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MILESTONES IN THE HISTORY OF DONBASS ARCHAEOLOGY

The systematic study of archaeological sites in the Donbass region began in the 1880s. The history of regional archaeology can be conditionally divided into the following stages: the Romantic, the pre-Gorodtsov, the Gorodtsov, the Early Soviet, the Middle Soviet, the Late Soviet, and the Contemporary ones. The key events for the identification of starting points of the periods are the beginning of kurgan excavations in 1888; XII and XIII Archaeological Congresses, in 1903 and 1905 respectively; the establishment of local museums in a series of towns and cities in the first half of the 1920s; years of the Great Patriotic War; the foundation of the Department of Archaeology in the State Donetsk University (1973); dissolution of the Soviet Union. The Donetsk Archaeological Center was formed and firmly established in the time period between 1973 and 1991. The Center is known for its active scholarly publishing and studies in specialized areas of archaeology. Refs 35.
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The history of Donbass archaeology is typical of the developed regions of Eastern Europe where socio-economic and cultural growth began relatively late. Donbass antiquities started to attract scholarly attention when Russian archaeologists came to take a consistent interest in the simple steppe kurgans of South Russia.

This paper defines the main historical milestones of studying the archaeological monuments of the Donbass. Donbass archaeology is an integral part of the archaeology of the Russian Empire, the USSR, Ukraine and Russia, and as such, it has repeatedly been discussed in archaeological historiography [Gening 1982; Pryakhin 1986].

The periodization of general and regional archaeology is closely connected with biographical and historiographical studies. The key figure in this respect is D. S. Tsveibel, who from the 1960 to the 1980s carried out a systematic study of the history of general and regional archaeology [Tsveibel 1969]. There has formed a considerable bulk of biographical studies dedicated to Donetsk archaeologists [Tsveibel 1972, 1989; Kolesnik, Panasenko
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There can also be distinguished a number of works on the development of archaeology in Donetsk National University [Shepko 1992; Kosikov, Litvinenko 1997; Kolesnik 2004]. “A History of Studying Donbass Archaeological Monuments” prepared by V. A. Kosikov is arranged as a series of biographical essays [Kosikov 2001].

The neighboring Lugansk region can boast a considerable body of such works [Prin’ 2012; Shestakov 2008, 2012; Kluchneva 2009].

Despite their obvious progress in biographical and historiographical studies Donetsk and Lugansk archaeologists have not yet created a common periodization of regional history of archaeology. A number of works mark the development stages of regional archaeology but this is done only in the issue-related fields. A.N. Usachuk and his co-author highlight four stages: “pre-Gorodtsov”, “Gorodtsov”, “pre-war” and “newbuilding” [Usachuk, Kolesnik 2012, p. 12] in the development of “kurgan” archaeology. In one of his interesting essays, I. A. Shestakov divides the history of studying the Paleolithic of Luganskchina into three chronological stages in the period from the 1910s until now [Shestakov 2008, 2012]. The history of studying ancient manufacture monuments of Donetschina and Luganskchina has been viewed in detail [Kolesnik 2013]. R. A. Litvinenko analyzes at length the new-building stage of Donbass kurgan archaeology as part of Ukrainian science [Litvinenko 2012].

Research shows that archaeology in the two neighboring regions has been developing largely at the same pace. Yet, Lugansk archaeology has had its own peculiar path. Therefore, it would be fair to consider the history of Donetsk archaeology as a separate subject of research.

Chronologically, the main stages of Donetsk regional archaeological development were marked by significant events and processes connected with the local archaeological center acquiring its independent status.

The first undifferentiated historical and cultural information of the most ancient monuments in the region began to accumulate in the 1730s after the research trip of G.V. Junker to the south of Russia. Academician I. A. Guldenstedt’s journey across the Azov region in the autumn of 1773 and across the regions of the Tor, Bakhmut and Severskii Donets in 1774 should also be mentioned here as part of the early period.

This “romantic” period in Donbass was replaced by the “academic” approach per se only in the second half of the 19th century. I. E. Zabelin’s arrival in Donbass in 1864 can be considered the conventional date for it.

The next stage was connected with academic — by the standards of the time — research into kurgans. It began with the excavations of N. E. Brandenburg (1888–1889, 1891) and E. Iu. Petri (1888) and was brilliantly continued by V. A. Gorodtsov (1901–1903). Archaeological congresses — the XII (1903) and the XIII (1905) — are what mark this period.

The beginning of the next stage is defined by several significant events of the first half of the 1920s — when a number of Museums of Regional Studies were created and the fruitful careers of N. V. Sibilev, S. A. Loktyushev and other archaeologists and regional historians began. The researches of N. E. Makarenko in Mariupol (1930) and Stalino (1930–1933) should be recognized as the internal milestone of this stage. 1943, when N. V. Sibilev passed away and S. A. Loktyushev fell victim to the war, marks the end of this stage. The museums and academic institutions resumed their activities in 1944–1945.
The beginning of the post-war period is associated with the fruitful efforts of D. S. Tsveibel at Stalin Pedagogical Institute in 1944. The “internal” marker was the foundation of Donetsk State University in 1965. 1973, the year when the Archaeology Department and the Department of History of Antiquity and Middle Ages were created at Donetsk State University, is the “upper” margin of this stage. After the creation of the specialized department, Donetsk regional archaeological center finally took shape. This stage continued until the collapse of the USSR in 1991.

