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Editor's Foreword

Globular Amphora culture settlements make one of the most important systems of circulation of cultural patterns in the border zone between the drainage areas of the Baltic and Black Seas. One aspect of this problem, namely the "eastern exodus" mentioned in the title, has seemingly rich historiography. Under closer scrutiny, however, it reveals many intuitive opinions based on weak and insufficiently explored sources. This belief lay behind the present issue of the "Baltic-Pontic Studies". The papers presented in this issue open new areas of discussion of the problems in question. For the first time, the discussion is set against an incontrovertible scale of absolute chronology. This issue anticipates a broader synthesising presentation to be published in the not too distant future.
Editorial comment

1. All dates in the B-PS are calibrated [see: Radiocarbon vol.28, 1986, and the next volumes]. Deviations from this rule will be point out in notes.

2. The names of the archaeological cultures (especially from the territory of the Ukraine) are standarized according to the English literature on the subject [e.g. Mallory 1989]. In the case of a new term, the author's original name has been retained.

3. The place names located in the Ukraine have been transliterat from the versions suggested by the author (i.e. from the Belorussian, Ukrainian, Polish or Russian originals).
ON EARLY ELEMENTS OF THE GLOBULAR AMPHORA CULTURE AND OTHER CENTRAL EUROPEAN CULTURES IN THE LATE ENEOLITHIC OF THE NORTHERN BLACK SEA REGION

During the past decade, more and more researchers have been attracted to the issue of the relation between the development of the Central European group of cultures, traditionally referred to the Neolithic (i.e. the Funnel Beaker culture and the Globular Amphora culture), and the steppe cultures of the Northern Pontic region and the Azov region of the Eneolithic and the Early Bronze Age (i.e. the lower level of the Mikhailovka culture, cultures of Sredniy Stog region and the Yamnaya culture). Special interest evoked by the so-called „pre-Yamnaya” period is accounted for by the ambition to find correlation between the development of the prehistoric „European pre-Corded period” and ancient pastoral peoples in the period of the development of early forms of nomadic cattle-breeding and the emergence of the barrow ritual. As a typical example, one can mention recent investigations conducted by Aleksander Kośko [1985; 1991]. Research in this field is stimulated by several reasons: first, by the emergence of a substantial basis of sources in the steppe zone as a result of many years of mass study of barrows, as well as by efforts to reconsider, on this basis, many long-standing concepts of the steppe Northern Pontic Eneolithic; second, by active investigation of the development of the above-mentioned cultures, in particular, of aspects revealing the dynamics of relations with the Tripolye world. Furthermore, in the issue area of the genesis of the Northern Caucasian Maykop culture, there is a growing number of supporters of the idea of the descent of the Novosvobodnaya monument group under the influence of Central European cultures with the Pontic steppes acting as a link between these two distant regions.
1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ZHIVOTILOVKA-VOLCHANSK TYPE

Special interest of researchers is caused by the steppe zone monuments which could cast some light on the above-mentioned issues, e.g. displayed elements, features or „imports” suggesting their relation to the European cultures. Such monuments exist, and in our view, they can be lined up along a single chronological and cultural group in the territory from the Danube and the Prut to the Don and the Kuban region (Fig. 1). This case refers to a particular group of burial monuments with very steady features of the burial ritual, a definite, strictly observed stratigraphic position in the barrows and with specific categories of items primarily unusual for other Eneolithic steppe cultures. The specific features of the ritual include occurrence of rectangular grave pits, often with ledges, and niches; the dead body was in a writhed position on the right or the left side, with arms bent at the elbows and hands put in front of the face; it was oriented in a western or south-western direction; a moderate amount of ochre was used (Fig. 2 and 3). Stratigraphically, these graves were often made into earlier Eneolithic barrows and covered by later graves of the Yamnaya culture. Discovered major mounds never precede other Eneolithic cultures known in the steppe zone, but always precede the Yamnaya culture. The late Eneolithic age of the monuments is confirmed by the found items. Ceramics can be classed into several groups:

(1) The late-Tripolye vessels with and without painting which refer to general Tripolye forms or are similar to the Gordineshly (or, according to other terminology, to the Kasperovtsy) group of the late Tripolye monuments of stage CII (Fig. 4,1-8). This kind of pot occurs in graves located in the territory from the Danube and the Prut to the Molochna river and the Dnieper's left tributary, the Samara.

