

THE DANUBE IN PREHISTORY

By V. GORDON CHILDE

ABERCROMBY PROFESSOR OF PREHISTORIC ARCHAEOLOGY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1929

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
AMEN HOUSE, E.C. 4
LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW
LEIPZIG NEW YORK TORONTO
MELBOURNE CAPETOWN BOMBAY
CALCUTTA MADRAS SHANGHAI
HUMPHREY MILFORD
PUBLISHER TO THE
UNIVERSITY

Printed in Great Britain

PREFACE

IN Great Britain there is one large group of workers engaged with the antiquities of the Ancient East, the Aegean, and Italy. There is another band whose energies are devoted to the archaeology of Britain. The two schools work very nearly in water-tight compartments, largely because their domains are widely separated in space. Britain undoubtedly absorbed influences from the Eastern Mediterranean long before Caesar landed, but those influences were for the most indirect. The missing links lie in the Iberian Peninsula or the Danube valley. The object of this book is to bridge part of the gap between the Ancient East and barbarian Britain in so far as their interconnexions are to be found in the valleys of the Danube and the Rhine.

The Ancient East and Britain

The area to be covered by this work is rich in prehistoric remains, rich with a wealth hardly dreamed of in this country. And those remains are often invested with especial interest by the light they throw on phenomena familiar in the Aegean or Anatolia. A characterization of the area from a geographical standpoint is given in the first chapter. Here we have to define a few geographical and archaeological concepts.

There is a large unitary area that for the last thousand years (with a few intermissions) has been known as 'Hungary'. It is at the moment divided between Yugoslavia, Roumania, Subcarpathian Ruthenia, Slovakia, and Hungary. Archaeologically as physiographically the area in question has often to be referred to as a unit. It would be tedious on every such occasion to repeat the names of the several States that at the moment hold bits of this unit; adequate compound words are foreign to the genius of our language. Hence the old historic term 'Hungary' has been retained, and the unstable boundaries, existing in 1927, have been as a rule ignored. So, too, for the benefit of audiles like myself the old pronounceable names have often been retained for places that in 1927 have been decorated with diacriticals. Sites are in all cases spelt in accordance with the familiar usage prior to 1918. The three or four current equivalents for the recently annexed towns are given in the index, save that in the Magyar territories at present held by Roumania the new names have been ignored.

'Hungary'

A word or two must next be said on archaeological concepts. We find certain types of remains—pots, implements, orna-

'Culture' and 'people'

ments, burial rites, house forms—constantly recurring together. Such a complex of regularly associated traits we shall term a 'cultural group' or just a 'culture'. We assume that such a complex is the material expression of what would to-day be called a 'people'.¹ Only where the complex in question is regularly and exclusively associated with skeletal remains of a specific physical type would we venture to replace 'people' by the term 'race'.

Movements of people The same complex may be found with relatively negligible diminutions or additions over a wide area. In such cases of the total and bodily transference of a complete culture from one place to another we think ourselves justified in assuming a 'movement of people'.

'Relations' between cultures At other times one or more elements of one culture reappear in various places in a more or less different context. In such cases we assume the existence of some sort of 'relation' between the respective areas or cultures. As a methodological principle every agreement must be assumed to denote some sort of relation and, as such, to be a challenge to the prehistorian. In practice, the significance attachable to correspondences must be admitted to vary. Abstract common traits—'the polishing of stone' or 'the practice of agriculture'—are very much less illuminating than concrete agreements—a definite type of stone implement or the cultivation of a specific grain. And the intimacy of the relation disclosed varies in proportion to the specialization and rarity of the type in question.

Survivals The nature of the 'relations' subsisting between cultures cannot usually be defined with any precision. But two main types may be distinguished according as the time factor does or does not intervene. In the first case the traits common to different areas may represent survivals from one former culture that has been at different points in its one time territory overlaid by distinct new cultures. So correspondence in the horn work of remote neolithic provinces may be interpreted as due to survivals in each of an epipalaeolithic tradition.

