

УДК (UDC) 930.1 : 94 (477) (=16)

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2024.1\(45\).701](https://doi.org/10.33782/eminak2024.1(45).701)

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECONSTRUCTIONS OF THE ETHNOGENESIS OF THE EASTERN SLAVS IN THE SCIENTIFIC HERITAGE OF VOLODYMYR BARAN AND DENYS KOZAK

*Kostiantyn Ivangorodsky*

Bohdan Khmelnytsky National University of Cherkasy (Cherkasy, Ukraine)

e-mail: [iwakos@ukr.net](mailto:iwakos@ukr.net)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4052-5253>

### ABSTRACT

*The purpose of the research paper* is a comparative analysis of the creative scientific heritage and ethnological criticism of the relevant archaeological reconstructions of the famous Ukrainian researchers V. Baran and D. Kozak, who at the turn of the millennium proposed their own hypotheses about the ethnogenesis and development of Eastern Slavic communities, including the formation of the 'Ukrainian ethnos' itself. An important task is also to characterize the excessive nationalization of archaeology and the ideologization of ethnogenetic reconstructions based on purely material artifacts, as demonstrated by the works of these Ukrainian archaeologists.

*The scientific novelty.* Ukrainian archaeologists still do not have an unambiguous interpretation of the category called 'archaeological culture', and even more, there is no theoretical explanation of its identity with 'ethnicity'. Another vulnerability of archaeological reconstructions is the unjustified politicization of ancient ethnicity, especially in the context of contemporary interethnic relations. Quite often, researchers incorrectly biologize ancient ethnic groups, including 'Slavic' ones, while avoiding any theoretical reflections on the phenomenon of ethnic identity in antiquity and the possibilities of its reconstruction by means of modern science. There are also purely terminological difficulties that are not sufficiently articulated, such as the interpretation of such concepts as 'clan', 'tribe', 'union of tribes', 'chiefdom', 'nation' etc. At the present stage, most versions of the rise and formation of East Slavic communities have been proposed by representatives of archaeological science. Modern Ukrainian archaeology is no exception.

*Conclusions.* The ethnological analysis of hypotheses concerning the ethnic history of Slavic communities proposed by archaeologists of the so-called 'Kyiv school' (in particular, in the scientific heritage of V. Baran and D. Kozak) shows that so far they do not go beyond the positivist methodology of understanding the historical process and are marked by significant schematism, linearity, teleology, and a priori adherence to the postulate of the actual existence of a 'single ethnic group of Slavs' in the past. As a result, the schemes of Slavic ethnogenesis available in the contemporary humanitarian discourse of Ukraine are characterized by arbitrariness of constructions, complete hypotheticality, engagement with the ideological moment and preferences of each author, which, however, are present mostly involuntarily, out of habit, rather than declaring any specific ideological attitudes.

*Keywords:* Volodymyr Baran, Denys Kozak, 'Kyiv Archaeological School', Eastern Slavs, Slavic studies, ethnogenesis

## АРХЕОЛОГІЧНІ РЕКОНСТРУКЦІЇ ЕТНОГЕНЕЗУ СХІДНИХ СЛОВ'ЯН У НАУКОВІЙ СПАДЩИНІ ВОЛОДИМИРА БАРАНА ТА ДЕНИСА КОЗАКА

*Костянтин Івангородський*

Черкаський національний університет імені Богдана Хмельницького (Черкаси, Україна)

e-mail: iwakos@ukr.net

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4052-5253>

### АНОТАЦІЯ

**Метою статті** є компаративний аналіз творчої наукової спадщини та етнологічна критика відповідних археологічних реконструкцій відомих українських археологів – Володимира Барана та Дениса Козака, котрі на рубежі тисячоліть запропонували власні гіпотези щодо етногенезу та розвитку спільнот східних слов'ян, зокрема й відносно формування безпосередньо «етносу українців». Важливим завданням є також характеристика надмірної націоналізації археології й ідеологізації етногенетичних реконструкцій, на базі суто матеріальних артефактів, що демонструють і праці названих українських археологів.

**Наукова новизна.** Українські археологи не мають однозначного трактування тієї категорії, котру іменують як «археологічна культура», а тим більше немає жодного теоретичного пояснення її тотожності «етносу». Вразливим місцем археологічних реконструкцій залишається й невинуватена політизація стародавньої етнічності, причому в контексті сучасних міжнаціональних відносин. Доволі часто дослідники некоректно біологізують давні етноси, в тому числі й «слов'янські», уникаючи одночасно будь-яких теоретичних роздумів з приводу феномену етнічної ідентичності в давнину та можливостей її реконструкції засобами сучасної науки. Недостатньо артикульованими є й суто термінологічні труднощі, приміром трактування таких понять, як «рід», «плем'я», «союз племен», «вождівство», «народність» тощо. На сучасному етапі більшість версій відносно появи та формування східнослов'янських спільнот запропонована представниками археологічної науки. Не становить виняток і новітня українська археологія.

**Висновки.** Етнологічний аналіз гіпотез стосовно етнічної історії спільнот слов'ян, пропонований археологами так званої «київської школи» (зокрема, у науковій спадщині В. Барана та Д. Козака) засвідчує, що поки вони не виходять за межі позитивістської методології розуміння історичного процесу та позначені істотним схематизмом, лінійністю, телеологізмом, апріорним дотриманням постулату про дійсне існування в минулому «єдиного етносу слов'ян». Унаслідок цього, наявні у сучасному гуманітарному дискурсі України схеми слов'янського етногенезу, відзначаються довільністю конструкцій, суцільною гіпотетичністю, ангажованістю ідеологічним моментом і вподобаннями кожного автора, котрі, щоправда, присутні здебільшого мимоволі, за звичкою, ніж декларують якісь конкретні ідеологічні установки.

**Ключові слова:** Володимир Баран, Денис Козак, «Київська археологічна школа», східні слов'яни, славістика, етногенез

### INTRODUCTION

**Objective.** A key aspect of all 'Slavic' archaeology is represented by the fact that, despite the virtual impossibility of ethnological reconstruction based on material remains alone, researchers cannot resist the temptation to endow them with some kind of ethnic identity. Hence, any version of the ethnogenesis of Slavic communities is

purely artificial and hypothetical. The lack of written sources and serious theoretical and methodological foundations, unfortunately, often 'allows' archaeologists to ascribe certain (and often modern) ethnic characteristics, political preferences, and even mental imperatives to the ancient population at their own discretion. Often, such 'versions' are intended to substantiate the current ideological beliefs of an archaeologist. If the author is a supporter of the creation of a 'national version' of history, then we are talking about the early formation of the Ukrainian ethnos or its components. Of course, most archaeologists are unlikely to approach the problem with a conscious desire for ideological abuse, but rather remain within the Soviet habit of looking for the origins of 'modern ethnic groups/nations' in 'ancient times' and, accordingly, apply the scientific tools that their Soviet teachers handed down to them. In this context, we believe that the analysis of the views of leading Ukrainian archaeologists-slavists of our time is not without heuristic potential for the further development of archaeological science and for establishing a scientific dialogue between the latter and other humanitarian fields of knowledge, especially ethnology, anthropology, philology, and history.

*The purpose of the research paper* is a comparative analysis of the creative scientific heritage and ethnological criticism of the relevant archaeological reconstructions of the famous Ukrainian researchers V. Baran and D. Kozak, who at the turn of the millennium proposed their own hypotheses about the ethnogenesis and development of Eastern Slavic communities, including the formation of the 'Ukrainian ethnos' itself. An important task is also to characterize the excessive nationalization of archaeology and the ideologization of ethnogenetic reconstructions based on purely material artifacts, as demonstrated by the works of these Ukrainian archaeologists. We are convinced that it is a thorough theoretical and ethnological analysis of such archaeological reconstructions that allows us to identify erroneous approaches to the problem, to be more attentive to the terminological features of the interpretation of ethnic processes of the past, and to find out the degree of 'national bias' of a particular specialist.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

There is no scientific analysis of ethnogenetic reconstructions of East Slavic communities in the archaeological heritage of V. Baran and D. Kozak, although it cannot be said that their work is completely devoid of attention from Ukrainian humanities. However, while the latter's views on the above-mentioned issues remain unconsidered, V. Baran's 'significant contribution' to its solution has already been reflected in the specific literature<sup>1</sup>. Unfortunately, most of these eulogistic articles are rather a summary of some of the scholar's theses with bibliographic information about

---

<sup>1</sup> Лебедєва О. Концепція етногенезу українців у монографії В.Д. Барана і Я.В. Барана «Походження українського народу». *Українознавство*. 2007. № 4. С. 262-264; Чирков О., Шакурова О. Етнологічний складник концепції Володимира Барана. *Українознавство*. 2013. № 3-4. С. 127-136; Фігурний Ю., Шакурова О. Етнокультурні та етногенетичні студії Володимира Барана. *Українознавство*. 2018. № 2. С. 88-107; № 3. С. 41-61; Фігурний Ю. Вагомий внесок В. Барана у наукову діяльність відділу етнології Інституту українознавства. *Україна й українство в етнокультурних процесах* / укл. В.Д. Баран та ін. Київ: НДІУ, 2017. С. 7-18; Чирков О. Науковий доробок Володимира Барана у періодичних виданнях Науково-дослідного інституту українознавства 2001-2017 рр. *Україна й українство в етнокультурних процесах* / укл. В.Д. Баран та ін. Київ: НДІУ, 2017. С. 31-45.

his activities than a serious scientific analysis of his concept of the origin of 'Slavs' and 'Ukrainians'. At the same time, this 'achievement' eliminates the need to elaborate on the scholar's life and career, as this has already been done in the above-mentioned articles.