(2) The second group is represented by biconic vessels with carved or glazed ornaments on the shoulders and often a minor groove in the base of the rim (Fig. 4,17-20). The vessels were found in graves in the territory from the Kuban region to the Ingulets river.

(3) The third group can be referred to as cups and cup-shaped vessels. These are smaller flat-bottomed round shaped artefacts, with a high, often bell-shaped rim. The cups' surfaces are well-smoothed and polished (Fig. 4:9-16). The cups occur throughout the whole territory, though with some local features, e.g. some formal differences in the dough texture with admixtures of sand, chamotte, flint and shells.

(4) The fourth group includes cup- and bowl-shaped vessels (Fig. 5:1-4). They are common for the whole territory and similar to the cups in their technological features.

(5) The fifth group united amphora-shaped vessels featuring flat bottoms, narrow round-shouldered bodies, high rims and vertical handles with horizontal holes (Fig. 5:5-7). These items are of different texture, as some contain admixtures of shells while other have admixtures of sand; the type of baking also varies.

(6) The most peculiar is the sixth group: small, often miniature items of various
forms. Most of them are cup-shaped vessels (Fig. 5:8-15). They are joined in this group because, in my opinion, they represent rather primitive imitations, unskilfully copying higher-quality traditional artefacts, or probably even made "by heart", e.g. cups, amphorae and the Tripolye vessels which occur in the whole territory where such graves can be found.

(7) Finally, I qualify the seventh group of ceramics as locally produced steppe artefacts which occur in the Lower Mikhailovka culture mounds. These vessels have steady forms and technological features and are represented by smaller round-bottomed vessels with high rims, smoothly translated into the body, or with a flute in the base (Fig. 5:16-20).

Other categories of objects include decorations: most typical are bone and bronze "pins" of a strongly curved shape; one of the ends being well-sharpened.
The bone pins have a hole in the bend; the bronze ones have the second end wound in a ring instead (Fig. 6:1-10). These „pins” resemble well-known staff-shaped decorations of the Novosvobodnaya monuments from the Northern Caucasus. All in all, 11 items of this type have been found: 5 in the Danube-Dniester basin, 3 in the Samara basin, 2 at the Molochna river and 1 at the Don. The latter is the most similar to the Novosvobodnaya pins.

Another typical kind of decoration besides the „pins” are strings of shell and jet beads which occur in different amount in the whole territory (Fig. 6:13-16). Of most interest are two pendants — „seals” found in the Don and Samara basins. One of them is made of lignited and ornamented with carved lines and equipped with a hole for hanging. The second is marble, smooth, with a special protruding eye for hanging (Fig. 6:11-12).

Handles in the history of stock do not bear many characteristic features and are not often found.

Cartography shows that the monuments in question form several groups of
major concentration in the Azov-Black Sea steppe zone (Fig. 1) which could be preliminarily defined by the names of the river basins, respectively. The largest area is covered by the Prut-Dniester group, the Samara and the Molochna groups are more compact, while the Ingulets-Dnieper group is rather vague. A number of mounds feature the Kalmius group. Individual graves were found in the Southern Bug basin and in the Northern Crimea. The eastern part of the massif is occupied by the Lower Don group; the pre-Caucasian region features the Kuban group,
Fig. 4. Ceramics of groups I - III. Legend: 1, 2, 13 - Taradkia; 3 - Velikaya Aleksandrovka 1/23; 4 - Taradkia II, 2/4; 5 - Sokolowo 2/9; 6 - Zhivotilovka; 7, 11, 12 - Volchansk I, 1/21; 8 - Nowomcsekovsk 1/10; 9 - Roshkany 5/7; 10 - Vinogradnoye 14/2; 14 - Primorskoye 4/2; 15 - Rostov-on-Don 7/1; 16 - Volchansk I, 1/16; 17 - Pavlograd 1, 8/3; 18 - Zhivotilovka, the Maydan barrow, grave 5; 19 - Sokolowo 6/4; 20 - Shakhayeuskaya 11, 3/8
immediately close to the Northern Caucasian Novosvobodnaya group of monuments of the Maykop culture.