'Influences' Where such survival is excluded, in particular where the two cultures are juxtaposed in space and time, we have to invoke 'influences'. This word has only a minimal connotation. It may mean actual movements and mixings of peoples, intertribal barter, imitation, or some other form of contact. Often it is merely a confession of ignorance, and in no case must it be

¹ As the adjective from 'people', corresponding to the German 'völkische', we use the term 'ethnic'.

taken as an explanation. Where any indications are available to guide us, we attempt to give 'influence' a precise meaning in concrete cases. It is plain that 'influences' do not travel *in vacuo* any more than influenza germs. They denote actual contact between peoples. But that contact may be anything from conquest or federation to friendly visits between neighbouring chiefs or the 'silent trade'.

Methods of diffusion

However, some things denote a real change in the habits of a people: such would be above all the adoption of a new style of pottery or of a new weapon when the superiority of the latter over traditional forms was not guaranteed on its face. Influences disclosed in agreements, affecting the whole habits of a people and not obviously dictated by practical motives, are almost certainly to be interpreted in ethnic terms, using 'ethnic' as the adjective from 'people'. On the other hand, no such significance need attach to the spread of an obviously superior device (e.g. the cut-and-thrust sword) or a new fashion in hair-pin (among peoples who wore hairpins). Such denote external relations—trade or imitation. External relations are further disclosed by all accidental agreements. We term an accidental agreement the sporadic occurrence in one culture of types proper to another. An agreement would still be accidental, even if the foreign object was occasionally imitated locally, so long as it was not appropriated and made a part of the receptive culture.

Total relations

External relations

Accidental agreements

Having defined the meaning of 'culture' and considered its relations in space, it remains to examine chronological relations. Plainly culture as defined above is not necessarily a chronological concept. Even in one place a culture might persist for a long time. In any case, the same culture might appear in one place at a given time and reach another place very much later. Generally, however, some accidental traits would be discoverable to betray the discrepancy in date.

'Culture' not a chronological unit

For determining the sequence of cultures or the development of one culture at a given site or in one small area the only certain method is stratigraphical observation. In a few rare cases geology comes to our aid instead: while the Baltic was sinking or its shores rising, the coastwise distribution of types characterizing later cultures is wider than that of older cultural types; the later objects could come down farther toward the present line because the coastline itself was lower.

Stratigraphy

Where stratigraphical or geological evidence is lacking, we must have recourse to typology. This depends on the assump-

Typology

Conditions for valid use tion that types evolved (or degenerated) regularly. It is only valid (1) when several series whose various terms can constantly be correlated are considered together, (2) when two or more terms are somehow fixed in the absolute time series, and (3) within a single culture or in an area of continuously inter-related cultures.¹ Even with these reservations typology yields a very abstract time sequence. In parts of Europe twentieth-century electric light and a pre-Roman oil lamp are in regular use by communities living only two or three miles apart.

Synchronisms The correlation of the relative sequences obtained by the above methods in distinct areas is possible (apart from rare cases where geology can be invoked) only in so far as 'external relations' subsist between the several areas. The occurrence as an accidental trait in cultural group A of a type characteristic of a specific phase of culture B affords a strong presumption of synchronism. This presumption becomes a certainty if equally distinctive types belonging to the same phase of group B occur as accidents in the appropriate phase of culture A.

Absolute chronology Absolute chronology can only rest on the establishment of such synchronisms between Continental cultures and the historically datable phases of Aegean, Egyptian, or Mesopotamian civilizations. In fact, datable Aegean or Anatolian types do occasionally appear as imports in a specific context in Central Europe. More rarely these synchronisms can be controlled by the appearance of Danubian types in a datable context in Greece or the Ancient East.

Dating by Aegean connexions is only possible during a relatively limited period. The Old Stone Age and part of the succeeding epipalaeolithic epoch lie outside the framework of the Egyptian calendar. Whatever *genetic* relations may be detected between early neolithic types in the Danube valley and those of the Aegean, they allow of no synchronism for reasons already adduced. It is first in the 'Copper Age' that 'external' influences from the Aegean make themselves felt. Absolutely unimpeachable evidence for a reaction of Central Europe on the latter area is not older than 1100 B.C., however much it be suspected earlier.

Plan of the work In the present book the exposition will be based as far as possible on cultures in chronological order. An attempt will be made to set forth the main traits of each complex as they are revealed by actual closed finds; the evidence for relations with other cultural groups and especially with the Aegean will

¹ e.g. London and New York, but not London and Lhasa.

then be stated separately, and the data on which the chronological position of the complex may be established and some speculations as to its origin will be added at the end. Maps are given to indicate the position of the more important sites, but few attempts have been made to plot distributions at all exhaustively. In the present state of our knowledge such maps would be only misleading. What they would show is not a real distribution, but the distinction between well-studied and virtually unexplored regions.