In addition, this situation allows us to raise several controversial questions: is the scientific approach to the heritage of famous scientists, worthy of attention; how objective were their approaches to the problem within the national narrative and to what extent did they allow 'nationalism' in archaeology; how do their interpretations meet the modern criteria of ethnological theory and are archaeologists responsible for their 'ethnic' conclusions?

#### **ETHNOLOGICAL CHALLENGES OF ARCHAEOLOGY**

To this day, a significant problem in the field of ethnological reconstruction of the specifics of prehistoric communities remains their archaeological verification, which is associated with the not entirely legitimate identification of ancient ethnic groups with individual archaeological cultures. Despite the unscientific and helplessness of this methodology, it still dominates 'East Slavic' archaeology, claiming ethnohistorical uniqueness in relation to pre-written communities that are arbitrarily constructed by archaeologists. The latter unreasonably assign ethnic identities to such linguistic concepts as 'Slavs', 'Balts', 'Finno-Ugrians', 'Celts', 'Germans', 'Iranians' etc. In reality, archaeological sources lack specific historical (and even ethnic) information, and thus the ability of archaeologists to 'directly' identify ethnic communities is misleading.

The situation is especially complicated given the fact that archaeologists still do not have an unambiguous interpretation of the category called 'archaeological culture' and even more, there is no theoretical explanation of its identity with 'ethnicity'. Another vulnerability of archaeological reconstructions is the unjustified politicization of ancient ethnicity, especially in the context of contemporary interethnic relations. Quite often, researchers incorrectly biologize ancient ethnic groups, including 'Slavic' ones, while avoiding any theoretical reflections on the phenomenon of ethnic identity in antiquity and the possibilities of its reconstruction by means of modern science. There are also purely terminological difficulties that are not sufficiently articulated, such as the interpretation of such concepts as 'clan', 'tribe', 'union of tribes', 'chiefdom', 'nation' etc.

At the present stage, most versions of the rise and formation of East Slavic communities have been proposed by representatives of archaeological science. Modern Ukrainian archaeology is no exception. The analysis of the relevant reconstructions convinced us that in this area, due to the lack of documentary sources, the dominant type of conceptual representation of the ethnohistorical past is hypothetical and arbitrarily constructed schemes devoid of a significant archaeological and ethnological theoretical basis. Hence, it is not surprising that archaeologists themselves have been constantly complaining about this fact for more than one or even two decades: the problem of the origin of the Slavs has not yet been solved. The fact that they almost never take into account the absence of such an ethnic reality as 'Slavs' in the past, who are essentially just an formal-based linguistic abstraction of the modern era, adds to the absurdity of this.

At the same time, while searching for the ancestral home of a certain 'Slavic ethnic group' and its cultural foundations in the Bronze Age, most archaeologists (including Ukrainian ones) do not take into account the significant level of political and ideological

engagement in this issue. And it is not the influence of the modern political elite on the scientific establishment or a direct state order to create a 'correct' scheme of the past (which, fortunately, is not observed in today's Ukraine), but the style of thinking inherent in scientists, which they actually inherited from the 'soviet school', which only strengthened the relevant practices formed in imperial times, when archaeological conclusions were determined mainly by political expediency.

The number of hypothetical constructions of the ethnogenesis of the 'Slavs' continues to grow, both directly and in Ukrainian humanitarian discourse. It is clear that, according to D. Kozak, "today the most acceptable is the concept of Kyivan scholars"<sup>2</sup>. According to R. Terpilovskyi, the so-called 'Kyiv archaeological school' of historical Slavic studies essentially continues to develop the ideas proposed by Soviet archaeologists V. Danylenko and P. Tretiakov, but "the problem cannot be considered finally solved"<sup>3</sup>. The traditions of this 'school' of Slavic archaeology date back to the 1930s, when the Institute of Archaeology was actually established within the structure of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian SSR, and are associated with the scientific and organizational skills of V. Petrov<sup>4</sup>. In the postwar period, a significant contribution to the solution of the Slavic problem was made by such Ukrainian archaeologists as V. Dovzhenok, E. Maksymov, E. Makhno, M. Braichevskyi, A. Smilenko, and others.

This topic became an independent scientific field within the mentioned institution in the mid-1970s, when a separate department of archaeology of the Early Slavs was created, headed by V. Baran (2002-2014 headed by D. Kozak; 2014 till present headed by O. Petrauskas). At the present stage, the contours of Ukrainian archaeological Slavic studies are determined, in addition to the above, by the research of such scholars as N. Abashyna, L. Vakulenko, B. Mahomedov, S. Pachkova, O. Prykhodniuk, R. Terpylovskyi, and others. However, the absence of a clear ethno-theoretical basis and a rethought methodology makes, unfortunately, the constructions of these researchers exclusively hypothetical. An ethnological analysis of their hypotheses regarding the ethnic history of Slavic communities shows that all of them do not go beyond the positivist methodology of understanding the historical process and are marked by significant schematism, linearity, teleology, and a priori adherence to the postulate of the actual existence of a 'single ethnic group of Slavs' in the past. As a result, the proposed schemes of Slavic ethnogenesis are characterized by arbitrariness of constructions, complete hypotheticality, involvement in the ideological moment and preferences of each author, which, however, are present in most of them involuntarily, out of habit, rather than declaring specific ideological attitudes<sup>5</sup>.

### THE CONCEPT OF VOLODYMYR BARAN

Back in the 1970s, the leader of the future Kyiv School, Volodymyr Baran (1927-2019), entered academic science as an expert on Prague-Corcha culture, bringing into scientific practice extremely important materials for its study from the Ukrainian

<sup>2</sup> Козак Д. Етнічні процеси в Україні наприкінці I тис. до н.е. – у I тис. н.е. *Етнічна історія давньої України*. Київ: ІА НАНУ, 2000. С. 119.

<sup>3</sup> Терпиловський Р.В. Славяне Поднепровья в первой половине I тыс. н.э. Lublin: UMCS, 2004. С. 16.

<sup>4</sup> Андреев В.М. Віктор Петров. Нариси інтелектуальної біографії вченого. Дніпропетровськ: Герда, 2012. С. 103-105.

<sup>5</sup> Івангородський К.В. Етнічна історія східних слов'ян у сучасній історіографії (український, білоруський і російський дискурси). Черкаси: Вид. Ю. Чабаненко, 2018. С. 319.

territory, which was, in fact, the place of its formation<sup>6</sup>. In 1973, the scientist presented his doctoral dissertation on these materials. Continued active field work (excavations of Slavic settlements in Rashkiv and Teremtsi) significantly deepened the understanding of the specifics of the life of the early medieval Slavs represented by the Prague culture<sup>7</sup>. In its final form, his concept of the ethnic history of the ancient Slavs was published in the late 1990s as a separate monograph as one of the volumes of the series 'Ukraine through the Ages'<sup>8</sup> (incidentally, in 2001 it was awarded the State Prize of Ukraine in Science and Technology). The fundamental postulate of the archaeologist's hypothesis was that from the beginning the Slavs did not have a single culture, but being autochthonous, from the turn of the century they formed components of various multi-ethnic archaeological cultures in the Vistula-Dnipro interfluvium, gradually integrating with other ethnic groups.

Unfortunately, the lack of a clear ethno-theoretical basis and a rethought methodology makes V. Baran's constructions (as well as other archaeological practices of a similar nature) completely hypothetical and rather controversial. In general, his concept is marked by the typical shortcomings of such post-Soviet studies: teleology, essentialism, schematism, and spontaneous positivism. Being a part of the retrospective method, the Ukrainian scholar also cannot help but talk about the origins of Slavic culture from the Bronze Age, although he replaces it with the amorphous term 'Proto-Slavs'. In particular, the researcher argues that the latter, along with "the Proto-Germans and the Proto-Balts, divided themselves in the Bronze Age (second millennium BC) into separate *self-sufficient groups* (hereinafter question marks and italics in the quotations indicate questionable terms not explained or incorrectly used by the researcher – *edited by the Author*). Thus, allegedly as early as the first millennium BC, "*the Prydnipro Proto-Slavs (? – Author)* were part of the territorial associations of Scythia and Sarmatia, and *the Pryvistula tribes of the Proto-Slavs (? – Author)* were part of the tribal associations of the East Germans, Celts, and Western Balts". Roman authors seem to have called both the former and the latter by the same name, the Venedi. In the early first millennium AD "the Venedi, represented by the Zarubynets culture", began to advance into the Baltic lands in Polissya, but this process was interrupted by the migration of the Goths (Velbar culture) – "a new multi-ethnic Chernyakhiv culture was formed". The latter also had a significant impact on the following 'Slavic' archaeological cultures – the Prague, Kyiv, Lypetsk, and Zubrytska groups. The nomadic communities of the Black Sea region of that time also had a considerable ethno-cultural influence on the Slavs<sup>9</sup>.