A group of similar mounds was first defined in the Lower Don region on the basis of materials from Koysug barrows [Maksimenko 1973; Kiyashko 1974]. Next, the Zhivotilovka group in the Samara basin on the left bank of the Dnieper [Kovaleva 1978] clearly demonstrated the late Tripolye component. Furthermore, investiga-
Fig. 6. Decorations. Legend: 1 - Tiraspol 3/27; 2 - Taraklia 10/2; 3 - Bolgrad 6/1; 4, 12 - Podgornoye X, 3/7; 5 - Kazaklia 17/22; 6 - Boguslav 23/7; 7, 13 - Volchansk I, 1/21; 8 - Pavlograd 7/3; 9 - Vinogradnoye 12/1; 10, 11 - Koşuş-Radotka, grave 24; 15, 16 - Taraklia 10/2

In the territory between Dniester and Prut, as well as in the Azov region and the Kuban region, suggested the existence of common cultural-chronological groups of monuments due to similarity of forms and technology of ceramics, specific decorations and the rituals [Rassamakin 1986, 1987, 1988, 1990, 1993; Rezepkin 1987; Zaginailo, Chernyakov, Petrenko 1987; Manzura 1989, 1992, 1993; Petrenko 1989; Kovaleva 1991]. Each of the above-mentioned local groups has its own features, but there is little doubt about their synchronous character and common origin. According to known Tripolye vessels, this group of monuments corresponds with the
CII stage of Tripolye culture, particularly with its latest phases (which, according to calibrated data may refer to the first quarter of the third thousand BC [Chernysh 1982:175; Movsha 1984:76, 1993:46]. The main issue is the origin of this group of monuments which could be preliminarily named „Zhivotilovka-Volchansk” type, by the names of the most typical locations with the most representative complexes in the Samara and Molochna basins in the center of the whole area of occurrence of this cultural group. They represent the synthesis of different traditions, suggesting, first of all, a lack of local steppe origin of the monuments. One, probably the main of these traditions, was brought in by the Gordineshty (Kasperovtsy) tribes of the forest-steppe version of the Tripolye culture (=first group of ceramics); the second, less specific group of ceramics with elements of the Tripolye, the Gordineshty ornamental tradition, was brought by the Maykop communities. The local steppe component is represented by ceramics of the seventh group, most typical for the late phase of the Lower Mikhailovka graves (Shirokoye-Baratovka stage, according to D.Y. Telegin). In our view, the search for origins of the ceramics of groups 3 to 6 brings us the Central European region. Such forms as cups, amphorae with various eyes, plasters, handles and special technology which included thick admixtures of chamotte, flint, and a well-glazed uneven surface have no prototypes either in earlier or in synchronous time. The reality of the selected direction of search for possible sources among Central European cultures synchronous to the late phases of the Tripolye culture is also confirmed by some burial complexes. Though the latter have not been widely referred to in scientific circles, they allow us to cast some light on events of that time. One of the most interesting of these complexes is a stone tomb, investigated in 1968 in barrow 1 at Baratovka of the Snegerevka region, the Mikolaiv district, on the right bank of Ingulets. Part of the material of this barrow was published, and since major interest is attracted by the earliest graves, we will provide their description and stratigraphic correlation based on the report data [Yelagina, Petrenko 1968] and our analysis [Rassamakin 1996].