Unreliability of distribution maps

And here we must insist on the extreme unevenness of the archaeological exploration of Central Europe. Serbia is largely a blank, relieved only by one scientifically excavated site, Vinča (the results of whose excavation are still only provisionally published), and a little surface-scratching in the north and east. Bosnia is far better explored; the Iron Age barrows of Glasinac and the urnfields of the same date have been studied and described in a truly masterly fashion, but other excavations, carried out in the area, even at Butmir, leave much to be desired. In the neighbouring regions of Slavonia, Croatia, Carniola, Styria, and South-Western Hungary excavations that conform to modern requirements have scarcely been attempted at all, and in several areas, particularly Slavonia and Styria, even the activities of the collector have been slight and the material published is almost negligible. The Hungarian plain is another dark region. The museums of Szekszard, Buda-pest, Debrecen, and Nyiregyháza are crammed with wonderful material collected in the neighbourhood, but in all too many cases data as to stratigraphy or associations are unobtainable. A few chalcolithic and Bronze Age cemeteries have been quite satisfactorily excavated, but for the stratigraphical determination of the sequence of cultures we are forced to rely on results obtained at a couple of sites near Arad and at Tószeg near Szolnok. In Transylvania no scientific excavations of any importance are on record apart from the work of Dr. László in the Alt valley and a few cemeteries dug along the Maros. In view of its wealth in metals the condition of Transylvania is particularly deplorable. And the no less important hill-country of Slovakia and North Hungary, which must have been supplying most of the copper used in Central Europe from quite early times, is in a still worse plight. Not one first class site had been described prior to 1926, and comparatively few stray finds had been recorded or placed in accessible museums.

Unevenness of exploration

With relief we cross the mountains into Moravia where the archaeological record is peculiarly exact thanks especially to the work of Palliardi round Moravské Budejovice. The neighbouring regions of Lower and Upper Austria, on the other hand, are again sadly deficient as far as published finds go. But farther north, Silesia and Bohemia provide bright patches, though in the latter country there is still an immense amount of unpublished material both in the east and the south-west. Farther down the Elbe we have again to pass through a comparatively blank stretch in the State of Saxony before we reach the well-explored lands of Saxo-Thuringia, where the rich material in the well-arranged museums has been in most cases admirably described. Returning to the Danube basin we find rich museums in Oberpfalz and Lower and Upper Bavaria, only a fraction of whose content has yet been published, though in many cases it is derived from well-conducted excavations. The same remark applies to the Tyrol.

In Switzerland much material has been gathered and published, but it is extraordinary how difficult it is to arrange it in its proper context. But as soon as we come to the Rhine basin and South-West Germany we enter a region that like Silesia, Saxo-Thuringia, Central Bohemia, and Moravia has been thoroughly explored in accordance with the very best methods.

Author's own journeys The real gaps due to inadequate exploration have to some extent been increased by the limitations of the author's personal knowledge. There are many local museums, some often quite important, that he has been unable to visit, but he has studied the most important and typical, and has not failed to see at least one collection in each of the principal regions covered by this book. To enable the reader to discount the personal factor, a list of the museums visited is given here:

<i>Museums visited</i>	Serbia.	†Belgrade: National Museum (Dr. Sarea).
	Bosnia.	Sarejevo: Zeml. Museum (Dr. Petrovic).
	Slavonia.	†Osijek (Dr. Celestin).
	Croatia.	§Zagreb.
	Carniola.	§Ljubljana (Laibach) (Dr. Zupanič).
	Styria.	Graz (Dr. W. Schmidt).
	Banat.	§Vršac (Dr. Milleker).
		†Temesvar.
	Hungary.	Szeged: †Varosi Muzeum (Dr. Mora);
		§University Museum (Prof. Buday).
		†Szekszard (Dr. Kovacs).