According to V. Baran, the central link in the process of ethnocultural transformation of the 'Proto-Slavs-Venedians' into Slavs was the Zarubynets culture that existed in Prypiat Polissya, Middle and Upper Dnipro in the 2 BC – 1 AD. It was not a genetic continuation of any previous tradition, but instead absorbed many substrate components from Pomeranian-Pidklosh, Pshevorsky, Mylohrad, and Scythian Forest cultures, which later determined the essential difference of post-Zarubynets

---

<sup>6</sup> Баран В.Д. Ранні слов'яни між Дністром і Прип'яттю. Київ: Наук. думка, 1972. 244 с.

<sup>7</sup> Баран В.Д. Пражская культура Поднепровья (по материалам поселений у с. Рашков). Київ: Наук. думка, 1988. 160 с.

<sup>8</sup> Баран В.Д. Давні слов'яни / Україна крізь віки. Т. 3. Київ: ВД «Альтернативи», 1998. 336 с.

<sup>9</sup> Баран В.Д. Слов'яни у первісності і ранньому середньовіччі: збірник вибраних етнологічних праць. Київ: Міленіум, 2011. С. 63-64.

monuments<sup>10</sup>. Therefore, the ancestral home of the Slavs can be recognized as the territory on the border of the forest and forest-steppe zones of mainly Ukraine, although “it is quite possible that in different periods of more ancient times (2-1 millennia BC) *Slavic formations* (? – *Author*) occupied other regions, moving in the interfluvium of the Dnipro and Oder”<sup>11</sup>.

An important postulate of V. Baran’s concept is the statement that “the Slavs *have never been* one ethnic community”. However, due to the lack of a theoretical basis, the researcher failed to overcome the ambivalence and uncertainty in the interpretation of the phenomenon of ‘Slavs’. It is significant that in the very next sentence after the declared position, we find the following: the Slavs “*from the very beginning* (?; the scientist is eloquently silent when it was. – *Author*) acted as separate, *though related, Proto-Slavic and Slavic* (? – *Author*) ethnolinguistic groups”<sup>12</sup>. However, there are no specifics on what basis this ‘kinship’ was based, and most importantly, in what it was manifested. The researcher’s statement that since the ninth century the name ‘Slavs’, having previously been “the self-name of only one of the *Slavic tribal groups* (? – *Author*)”, has forever covered “*all Slavic* (? – *Author*) tribal formations, regardless of their specific names” and “remains in the sense of their *ethnic origins* (? – *Author*), along with such names as ‘Germanic peoples’, ‘Romanic peoples’ etc.”<sup>13</sup>. Unfortunately, it remains unclear why ‘all Slavic tribal entities’ (and what, after all, does the term ‘tribal entity’ mean?) needed to call themselves the same, and most importantly: why did they agree to this particular ‘name’ and were they ‘Slavic’ before?

The polysemantic dissonance on this background is also caused by the opposite categories used by the experienced scientist. Thus, in the 1991 work, the emergence of the “early medieval *Slavic ethnos*” was proclaimed at its beginning, which became “a new concept of the *ethnogenesis of the Slavs*,” and in addition, it is about “a large *independent* (? – *Author*) ethnic group” that was “the people of the Slavs-Venedis”<sup>14</sup>. Although another study states that “the ethnonym ‘Venedis’ *partially* refers to the Slavs,” nevertheless, it is from them that “we can begin the history of the *Slavic ethnos*,” while stating “the completion of the process of *pan-Slavic ethnogenesis* (? – *Author*) in the middle of the first millennium”<sup>15</sup>. Thus, it turns out that the ‘Slavs’ were both an ethnic group and not. The proposed scheme finally loses its internal logic with the statement that this ‘Slavic ethnic community’ formed in the middle of the first millennium “was never a *homogeneous mass*, but consisted of various *related tribes*”. Moreover, even the ‘Venedis’ here “could not remain a single monolith”, but instead it was “a collective name for Slavic tribal unions that the Germans transferred from their western neighbors (? – *Author*) to the Slavs who were their eastern neighbors”<sup>16</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> Баран В. Процеси етнокультурного розвитку на території України в першій половині I тис. н.е. *Археологія*. 1999. № 4. С. 49-50.

<sup>11</sup> Славяне Юго-Восточной Европы в предгосударственный период / ред. В. Баран. Киев: Наук. думка, 1990. С. 455.

<sup>12</sup> Баран В.Д. Давні слов’яни... С. 6.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. С. 107.

<sup>14</sup> Баран В.Д., Козак Д.Н., Терпиловський Р.В. Походження слов’ян. Київ: Наук. думка, 1991. С. 3, 19.

<sup>15</sup> Давня історія України: в 3 т. Т. 3: Слов’яно-руська доба / редкол. тому: П. Толочко (відп. ред.) та ін. Київ: Наук. думка, 2000. С. 17, 25, 59-60.

<sup>16</sup> Баран В. Склавини та анти у світлі нових археологічних джерел. *Проблеми походження та історичного розвитку слов’ян*: збірник статей, присвячений 100-річчю з дня народження В. Петрова / відп. ред. В. Баран. Київ; Львів: РАС, 1997. С. 120, 127-129.

According to V. Baran, the absence of a 'single Slavic ethnos' is also confirmed by the ethno-cultural processes of the third quarter of the first millennium, when three separate 'early Slavic' cultures – Prague, Penkiv, and Kolochyn, as well as Dzedzic in the lands of modern Poland, known in written sources as Venedis, Sławyny, and Antis - were formed simultaneously and 'independently' on Ukrainian territory. He is prompted to this conclusion by the fact that they do not share a common cultural background. In view of this, the hypotheses of researchers who believe that the origins of the early medieval Slavs should be sought in only one small area on the territory of, for example, the Kyivan or Pchevorian cultures are not supported by any sources. All of this, according to the Kyiv archaeologist, convincingly demonstrates that the ethno-cultural "division of the Slavic world existed already in the first half of the first millennium". At the same time, the 'Slavs' were no longer just one of the components of Kyivan culture, but also part of the population of the multiethnic cultures of Chernyakhiv and Pshyvor<sup>17</sup>.

One of the leading aspects of V. Baran's concept is the participation of the Cherniakhiv population in the emergence of Prague culture, which actually began the scientist's scientific career (his 1958 PhD thesis was devoted to this problem), and a separate monograph<sup>18</sup> is devoted to it. In the end, the archaeologist concluded that the Cherniakhiv culture was not the creation of the Goths alone, but was formed on the basis of Black Sea, local substrate cultures: Scythian-Sarmatian, Dac-Gothic, Volyn-Podilsky, and introduced Velbar, although it is still impossible to reveal the nature of the relationship between all these groups<sup>19</sup>. One example of the cultural transfer of the Chernyakhiv tradition within the Prague archaeological culture is, according to the scientist, the materials of excavations in Podnistrovia, near the village of Teremtsi, in particular the fact that this Slavic settlement existed continuously in the 4-6 centuries<sup>20</sup>.

V. Baran could not resist reminiscing about 'Hrushevsky's scheme', saying that archaeological materials from the Raikovets, Volyn and Romny cultures of the seventh and eighteenth centuries suggest the existence of a 'Naddniprian union of Eastern Slavs and Antes', which can be considered the ancestors of Ukrainians<sup>21</sup>. For his part, R. Terpilovskyi also believes that the scheme of formation of modern East Slavic ethnic groups proposed by his colleague looks somewhat simplified<sup>22</sup>. It is associated with the period of the so-called 'Great Migration of the Slavs' in the sixth to thirteenth centuries and is largely based on a not flawless 'substrate theory'. For example, he believes that "some of the carriers of the Kolochin and Bantser cultures, as well as the Raikovets culture, having assimilated the Baltic substrate, gave rise to a new northwestern group

---

<sup>17</sup> Баран В.Д. Пражская культура Поднепровья (по материалам поселений у с. Рашков). Київ: Наук. думка, 1988. С. 77-78; Баран В. Слов'янські ранньосередньовічні культури та їхні підоснови. *Старожитності Русі-України* / редкол.: П. Толочко та ін. Київ: КАЕ, 1994. С. 5-6, 10-12; Баран В.Д. Давні слов'яни... С. 247.

<sup>18</sup> Баран В.Д. Черняхівська культура (за матеріалами Верхнього Дністра і Західного Бугу). Київ: Наук. думка, 1981. 264 с.

<sup>19</sup> Баран В., Гороховский Е., Магомедов Б. Черняховская культура и готская проблема. *Славяне и Русь (в зарубежной историографии)*: сб. науч. тр. / редкол.: П. Толочко и др. Киев: Наук. думка, 1990. С. 69.

<sup>20</sup> Баран В. Слов'янське поселення середини I тисячоліття н.е. біля с. Теремці на Дністрі. *Вісник Інституту археології*. Львів, 2008. Вип. 3. С. 55-56.

<sup>21</sup> Баран В. Склавіни та анти... С. 129-130.