2. BARATOVKA

Prior to excavation, the barrow was 5 m high and 60-70 m in diameter. the ancient layer was found 4.8 m deep. First, a small mound was made over an Eneolithic grave no. 5 (Fig. 7). Probably, graves nos. 16 and 17 were synchronous with grave no. 5, but had their individual mounds. Next, as shown by the profile of the only edge, was grave no. 6 in the stone tomb. The construction of it covered the remains of the mound over grave no. 5. Later a stone cist of the Kemi-Oba culture (grave no. 8) was installed on grave no. 6, and an additional mound was put on it.
Later on the barrow was used and built up by the Yamnaya culture tribes as well as by later populations.

Grave no. 5 is the main one (Fig. 8). A stone base with dimensions of 0.8 m x 0.7 m was found 4.49 m deep. Underneath there were several more plates: one at the southern and two at the northern edges of the grave pit. The pit was oval in form, 1.25 m x 0.7 m, oriented along the NNE-SSW axis, with a filling of ashes with an admixture of small pieces of charcoal and a layer of pure ashes in the middle.

Fig. 7. Baratovka. General view and cross-section of barrow 1
part. The pit is 5.1 m deep (0.3 m from the ancient level). At the northern wall, on the bottom, there was a large unprocessed piece of red ochre (14 x 9.5 x 8.5 cm); at the western wall there was a moulded flat-bottomed vessel with a rich admixture of shells in the dough and an ornament around the rim, the neck and the shoulders. The ornament represented three rows of cord impressions and three rows of small caterpillars. Along with ashes, the pit filling contained calcinated bones and grains of ochre (Fig. 8).

Grave no. 16, the main one, was made on the ancient level (Fig. 9). Remains of a stone box represent individual plates, placed edgewise along the western, northern and partly eastern walls. The plates’ surfaces are polished. The box of 1.5 m x 1.3 m
in dimensions is oriented along the east-west axis. The plates' bases are deepened into the ground by 17 cm. The box contained very badly preserved remains of two children's bodies. The first of the buried lay at the northern wall, on the right side with bent knees and the head to the east. The second body was located to the south of the first one. Only fragments of the skeleton were preserved: a piece of the skull, individual fractions of bones which could hardly suggest the position of the body, oriented to the east. Pieces of ochre were found in front of the chest of the first of the buried and at the skull of the second. The floor displayed traces of sprinkled chalk. Between the skulls, a small, flat-bottomed vessel of slightly elongated proportions with well-defined, rounded shoulders was lying on its side. Its surface was well-smoothed, of a reddish-ochre colour. The thick dough contained lime; the upper layer partially exfoliated. The height of the vessel is 8.4 cm, the diameter of the rims is 5.4 cm and the diameter of the bottom is 3.3 cm (Fig. 9).

Grave no. 17, a major one, was made on the ancient level in a stone cist (Fig. 10). It was found 4.27 m deep. The cist was covered with a large plate (1.1 m x 0.85 m). It consisted of nine plates comprising a polygon. The inner side of the plates were hewed. The cist was 1.2 m x 1.03 m in its dimensions, oriented along the NNW-SSE axis. The western wall was represented by one plate (0.85 m x 0.52 m, 0.1 m thick). Other plates varied in length from 0.2 m to 0.5 m; the average height was 0.55 m and the thickness from 0.09 m to 0.17 m. The plates' bases were deepened
in the ground and strengthened by detritus and, on the outside, by additional minor inclined plates. The space between them and the cist’s walls was filled with small stones. The bottom of the cist was plastered with earth mixture (Fig. 10).