- Hungary. †Szombathely (Baron von Miské).
 §Buda-Pest: A Magyar Nemzeti Muzeum (Dr. Hillebrandt); Geological Museum.
 Kecskemét.
 †§Debrecen (Dr. Zoltai).
 †§Nyiregyháza (Dr. Kiss).
- Subcarpathian
 Ruthenia. Munkacs (Munkačevo): Lehoczky Collection.
- Roumania. Nagyvarad (Grosswerdein).
 †§Arad: Kulturpalota (Dr. Niki).
- Transylvania. †Sepsi-Szent-György: Székely Nemzeti Muzeum.
 Kronstadt (Brassó) (Dr. Julius Teutsch).
 §Kolozsvar (Clausenburg): Erdelyi Nemzeti Muzeum (Dr. Roska).
- Slovakia. †Košice (Dr. Polak).
 †Turč. Sv. Martin (Turocz Szt. Márton).
 §Pressburg (Pozsony-Bratislava): City Museum; Gymnasium na Grösslingu.
- Moravia. †§Brno: Moravské Museum (Dr. Absalon and Dr. Červinka).
 †Olomouc.
- Galicia. Krakow: Akademia Nauk.
 Lwów (Lemberg): Museum Dzieduszicky (Prof. Kozłowsky).
- Silesia. §Breslau: Schlesisches Museum (Prof. Seger).
- Bohemia. Hradec Králove (Königgrätz).
 §Prague: Narodni Museum (Dr. Stocký); Sbirka Jira (at Podbaba).
 Plzen.
- Saxony. §Halle: Landesanstalt für Vorgeschichte (Dr. Niklassen).
- Lower Austria. Vienna: §Naturhistorisches Museum (Dr. Mahr);
 Niederösterreichisches Landesmuseum; Urgeschichtliches Institut der Universität.
- Oberpfalz. Regensburg: Ulrichsmuseum.
 §Nürnberg: Luitpoldmuseum (Dr. Hörmann).
- Lower Bavaria. Landeshut (Dr. Wolff).
- Upper Bavaria. Munich: Prähistorische Staatssammlung (Academy) (Dr. Wagner); National Museum.
- Tyrol. §Innsbruck (Dr. von Merhardt).
- Switzerland. §Schaffhausen (Dr. Sulzberger).
 Zurich (Dr. Viollier).

Switzerland. Berne (Prof. Tschumi).
 Neuchâtel (Dr. Vouga).
 Lausanne.

Wurtemberg. Tübingen: Urgeschichtliches Forschungsinstitut (Prof. R. R. Schmidt).

§Stuttgart: Sammlung der vaterländischen Altertümer (Dr. Paret).

Franconia. §Würzburg: Luitpoldmuseum (Prof. Hock).

Alsace. Strasburg: Musée préhistorique et Gallo-romain (Dr. R. Forrer).

Baden. Karlsruhe.

Rheinisch Palatinate. §Speyer (Dr. Sprater).

Hessen. Worms (Dr. Koehl).

Mainz: Römisch-germanisches Central-Museum (Prof. Schumacher).

Rhine Province. Cologne (Dr. Rademacher).

Acknowledgements

To the authorities of all the foregoing museums, but especially to the gentlemen mentioned by name, I am deeply indebted for many courtesies and much valuable help. Those marked with a † I have further to thank for permission to photograph and reproduce here objects included in the collections under their charge, while those marked with a §, as well as the authorities of the British Museum, Mr. C. Daryll Forde, and Dr. Schaeffer of Haguenau, have very kindly sent me photographs which I now gratefully acknowledge. I am much indebted to many kind friends and colleagues, both in England and on the Continent, who have helped my work in various ways. I might especially mention Mr. Forde and Mr. Louis Clarke with whom I had the pleasure of working in the field, Prof. Vassits of Belgrade, Dr. Márton the excavator of Tószeg, Dr. Tompa of Buda-Pest, Dr. Jan Eisner of Bratislava. The beautiful and understanding drawings of Miss A. M. Calverley have done much to make the text intelligible. Finally, I owe much to the Oxford University Press who have made possible the publication of this work by financial and other help.

The text was completed in September 1927, but owing to various difficulties final publication had to be postponed till 1929. The author has endeavoured as far as possible to incorporate material subsequently published, but naturally many books and articles had to be ignored and no analysis of new theories was possible.

V. G. C.

EDINBURGH, *February*, 1929.