<sup>22</sup> Терпиловський Р. Біля витоків слов'янства (за матеріалами Подніпров'я). *Ruthenica*. 2002. Вип. 1. С. 38-39.



of Slavs – the ancestors of the Belarusian people”<sup>23</sup>. Having moved to the North-East, the population of the Kolochyn culture met the Finno-Ugrians, who were also Slavised. As a result, a kind of ethno-cultural symbiosis was formed (represented, for example, by the Imenkiv culture), which laid “the preconditions for the emergence of a new ethnic group that can be put in the basis of the birth of the future Russian people”. At the same time, the scholar warns quite rightly: “In the 8-9 centuries, there was never an Eastern, Western, or Southern Slavic ethnic community, but rather Eastern, Western, and Southern Slavic tribes or their unions. Therefore, each of today’s Slavic peoples can look for their origins in the environment of those historical events that took place during the era of the great migration of peoples”<sup>24</sup>.

As one of the former Soviet scholars who radically revised the relevant ideological postulates on the history of Rus, V. Baran quite sharply criticizes the supporters of the version of the ancient existence of the ‘Rus’ as one of the Slavic peoples. According to the researcher, the search for the ‘original Rus’, which is supposed to confirm the almost primordial ethnic unity of the Eastern Slavs, and hence legitimize the ‘Old Rus nation’ in the vast expanses from the Carpathians to the Don and from Ladoga to the Black Sea, is far-fetched, unrealistic and based on artificial combinations. Therefore, neither the ‘legendary Slavic dews’ derived by B. Rybakov from the fantasies of Zacharias Rytor, nor the Black Sea ‘roxy/rukxy’, exquisitely created by O. Trubachov and supported by V. Sedov, are real. Thus, summarizes V. Baran, “we have no doubt that in the fifth to seventh centuries Slavic Rus did not exist, just as the name ‘Rus land’ did not exist at that time”<sup>25</sup>.

In this context, the researcher also criticizes the attempt to artificially construct such a ‘tribe’ using archaeological sources, as V. Sedov did, turning the northerners into the Russian Khaganate. The Ukrainian archaeologist is also surprised by the way his Russian colleague does this, declaring the Volyntsev culture (the Northerners) to be the successor of the Volga, allegedly Slavic, Imenkiv culture, especially since his assumption is based on the extremely dubious pottery similarities of some materials, the common source of which was most likely infiltration from the Saltov (Khazars) cultural tradition. In V. Baran’s opinion, the “Slavic-Iranian symbiosis in Chernyakhiv culture, where Sarmatian materials are known, but no Slavic ones”, invented by the Moscow researcher is equally far-fetched. There is also no evidence that “it is this symbiosis that is the Ruses who first went to the Volga, and from there, in the form of the Imenkiv culture, returned to the Dnipro and created the ‘Rus Khaganate’ here”<sup>26</sup>.

In addition, the ethnicity of the Imenkiv culture has not yet been determined, and its artefacts have led to a variety of identifications in historiography – Turkic, Alanian, Baltic, Finno-Ugric, and thus it is possible that it contained a ‘Slavic segment’. However, as V. Baran rightly emphasizes, this component did not come from the Pchevorian or Chernyakhiv cultures, but from the Kyivan or Kolochyn cultures<sup>27</sup>. Therefore, the migration of Slavic-Rus from the Volga region to the Dnipro left bank in the late

---

<sup>23</sup> Баран В.Д. Давні слов’яни... С. 114.

<sup>24</sup> Баран В. Велике розселення слов’ян. *Археологія*. 1998. № 2. С. 31-32, 35.

<sup>25</sup> Баран В. Скарби VI-VIII ст. Анти чи Русь? *Археологія*. 1998. № 1. С. 23, 24, 26.

<sup>26</sup> Баран В. Державотворчі та етнокультурні процеси в період Київської Русі. *Істину встановлює суд історії: збірник на пошану Ф.П. Шевченка*. Т. 2. Київ: Інститут історії України НАНУ, 2004. С. 83-84.

<sup>27</sup> Баран В.Д. Слов’яни у первісності і ранньому середньовіччі: збірник вибраних етнологічних праць. Київ: Міленіум, 2011. С. 87.

7<sup>th</sup> century is an outright biased speculation. According to the Ukrainian expert, the Ruses and their 'khaganate' were useful to V. Sedov as "an ethno-creative and later state-building force, which, having allegedly absorbed other East Slavic tribal groups, led to the emergence of the East Slavic ethnic community in the pre-state tribal period, and in the conditions of statehood – the Old Rus nation". However, "these ethnically oriented 'concepts' resemble only Pohodin's imperialism and seek confirmation of their exclusive rights to the Kyivan Rus heritage"<sup>28</sup>.

In view of this, the position of the Ukrainian researcher regarding the impossibility of not only the existence, but even the formation in medieval ethnic reality of such a phenomenon as the 'Old Rus nation', which is declared to be the ethnic community of all Eastern Slavs, is also quite reasonable. While new Slavic ethnic groups were formed west of the Vistula or south of the Carpathians in the sixth and 7<sup>th</sup> centuries, and no one denies this, V. Baran is not without reason "surprised by the urge to unite all East Slavic tribes and their alliances with different archaeological cultures into one ethnic group", while "in the light of archaeological materials and the correlation of written and linguistic sources with them, such an East Slavic group never existed, and this unfortunate methodological error should and can be corrected"<sup>29</sup>. Boundless spaces, natural obstacles, poor communications, constant inter-communal wars, and external factors were insurmountable obstacles to the ethnic consolidation of the population of Ancient Rus. That is why "supporters of the idea of the primordial unity of the Eastern Slavs and the Old Rus nation often substitute the concept of state and political unity for the concept of ethnic unity, although these concepts can determine different, even radically different historical processes"<sup>30</sup>. Thus, "the Eastern Slavs, scattered over vast areas, have never felt themselves to be one *ethnolinguistic community* (? – *Author*)", and "the Old Rus nation was invented by historians"<sup>31</sup>.

The proposed concept of multiculturalism of the Slavs by V. Baran generally contains many rational germs regarding the reconstruction of the ethnic history of the communities that are considered to be their 'eastern branch'. However, it is not difficult to see how fragile such research constructions are, which are dominated primarily by terminology that is used more out of habit and more intuitively. Neglecting the essential meaning of 'loud' terms leads such studies to a dead end and raises more questions than it answers the key ones. The analyzed scheme of the Ukrainian archaeologist also does not specify who/what the 'Slavs' are, what criteria allow to impose this identity on archaeological cultures, why, for example, the Dzedzitsk culture does not belong to the 'Eastern Slavs' or why only three modern 'East Slavic' ethnic groups formed out of a dozen 'chronicle tribes'?

### DENYS KOZAK'S HYPOTHESIS

There are no explanations for these aspects in the hypothesis of the equally well-known representative of the 'Kyiv archaeological school' Denys (aka Dionyzii) Kozak (1944-2014), who believes that "the history of the ethnogenesis of the Slavs is perhaps

---

<sup>28</sup> Баран В. Етнокультурні процеси в період Києво-Руської держави. *Матеріали до української етнології*. Київ: ІМФЕ ім. М. Рильського НАНУ, 2014. Вип. 13. С. 7-8.

<sup>29</sup> Баран В.Д. Давні слов'яни... С. 104.

<sup>30</sup> Баран В. Державотворчі та етнокультурні процеси... С. 88, 93, 100.

<sup>31</sup> Баран В.Д., Баран Я.В. Історичні витоки українського народу. Київ: Генеза, 2005. С. 8.

the most difficult in historical science”<sup>32</sup>. We are convinced that for this expert, the problem voiced in this way immediately became insurmountable, since a separate ethnic group of Slavs has hardly ever existed. At the same time, the researcher personally blocked all the ways out of the impasse with an equally unfortunate theoretical error. We are talking about his identification of ethnicity and archaeological culture, which, while declaring solidarity with the vision of V. Baran (who, as already noted, on the contrary, rejects such an identity and rightly denies a separate ethnic community of ‘Slavs’), turns his internally contradictory hypothesis automatically into another example of ethnoarchaeological paradox.

First of all, the scholar criticizes all the approaches available in science to establishing the origin of the Slavs, although “without going into a detailed analysis of these concepts”<sup>33</sup>, declaring the version of the ‘Kyivan school’ to be the most acceptable. At the same time, D. Kozak has to admit that the discovery of Slavic settlements of the 4-5 centuries by its representatives still did not solve the ‘problem of Slavic ethnogenesis’ but only “through a retrospective analysis of archaeological complexes to determine the ways of formation of the *Slavic culture* of the 6-7 centuries”<sup>34</sup>. However, Denys Nikodymyrovych is disingenuous here as well, since V. Baran postulates the phenomenon much more correctly, speaking not of one but of ‘several Slavic cultures’. In turn, this once again confirms the absence of the Slavs as an ethnic group in the past, even at the level of the absence of a separate archaeological culture peculiar to it, according to D. Kozak’s logic.

Moreover, the latter, after all, confidently speaks about ‘*Slavic cultures* of Roman times’, which he rather controversially calls ‘Venedian’ at the same time – Zarubynets, “the Western Ukrainian group of monuments of the Shevorska culture”, Zubrytska, late Zarubynets (questionable), Kyiv and the northern part of Cherniakhivska one. The Ukrainian archaeologist rightly regards the attempts to connect the first two cultures with the Germans and the Balts, including the Bastarns, presented in the concepts of the ‘Leningrad archaeological school’ (K. Kasparova, M. Shchukin, H. Lebedev) as unsuccessful<sup>35</sup>. Instead, he calls for adherence to the essence of V. Baran’s concept of the gradual formation of the Slavs, which allegedly began in the Vistula-Oder interfluvium in the 3-2 century BC, represented by the areas of the Luzhytsia, Pomorian, and Klesh cultures. With the emergence of the Zarubynets culture, the main substrate of which was the ‘Pomorian-Klesh tribes’ (questionable), “the center of Slavic history (? – *Author*) moved to the Vistula-Dnipro interfluvium”<sup>36</sup>. However, it remains unexplained at what stage the hypothetical ‘Slavic ethnic group’ was formed – at the Pomorian-Klesh, Zarubynets, or even later/earlier?