The cist contained remains of an infant’s interment, all the bones of which had mouldered. Traces of the skull could be observed at the north-eastern wall, and traces of a phalanx of toes were found at the south-western wall. The floor displayed patches of ochre and sprinkled chalk. To the left of the skull and in the middle of the cist there was a stone anthropomorphic statuette, decorated with notches and cut lines, 3.3 cm high and 2.7 cm high, respectively. Besides the statuettes, there was a coquina amulet-pendant of elongated-oval shape, 3 cm x 1.1 cm. At the eastern wall of the cist there was a massive shiver of grey stone with traces of fine retouching on one long edge. Dimensions: 5.5 cm x 2.4 cm, 2 cm thick.
Grave no. 6 was the first supplementary (when the dead body is „added” to
the ashes buried in an old grave before) burial interment performed on the ancient
level, at the base of the mound over grave no. 5, in a stone tomb (Fig. 11). The
tomb was covered with a stone pile; the floor was of ground and partly covered the
earliest main mound of the barrow. The pile of stones occupied a round-shaped
space of about 4 m in diameter; sizes of stones and plates were an average of 0.4 x
0.7 m. The pile was 1.25 m to 1.0 m from the ancient level. Beneath the pile there
was a box of elongated-rectangular shape with a slightly narrowed western part,
oriented along the west-east axis. Inside dimensions were 2.65 m x 1.0 m. Long
walls consisted of three plates each, while butt-ends were made of one plate each.
The upper edge of the plates was located 4.0-4.18 m deep from the 0-level, i.e. it
had reached the height of 0.62-0.8 m from the ancient level. The western butt plate
is 0.3-0.4 m lower than the other plates. This was the entrance to the tomb, i.e.
from the outside this plate was screened with a larger plate which covered a hole
between the ceiling and the upper edge of the butt plate. The largest plate is the
eastern one (1.25 m x 0.86 m) and the adjacent side plates from the south and the
north (1.32 m x 1.18 m). All the plates were roughly finished from the inside. They
were joined tightly, with the seams plastered by clay mixed with earth. The plates’
bases were deepened in the soil by up to 0.2 m. Detritus filling was found on the
bottom level along the plates. To strengthen the walls from the north, south and
east, smaller plates were put horizontally in one to three layers along major plates;
the spaces between them were filled with earth mixed with clay.

The grey light filling of the box contained individual human bones. At the
bottom there were six badly preserved skulls: one in the north-eastern corner, four in
the middle and one at the western wall. Most of the bones were found in the eastern
part of the box. Here there were mixed bones of legs, pelvis, shoulder-iaoades
and ribs. In the western part, in situ, there were two skeletons. The first from the
entrance, the skeleton of an adult in the embrional position on the right side, is
oriented to SSE. The skull is missing; the right arm is strongly bent, hand on the
chest; the left arm is bent under the right angle. The second was the child’s skeleton.
Probably, it was also put in the embrional position with the same orientation. The
skull is missing. The left arm is bent under a sharp angle and put onto the chest; the
remaining shoulder bone of the right arm was located along the body. Of the leg
bones only the one of the fibulae, put to the right, remained. Both of the skeletons
had been painted.

At the southern wall, in the middle, there was a piece of ochre shaped as a
four-faced pyramid with a cut-off top, 14.3 cm high, with a base of 8.5 cm x 7 cm
and upper part of 5.7 cm x 5.3 cm. Its surface was smoothed. At the base of one of
the side facets there were three oblique notches, joined with the two on the bottom
surface.
The bottom of the box is of earth, well-rammed, with a layer of ashes and ochre.

Considering the fact that in the profile of the barrow we have an asymmetric construction of a pile over an interment, in addition to which there is an easy-to-open entrance for later burial rituals, and the lack of an adjacent additional support of flinty put plates, one can assume, with a high degree of probability, that the construction of stones and earth over the tomb was not closed from the side of the entrance. Possible contours of the whole construction are marked on the general plan of the barrow (Fig. 7). Probably, only after the end of the functioning of the tomb the whole construction was covered with the ground mound. The next in time, the Kemi-Oba grave no. 8, was made on its surface.

Grave no. 8, the second „supplementary“ interment, belongs to the Kemi-Oba culture (Fig. 12). 1.99 m deep from the 0-level there was a plate covering a stone box (2 m x 1.1 m) with adjacent smaller stones on the area of 2.5 m x 2.3 m. The box consisted of 8 plates: three on each of the long walls and one on each of the butt-ends. The length of the butt-end plates was 0.96 m and 1 m, of the side plates from 0.5 m to 0.66 m; height from 0.85 m to 1 m. Thickness varied from 0.1 m to 0.2 m. About one-third of the plates were dug into the ground. The inner surface was finished more roughly. The plates' bases, deepened in the ground, were not finished. From the inside, the butt plates have narrow vertical flutes on the edges.

