the accounts of Procopius, Menander the Guardsman, Theophylact Simocatta.⁹

Hintergrund, "Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas" 1995, nr 43, pp. 172–175; O.Б. Бубенок, *Анти: слов'яни чи іранці?*, "Східний світ" 2005, nr 2, pp. 9–33; See also C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, p. 12; A.M. Schenker, *Slavic Philology*, p. 9; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 53–55, 61–62; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, pp. 20–22.

⁴ B. Strumins'kiy, *Were the Antes Eastern Slavs?*, [in:] I. Shevchenko, F. E. Sysyn (eds., with the assistance of U. M. Pasiecznyk), *Eucharisterion: Essays presented to Omeljan Pritsak on his Sixtieth Birthday by his Colleagues and Students, Harvard Ukrainian Studies 3/4, 1979–1980*, pp. 786–796; G. Schramm, *Venedi*, pp. 175–176; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, p. 29.

⁵ R. Werner, *Herkunft*, p. 590; On the etymology of the Antic anthroponyms see also H. Ditten, *Slawen im byzantinischen Heer von Justinian I. bis Justinian II.*, [in:] H. Köpstein, F. Winkelmann (eds.), *Studien zum 7. Jahrhundert in Byzanz. Probleme der Herausbildung des Feudalismus*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag 1976, pp. 79–80; M.В. Грацианский, *О происхождении этнонима «анты»*, "Византийский временник" 2012, nr 71 (96), p. 32.

⁶ See N. Županić, *Boz*, pp. 103–115, 118–122 (old turcic/hunnic etymology); B. Strumins'kiy, *Eastern Slavs*, pp. 788–789; R. Werner, *Herkunft*, p. 590; G. Schramm, *Venedi*, pp. 175–176; A. Łukaszewicz, *De Sclavinis et slavivis...* "Dialogues d'Histoire Ancienne" 1998, nr 24/2, p. 130; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, p. 64; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, p. 55.

⁷ Б.А. Рыбаков, *Анты и Киевская Русь*, "Вестник древней истории" 1939 nr 1, pp. 319–337; А.Д. Удальцов, *Основные вопросы этногенеза славян*, "Советская этнография" 1947, nr 6–7, pp. 3–13; See also М.Ю. Брайчевський, *Антська проблема в контексті візантійської історії*, "Археологія" 1991, nr 2, p. 123; В.В. Седов, *Анты*, [in:] В.В. Кропоткин et al. (ed.), *Проблемы советской археологии* [сборник статей], Москва: Институт археологии АН СССР 1978, p. 165; C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, p. 151; R. Werner, *Herkunft*, pp. 582–583; D. Schorkowitz, *Die Herkunft der Ostslaven und die Anfänge des Kiever Reiches in der postsowjetischen Revision*, "Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas" 2000, nr 48, p. 575; F. Curta, *Archaeology of Identities in Old Russia (ca. 500 to ca. 650)*, "Russian History" 2007, nr 34, pp. 32–33; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 54, 57, 79; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, p. 23–24.

⁸ М. Грушевський, *Анти (Avrai, Antes)*, "уринок з історії України – Руси. Записки Наукового Товариства імені Шевченка" 1898, nr 21, pp. 1–16, a view followed by many modern Ukrainian scholars; F. Curta, *Old Russia*, p. 33; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 56, 60; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, p. 22.

⁹ М.Ю. Брайчевський, *Об "антах" Псевдомаврикия*, "Советская этнография" 1953, nr 2, pp. 21–36; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, pp. 71–72.

Regarding the tribal names, it is believed that the name *Sclaveni* concerns self-determination, while that of the Antes was given to them by others. The ethnonym of the former occurs initially in sixth century sources (*Sclavi*, *Sclaveni*, *Sclavini* etc.), in order to describe a people appeared north of the Lower Danube after the year 500. These various forms are most likely linked to a tribal name used for self-determination. According to this point of view, the Slavs called themselves *Slovani* (those who speak). For the etymology of their name the words *slava* (honour, glory) and – more often – *slovo* (word) are proposed.¹⁰ However, certain scholars dispute the case of the self-determination for the name *Sclaveni* and attribute its provenance to the Germanic or nomadic peoples.¹¹ For the name *Antes*, the Byzantines used it either for a union of Slavs and Iranian-speaking peoples,¹² or the eastern Slavic tribes¹³ (even more precisely in the Dnieper basin)¹⁴ or even as a term related to political entity and not to ethnically homogeneous people.¹⁵ The scholars considered the tribal union¹⁶ of the Antes as a political union of Eastern

¹⁰ P.M. Barford, *The Early Slavs. Culture and Society in Early Medieval Eastern Europe*, New York: Cornell University Press 2001, pp. 28–29; S. Brather, *Archäologie der westlichen Slawen. Siedlung, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im früh- und hochmittelalterlichen Ostmitteleuropa*, Berlin–New York: W. de Gruyter 2008, pp. 51–52; A. Buko, *The Archaeology of Early Medieval Poland. Discoveries – Hypotheses – Interpretations*, Leiden–Boston: Brill 2008, p. 59; On the name of the Slavs in the Byzantine sources see G. Weiss, A. Katsanakis, *Das Ethnikon Sklabenoi, Sklaboi in den griechischen Quellen bis 1025*, Stuttgart: F. Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden, 1988; J. Koder, *Anmerkungen zum Slawen-Namen in byzantinischen Quellen*, “Travaux et Mémoires” 2002, nr 14 [Mélanges G. Dagron], pp. 333–346; On the Old Slavic language see H. Lunt, *On Common Slavic*, “Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku” 1984–85, nr 27–28, pp. 417–422; C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, p. 87–94.

¹¹ C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, p. 13; D. Schorkowitz, *Revision*, pp. 575–576; P.B. Терпиловский, *Славяне Поднепровья в первой половине I тыс. н.э. (Slavs in the Dnieper Region in the first half of the first millennium A. D.)*, Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS 2004, p. 135; A. Łukaszewicz, *De Sclavinis*, pp. 131–135; See also, G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, pp. 39, 54.

¹² O.B. Бубенок, *Алани-аси у складі середньовічних етнополітичних об'єднань Євразійського степу*, Київ 2006, p. 22; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, p. 61.

¹³ Б.А. Рыбаков, *Анты и Киевская Русь*, “Вестник древней истории” 1939, nr 1, pp. 319–337; Cs. Bálint, *Die Archäologie der Steppe. Steppenvölker zwischen Wolga und Donau vom 6. bis zum 9. Jahrhundert*, Wien – Köln: Böhlau 1989, p. 87; C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, p. 151.

¹⁴ A. Bolşanov-Gimbu, *La localisation de la forteresse Turrus*, “RESEE” 1969, nr 7/4, p. 688; L. Waldmüller, *Die ersten Begegnungen der Slawen mit dem Christentum und den christlichen Völkern vom 6. bis 8. Jahrhundert. Die Slawen zwischen Byzanz und Abendland*, Amsterdam: A.M. Hakker 1976, pp. 568–569.

