

To the question of origin of the chernyakhiv pottery forms (historiographical review)

Научный руководитель – Каплин Александр Дмитриевич

Калашникова Ольга Юрьевна

Выпускник (магистр)

Харьковский национальный университет им. В.Н. Каразина, Харьков, Украина

E-mail: kalashnikovaolga1994@gmail.com

Interest to the chernyakhov pottery, as the main, culturally defining feature, arose after culture has been discovered [14, 16]. Even now, this interest has been existing. Later, this interest has increased, which has led to the emergence of many issues related to the production technology, decoration and classification. Recently, the actual becomes the question of the possibility of using ceramics as chronoindicators, but the most complex and controversial is the question of the place and time of borrowing its basic forms. Collect and analyze the main ideas of researchers of this question and identify feature perspectives, has become the mainest topic of this work.

One of the first, in the literature, to this question turned M.A. Tikhanova, who based on materials from the excavations of the settlement near the village of Lepesovka, put hypothesis about the North-Black Sea influence on the formation of the chernyakhov ceramic complex [13, 30-31]. The primary reason for this was the finds of fragments of pottery with inscriptions in Greek language. After analyzing ceramics and pottery furnaces, the author noted that the Lepesovka's furnaces have a typical Olvia design, as well as a number of pottery, in particular bowls and jugs. In addition, the researcher pointed out the similarity in ornamental motifs, such as a float and a stamp.

Pulling out the thesis of identity with Olvian ceramics, the author, as well as her followers, referred exclusively to the previously published work of R.I. Wetstein [6, 18], dedicated to the pottery of Olvia I-II century AD. In the work, the author himself points out the dissimilarity of Chernyakhov and Olvia ceramics. In addition, it seems irrational to transfer the conclusions drawn from the materials of one monument to the whole culture, which is not unsuccessfully the author has done.

Despite the fact that the work of M.A. Tikhanova contained a number of errors, the theory of the north-Black Sea influence was supported by other researchers. So, about the possible influence of the Greek Black Sea cities, especially Tire and Olbia, were expressed by E.A. Rickman, B.V. Magomedov and A.T. Smilenko. Among these works, the greatest attention is paid to the article by B.V. Magomedov. For comparison, the author used materials from the territories previously occupied by the Geto-Dacian tribes, Celts and Zarubintsy culture. The conclusions of the author on technology issues are also doubtful. In his opinion, all known furnaces in Roman times have the same design, and their study is meaningless in deciding on the issue of borrowing. However, this statement is not true.

With the advent of new works on the ceramics of Olvia and its districts, the theory as a whole proved to be more than mistaken. V.V. Krapivina and A.V. Gudkova [7, 45] conducted a fractional classification of the gray-clay pottery of Olvia of the first centuries of our era, and compiled a wide list of analogies.

It was possible to determine that the chernyakhov population appears in the Northern Black Sea coast not earlier than the middle of the III century AD, already with the existing ceramic complex, which has nothing in common with the early Olvian ceramics. The authors do

not exclude the possibility of the work of individual masters of Tira and Olvia on cherniakhov monuments, which, however, could not in any way affect the appearance of the whole culture.

No less noticeable in historiography is the theory of the influence of the lipetsk culture on the formation of the chernyakhov ceramic complex. About the similarity of some forms of pottery ceramics of the Dniester region with lipetsk forms, in one of her earlier works mentioned M.A. Tikhanov. Further development of the theory was later developed. So, M.Yu. Braychevsky believed that pottery can not be deduced from stucco, meaning the difference in production conditions, so look for prototypes in earlier cultures that did not know the potter's wheel does not make sense. In his opinion, the origins of pottery forms should be derived from those cultures that already by the II century AD. actively used pottery. First of all, he referred to such lipetsk and pukhov culture.

G. Diakonu held similar views [1, 247]. He believed that to resolve the issue of the appearance of pottery in chernyakhov culture, it is necessary to consider the pottery and stucco in the complex. The researcher divided all the stucco ceramics by the territorial feature into four large groups, and the pottery by three, according to a number of technological features. The author came to the conclusion that the most probable path of penetration of fine gray-clay ceramics and the appearance of a potter's wheel are the northwestern regions of the chernyakhov culture area. Where previously existed the culture of Lipica-Poiana, with the traditionally formed production of gray pottery.

The theory lipitsa impact refuted by some researchers because it ceases to exist for about 180 AD. And when G. Diakonu was identified with the chernyakhov culture with the goths, in any case monuments were to appear, where both the lipetsk and the velbark elements would be combined.

As borrowing space, a number of researchers called the Danubian provinces of Rome. This version has arisen on the basis of similarity of some Cherniakhov forms with provincial-Roman ceramics. The most complete in the historiography of this version introduced V.D Baran, based on the materials of the monuments of the Upper Dniester and the Western Bug [4, 104].

The author believed that the potters did not belong to the local chernyakhov tribes, but lived as representatives of a certain profession in these areas, while there were favorable conditions for the development of pottery and the sale of products. When the situation changed, they left this territory, taking with them the secrets of production. Thus, pottery in the territory of South-Eastern Europe was brought from outside and was in the hands of provincial-Roman masters.

On the territory of Upper Dniestr, pottery appears in ready-made form already in the Late Laten period together with Celtic antiquities, then pottery utensils are used by the lipets tribes, but it is most widely spread in the late II-IV centuries AD. with the appearance of the chernyakhov population. To confirm his conclusions, he cites examples of ceramics from the Roman provinces and the Roman layers of the Black Sea, which in form is similar to the chernyakhov, in particular, this refers to bowls and vases with three hands.