Fig. 11. Baratovka. Barrow 1, grave 6 (1 - ochre)
so that they could be joint more tightly with side plates. The seams were plastered with clay mortar both from the inside and the outside. The inside dimensions of the box were 1.65 m x 0.8 m; it was oriented along the NNE — SSW axis. From the outside the plates of the box were strengthened with a filling of small stones. The box was surrounded with a pile of small and medium plates and stones. In the cross-section the whole structure represents a cut-topped cone with a flat summit of the box's ceiling. The total area of the pile's base is 4 m from north to south and 2.9 m from west to east (Fig. 12).
An adult skeleton is very poorly preserved. The remains of the skull are represented by a fraction of the occipital part and the lower jaw. It lay in a spinal position with legs bent up at the knees, head northward. The arms were stretched along the body; legs to the left. The bones had been painted with red ochre. To the left from the skeleton, at the forearm there was a piece of ochre representing a grating-stone with a smoothed surface, 7.5 cm high, the diameter of the base 10 cm and of the upper facet 7.3 cm.

The floor of the box consists of two coquina plates. The northern plate is quite well-adjusted to the box's shape, while the southern one does not reach the wall. The gap is filled with smaller plates. The seams between the plates of the floor are filled with clay mortar mixed with earth.

The barrow described above is interesting not only for the occurrence of the tomb complex unique for the steppe zone (grave no. 6), but also for the stratigraphic surrounding of the latter. In all versions of possible reconstructions of stratigraphy, the interment in the tomb overlays an earlier mound over a grave which contained materials of the late Tripolye culture, stage CII. The Serezlievka-type statues from the grave no. 17 are dated by this period, as well as the vessel from the grave no. 5, which, according to all dimensions, is similar to the late Tripolye kitchen ceramics, well-known, for example, in the Usatovo version and in the late Tripolye settlements of the Southern Bug. However, the latter feature an admixture of ground shells [Movsha 1972:9; Zbenovich 1972:16-18]. The tomb is overlaid by a Kemi-Oba grave and later Yamnaya graves. This situation is also typical for graves of the Zhivotilovka-Volhansk type, for example, in the Samara and the Molochna basins, where there was evidence of graves lowered into earlier Eneolithic mounds which contained burial interments, synchronous, according to the items found, with the Tripolye CII period, i.e. the Sofievka and the Usatovo variants. For instance, in the Samara basin, at Sokolovo, in barrow 6, a grave of the Zhivotilovka-Volhansk type (no. 4) was younger than the destroyed major grave no. 6, which contained a specific stone axe analogous to those found in the Sofievka-type barrows [Kovalev 1978:52, Tab.1; Rassamakin 1988:23-24].

On the Molochna, at Vinogradnoye, in barrow 2, two Zhivotilovka-Volhansk graves (no. 4 and no. 14) in the pit and in the niche were drilled into the mound with the main „stretched” grave, which contained bone elongated figured beads [Rassamakin 1987:33-36] which earlier occurred in a grave in the late Usatovo complex in the Dniester basin, near Sadovoye [Mal'yukevich, Petrenko 1993: 25-29].

Besides proximity of stratigraphic position, in the tomb we observe a ritual very similar to the Zhivotilovka-Volhansk one. Probably, it is appropriate to include the grave in the tomb near Baratovka in a common cultural-chronological group of monuments with the Zhivotilovka-Volhansk graves.
3. ORIGIN OF THE ZHVOTILOVKA-VOLCHANSK TYPE