¹⁵ B.J. Darden, *Who were the Sclaveni and where did they come from?*, “Byzantinische Forschungen” 2004, nr 28, p. 143–144; See also C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, p. 12; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, p. 82; А.П. Моця, *Анты за Дунаєм*, “Stratum plus” 2011, nr 5, p. 38; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, p. 54.

¹⁶ The term “tribal union”, or a similar one, use many scholars: see L. Waldmüller, *Begegnungen*, p. 299 (tribal confederation); Ch. Bonev, *Les Antes et Byzance*, “Études Balkaniques” 1983, nr 19/3, p. 111; Г.Г. Литаврин, *О двух Хилбудах Прокопия Кесарийского*, “Византийский временник” 1986, nr 47, pp. 27–28.

Slavic tribes,¹⁷ or a political-social one, located between the Rivers Danube, Dnieper and Dniester, namely north of the nomadic tribes.¹⁸ These views could be justified at least from Procopius' account on a *great number of tribes* to the Antes.¹⁹ According to C. Goehrke, the consideration of the name *Antes* not as an ethnonym but as a name for a loose political union explains why the Antes left no traces in the later ethnonyms after they had disappeared from the written sources in the early seventh century.²⁰

For the settlement area of the Sclaveni and the Antes we derive information from Jordanes – probably an eye-witness of the events at the Lower Danube – and Procopius. Both authors consider them as branches of the same people but distinguish them as separate political entities. According to Jordanes, the Sclaveni were living in forests and swamps between Vistula, Dniester and Noviodunum, while the Antes between the Dniester and Dnieper (namely in the forest-steppe zone). On the other hand, Procopius states that the Antes were living north of the Utigurs and also that the Antes and Sclaveni had already settled to the northern bank of the Lower Danube.²¹ Plausibly, Procopius had direct information from the Antes (as well as the Sclaveni) soldiers served in Constantinople or in Italy under Belisarius.²² Furthermore, there are reservations regarding the direct knowledge that Jordanes and Procopius had about the settlement area of the Antes and the credibility is given only to Procopius' testimony on the contacts of the Antes with Byzantium.²³

¹⁷ О.М. Приходнюк, *Анти та Візантія*, “Археологія” 1991, nr 2, pp. 134, 136, 140–141; idem, *Пеньковская культура. культурно-археологический аспект исследования*, Воронеж: Воронежский Университет 1998, p. 77; idem, *Степове населення України та східні слов'яни (друга половина I тис. н. е.)*, Київ – Чернівці: Інститут Археології НАНУ 2001, pp. 49, 58.

¹⁸ М.Ю. Брайчевський, *Об “антах”*, p. 36; idem, *Антська проблема*, pp. 126, 129; See also B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 61, 82; G. Kardaras, *Οι Άντες*, pp. 54–55.

¹⁹ Procopius, *Wars*, J. Hauriy-G. Wirth (ed.), Leipzig: Teubner 1962–1963, VIII, 4. 9, p. 501; G. Vernadsky, *Antae*, p. 58; О.М. Приходнюк, *Візантія*, p. 136; G. Kardaras, *Οι Άντες*, p. 55.

²⁰ C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, p. 13. G. Kardaras, *Οι Άντες*, p. 55.

²¹ Jordanes, *Getica*, Th. Mommsen (ed.), [MGH AA V/1], Berlin: Weidmann 1882, V 35, p. 63; Procopius, *Wars*, VIII, 4. 8–9, p. 501; В.В. Седов, *Анты*, p. 164; G. Schramm, *Venedi*, pp. 169, 172; B.J. Darden, *Sclaveni*, pp. 143, 152–153; P.M. Barford, *Early Slavs*, pp. 35, 50; F. Curta, *The Making of the Slavs: History and Archaeology of the Lower Danube Region, c. 500–700*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2001, p. 39; T. Živković, *Forging Unity. The South Slavs Between East and West: 550–1150*, Belgrad: Institute of History 2007, p. 34; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 63–65; M. Kazanski, *The Land of the Antes according to Jordanes and Procopius*, [in:] F. Curta, B.-P. Maleon (eds.), *The Steppe Lands and the World beyond them: Studies in honor of Victor Spinei on his 70th birthday*, Iași: Editura Universității “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” 2013, pp. 35, 37–39; G. Kardaras, *Οι Άντες*, pp. 49–50.

²² F.E. Shlosser, *The Slavs in Sixth-Century Byzantine Sources*, “Byzantinoslavica” 2003, nr 61, p. 76; T. Živković, *Forging Unity*, pp. 51, 58; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, p. 64.

²³ R. Werner, *Herkunft*, p. 579; See also F. Curta, *The North-western Region of the Black Sea during the 6th and early 7th Century A.D.*, “Ancient West and East” 2008, nr 7, pp. 149–151; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, p. 65; G. Kardaras, *Οι Άντες*, p. 53.

According to G. Schramm, the source of Procopius about the geographical location of the Antes was the delegation of the Tetraxites Goths to Constantinople dating back to 548,²⁴ while B.J. Darden assumes that Jordanes' source on the Sclaveni were the amber merchants who traveled through their regions.²⁵

About half a century later,²⁶ Maurice presents a more detailed and better structured image of the early Slavs in the eleventh chapter of *Strategikon*. Similar to Procopius, Maurice considers the *Sklavoi* and the *Antes* as two peoples with common morals and customs, and counts them among the possible enemies of Byzantium. Besides the way the operations against them should be done, the chapter describes their way of life, their desire for freedom, dislike for the imposing any power on them, the hard conditions of life, the agricultural character of their society, their attitude towards the foreigners, the art of war, etc.²⁷

B) Material culture

Regarding the material culture, a pattern accepted by most scholars is the identification of the Sclaveni with Prague culture and the Antes with Penkovka,²⁸ while others associate the Kolochin culture with the Venethi.²⁹ The three early Slavic cultures developed in the second half of the fifth c. in the forest-steppe zone

²⁴ G. Schramm, *Venedi*, p. 176.

²⁵ B.J. Darden, *Sclaveni*, p. 153; See also G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, pp. 53–54.

²⁶ On the date of *Strategikon* see F.E. Shlosser, *Sources*, pp. 81–82.

²⁷ Maurice, *Strategikon*, G.T. Dennis, E. Gamillscheg (ed.), Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften 1981, XI, 4, pp. 370–386; L. Waldmüller, *Begegnungen*, pp. 22–28; M. Kazanski, *L'armement Slave du Haut Moyen-Age (Ve–VIIe siècles). À propos des chefs militaires et des guerriers professionnels chez les anciens Slaves*, “Přehled Výzkumů” 1995–1996, nr 39, p. 197; F. Curta, *Slavs*, pp. 50–52, 325, 346–347; T. Živković, *Forging Unity*, pp. 32–34, 46, 51, 57–58; S. Dolinnescu-Ferche, *Les rapports des Slaves et des autochtones au Bas-Danube (VIe siècle de n.è.) à la lumière de l'archéologie et des sources écrites*, [in:] B. Chropovský (ed.), *Rapports du III-e Congrès International d'Archéologie Slave (Bratislava 7–14 Septembre 1975, vol. I–II)*, Bratislava: VEDA 1979–1980, I, pp. 172–174; М.Ю. Брайчевський, *Об “антах”*, pp. 22–24, 29–31; F.E. Shlosser, *Sources*, pp. 78–79; А.П. Моця, *Анты за Дунаєм*, p. 39; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, pp. 67–68.