The vagueness of the proposed hypothesis is preserved in the researcher’s final monograph ‘Venedis’ (2008), although the amount of archaeological work contained in it is impressive – almost 28 000 m<sup>2</sup> of excavated area. We agree with the reviewer, V. Voinarovskiy, that hardly any Slavic archaeologist can boast of such a large-scale field

---

<sup>32</sup> Козак Д. Етнічні процеси в Україні... С. 119.

<sup>33</sup> Козак Д. Формування давньослов’янських пам’яток на території Волині і Північної Галичини в першій чверті I тис. *Археологія*. 1996. № 2. С. 55.

<sup>34</sup> Козак Д. Етнічні процеси в Україні... С. 179-180.

<sup>35</sup> Козак Д. Взаємовідносини слов’ян і германців на території України в першій половині I тис. н.е. *Археологія*. 1993. № 2. С. 26.

<sup>36</sup> Козак Д. Формування давньослов’янських пам’яток... С. 55-56.

study of only one culture (i.e. Zubrytska)<sup>37</sup>. However, as in the previous works, the hypothetical style of formulating assumptions, based mainly on intuitive guesses rather than on specific sources, also dominates here regarding the probable 'ethnogenesis of the Slavs'. Thus, even in later studies, the scholar defines the chronology of this process in a very abstract way, stating, for example, that when the expansion of the Goths began in the Ukrainian territories at the end of the second century, it was "the time when the Slavs *already constituted* (? – Author) a fully formed ethnic group"<sup>38</sup>. However, there is, of course, no information that allows us to speak so confidently about this.

Moreover, in another work, the researcher explains this ethnic process rather vaguely: "In the region of Middle and Upper Podniprovia, Podesenia, at the end of the first and second centuries there were active assimilation processes that led to the formation of *another* Kyivan culture, whose carriers *obviously* (?! – Author) did not have a clear ethnic face (? – Author). It was only in the fifth century that a *peculiar group* (? – Author) of the early medieval Slavic ethnos was formed in the area of this culture"<sup>39</sup>. In general, D. Kozak's scheme is characterized by an arbitrary assumption of very extensive ethnic mixtures, among which he magically distinguishes the ancestors of the Slavs. For example, when he studied the Pshevor culture in the Transnistria region, he saw in this area "the meeting of several multicultural groups of people in the first centuries AD". Therefore, he boldly, though without evidence, suggests that "as a result, new formations emerged, *often changing the direction of ethno-cultural processes*", and this region "became a zone of contact between the largest cultures of Southeastern Europe", and "among the carriers of these cultures were also the ancestors of early Slavic tribes"<sup>40</sup>.

The hypothesis that, according to D. Kozak, "one can conclude that in Volyn in the early first century, there were integration processes between the Pomorian-Klesh culture and the Pshevor culture, which led to *mutual assimilation*", is also rather dubious, based solely on material fossil artifacts from the Shankiv Yar tract (Rivne region)<sup>41</sup>. Especially given that the author does not specify what kind of assimilation he is talking about here – cultural or ethnic? Although, given the following statement by the archaeologist, it is the latter that is meant, and this is a very incorrect assumption: "It was *the creators* (? – Author) of the Pomorian-Klesh culture who became the ethnic core on the basis of which, with the involvement of *neighboring ethnic components* (? – Author), the Slavic ethnos was finally formed by the 1<sup>st</sup> century AD", the scholar argues<sup>42</sup>. And it is in them that he sees the part of the European population that Tacitus called the 'Venedians', and their archaeological equivalent is the late Zarubynets and Zubrytska cultures. At the same time, he deduces the 'roots of Slavic ethnogenesis' from the fifth century BC, when, allegedly, "*a single Indo-European massif* (? – Author) for the first time (? – Author) was divided into *potentially* (? – Author)

---

<sup>37</sup> Войнаровський В. Рец. на: Козак Д. Венеди. Київ, 2008. *Археологія*. 2009. № 4. С. 79.

<sup>38</sup> Козак Д. Проблема контактів давніх слов'ян і германців (поморсько-кльошова та ясторфська культури на Волині). *Археологія*. 2013. № 1. С. 83.

<sup>39</sup> Козак Д. Етнічні процеси в Україні... С. 119.

<sup>40</sup> Козак Д.Н. Пшеворська культура у Верхньому Подністров'ї і Західному Побужжі. Київ: Наук. думка, 1984. С. 3.

<sup>41</sup> Козак Д.Н. Хрінники (Шанків Яр) – пам'ятка давньої історії Волині. Дослідження 2010-2014 рр. Київ: ІА НАНУ, 2016. 118 с.

<sup>42</sup> Козак Д.Н. Поселення неврів, слов'ян та германців на Стирі. Київ: ІА НАНУ, 2012. С. 75-76.

Germanic and Slavic *ethnic branches* (? – *Author*)”<sup>43</sup>. In the end, we are forced to note here a case of a triple (!) methodological error, when purely linguistic phenomena are incorrectly added to the identification of archaeological and ethnological phenomena. We cannot agree with the following postulate either: “The unification of the material culture of the population may indicate the formation of a single ethnic group, which was Slavic, or rather, Venedian”<sup>44</sup>.

Thus, this completely hypothetical (in fact, artificially constructed in the imagination) ‘Slavic ethnic group’, which, “judging by archaeological data, *has gone through a difficult path of progressive historical development* (? – *Author*)”<sup>45</sup>, serves as just one element of D. Kozak’s teleological version, on which other cultural phenomena are strung to depict the linearity of its probable development. Although the scientist is convinced that he is allegedly revealing “a genetic link between certain historical and cultural types of monuments that gradually replaced each other”, and therefore it is not difficult for him to prove that, for example, monuments of the Chernyakhiv type of the Eastern Carpathian region were formed on the basis of antiquities of the Zubrytska culture, which, in turn, at the will of the archaeologist, “were formed as a result of the process of *ethno-cultural consolidation* (? – *Author*) of the carriers of the Pshevor and Zarubynets cultures, with the inclusion of Dacian tribes in the Carpathian region”. Consequently, it is now not difficult to include this region “in the lands where tribes, *whose core* (? – *Author*) is the Slavic ethnic group, have long lived”<sup>46</sup>. The latter leads to another paradox, since an ethnic group cannot have several cores, let alone be scattered among some hypothetical tribes.

The ethnological uncertainty of D. Kozak’s approach is also evident in his attempts to interpret the ethnicity of the carriers of Zarubynets culture. The researcher again speaks in this regard only hypothetically: “It can be *assumed* that the Slavic ethnic group played a possibly dominant role in Zarubynets culture” and “*perhaps* Zarubynets culture became one of the main components of archaeological cultures whose creators can be identified with the ancient Slavic tribes”<sup>47</sup>. On the other hand, he criticizes S. Pachkova for being “captive to traditional ideas about the unconditional purity of the ‘Slavic blood’ (? – *Author*) of the Zarubynets tribes”<sup>48</sup>. Although he himself proves, as we have seen above, that the combination of Zarubynets and Pshevorians *gave rise* to the ‘Venedis’ – the Zubrytska culture in Volyn – that is, D. Kozak himself is in captivity to a rather simplified primordial version of ethnogenesis.

The assumption of the possibility of solving the ‘blood problem’ of archaeological cultures by means of a mechanistic comparison of ceramic types, practiced by the Ukrainian Slavicist, is leveled by him on the example of the image of the so-called ‘ethnic face’ of the Chernyakhiv culture. The analysis of its ‘multiethnicity’ made

<sup>43</sup> Козак Д. Культурно-етнічна ситуація на Волині і у Верхньому Подністров’ї в ранньозалізний та латенський час. *Слов’яни і Русь: археологія та історія: збірник праць на пошану Петра Толочка* / ред. Г. Івакін. Київ: Стародавній Світ, 2013. С. 115-116.

<sup>44</sup> Козак Д.Н. Венеди. Київ: ІА НАНУ, 2008. С. 30.

<sup>45</sup> Козак Д. Етнічні процеси в Україні... С. 146; Козак Д.Н. Венеди... С. 40.

<sup>46</sup> Козак Д. Особливості етнічної історії Східнокарпатського регіону в латенський час і в перших століттях нашої ери. *Етногенез та етнічна історія населення Українських Карпат: у 4 т.* / ред. С. Павлюк. Т. 1: Археологія та антропологія. Львів: Ін-т народознав. НАНУ, 1999. С. 222-223.

<sup>47</sup> Козак Д. До проблеми походження слов’ян у Дністро-Дніпровському межиріччі. *Археологія*. 2006. № 2. С. 45.

<sup>48</sup> Козак Д. Культурно-етнічна ситуація на Волині... С. 120.