A general view of the Zhivotilovka-Volchansky type monuments, as well as analysis of the burial ritual and the most typical categories of the stock show that in this case we deal with a definite migration process, which united the Danube and Prut regions with the lower Don, the Kuban basins and the Northern Caucasus. The origins of this movement depend on how the question of direction of migration is answered. This is proved by the materials of the Samara and Molochna groups. Occurrence among them of Tripolye ceramics, defined by experts as the Kasperovtsy (Gordineshty) type [Movsha 1984:68-69, 1993:42-45; Manzura 1990]; of bow-shaped „pins”, most of which are now known in the Prut-Dniester basin, suggest the closest connection with monuments of the Dniester and Prut regions. Further eastward, in the Don group such a relation is not observed. Instead, more expressive are Maykop elements. The author has already pointed to this conformity [Rassamakin 1988: 21-22], but now „Western” impulses have become even more obvious, and the movement from the West eastward raises no doubt. Researchers of the Lower Don monuments also agree to this point of view [Kiyashko 1992:4-6, 1994:80]. Therefore, the search area of the movement’s sources is narrowed to the Prut-Dniester basin, while occurrence of representative Kasperovtsy (Gordineshty) materials — not only in these graves, but in the steppe monuments in general (including the middle level of the Mikhailovka settlement) — allows one to agree with the position advocated by researchers of the Tripolye culture who point out to increased activity of the population of the Kasperovtsy (Gordineshty) forest-steppe Tripolye variant [Movsha 1984, 1993; Manzura 1990, 1993:33].

This leads us to the border between forest and steppe and the forest-steppe zone of the Prut-Dniester basin. Meanwhile, occurrence of glazed cups and cup-shaped vessels, amphorae, cups and bowls, suggest influence of Central European or Balkan-Carpathian cultures on the emergence of ceramics of groups 3-6. These cultures could include the Funnel Beaker, the Globular Amphora, and the Baden cultures. It is interesting to note that the ritual in the above-mentioned regions was similar, though mainly barrowless [Haüsler 1971, 1989]. It should also be mentioned that experts explain the formation of the late Tripolye ritual by the influence of Balkan-Carpathian traditions [Haüsler 1964:777, Zbenovich 1974:55]. Furthermore, the existent material prove contacts of, particularly, the Kasperovtsy (Gordineshty) variant with the Funnel Beaker and the Globular Amphora cultures [Movsha 1985b], though this problem has not been investigated sufficiently, especially with regard to relations with the Tripolye and the Globular Amphora cultures. It is very difficult to specify this process, to define the causes of migration. Moreover, the correlation between Central European and Balkan-Carpathian cultures is not clear enough. In our view, the question is in the time of the split of the Funnel Beaker culture, its „Badenisation” on the one hand, and „acculturation” by the later Tripolye, according to A. Koško [1981:118] and, probably, the emergence of the Globular Amphora
culture. According to A. Koško’s periodisation, this time corresponds with stages D and partly E in the system of development of contacts between populations of the Vistula-Oder basins and the Northern Pontic steppes [Koško 1991:242-248]. We believe this time could correspond with Gródek III and Bronocice IV-V [Ścibior 1994]. Also, one could assume the existence of a relation between the active process of transformation of the Funnel Beaker culture under the influence of the Baden culture, emergence of the Globular Amphora culture and activity of bearers of the Gordineshty (Kasperovtsy) variant both towards the Vistula and the the steppe regions. The latter acted as intermediaries in the transfer of cultural elements which explains, for instance, the occurrence of the Łasin statuette, similar to the Serezlievka type [Kirkowski 1984]. Zhivotilovka-Volchansk graves suggest routes of migration and the of new cultural elements which gradually acquired a more syncretic character up to the Northern Caucasus; discussion of the European component makes the issue of formation of the Novosvobodnaya group of the Maykop culture more realistic [Dergachev, Manzura 1991:55-58; Rassamakin 1991:52-55].