²⁸ В.В. Седов, *Анты*, pp. 165, 171; В.Д. Баран, *Венеди, склавини, та анти у світлі археологічних джерел*, [in:] В.В. Седов (ed.), *Труди VI Міжнародного Конгресу славянської археології (Новгород 26–31 августа 1996)*, Том. I–V, Москва: Институт Археологии РАН 1997–1999, I, p. 156; О.М. Приходнюк, *Візантія*, pp. 136–137; idem, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 14, 77; S. Brather, *Ethnische Interpretationen in der Frühgeschichtliche Archaeologie. Geschichte, Grundlagen und Alternativen*, Berlin: W. de Gruyter 2004, pp. 186–187; See also B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, p. 58; M. Kazanski, *Land*, pp. 35, 40; idem, *Middle Dnieper*, pp. 772.

²⁹ P.B. Терпиловский, *Славяне Поднепровья*, pp. 134–135; M. Shchukin, M. Kazanski, O. Sharov, *Des les goths aux huns: Le nord de la mer noire au Bas-empire et a l'epoque des grandes migrations*, Oxford: John and Erica Hedges Ltd 2006, p. 153.

and the southern part of the forest zone. In all of them dominate small unfortified settlements, square sunken huts, handmade and unornamented pottery as well as cremation in the burial customs, finds that reflect agricultural and the so-called “egalitarian” early Slavic society.³⁰ In the written sources, apart from Procopius’ short record,³¹ valuable information on the early Slavic settlements occurs in the *Strategikon* of Maurice, namely that their *villages* (the firsts, the middle or the big ones) were beside rivers, close to each other and with easy access to the forests.³²

Considering the formation of the early Slavic cultures, a continuity can be observed between them and two earlier cultures, the late Zarubintsi (first–second c.) and the Kiev (third–fifth c.) respectively, which appeared to an area surrounded by many rivers (Dnieper, Sozh, Desna, Seim, Psel, Vorskla, Teteriv, Irpen, Stugna, Pripet, Donets and Oskol). These cultures included, among others, handmade – usually undecorated – pottery, subterranean dwellings and cremation. The populations of the Zarubintsi and Kiev cultures were heterogeneous and related to the bearers of different cultures (Przeworsk, Wielbark and Cherniakhov) who probably migrated to the aforementioned areas during the first centuries A.D.³³

³⁰ On the three early Slavic cultures (Kolochin, Penkovka and Prague) see K. Godłowski, *Zur Frage der Slawensitze vor der grossen Slawenwanderung im 6. Jahrhundert*, “Settimane di Studi del Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo” 1983, nr 30, pp. 257–284; C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, p. 14–25, 74–78; В.В. Седов, *Этногенез славян в древности и начале средневековья*, [in:] *Труды VI*, vol. I, pp. 140–153; Р.В. Терпиловский, *Некоторые дискуссионные проблемы археологии и истории ранних Славян*, “Stratum plus” 2001–2002, nr 5, pp. 420–430; M. Shchukin, M. Kazanski, O. Sharov, *Mer noire*, p. 153–156; И.О. Гавритухин, *Понятие пражской культуры*, “Труды Государственного Эрмитажа” 2009, nr 49, pp. 7–25; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 67–76; M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, p. 774; А.М. Обломский, *Колочинская культура*, [in:] И.О. Гавритухин, Н.В. Лопатин, А.М. Обломский (eds.), *Раннесредневековые древности лесной зоны Восточной Европы (V–VII вв.)*, Москва: Институт Археологии РАН 2016, pp. 10–113; ibidem, С.А. Горбаненко, *Сельское хозяйство населения колочинской культуры*, pp. 114–135; See also О.М. Приходнюк, *Пеньковская культура*; P.M. Barford, *Early Slavs*.

³¹ Procopius, *Wars*, VII, 14. 24 and 29–30, p. 358; S. Dolinescu-Ferche, *Bas-Danube*, p. 172; F. Curta, *Slavs*, p. 38; Т. Živković, *Forging Unity*, p. 33.

³² Maurice, *Strategikon*, XI, 4, p. 372, 382, 384; М.Ю. Брайчевский, *Об “антах”*, p. 30; В.В. Седов, *Анты*, p. 166; S. Dolinescu-Ferche, *Bas-Danube*, p. 172; В.Д. Баран, *склавіни*, p. 156; О.М. Приходнюк, *Степове населення*, p. 54; Т. Živković, *Forging Unity*, p. 33; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, pp. 128–129.

³³ В.Д. Баран, *склавіни*, pp. 158–159; О.М. Приходнюк, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 13–14, 16, 72; C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, pp. 16–18, 76–78; M. Kazanski, *Les relations entre les Slaves et les Goths du IIIe au Ve siècle: l’apport de l’archéologie*, “Revue des Études Slaves” 1993, nr 65/1, p. 8, 11, 14–15; А.М. Oblomski, O.V. Petrauskas, R.V. Terpilovski, *Environmental reasons of migrations of the south-eastern Europe population in the 1st-5th centuries A.D.*, “Archaeologia Polona” 1999, nr 37, pp. 71–86; D. Schorkowitz, *Revision*, pp. 574–575; Т.В. Томашевич, *Об особенностях могильников киевской культуры*, “Stratum plus” 2001–2002, nr 4, pp. 343–348; Терпиловский, *Славяне Поднепровья*, pp. 121–130, 135; idem, *Некоторые дискуссионные проблемы археологии и истории ранних славян*, “Stratum plus” 2001–2002, nr 5, pp. 420–430; M. Shchukin, M. Kazanski, O. Sharov, *Mer*

In accepting the model Sclaveni-Prague and Antes-Penkovka, we could attempt to record the peculiarities between these two early Slavic cultures. While it is a common view that Prague was a pure Slavic culture, only part of scholars assumes the same for Penkovka.³⁴ The latter is dated from the late fifth to the late seventh/early eighth century³⁵ and covered the area between the Lower Danube and the Rivers Orel and Donets, within its five zones.³⁶

Starting from the cultural background, Penkovka accepted influences from the Gothic Cherniakhov culture (c. 250–450 A.D.) as well as the nomadic cultures of the steppe – however these influences were often overestimated and paved the way for various theories. In the Soviet era, the Sclaveni and the Antes were correlated to Cherniakhov – a supposed Slavic culture which lasted up to the sixth, or even the eighth century –, a view hardly supported any more.³⁷ Actually, the influences of Cherniakhov on Penkovka – the latter replaced the former in the forest-steppe zone –, were not so essential for its formation, as the finds of the former in Penkovka settlements concern mainly the so-called grey pottery and bone combs.³⁸ Limited influences from Cherniakhov, namely grey pottery and certain fibulae, as

noire, pp. 153–154; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 59, 67–69; M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, p. 774; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, pp. 118–122; See also Н.В. Лопатин, А.Г. Фурасьев, *Северные рубежи раннеславянского мира в III–V вв. н.э.*, Москва: Институт Археологии РАН 2007.