D. Kozak immediately forget about the 'single Slavic ethnicity' and the identification of ethnicity with archaeological culture. Instead, "three varieties of the *archaeological culture of the Slavs*" and "*different branches of Eastern Slavism (? – Author)*" appeared – Prague, Penkov, and Kolochyn. Moreover, the second, in his opinion, was formed on the basis of the Chernyakhiv (Scythian-Sarmatian part of it) and Kyiv cultures and was allegedly Antes<sup>49</sup>. In addition, the scholar quite rightly criticizes B. Magomedov for attributing one ethnicity to the Chernyakhivtsi, since "it is generally impossible to assign Chernyakhivtsi culture to any particular ethnic group, as some researchers often do"<sup>50</sup>. Unfortunately, in his own practice, the archaeologist did not always adhere to this reasonable position. D. Kozak's remark on the poor research of the problem of relations between the Slavs and the nomadic communities that took place during the existence of the Chernyakhiv culture must also be recognized as correct, since "contacts between the Slavic and Sarmatian peoples lasted for about half a millennium"<sup>51</sup>.

However, in the latter case, one can only guess what the Kyiv archaeologist means by the categories 'Slavic people' and 'Sarmatian people'. Thus, the arbitrary handling of ethnohistorical terminology makes D. Kozak's hypothesis regarding the 'ethnogenesis of the Slavs' quite vulnerable. The author's theoretical uncertainty (ignorance) led him to an ambivalent construction that, on the one hand, rigidly and unjustly ties archaeological culture to an ethnic group, and on the other hand, does not allow us to determine which culture was the 'Slavic ethnic group'. The general reference to the version of the phased ethnogenesis of the Slavs proposed by V. Baran is made by D. Baran, makes D. Kozak's hypothesis even more controversial, as it allows anyone to be declared 'Slavs'. Criticizing other Slavic 'schools' of archaeologists (Krakow, St. Petersburg, Moscow) for the narrow localization of the problem, the Ukrainian scholar, instead of taking into account their shortcomings, unwittingly becomes a hostage to archaic views on ethnogenesis and the phenomenon of ethnicity. Hence, his hypothesis reduces to artificially invented ethno-cultural mixtures between certain archaeological cultures, as if they were actually organisms in the sense of biological primordialism.

#### IN BETWEEN THE IDEOLOGY AND SCIENCE

Many modern archaeologists generally demonstrate a banal misunderstanding of ethnological categories, do not offer their own definitions, and often do not understand each other even when using the same terms. In the end, many phenomena of the 'present' are attributed to phenomena and processes of the distant past, resulting in tribes having both 'national' and 'super-ethnic' identities, ethnic groups integrating into society, and the state acquiring an unclear and impossible ethnicity. As we have seen above, archaeologists from the 'Kyiv school' also have a tendency to invent new ethnological categories and use them in their research. Unfortunately, V. Baran did not escape this either, believing that "state-building processes [after the era of the 'migration of peoples'] did not affect the ethnic development of European *peoples*,

---

<sup>49</sup> Козак Д. Основні напрями етногенетичного розвитку племен України в I тис. н.е. (проблема етногенезу слов'ян). *Український історичний журнал*. 2001. № 3. С. 13-14.

<sup>50</sup> Козак Д. Вельбарська культура: готи чи гепіди? *Археологія*. 2002. № 3. С. 15.

<sup>51</sup> Козак Д. Сармати та слов'яни на Україні. *Старожитності I тис. н.е. на території України* / редкол.: В. Баран та ін. Київ: ІА НАНУ, 2003. С. 64, 68.

including *Slavs*, and did not lead to *fundamental ethno-cultural changes*<sup>52</sup>. Despite the fact that many times before in many works he quite reasonably denied the assumption that ‘Slavs are an ethnic group’, the concept of ‘radical ethno-cultural changes’ clearly falls out of this passage, since it essentially means the disappearance of an ethnic group(s). The archaeologist’s statement is also much more problematic in the category of the ‘East Slavic empire of Kyivan Rus’<sup>53</sup>: the empire is anti-ethnic, and as for Rus, its ‘imperialism’ is highly questionable<sup>54</sup>. The concept of ‘ethno-cultural’ also deserves a more thorough interpretation, since archaeologists often use it ambivalently and speculatively.

For example, D. Kozak uses it in this way, claiming that he seeks to reveal “the peculiarities of the ethno-cultural process in the contact zone (we are talking about Northwestern Ukraine – *Author*)”, although he does not specify what the concepts of ‘ethno-cultural process’ and ‘cultural and ethnic process’ mean, nor what the difference between them is. The lack of understanding of ethnological terminology ultimately leads this researcher to construct a rather eclectic and confusing scheme in the style of a remarkable ‘conceptual equilibristic’. In particular, he proposed to distinguish an ‘archaeological and ethnic type’ as a ‘model of a microstructural unit’ and before that, a ‘cultural component’ and a ‘cultural group’ consisting of ‘cultural and ethnic types’, although it is unclear why, perhaps to obscure an even more obscure thesis – “so-called ‘pure’ cultures cannot be formed in the contact zone” Therefore, the basis of “historical and cultural development in the contact zone” is allegedly a certain “*multi-ethnic unit* (? – *Author*), which we called a cultural and ethnic type (CET)” and which “consists of several *separate ethnic units* (? – *Author*) – cultural components that exist in one settlement at a certain time and are in a state of *integration* (? – *Author*)”<sup>55</sup>.

The following passage has no less heuristic value: “The formation of a particular ethnic group is the result of the development of human communities and is determined by *the relevant laws* of social evolution”<sup>56</sup>, especially given the author’s openly biological understanding of ethnicity: “The Venedian ethnic group became the basis of the Ukrainian *ethnic population*”<sup>57</sup>. The crowning glory of this collection of ethnological nonsense is the statement that “archaeological culture (which, as we remember, is ‘not pure’ in D. Kozak’s vision of the contact zone – *Author*) is nothing more than one of the *cultural components* (= ethnic unit) (? – *Author*) in the next round of the spiral of historical and cultural development”<sup>58</sup>. Unfortunately, we have to state the complete ethno-historical inapplicability of the proposed interpretation of the ‘peculiarities of the ethno-cultural process’ that D. Kozak, an extremely talented archaeologist but a weak ethnologist and theorist, has set as the goal of his research.

In conclusion, we consider it important to raise another controversial issue, although not directly articulated by Ukrainian archaeologists, but invisibly present in

<sup>52</sup> Баран В. Археологія як складова частина українознавства. *Українці у світовій цивілізації: колективна українознавча монографія*. Київ: НДІУ, 2008. С. 120.

<sup>53</sup> Баран В. Археологія як складова частина українознавства... С. 121.

<sup>54</sup> Арістов В. Давня Русь у світлі теорій імперій. *Таврійські студії*. Сімферополь, 2012. Вип. 2. URL: <http://kukiit.ru/docs/ts>

<sup>55</sup> Козак Д.Н. Венеди... С. 8.

<sup>56</sup> Козак Д. Проблема контактів давніх слов’ян і германців... С. 76.

<sup>57</sup> Козак Д. Етнічна історія Волині й Галичини в ранньоримський час. *Археологічні дослідження Львівського університету*. Львів, 2005. Вип. 8. С. 323.

<sup>58</sup> Козак Д.Н. Венеди... С. 8.

their reconstructions and related to attempts to link the latter to the national historical narrative, in order to find the 'roots of Ukrainians' through the 'ethnogenesis of the Slavs'. Of course, at the initial stage of the development of independent Ukraine, this approach seemed quite natural and extremely important, but today it is time to speak about it more openly, because excessive politicization and nationalization of archaeology contains at least two significant dangers. First of all, it is the academic devaluation of the scientific discipline itself, and secondly, it is a socio-political danger that took place, for example, in Nazi Germany<sup>59</sup>, where the Nazis directly used the nationalist postulates of the archaeologist G. Kossina and his followers to prove their Aryan superiority and exclusivity (unfortunately, the sad consequences of such a policy are well known).

Despite the reluctance of Ukrainian archaeologists to talk about this topic, it is becoming increasingly clear that as a professional scientific discipline, archaeology is far from being on the margins of the country's social and political life, and its society has considerable demands on it. Moreover, in the Western scientific space, the relevant discussion has been going on for several decades<sup>60</sup>. Some researchers generally emphasize that it was the ideology of nationalism as a means of shaping national consciousness that ensured the formation of the status of archaeology as a separate scientific discipline<sup>61</sup>. At the same time, as a human being, every archaeologist cannot be outside of a specific economic, social, and political situation, which affects, among other things, his or her scientific postulates and conclusions. Of course, this is also strongly influenced by their ethnic (national), cultural, and religious identities<sup>62</sup>. The problem of manipulation of archaeological knowledge by various forces and structures for political purposes<sup>63</sup>, the use of archaeology by the state within the framework of current historical policy<sup>64</sup> and in discussions around the sacredness of the territory of a particular state<sup>65</sup>, etc. also requires professional discussion. From this perspective, ethnogenetic reconstructions by Ukrainian archaeologists may also develop in a new direction, toward less ideologization and subjectivity.