Maykop elements in the Zhivotilovka-Volchansk-type interments in the Samara and especially in the Don groups can be explained only by investigation of the processes which began in the Northern Caucasus and the pre-Caucasian region after it was reached by the migration wave described above. The Maykop cultures are typical for a comparatively late period of cultural development. One of the vessels of the Samara group (Pavlograd I, barrow 8, grave 3) has a definite pumpkin-shape (Fig. 4:17), typical for late Novosvobodnaya dolmens [Resepkin 1989]. This concerns the second group of ceramics specified above (Fig. 4:17-20). Some researchers consider it as purely Maykop samples [Kovaleva 1978:40, 1991:83; Nechytaïlo 1991:26-29]; others believe it is connected with the Tripolye traditions [Movsha 1984:69; Zbenovich 1987:115-116]. We are more inclined to accept the position of I.V. Manzura, who considers these vessels to be a synthesis of the Gordineshty (Kasperovtsy) ornament on morphologically alien vessels, thought often biconic features of the latter also resemble Tripolye shapes [Manzura 1990:32]. This position has its reason, since the emergence of Gordineshty (Kasperovtsy)-style retouched or polished ornament on typically Maykop ceramics also can be explained by the influence of the migrants’ traditions. This phenomenon was observed in the steppe region, for example, on the right bank of the Dnieper (Shirokoye, barrow 1, grave 3), but on ceramics made according to the steppe Lower Mikhailovka traditions. Actually, V.I. Zbenovich did not reject the idea of imitated Tripolye artefacts [Zbenovich 1987:116].

The emergence of the Maykop elements can be accounted for by the process of interaction and population movement not only from the West eastward, but also in the reverse direction. This phenomenon suggests the existence of a certain bridge between the regions and destination territories of migration. This is also proved by a burial complex from Kosteshty (barrow 2, grave 2) on the left bank of the Prut — the most north-western point of the Zhivotilovka-Volchansk type [Dergachev 1982:10-12], in which, along with an original vessel and a flat flint axe, there was a set of asymmetric Maykop-type arrowhead (Fig. 13). This find even
allowed V.A. Dergachev to assume the Northern Caucasian origin of the buried man [Dergachev 1982:127].

It should be noted that the assumed migration process, represented by Zhitovitilovka-Volchansk type graves, in Azov-Black Sea region steppes coincided with the existence of local population groups: according to our terminology, the Lower Mikhailovka and Kvitanskaya cultures with typical for them embrionic on the side and stretched position of the burial ritual [Rassamakin 1993, 1994]. The contacts resulted in the emergence of ceramics of Lower Mikhailovka traditions (group 7) in the Zhitovitilovka-Volchansk graves and finds of small glass beads, a biconic vessel without glazed ornament in graves of local cultures.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Summing up, one should note that during the final period of development of the Tripolye culture a bridge between the forest-steppe Tripolye communities of the Gordeshty (Kasperovtsy) variant and the Northern Caucasian population was
formed as a result of migration processes. This connection found its specific archaeological representation in the monuments classed as the Zhivotilovka-Volchansk type. Meanwhile, the Tripolye population acted as a carrier of elements common for the Central European and Balkan-Carpathian regions: the Baden, the Funnel Beaker and the Globular Amphora cultures. Features of the Globular Amphora culture, probably, occurred in the steppe earlier than most scholars thought before. As a rule, more expressive materials, in particular, imported ceramics of the Globular Amphora culture, are known in the period of the Yarmaya culture in the territory of Moldova [cf. in this volume: Szmyt, Globular...]. Probably they are reflected in the emergence of smaller amphorae (especially in the Samara group) as well as of stone tombs similar to the Baratovka tomb. The latter has much in common with stone grave structures of the eastern group of Globular Amphora culture, e.g. in the Volhynia and the Podolia variants [Sveshnikov 1983].

On the other hand, the Zhivotilovka-Volchansk type monuments concretise the hypothesis about an occidental origin of the Novosvodnaya-type monuments, or, in any case, about the presence of European influences in the Maykop culture. Though the topic leaves much room for discussion, the direction being developed by N.A. Nikolayeva and V.A. Safronov [1974:17-22, 1991:189-197] obtains more specific meaning due to Zhivotilovka-Volchansk monuments, which require further investigation.
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