³⁴ В.В. Седов, *Анты*, p. 173; В.Д. Баран, *склавіни*, p. 155; See also G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, pp. 24–25, 125.

³⁵ See C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, pp. 16, 24–26; О.М. Приходнюк, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 11–13, 40, 45–46, 60, 72–76; M. Shchukin, M. Kazanski, O. Sharov, *Mer noire*, pp. 153–155; P.В. Терпиловский, *Славяне Поднепровья*, pp. 130, 135; В.В. Седов, *Анты*, p. 173; М.Ю. Брайчевский, *Антська проблема*, p. 124; В.Д. Баран, *склавіни*, p. 160; D. Schorkowitz, *Revision*, p. 596; В.В. Приймак, *Некоторые дискуссионные вопросы изучения вольтынецких памятников между-речья Средней Десны и Средней Ворсклы*, “Stratum plus” 2001–2002, nr 5, pp. 438–447; M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, pp. 789–794, 820–821, 825; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, p. 123.

³⁶ В.В. Седов, *Анты*, pp. 164–166, 171; idem, *Этногенез*, pp. 142–143; R. Werner, *Herkunft*, p. 574, 578; Ch. Bonev, *Les Antes*, p. 113; C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, p. 16; G. Schramm, *Venedi*, pp. 176–177; О.М. Приходнюк, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 12–14, 21–22, 61–71, 145–160; P.M. Barford, *Early Slavs*, p. 63; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 69–70; M. Kazanski, *Land*, pp. 35, 40; idem, *Middle Dnieper*, p. 784; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, pp. 50–51.

³⁷ See М.Ю. Брайчевский, *Антська проблема*, pp. 126–128; D.A. Маџинский, *Erwähnung*, pp. 66–67; C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, pp. 14, 16, 70; В.В. Седов, *Этногенез*, pp. 142, 148; О.М. Приходнюк, *Der Schatz von Martynovka und seine ethnokulturelle Interpretation*, [in:] L.V. Pekars’ka – D. Kidd (eds.), *Der Silberschatz von Martynovka (Ukraine) aus dem 6. und 7. Jahrhundert*, Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag Wagner 1994, pp. 171–172 n. 64; idem, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 14, 19–20; F. Curta, *Old Russia*, p. 33; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 57–60; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, p. 24.

³⁸ K. Godłowski, *Slawensitze*, pp. 275–281; M. Kazanski, *Relations*, pp. 14–15; О.М. Приходнюк, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 13, 73; M. Shchukin, M. Kazanski, O. Sharov, *Mer noire*, pp. 25–51, 128–145, 153–156; See also C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, pp. 14, 69–73; В.В. Седов, *Этногенез*, pp. 143–144; В.Д. Баран, *склавіни*, pp. 159–160; D. Schorkowitz, *Revision*, pp. 595–596; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, p. 69; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, pp. 120–122.

well as from the Danube and the Baltic area, are also observed in the early Prague culture.³⁹ On the other hand, the view that Penkovka was a nomadic culture, with a preponderance of elements related to the Bulgars and the Avars, should be also rejected. A main supporter of that theory, M.I. Artamonov, used the term *Martynovka culture* for the pottery of Penkovka, the finds from the Pastyrs'ke stronghold (namely *Pastyrs'ke culture*) and the so-called *Antic antiquities*.⁴⁰ Doubt can also be cast on the case of a “balanced” composition of Penkovka from Slavic, Iranian and nomadic populations.⁴¹ However, the nomadic influences on the adjacent to the steppe zone Penkovka culture were stronger compared to the other early Slavic cultures. These influences can mainly be observed in metalwork, e.g. buckles and belt fittings, and also in some of the subterranean dwellings. A particular group of the latter came to light in the areas of Nadporozh'e and Lower Orel, on the southern boundaries of the culture (circular or oval constructions, similar to the nomadic *yurt*) as well as certain dwellings on ground level with stone foundations.⁴² Furthermore, although the main burial custom of Penkovka was cremation, as in the Prague culture, there is a small number of inhumations (Alekseyevka, Selište, Dănceni etc.), plausibly as the result of nomadic influences or intermarriages.⁴³ In addition, the nomadic influences on weapons can be seen in all three early Slavic cultures.⁴⁴

³⁹ See M. Shchukin, M. Kazanski, O. Sharov, *Mer noire*, pp. 155–156; И.О. Гавритухин, *Понятие*, pp. 8–9.

⁴⁰ М.И. Артамонов, *Некоторые вопросы отношений восточных славян с болгарами и балтами в процессе заселения ими Среднего и Верхнего Поднепровья*, “Советская археология” 1974, nr 1, pp. 245–254; idem, *Первые страницы русской истории в археологическом освещении*, “Советская археология” 1990, nr 3, pp. 271–290; R. Werner, *Herkunft*, p. 586; Cs. Bálint, *Steppe*, pp. 84–87; See also М.Ю. Брайчевский, *Антська проблема*, p. 125; C. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, p. 16; O.M. Приходнюк, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 13–18; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 58, 69; M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, p. 824; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, pp. 25–26, 125–126.

⁴¹ И.П. Русанова, *Славянские древности VI–VII вв. Культура пражского типа*, Москва: наука 1976, pp. 85–112; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 58, 82; See also В.Д. Баран, *склавіни*, p. 154; O.M. Приходнюк, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 14–15, 19; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, pp. 125–126.

⁴² В.В. Седов, *Анты*, pp. 166, 168; O.M. Приходнюк, *Анти та авари [in:] В.Д. Баран, Р.В. Терпиловский, Н. абашина, (eds.) Проблеми походження та історичного розвитку слов'ян*, Київ: Інститут Археології НАНУ 1997, p. 143; idem, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 15–18, 21, 25–27, 63–68, with references also on the nomadic influences to Penkovka pottery; F. Curta, *Black Sea*, p. 167; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 72–73; M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, pp. 774, 776, 807, 829–831, 834. G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, pp. 126, 132–133.

⁴³ O.M. Приходнюк, *авари*, p. 143; idem, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 17–18, 30, 33, 66–68; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, p. 74; M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, pp. 776–780, 822–824; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, p. 130.

⁴⁴ M. Shchukin, M. Kazanski, O. Sharov, *Mer noire*, p. 155; M. Kazanski, *L'armement Slave*, pp. 199–207; idem, *Middle Dnieper*, pp. 774–776; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, pp. 72–73, 126.