In an effort to secure a priority in the study of the problem of the ethnogenesis of the Slavs, modern Ukrainian archaeology should change its attitude to methodological and theoretical guidelines as soon as possible, in particular in an interdisciplinary format. Instead, so far, we cannot identify any archaeological theory or praxeological

---

<sup>59</sup> Arnold B. The Past as Propaganda: Totalitarian Archaeology in Nazi Germany. *Antiquity*. 1990. № 64. P. 549-569. DOI: 10.1017/S0003598X00078376

<sup>60</sup> Shanks M. Archaeology and Politics. *A Companion to Archaeology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. P. 490-508.

<sup>61</sup> Diaz-Andreu M., Champion T. Nationalism and archaeology in Europe: an Introduction. *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*. London: UCL Press, 1996. P. 35; Kohl Ph. Nationalism and Archaeology: on the Constructions of Nations and the Reconstructions of the Remote Past. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 1998. Vol. 27. P. 223-246.

<sup>62</sup> Trigger B.G. Romanticism, nationalism, and archaeology. *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology* / Eds. Ph. Kohl, C. Fawcett. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995. P. 265-266.

<sup>63</sup> Archaeology, ideology and society. The German experience / ed. H. Härke. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2000, 432 p.

<sup>64</sup> Selective remembrance: archaeology in the construction, commemoration, and consecration of national pasts / eds. Ph. Kohl, M. Kozelsky, N. Ben-Yehuda. Chicago University Press, 2007. 384 p.

<sup>65</sup> Archaeology under fire: nationalism, politics and heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East / ed. L. Meskell. London: Routledge, 1998. 264 p.; Шнурельман В.А. Национализм и археология. *Этнографическое обозрение*. 2013. № 1. С. 9-25; Кол Ф. Прародины в современности и в прошлом: политическое применение опасной концепции. *Этнографическое обозрение*. 2013. № 1. С. 26-36.



methodology that is coherent with the solution of the problem of the ethnic history of the East Slavic communities, which significantly undermines the ethnohistorical conclusions of archaeologists. This situation is further complicated by the rather weak theoretical basis of empirical studies of the ethnic past by Ukrainian scholars. Unfortunately, the theoretical and methodological aspects of such studies are still largely neglected, and sporadic and uncritical adherence to the outdated and highly controversial postulates of the so-called 'Soviet theory of ethnicity' is observed.

## CONCLUSIONS

Thus, the ethnological analysis of hypotheses concerning the ethnic history of Slavic communities proposed by archaeologists of the so-called 'Kyiv school' (in particular, in the scientific heritage of V. Baran and D. Kozak) shows that so far they do not go beyond the positivist methodology of understanding the historical process and are marked by significant schematism, linearity, teleology, and a priori adherence to the postulate of the actual existence of a 'single ethnic group of Slavs' in the past. As a result, the schemes of Slavic ethnogenesis available in the contemporary humanitarian discourse of Ukraine are characterized by arbitrariness of constructions, complete hypotheticality, engagement with the ideological moment and preferences of each author, which, however, are present mostly involuntarily, out of habit, rather than declaring any specific ideological attitudes.

The analyzed reconstructions of the East Slavic ethnogenesis are frankly based on a weak theoretical basis, both in the field of archaeological science and in the field of ethnological theory, which makes these hypotheses quite vulnerable to scientific verification. Scientists, rather intuitively than theoretically convincingly, demonstrate a desire to identify archaeological cultures with probable ethnic groups, complicating the situation by identifying these categories with desk-based linguistic abstractions. On the other hand, the absence of ultra-patriotic constructions of the earliest origins of the Ukrainian ethnic group, as well as unreasonable searches for purely Ukrainian ethnic specificity among material artifacts, should be recognized as a very positive phenomenon. However, the dominant approach to East Slavic ethnic past in the works of V. Baran and D. Kozak is still a 'nationalized' approach. At the same time, one cannot fail to note attempts to analyze ethnic issues on the basis of new methodological principles, which allows us to hope for a qualitatively different level of ethnohistorical reconstructions of the communities of the Eastern Slavs in the future.

## REFERENCES

- Andrieiev, V.** (2012). *Viktor Petrov. Narysy intelektualnoi biohrafiï vchenoho* [Victor Petrov. Essays of the scientist's intellectual biography]. Dnipropetrovsk: Herda [in Ukrainian].
- Aristov, V.** (2012). *Davnia Rus u svitli teorii imperii* [Ancient Rus' in the light of theories of empires]. *Tavriiskii studii*, 2. Simferopol. Retrieved from <http://kukiit.ru/docs/ts> [in Ukrainian].
- Arnold, B.** (1990). The Past as Propaganda: Totalitarian Archaeology in Nazi Germany. *Antiquity*, 64, 549-569.
- Baran, V.** (1972). *Ranni sloviany mizh Dnistrom i Prypiattiu* [Early Slavs between the Dniester and Pripyat]. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka [in Ukrainian].
- Baran, V.** (1981). *Chernyakhivska kultura (za materialamy Verkhnoho Dnistra i Zakhidnoho Buhu)* [Chernyakhiv culture (based on Upper Dniester and Western Bug materials)]. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka [in Ukrainian].
- Baran, V.** (1988). *Prazhskaia kultura Podnestrovia (po materyalam poselenyi u s. Rashkov)* [Prague culture of the Dniester region (based on materials from settlements near the village of Rashkov)]. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka [in Russian].

- Baran, V. (Ed.).** (1990). *Slaviane Yuho-Vostochnoi Evropy v predgosudarstvennyi period* [Slavs of South-Eastern Europe in the pre-state period]. Kiev: Nauk. dumka [in Russian].
- Baran, V.** (1994). Slovianski rannoserednovichni kultury ta yikhni pidosnovy [Early medieval Slavic cultures and their foundations]. In **Tolochko, P. et al. (Eds.).** *Starozhytnosti Rusi-Ukrainy*. Kyiv: KAIe, 5-13 [in Ukrainian].
- Baran, V.** (1997). Sklaviny ta anty u svitli novykh arkeolohichnykh dzherel [Slaves and antis in the light of new archaeological sources]. In **Baran, V. (Ed.).** *Problemy pokhodzhennia ta istorychnoho rozvytku slovia: zbirnyk statei, prysviachenyi 100-richchiu z dnia narodzhennia V. Petrova*. Kyiv; Lviv: RAS, 119-133 [in Ukrainian].
- Baran, V.** (1998). *Davni sloviany / Ukraina kriz viky* [Ancient Slavs / Ukraine through the ages]. T. 3. Kyiv: VD «Alternatyvy» [in Ukrainian].
- Baran, V.** (1998). Skarby VI-VIII st. Anty chy Rus [Treasures of the VI-VIII centuries. Anti or Rus?]? *Arkheolohiia*, 1, 15-28 [in Ukrainian].
- Baran, V.** (1998). Velyke rozselennia slovia [Great resettlement of Slavs]. *Arkheolohiia*, 2, 30-37 [in Ukrainian].
- Baran, V.** (1999). Protsey etnokulturnoho rozvytku na terytorii Ukrainy v pershii polovyni I tys. n.e. [Processes of ethnocultural development on the territory of Ukraine in the first half of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium AD]. *Arkheolohiia*, 4, 49-57 [in Ukrainian].
- Baran, V.** (2004). Derzhavotvorchi ta etnokulturni protsey v period Kyivskoi Rusi [State-building and ethnocultural processes in the period of Kyivan Rus]. In *Istynu vstanovliuie sud istorii: zbirnyk na poshanu F.P. Shevchenka*, 2. Kyiv: Instytut istorii Ukrainy NANU, 82-101 [in Ukrainian].
- Baran, V.** (2008). Arkheolohiia yak skladova chastyna ukrainoznavstva [Archeology as a constituent part of Ukrainian studies]. in **Baran, V. (Ed.).** *Ukrainci u svitovii tsyvilizatsii: kolektyvna ukrainoznavcha monohrafiia*. Kyiv: NDIU [in Ukrainian].
- Baran, V.** (2008). Slovianske poselessnia seredyny I tysiacholittia n.e. bilia s. Teremtsi na Dnistri [Slavic settlement of the middle of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium AD near the village Teremtsi on the Dniester]. *Visnyk Instytutu arkeolohii*, 3, 38-67 [in Ukrainian].
- Baran, V.** (2011). *Sloviany u pervisnosti i rannomu serednovichchi: zbirnyk vybranykh etnolohichnykh prats* [Slavs in antiquity and the early Middle Ages: a collection of selected ethnological works]. Kyiv: Milenium [in Ukrainian].
- Baran, V.** (2014). Etnokulturni protsey v period Kyievo-Ruskoï derzhavy [Ethnocultural processes during the period of the Kyivan Rus state]. *Materialy do ukrainskoi etnolohii*, 13, 6-24 [in Ukrainian].
- Baran, V. & Baran, Ya.** (2005). *Istorychni vytoky ukrainskoho narodu* [Historical origins of the Ukrainian people]. Kyiv: Heneza [in Ukrainian].
- Baran, V., Gorokhovskii, E. & Magomedov, B.** (1990). Cherniakhovskaia kultura i gotskaia problema [Chernyakhov culture and the Gothic problem]. In **Tolochko, P. et al. (Ed.).** *Slaviane i Rus (v zarubezhnoi istoriografii)*. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka, 30-78 [in Russian].
- Baran, V., Kozak, D. & Terpylovskiy, R.** (1991). *Pokhodzhennia slovia* [Origin of the Slavs]. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka [in Ukrainian].
- Chyrkov, O. & Shakurova, O.** (2013). Etnolohichni skladnyk kontseptsii Volodymyra Barana [Ethnological component of Volodymyr Baran's concept]. *Ukrainoznavstvo*, 3-4, 127-136 [in Ukrainian].
- Diaz-Andreu, M. & Champion, T.** (1996). Nationalism and archaeology in Europe: an Introduction. In *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*. London: UCL Press.
- Fihurnyi, Yu.** (2017). Vahomyi vnesok V. Barana u naukovu diialnist viddilu etnolohii Instytutu ukrainoznavstva [Significant contribution of V. Baran to the scientific activity of the Department of Ethnology of the Institute of Ukrainian Studies]. In **Baran, V.D. et al. (Comps.).** *Ukraina y ukrainstvo v etnokulturnykh protsesakh*. Kyiv: NDIU, 7-18 [in Ukrainian].
- Fihurnyi, Yu. & Shakurova, O.** (2018). Etnokulturni ta etnogenetychni studii Volodymyra Barana [Ethnocultural and ethnogenetic studies of Volodymyr Baran]. *Ukrainoznavstvo*, 2, 88-107; 3, 41-61 [in Ukrainian].
- Härke, H. (Ed.).** (2000). *Archaeology, ideology and society. The German experience*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Ivanhorodskiy, K.** (2018). Etnichna istoriia skhidnykh slovia u suchasniï istoriografii (ukrainskyi, biloruskyi i rosiyskyi dyskursy) [The Ethnic History of East Slavs in the contemporary historiography (Ukrainian, Belarusian and Russian discourses)]. Cherkasy: Vyd. Yu. Chabanenko [in Ukrainian].