M.B. Shchukin proposed the theory of the "Celtic Renaissance" [17, 18] in chernyakhov pottery. In confirmation, he points to a number of forms that strongly resemble Celtic gray glazed ceramics, as well as pottery hills with a central wall in the combustion chamber that are of Celtic origin. Realizing the doubtfulness of the theory, since by the time the chernyakhov culture was formed, the Celts as a community no longer existed, he points to the fact that the population of the former Celtic lands of the Upper and Middle Danubian, and also Rhine, to some extent kept its traditions for several centuries. And the edict of Caracalla, 212, contributed to the revitalization of the Celtic-Roman artisans provincials.

The view that the origins of forms should be sought in this direction was shared by O.V. Sharov and A.I. Bazhan. However, the researchers believe that the phenomenon of the Celtic

renaissance could not hang in the air, and if these traditions took place, then they should have been transmitted through real carriers. Researchers admit the possibility of migration of both creators and main consumers of ceramics from any point of Europe, where they later developed the basic forms of utensils.

According to their preliminary conclusions, similar ceramics from the early chernyakhovskaya first series are already known from the II century. AD in the Upper and Middle Elbe, which is due to the influence of the Rhine-Weser region. Ceramics of the second series with a typical celtic ornamental form of a roller, localized in Thuringia and Bohemia, where it existed from the beginning of Roman times and until its distribution in the area of chernyakhov culture. As the tribes that could distribute this pottery to the east, the researchers call the tribes of burgundians.

Among the cultures that could affect the appearance of the chernyakhov ceramic complex, the neighboring welbark and pshevorsk culture are also called. B.V. Magomedov, in later works says that the origins of chernyakhov pottery should not be sought in any one particular place. According to him, the entire chernyakhov ceramic complex is a kind of synthesis of not one but several cultural communities, on the basis of which a special chernyakhov style emerged.

As an example, there are some types of jugs that have prototypes in the Roman provinces, but already with elements inherent in the welbark pottery, bowls, and especially the three-handed vases, in details strongly reminiscent of pshevorsk ceramics and utensils from the territory of Jutland [10, 47-50].

About welbark influence tell K.V. Kasparov and M.B. Shchukin, in particular, on the first type of biconical mugs, similar to the stucco welbark, which date back to the Lusatian-Pomorian milieu.

M. Levada and A. Dudek comparing ceramics of the Upper Dniester and Western Bug, monuments like the Cherepin-Teremtsi with pshevorsk ceramics of Southern Poland, also see a strong influence of the ceramic tradition of the pshevorsk [8, 150-155].

In this way, in modern science we can observe the existence of diverse opinions on the origin of chernyakhov pottery forms. Perhaps the solution to this problem is to be seen in further searches with the obligatory application of the newest natural methods in the study of ceramics. Although, it is unlikely that we will be able to get an unambiguous answer, since there is no doubt that the ceramics of the chernyakhov culture absorbed the features of many neighboring cultures of the Late Roman Time.

Источники и литература

- 1) Diaconu G. Uber die scheibengedrehte Keramik in der Sintana de Mures – Tschernjachow Kultur // Dacia. 1970. XIV. S.243-261.
- 2) Dobrzańska H. Osada z późnego okresu rzymskiego w Igołomi, woj. Krakowskie. Kraków: Polska Akademia nauk, Instytut historii kultury materialnej, 1990. 148s.
- 3) Wołagiewicz R. Ceramika kultury wielbarskiej między Bałtykiem a morzem Czarnym. Szczecin, 1993. – 342 s.
- 4) Баран В.Д. Черняхівська культура. Київ: Наук. думка, 1981. 263 с.
- 5) Брайчевський М.Ю. Біля джерел слов'янської народності. К.: Наук.думка, 1964. 356 с.
- 6) Ветштейн Р.И. Керамическое производство Ольвии первых веков нашей эры: автореф. дис. .. канд. ист. наук. Киев, 1955. 20 с.
- 7) Крапивина В.В. Сероглиняная керамика Тиры, Ольвии и памятников черняховской культуры / В.В. Крапивина, А. В. Гудкова. К.: НА ИА НАНУ, 1990. С. 45 – 47.

- 8) Левада М. Пшеворское влияние на керамический комплекс черняховской культуры (по материалам Южной Польши, Верхнего Днестра и Западного Буга) / М.Левада, А.Дудек // *Kultura Przeworska*. 1998. Т.IV.S.147-158.
- 9) Магомедов Б.В. О происхождении форм гончарной черняховской керамики // Новые исследования археологических памятников на Украине. К, 1977. С.111-123.
- 10) Магомедов Б. К вопросу о влиянии культур Центральной Европы на черняховский керамический комплекс // *Kultura przeworska (materially z konferencji)*. 1997. S. 40 - 55.
- 11) Магомедов Б.В. Вельбаркские традиции в черняховской гончарной керамике // *20 lat archeologii w Masłomeczu*. Lublin, 1998. Т. II. S. 143-155.
- 12) Тиханова М.А. О локальных вариантах черняховской культуры // *СА*. 1957. № 4. С. 168-177.
- 13) Тиханова М.А. К вопросу о происхождении гончарной керамики черняховской культуры // *Античные города северного Причерноморья и варварский мир*. Л, 1973. С.29-31.
- 14) Хвойка В.В. Поля погребений в Среднем Приднепровье (раскопки В.В. Хвойки в 1899-1900 годах) // *ЗРАО, новая серия*. 1901. Т.12. Вып. 1-2. С.172 – 190.
- 15) Шукин М.Б. Черняховская культура и явление кельтского ренессанса (к постановке проблемы) // *КСИА*. 1973. Вып. 133. С. 17-24.