According to Procopius, the Sclaveni and Antes moved freely within each other's area,⁴⁵ a situation that probably helped the mutual influences. Regarding the latter, we can observe those of Prague to Penkovka west of Dnieper, namely the stone ovens and the Prague handmade pottery, as well as the infiltration of the Penkovka handmade pottery (the biconical and the baggy vessels) into the Prague area in the Middle Dniester region. East of Dnieper, and to the north of the forest-steppe area, existed another contact zone, that between Penkovka and Kolochin.⁴⁶ As O.M. Prikhodniuk points out, the Prague-type finds occur in an area greater than that given by Procopius and Jordanes as the settlement of the Sclaveni, and, on the other hand, the two historians of the sixth century could not discern the northern limits of the Antic settlement and the contact zones mentioned above.⁴⁷ The sunken huts of the early Penkovka culture have either no traces of heating or only an open hearth, made of clay or stone. Under the influence of the Prague culture, the hearths were replaced by stone (rarely clay) ovens in the Penkovka dwellings.⁴⁸ A mixture of Prague and Penkovka elements is observed in the early Slavic Ipotești-Cindești-Ciurel culture in Romania and Moldova, dated back to the first half of the sixth century. The most important cemetery of that culture is Sărata Monteoru in northeastern Muntenia.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ Procopius, *Wars*, VII, 14, 16, p. 356; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, p. 144.

⁴⁶ В.В. Седов, *Анты*, p. 169; С. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, pp. 16–17; В.Д. Баран, *склавіни*, p. 155; Приходнюк, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 12–14, 21, 33–35, 42–45, 61–68, 74; idem, *Степове населення*, pp. 49, 57–58. P.M. Barford, *Early Slavs*, p. 63; P.B. Терпиловский, *Славяне Поднепровья*, p. 130; M. Shchukin, M. Kazanski, O. Sharov, *Mer noire*, pp. 154–155; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 70, 73; M. Kazanski, *Land*, p. 40, who considers as limit between the Penkovka and Prague cultures the area of the Stugna river, south of Kiev; idem, *Middle Dnieper*, pp. 769, 772; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, pp. 127–128, 137.

⁴⁷ О.М. Приходнюк, *Пеньковская культура*, p. 77; Моця, *Анты за Дунаєм*, pp. 37–38; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, p. 126.

⁴⁸ В.В. Седов, *Анты*, p. 166; K. Godłowski, *Slawensitze*, pp. 270–271; O.M. Приходнюк, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 24–25, 40–42, 61–63, 68; P.M. Barford, *Early Slavs*, p. 63; M. Shchukin, M. Kazanski, O. Sharov, *Mer noire*, p. 155; P.B. Терпиловский, *Славяне Поднепровья*, p. 131; B.S. Szmoniewski, *Stronghold at Pastirs'ke (Ukraine), Centre of Power in the Forest-steppe Belt*, [in:] A. Paroń et al., (eds.), *Władza a struktury społeczne w średniowieczu na wschód Łaby/Herrschaft und Sozialstrukturen im Mittelalter östlich der Elbe/Power and social structure in the Middle Ages East of the Elbe*, Wrocław – Göttingen: Wydawnictwo Naukowe "Akapit" 2008, pp. 103–104; idem, *The Antes*, pp. 71–75; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, p. 131.

⁴⁹ В.В. Седов, *Анты*, pp. 170–171; idem, *Этногенез*, p. 142; R. Werner, *Herkunft*, pp. 585–586; U. Fiedler, *Studien zu Gräberfeldern des 6. bis 9. Jahrhunderts an der unteren Donau*, vol. I–II, Bonn: R. Habelt 1992, I, pp. 74–91; С. Goehrke, *Frühzeit*, pp. 17–18; В.Д. Баран, *склавіни*, p. 155; О.М. Приходнюк, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 34, 43, 67–74; S. Dolinescu-Ferche, *Bas-Danube*, p. 172; P.M. Barford, *Early Slavs*, pp. 48–49; И.О. Гавритухин, *Понятие*, p. 13; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, p. 70; И. Станчу, *Ранние славяне в румынской части Карпатского бассейна*, "Stratum plus" 2015, nr 5 [Славяне на Дунае. Обретение родины-Ad memoriam Л. Нидерле], pp. 174–175, 181, 202; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, pp. 144–145.

Contrary to the Prague culture, few fortifications can be observed in the Penkovka area, namely Seliște in Moldova, Budishche and, the most important, Pastyrsk'e in the Cherkasy region. The great expanse of Pastyrsk'e, about 25 h., included about 50 sunken huts with a hearth or oven and an ironworks. Among its finds there are many decorative objects (e.g. earrings, buckles, anthropomorphic and zoomorphic brooches) and wheel-made pottery of local production. In addition, the remnants of a long construction and its finds seem to strengthen the assumption that Pastyrsk'e was either an important power center or a religious one.⁵⁰ Seliște included sunken huts and kilns used by the craftsmen, in other words a permanent settlement considered too as a power center.⁵¹

Another distinction between the Prague and Penkovka cultures could be further seen in metalwork and the production of decorative metal objects (brooches, buckles, earrings etc.). Such objects occur also in the Prague culture, however, the area of Penkovka clearly provides more material as a great number of hoards have been unearthed, with the hoard of Martynovka being the most known of them.⁵² The finds from the latter include objects from different cultures, as e.g. of Byzantine origin (a bowl, a cup, a disk and a spoon) dated probably, after a stamp on the bowl, to 577. Their provenance is related to the diplomatic presents, booty, yearly tribute etc.⁵³ Particular finds in the Penkovka culture are the brooches of

⁵⁰ М.И. Артамонов, *Некоторые вопросы*, p. 249; idem, *Первые страницы*, p. 274, who considers Pastyrsk'e as the administrative center of temporary nomadic settlements; Cs. Bálint, *Steppe*, pp. 119–120; В.В. Седов, *Анты*, pp. 169–170; М.Ю. Брайтчевский, *Антська проблема*, p. 125; О.М. Приходнюк, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 35, 39, 43, 75; idem, *Степове населення*, p. 48; B.S. Szmoniewski, *Stronghold*, pp. 103–106; idem, *The Antes*, pp. 75–76; M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, pp. 793, 809–825; G. Kardaras, *Oι Άντες*, pp. 134–136.

⁵¹ О.М. Приходнюк, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 22–24; idem, *Степове населення*, pp. 54–55; M. Kazanski, *L'armement Slave*, p. 209; F. Curta, *Feasting with 'Kings' in an Ancient Democracy: On the Slavic Society of the Early Middle Ages (Sixth to Seventh Century A.D.)*, "Essays in Medieval Studies" 1999, nr 15, p. 25; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, p. 74; G. Kardaras, *Oι Άντες*, p. 133.

⁵² On the treasure of Martynovka and the possible provenance of the finds see D. Kidd, L.V. Pekarskaja, *Das Fundmaterial im Überblick*, [in:] *Martynovka*, pp. 25–27; D. Kidd, L. Pekars'ka, *Der Silberschatz von Martynivka (Martynovka)*, [in:] *Reitervölker aus dem Osten. Hunnen+Awaren. Katalog der Burgenländische Landesausstellung 1996 Schloß Halbturn 26. April – 31. Oktober 1996*, Eisenstadt: Amt der Burgenländischen Landesregierung 1996, pp. 204–209; O.M. Prikhodniuk, *Interpretation*, pp. 163–170; idem, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 30, 33, 56–60, 76–77; idem, *Степове населення* p. 47; Cs. Bálint, *Steppe*, pp. 88–90; И.О. Гавригухин, *Понятие*, pp. 9–10; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 77–80; M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, pp. 832–848; G. Kardaras, *Oι Άντες*, pp. 149–154; For other Byzantine finds or patterns in the Penkovka sites, see M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, pp. 783, 789, 800, 816, 820–822, 830, 836–837.