- Kohl, Ph.** (1998). Nationalism and Archaeology: on the Constructions of Nations and the Reconstructions of the Remote Past. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 27, 223-246.
- Kohl, Ph., Kozelsky, M. & Ben-Yehuda, N. (Eds.)**. (2007). *Selective remembrance: archaeology in the construction, commemoration, and consecration of national pasts*. Chicago University Press.
- Kol, F.** Prarodiny v sovremennosti i v proshlom politicheskoe primeneniye opasnoi kontseptsii [Ancestors in Present and in Past: the political application of a dangerous concept]. *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie*, 1, 26-36 [in Russian].
- Kozak, D.** (1984). *Pshevorska kultura u Verkhnomu Podnistrovyi i Zakhidnomu Pobuzhzhzi* [Przeworsk culture in Upper Transnistria and Western Pobuzhzhzia]. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka [in Ukrainian].
- Kozak, D.** (1993). Vzaiemovidnosyny slovia i hermantsiv na terytorii Ukrainy v pershii polovyni I tys. n.e. [Relations between Slavs and Germans on the territory of Ukraine in the first half of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium AD]. *Arkheolohiia*, 2, 24-36 [in Ukrainian].
- Kozak, D.** (1996). Formuvannia davnoslovianskykh pamiatok na terytorii Volyni i Pivnichnoi Halychyny v pershii chverti I tys. [The formation of ancient Slavic monuments on the territory of Volhynia and Northern Galicia in the first quarter of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium]. *Arkheolohiia*, 2, 54-68 [in Ukrainian].
- Kozak, D.** (1999). Osoblyvosti etnichnoi istorii Skhidnokarpatskoho rehionu v latenskyi chas i v pershykh stolittiakh nashoi ery [Peculiarities of the ethnic history of the East Carpathian region in the Latén period and first centuries AD]. In **Pavliuk, S. (Ed.)**. *Etnohenez ta etnichna istoriia naselennia Ukrainskykh Karpat*. Vol. 1: Arkheolohiia ta antropolohiia. Lviv: In-t narodoznav. NANU, 163-226 [in Ukrainian].
- Kozak, D.** (2000). Etnichni protsesy v Ukraini naprykintsi I tys. do n.e. – u I tys. n.e. [Ethnic processes in Ukraine at the end of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BC – in the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium AD]. *Etnichna istoriia davnoi Ukrainy*. Kyiv: IA NANU, 118-194 [in Ukrainian].
- Kozak, D.** (2001). Osnovni napriamy etnohenetychnoho rozvytku plemen Ukrainy v I tys. n.e. (problema etnohenezu slovia) [The main directions of the ethnogenetic development of the tribes of Ukraine in the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium AD (the problem of the Slavs ethnogenesis)]. *Ukrainskyi istorychnyi zhurnal*, 3, 11-14 [in Ukrainian].
- Kozak, D.** (2002). Velbarska kultura: hoty chy hepidy [Velbar culture: Goths or Gepids?]. *Arkheolohiia*, 3, 7-17 [in Ukrainian].
- Kozak, D.** (2003). Sarmaty ta slovia na Ukraini [Sarmatians and Slavs in Ukraine]. In **Baran, V.D. et al. (Eds.)**. *Starozhytnosti I tys. n.e. na terytorii Ukrainy*. Kyiv: IA NANU, 64-71 [in Ukrainian].
- Kozak, D.** (2005). Etnichna istoriia Volyni y Halychyny v rannorymskyi chas [Ethnic history of Volhynia and Halychyna in early Roman times]. *Arkheolohichni doslidzhennia Lvivskoho universytetu*, 8, 322-345 [in Ukrainian].
- Kozak, D.** (2008). *Venedy* [Venedy]. Kyiv: IA NANU [in Ukrainian].
- Kozak, D.** (2012). *Poselennia nevriv, slovia ta hermantsiv na Styri* [Settlement of the Nevrians, Slavs and Germans on Styr]. Kyiv: IA NANU [in Ukrainian].
- Kozak, D.** (2013). Kulturno-etnichna sytuatsiia na Volyni i u Verkhnomu Podnistrovyi v rannozaliznyi ta latenskyi chas [The cultural and ethnic situation in Volyn and Upper Transnistria in the Early Iron and Latén Age]. In **Ivakin, H. (Ed.)**. *Sloviany i Rus: arkheolohiia ta istoriia: zbirnyk prats na poshanu Petra Tolochka*. Kyiv: Starodavnii Svit, 114-121 [in Ukrainian].
- Kozak, D.** (2013). Problema kontaktiv davnikh slovia i hermantsiv (pomorsko-kloshova ta yastorfaska kultura na Volyni) [The problem of contacts between ancient Slavs and Germans (the Pomeranian-Klosh and Jastorf cultures in Volyn)]. *Arkheolohiia*, 1, 76-84 [in Ukrainian].
- Kozak, D.** (2016). *Khrinnyky (Shankiv Yar) – pamiatka davnoi istorii Volyni. Doslidzhennia 2010-2014 rr.* [Khrinnyki (Shankiv Yar) is a monument of the ancient history of Volyn. Research 2010-2014]. Kyiv: IA NANU [in Ukrainian].
- Kozak, D.** (2006). Do problemy pokhodzhennia slovia u Dnistro-Dniprovskomu mezhyrichchi [To the problem of Slavs origin in the Dniester-Dnieper interfluve]. *Arkheolohiia*, 2, 44-52 [in Ukrainian].
- Liebiedieva, O.** (2007). Kontseptsii etnohenezu ukrainsiv u monohrafi V.D. Barana i Ya.V. Barana «Pokhodzhennia ukrainskoho narodu» [The concept of ethnogenesis of Ukrainians in the monograph of V.D. Baran and Ya.V. Baran "The Origin of the Ukrainian People"]. *Ukrainoznavstvo*, 4, 262-264 [in Ukrainian].
- Meskel, L. (Ed.)**. (1998). *Archaeology under fire: nationalism, politics and heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*. London: Routledge.
- Shanks, M.** (2006). Archaeology and Politics. In *A Companion to Archaeology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 490-508.

- Shnirelman, V.** (2013). Natsionalizm i arkeologiya [Nationalism and archeology]. *Etnograficheskoe obozrenie, 1*, 9-25 [in Russian].
- Terpilovskii, R.** (2004). Slaviane Podneprovia v pervoi polovine I tys n. e. [Slavs of the Dnieper region in the first half of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium AD]. Lublin: UMCS [in Russian].
- Terpylovskiy, R.** (2002). Bilia vytokiv sloviaanstva (za materialamy Podniprovia) [Near the Origins of Slavs (based on materials from the Dnieper region)]. *Ruthenica, 1*, 25-40 [in Ukrainian].
- Tolochko, P. (Ed.)**. (2000). *Davnia istoriia Ukrainy. Vol. 3: Sloviano-ruska doba* [Ancient history of Ukraine. Vol. 3: Slavic-Rus era]. Kyiv: Nauk. dumka [in Ukrainian].
- Trigger, B.** (1995). Romanticism, nationalism, and archaeology. In **Kohl, Ph. & Fawcett, C. (Eds.)**. *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 265-266.
- Voinarovskiy, V.** (2009) Rets. na: Kozak D. Venedy. Kyiv, 2008 [Review of the book: Kozak D. Venedy. Kyiv, 2008]. *Arkheolohiia, 4*, 79-86 [in Ukrainian].

Надійшла до редакції / Received: 17.12.2023

Схвалено до друку / Accepted: 13.04.2024