⁵³ Cs. Bálint, *Steppe*, pp. 90–92; M. Mundel-Mango, *Die drei byzantinischen Silbergefäße und der Löffel. Bemerkungen*, [in:] *Martynovka*, pp. 36–42; О.М. Приходнюк, *Візантія*, p. 137; idem, *Interpretation*, pp. 169–170; D. Kidd, L. Pekars'ka, *Silberschatz*, p. 206; M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, pp. 833, 846; G. Kardaras, *Oι Άντες*, pp. 150–151.

the Dnieper (or Antic) type as well as the Danube-type brooches.⁵⁴ Furthermore, in the Penkovka and Kolochin cultures, but not in the Prague one, the so-called anthropomorphic and zoomorphic brooches occur, which are believed to be of Byzantine origin. Such motifs also concern the figurines/mounts and the buckles of the Penkovka culture.⁵⁵

The hoards of *Martynovka type*⁵⁶ (part of the *Antic antiquities* in the territory of Penkovka and Kolochin cultures) appear influences of various cultural environments (Baltic Sea, Slavs, Byzantium, nomads, Sassanian Persia) and, taking into account the belt fittings, they reflect a wide-spread in Eurasia male “dress code” of the early Middle Ages.⁵⁷ On the other hand, the various types of brooches in women graves (Seliște, Dănceni etc.) are considered to be indications of intermarriages with foreigners.⁵⁸ Also, the rather substantial quantity of Byzantine coins found in the Antic territory are associated either with the Antic raids or with the Byzantine-Antic trade relations or even with the payments of Constantinople to the Antes federates after the treaty of 545/46 (see below).⁵⁹

C) Political and social organization

Besides the aforementioned, peculiarities between the Sclaveni and the Antes are noted also in the case of their political and social organization. Jordanes’ reference to *the rex* (king?) Boz and his higher officials (*primates*) in c. 375 should

⁵⁴ О.М. Приходнюк, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 38–39, 55–57; M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, p. 792; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντεες*, pp. 140–141.

⁵⁵ Prikhodniuk, *Interpretation*, p. 166; idem, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 39, 56–57; M. Kazanski, *L’armement Slave*, pp. 205–207; B.S. Szmonewski, *Anthropomorphic Brooches of the Dnepr Type in Initial Phases of the Early Middle Ages: The Migration of a Style-Idea-Object*, [in:] S. Możdzioch (ed), *Wędrówki rzeczy i idei w średniowieczu: Spotkania Bytomskie V*, Wrocław: IAE PAN. Oddział 2004, pp. 301–312; idem, *Two worlds, one hoard: what do metal finds from the forest-steppe belt speak about?*, [in:] F. Curta (ed., with the assistance of R. Kovalev), *The Other Europe in the Middle Ages. Avars, Bulgars, Khazars and Cumans*, Leiden: Brill 2008, pp. 266–277; A.B. Скиба, *Зооморфные и зоо-антропоморфные фибулы в днепровских кладах*, “Stratum plus” 2011, nr 5, pp. 133–142; M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, p. 832; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντεες*, pp. 141–143.

⁵⁶ See M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, pp. 787–789; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντεες*, pp. 147–154.

⁵⁷ О.М. Приходнюк, *Interpretation*, pp. 167–168, 170; idem, *Византия*, p. 138; idem, *авары*, p. 145; idem, *Пеньковская культура*, pp. 58–60; M. Kazanski, *L’armement Slave*, p. 210; D. Kidd, L.V. Pekarskaja, *Überblick*, p. 27; D. Kidd, L. Pekars’ka, *Silberschatz*, pp. 206–208; B.S. Szmonewski, *The Antes*, pp. 80–82; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντεες*, pp. 142–143, 152–153; M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, pp. 787–788; On the issue of the so-called *Antic antiquities* see mostly M. Kazanski, op. cit., pp. 831–848.

⁵⁸ M. Kazanski, *L’armement Slave*, p. 210; idem, *Middle Dnieper*, p. 848; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντεες*, p. 143.

⁵⁹ О.М. Приходнюк, *Византия*, pp. 138–141; F. Curta, *Black Sea*, p. 172; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντεες*, p. 151.

be probably seen as an indication of the peculiar political and social organization the Antes had, namely a central power model (a ruler of a great tribal union and seventy leaders of small tribes).⁶⁰ That model of power was considered as equal to a hereditary monarchy.⁶¹ Furthermore, the view that the Antes formed “the first Slavic state in history” was promoted⁶² and that the king Boz was “the first known person in the history of the Slavs”.⁶³ Additionally, some scholars consider the Martynovka type hoards as good exemplification of the cultural, as well as the social, level of the Antes, namely the formation of social hierarchy with central power and local nobility in accordance with Jordanes’ testimonies. On the other hand, they correlate the less prestigious finds with the “middle social class”.⁶⁴ The development of a social hierarchy among the Antes is investigated through the terminology of the written sources either on their leaders⁶⁵ or through a kind of genealogy known for some of them, e.g. *Mezamer, the son of Idariz and brother of Kelagast*, or *Leontius, son of Dabragezas*.⁶⁶

Comparing the testimonies of Procopius and Jordanes on the early Slavs, we could note differences on the relevant accounts, namely their origin (*Sporoi* in Procopius, *Venethi* in Jordanes), their way of life and settlement area (nomadic according to Procopius, living in forests and swamps according to Jordanes), but also their political system (*democracy*, contrary to the mention of a *rex* with *primates* in the Antes in the fourth century).⁶⁷ Furthermore, taking into account the

⁶⁰ Jordanes, *Getica*, XLVIII 247, p. 121: [*Hermanaricus*] ... in Antorum fines movit procinctum, eosque dum adgreditur prima congressione superatus, deinde fortiter egit regemque eorum Boz nomine cum filiis suis et LXX primatibus in exemplum terroris adfixit, ut dediticiis metum cadavera penduntium geminarent; G. Schramm, *Venedi*, pp. 169–170; M. Shchukin, M. Kazanski, O. Sharov, *Mer noire*, p. 152; See also B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, p. 64; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, p. 57.

⁶¹ М.Ю. Брайчевский, *Об “антах”*, p. 23.

⁶² See D. Schorkowitz, *Revision*, p. 575; O.M. Приходнюк, *Степове населення*, p. 59; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, p. 64; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, p. 57.

⁶³ N. Županić, *Boz*, pp. 116, 118.

⁶⁴ O.M. Prikhodniuk, *Interpretation*, pp. 171–173; idem, *Пеньковская культура*, p. 77; D. Kidd, L. Pekars’ka, *Silberschatz*, p. 206; M. Kazanski, *L’armement Slave*, p. 210; M. Kazanski, *Middle Dnieper*, pp. 846–848.

⁶⁵ See below, n. 76–79.

⁶⁶ Menander the Guardsman, *History*, R.C. Blockley (ed.), Liverpool: F. Cairns 1985, fr. 5.3, p. 50; Agathias, *Histories*, R. Keydell (ed.), Berlin: W. de Gruyter 1967, IV 18. 1, p. 145; Приходнюк, *Візантія*, p. 140; M. Kazanski, *L’armement Slave*, p. 211; F. Curta, *Slavs*, pp. 47, 90, 332; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, pp. 65–66; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, pp. 92–93, 109.

⁶⁷ R. Werner, *Herkunft*, pp. 578–579; F. Curta, *Hiding Behind a Piece of Tapestry: Jordanes and the Slavic Venethi*, “Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas” 1999, nr 47, pp. 326–327; G. Kardaras, *Oi Άντες*, p. 61; On the political structures of the early Slavs see also M. Kazanski, *L’armement Slave*, p. 211; F. Curta, *Slavs*, p. 326; idem, *Ancient Democracy*, pp. 22–23; М.В. Грацианский, *О происхождении*, p. 34; The etymology of the name *Sporoi* is debated; probably it comes from a Proto-Slavic word for “multitude” and it was known to Procopius by oral tradition; See R. Bene-

various military conflicts described in the Byzantine sources, where the authors discerned bravery as a characteristic of the Antes and their great number as that of the Sclaveni, R. Werner assumed that the Antes were leading the mass of the Sclaveni into war.⁶⁸ W. Pohl also distinguishes in Procopius' testimony that "the Antes were experienced in combat on rough territory, while the Slavs were experts at laying ambushes".⁶⁹

In the Lower Danube, only the Antes and not the Sclaveni are referred as part of the Byzantine "barbarian" policy. The rapprochement of the Antes by Justinian and the conclusion of an alliance with them in 545/46 are linked to a wider frame of alliances which reflects the new concept of his era. Procopius, after a thorough reference to the episode of phoney-Chilbudius,⁷⁰ describes the Byzantine delegation to the Antes that led to the conclusion of a treaty (*foedus*). According to the treaty, the Antes were settled as federates, namely obtaining annual payments, in the area of the ancient city Turris (north of the Lower Danube, probably close to the Roman Dinogetia), their main task being to defend the empire against the attacks of the nomadic tribes. The Antes are referred to in the sources as Byzantium's allies until the year 602.⁷¹

Taking into account the view concerning the tribal union of the Antes, V. Sedov assumed that federates of Byzantium became the Antes of the Middle Dniester River (and not those of the Lower Danube). On the other hand, H. Ditten supported the opinion that Bessarabia was the settlement area of the Antes federates. The German scholar identifies them with the Western Antes (between the estuaries of the Rivers Danube and Dnieper up to the Black Sea), while the Eastern Antes lived

dicty, *Prokopios' Berichte über die slavische Vorzeit. Beiträge zur historiographischen Methode des Prokopios von Kaisareia*, "Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinischen Gesellschaft" 1965, nr 14, p. 77; P.M. Barford, *Early Slavs*, p. 36.

⁶⁸ Jordanes, *Getica*, V 35, p. 63: ... Antes vero, qui sunt eorum fortissimi, qua Ponticum mare curvatur, a Danastro extenduntur usque ad Danaprum, quae flumina multis mansionibus ab invicem absunt; Procopius, *Wars*, VII, 13. 24, p. 353· VII, 14. 4, p. 354· VII, 40, 1, p. 475· VIII, 25. 1, p. 623; R. Werner, *Herkunft*, pp. 578, 580; G. Schramm, *Venedi*, p. 170; F. Curta, *Jordanes*, p. 326; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, p. 61.

⁶⁹ Procopius, *Wars*, VI, 26. 18–24, pp. 268–269; *ibid*, VII, 22. 3–5, pp. 394–395; W. Pohl, *Telling the Difference: Signs of ethnic Identity*, [in:] W. Pohl, H. Reimitz (eds.), *Strategies of Distinction. The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300-800*, Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill 1998, p. 38.

⁷⁰ Procopius, *Wars*, VII. 14. 8–21 and 31, pp. 354–359; Ch. Bonev, *Les Antes*, p. 111; F. Curta, *Slavs*, pp. 79–81, 83; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, pp. 100–106.

⁷¹ Procopius, *Wars*, VII. 14. 32–36, pp. 359–360; Ch. Bonev, *Les Antes*, pp. 110–104; Г.Г. Литаврин, *О двух Хилбудах*, p. 25; О.М. Приходнюк, *Византия*, p. 136; G. Schramm, *Venedi*, pp. 170, 172; F. Curta, *Slavs*, pp. 80–82, 331–332; M. Kazanski, *Land*, p. 39; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, pp. 87–91, 113.

north of the Kutrigurs and the Sea of Azov.⁷² In addition, Procopius' reference to a Slavene and an Antic who held captives and exchanged a sum of money could be interpreted, despite the mythical character of the phoney-Chilbudius' narration (where we find this particular testimony), as concerning certain chieftains in the early Slavic society.⁷³

Regarding the terminology used in the Byzantine sources referring to the political and social organisation of the Slavs, a long discussed topic concerns the use of the word *democracy* by Procopius. Probably its meaning was linked to the Slavs' way of living, the *sporadic fashion* in small tribes without central power, or, in a wider sense, the *un-ruled* way of life in *barbaricum*, contrary to the institutions of *civitas Romanorum* and the imperial power. Probably, as R. Benedicty pointed out, Procopius uses this word taking into account testimonies of ancient authors (such as Hippocrates and Aristotle) about the lack of monarchy and political institutions of "barbarians", and, on the other hand, the reality of his era, linking the *democracy* with the Byzantine *demoi* and their riots. In other words, the term *democracy* describes the Byzantines' impression about the "freedom" (or even the "chaos") of the early Slavic society, fragmented into tribes and local leaders and without central authority, namely the rules and the discipline of a "normal" state. The main institution of the Slavic *democracy* was an assembly for the important decisions, known as *věče*, that prevented the concentration of power in one person.⁷⁴

⁷² В.В. Седов, *Древнерусская народность. Историко-археологическое исследование*, Москва: Институт Археологии РАН 1999, p. 37; H. Ditten, *Zur Bedeutung der Einwanderung der Slawen*, [in:] F. Winkelmann, H. Köpstein (eds.), *Byzanz im 7. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen zur Herausbildung des Feudalismus*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag 1978, pp. 89, 93 n. 2; The distinction between Western and Eastern Antes attempted initially G. Vernadsky (*Antae*, pp. 58, 64), based on Procopius' testimony on the Antic settlement at the Lower Danube area (the Western), as well as north of the Azov Sea (the Eastern). Regarding the Western Antes, he located them between the Rivers Prut, Dniester and southern Bug with possible center modern Iași; B.S. Szmoniewski, *The Antes*, p. 60; G. Kardaras, *Οι Άντες*, p. 89.

⁷³ Procopius, *Wars*, VII, 14. 7–13, pp. 354–355; G. Kardaras, *Οι Άντες*, p. 102.

⁷⁴ R. Benedicty, *Prokopios' Berichte*, pp. 54–55, 61–64, 68–71; Idem, *Die auf die frühslawische Gesellschaftsbezügliche byzantinische Terminologie*, [in:] G. Ostrogorsky et al. (eds.) *Actes du XII-e Congrès international d'études byzantines (Ochride, 10–16 septembre 1961)*, vol. 2, Belgrade: Comité Yougoslave des Études Byzantines 1964, pp. 46–49, 54; L. Waldmüller, *Begegnungen*, pp. 26–27; R. Werner, *Herkunft*, p. 579; С.А. Иванов, Л.А. Гиндин, В.Л. Цымбурский, *Прокопий Кесарийский*, [in:] Л.А. Гиндин, С.А. Иванов, Г.Г. Литаврин (eds.), *Свод древнейших письменных известий о Славянах*, том I (I–VI вв.), Москва 1991, p. 220, n. 65–66; P.M. Barford, *Early Slavs*, pp. 49–50, 59; F. Curta, *Ancient Democracy*, p. 19; idem, *Slavs*, p. 311; E.M. Revanoglou, *Γεωγραφικά και εθνογραφικά στοιχεία στο έργο του Προκοπίου Καισαρείας*, Thessaloniki 2005, pp. 219–220, 243; T. Živković, *Forging Unity*, pp. 32, 46; G. Kardaras, *Οι Άντες*, pp. 79–80.

A similar negative meaning of *democracy* has the word *anarchy* that Maurice uses in *Strategikon* for the early Slavs.⁷⁵

Focusing our interest on the tribal organization, Menander the Guardsman mentions *leaders* (ἄρχοντες, or οἱ ἐν τέλει) in the Antes in order to denote the local chieftains, as well as *rulers/chiefs* (ἡγεμόνες) in the *nation of the Sclaveni* (τῶν Σκλαβηγῶν ἔθνος), e.g. Daurentius/Dauretas, testimonies interpreted as formation of a chiefdom or a tribal union in the Sclaveni and the Antes.⁷⁶ Particularly the testimony on Daurentius is considered as indication for a *primus inter pares* among the Sclaveni who co-decided with the rest of the chieftains on peace or war within the context of the so-called *military democracy*.⁷⁷ Maurice uses the word ῥήγες for the Slav leaders⁷⁸ while Theophylact Simocatta does not clarify the political or social organization of the Antes, whom he characterizes as *ethnos* (nation). On the other hand, making reference to the *nation of the Sclaveni*, he gives the names of certain chieftains (Ardagastus, Musocius and Peiragastus), using titles such as ῥήξ/rex, φύλαρχος/chieftain and ταξίαρχος/brigadier.⁷⁹ These references of the Byzantine authors are likely a good indication of the social transformations among the Slavs (e.g. local elites or tribal aristocracy) during the second half of the sixth and, mostly, the seventh century.⁸⁰

The comparison of the Sclaveni with the Antes attempted above could lead to some conclusions about the peculiarities of each one, considering their ethnic relationship. Although it is widely accepted that in the sixth century the Antes were a Slavic people, as mentioned in the written sources, their Slavic or Iranian origin

⁷⁵ Maurice, *Strategikon*, XI, 4, p. 374 ibidem, IX, 3, p. 312; М.Ю. Брайтчевський, *Об “антах”*, pp. 22–24; L. Waldmüller, *Begegnungen*, p. 27; О.М. Приходнюк, *Візантія*, pp. 134–135; F.E. Shlosser, *Sources*, p. 77; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, p. 81.

⁷⁶ Menander, *History*, fr. 5.3, p. 50: *When the leaders of the Antae had failed miserably and had been thwarted in their hopes...*; ibidem, fr. 21, p. 194: *For the leader of the Avars had sent to Daurentius and the chiefs of his people ordering them to obey the commands of the Avars*; G. Vernadsky, *Antae*, p. 58; R. Benedicty, *Terminologie*, pp. 50–53; L. Waldmüller, *Begegnungen*, pp. 27–28; M. Kazanski, *L'armement Slave*, p. 211; F. Curta, *Ancient Democracy*, p. 23; idem, *Slavs*, pp. 90, 326–327; T. Živković, *Forging Unity*, pp. 48–49; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, p. 81.

⁷⁷ T. Živković, *Forging Unity*, p. 47.

⁷⁸ Maurice, *Strategikon*, XI, 4, pp. 380; F.E. Shlosser, *Sources*, p. 77; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, p. 80; On the use of the title ῥήξ/rex for the barbarian leaders see R. Benedicty, *Terminologie*, pp. 51–52, 55; L.M. Whitby, *Theophylact's knowledge of languages*, “Byzantion” 1982, nr 52, pp. 425–428; P.M. Barford, *Early Slavs*, p. 128.

⁷⁹ Theophylact Simocatta, *History*, C. De Boor (ed.), Leipzig: Teubner 1887, I, 7, pp. 52–53; VI, 7.1–5, pp. 232–233; VI, 9.5–6, p. 237 (Ardagastus); ibid, VI, 9.1–6, pp. 236–237 (Musocius); ibid, VII, 4.13, p. 252 and VII, 5.4, p. 253 (Peiragastus); R. Benedicty, *Terminologie*, pp. 51–52, 55; F. Curta, *Ancient Democracy*, pp. 24–25; idem, *Slavs*, pp. 327–332; T. Živković, *Forging Unity*, pp. 47–50; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, p. 82.

⁸⁰ R. Benedicty, *Prokopios' Berichte*, p. 66–68; idem, *Terminologie*, pp. 53–55; M. Kazanski, *L'armement Slave*, p. 211; F. Curta, *Slavs*, pp. 333–334; G. Kardaras, *Oi Antes*, p. 82.

is still under discussion, as well as the etymology of their name (also Slavic or Iranian). According to the data from our research, we could argue that the Antes were a Slavic people related to the Sclaveni and both formed the two branches of the early Slavs. Sixth- and early seventh century Byzantine sources make clear that they shared enough similarities, but actually were not one and the same at all. Compared to Sclaveni, the Antes accepted more influences from the Germanic and the steppe peoples on their political organization and their material culture (e.g. the metalwork of Penkovka was more developed than in Prague and Kolochin cultures). The model of the centralized power to the Antes is appeared only in the fourth century. For the sixth century, the data shows that the leaders (*ἄρχοντες/archontes*) of the Antes held an intermediate position between a monarch and a chieftain, while in the case of the Sclaveni are rather evident only the chieftains. These leaders ruled the Antic tribal unions which still had a not developed social hierarchy. That these leaders were not simple chieftains is confirmed by the genealogy of certain Antes and, from the archaeological point of view, by the Martynovka type treasures and the possible role of Pastyrsk'e (or Selište) stronghold as an administrative center. The most important, however, is that Byzantium concluded a treaty with the Western Antes, but not with Sclaveni, which probably means that the Antes possessed, at the very least, some sort of centralized power structure. The historical and cultural evolution of the Antes was not the same as that of the Sclaveni, as it seems that the Antes were more “developed” on a political and social level. However, this does not alter their ethnic and cultural identity, and, consequently, we believe that their Slavic character should not be a matter for discussion.

Acknowledgements

The work was supported by 2016 Grant of the Institute for Advanced Study at Moscow State Pedagogical University.