The period from 1992 to 2014 can be called “contemporary”, as all the key events in the development of archaeology are witnessed by our contemporaries.

So, the history of Donbass archaeology can be divided into the following interrelated stages: “Romantic” (1735–1864); “Pre-Gorodtsovian” (1865–1887); “Gorodtsovian” (1888 — beginning of the 20th century); “Early Soviet” (early 1920s — 1943); “Middle Soviet” (1944–1973); “Late Soviet” (1974–1991); “Contemporary” (1992–2014).

The “Romantic” stage. The main milestones of this stage — a conventional one, in a sense, — concern almost exclusively kurgans and stone sculptures.

The first European academic in the service of the Russian empire who took note of the stone idols in the Azov steppes was G. F. Junker. In 1735–1737, as a member of an expedition of the Academy of Sciences, he took part in the “description” of the lands in the south of Russia, i.e. investigated the lands of modern Donbass, and paid attention to the “hideous stone figures”.

Academician I. A. Guldenstedt also saw the kurgans with stone sculptures on his way from Astrakhan to the Crimea in 1773–1774 [Magidovich, Magidovich 1984]. His journeys were complex, his routes crossing the territory of modern Donbass twice [Krutaya 1992]. I. A. Guldenstedt’s jounals contain highly precise information of his route and the antiquities seen by him.

Along with the rising scholarly apprehension of the kurgans from the 18th to the first half of the 19th centuries, there continued the permanent practice of using them as spatial frameworks or boundary marks. This practice is known to date back from the beginning of the 17th century and is mentioned in the “Book of the Big Map”.

These episodes of academic attention to the mounds and stone effigies in the Donbass is rare is quite logical as Russian science of the time can, on the whole, be characterized as “notes of traveling scholars”.

In the middle of the 19th century “stone babas” (kurgan balbals) in South Russian steppes became objects for collecting. In 1849, a comprehensive collection of stone effigies was recorded in Velikoanadolsk forestry in the North Azov region [Pletneva 1984].

The “romantic” stage of Donetsk archaeology is a time of accumulating knowledge on the archaeological monuments in the course of complex expeditions of the Russian Academy of Sciences, with attention predominantly given to kurgans, stone effigies and their collecting.

The “Pre-Gorodtsovian” period. The foundation of the Emperor’s Archaeological Commission in 1859 had crucial consequences for the development of archaeology in the Russian Empire [Smirnov 2011]. Inviting I. A. Zabelin to take the position of a research associate almost at the same time as when the Archaeological commission was created was vital for the territory we are discussing [Imperatorskaia Arkheolog Komissiia 2009, p. 42]. One of the most vivid episodes of the commission’s early activity was I. A. Zabelin’s research of the Scythian kurgans, the Chortomlyk kurgan among them in 1862–1863. In
1864, I. E. Zabelin conducted an archaeological reconnaissance on the territory of Donbass and visited Savur-Mohyla (near Shakhtersk).

The year 1869 saw the first documented case of kurgan excavations in Mariupol (the Kambur kurgan). This kurgan remained the focus of attention for many years after and left a considerable document trail. In the 1870s and 1880s, amateur excavations became widespread in landed estates in search of buried treasures [Usachuk, Kolesnik 2004, p. 12–13]. Kurgans were sometimes accidentally destroyed during construction and earthworks.

The “pre-Gorodtsovian” stage is the time when the Emperor’s Archaeological Commission’s interest to kurgans was taking shape. It was a time of unsystematic works and accidental archaeological findings. Peripheral position in comparison to governorate centers of the Russian empire and the absence of striking archaeological findings limited the Donbass in terms of developing its own independent archaeological centers.

**The “Gorodtsovian” stage.** Systematic academic excavations of kurgans began to be conducted in the Donbass only in 1888. Almost simultaneously in 1888, expeditions under E. Iu. Petri (St. Petersburg University) and N. E. Brandenburg (the Historical Artillery Museum in St. Petersburg) worked here. Finally, in the 19th century there were excavations in the summer of 1900 conducted by A. Yakovlev and A. M. Pokrovskii [Usachuk, Kolesnik 2004, p. 17–18].

The academic study of Donbass antiquities was brilliantly continued by V. A. Gorodtsov and a number of other researchers during the preparation of the XII Archaeological congress in Kharkov (1903) and the XIII Archaeological congress in Ekaterinoslav (1905) [Gorodtsov 1905, 1907]. Along with research in private estates, pillaging excavations were done on a massive scale.

A highlight of the early archaeological regional studies in the Donbass were the efforts in collecting by a priest from a settlement Raygorodok of Izyum Uyezd, Fr. Vasily (V. F. Spesivtsev) [Kosikov, Kosikova 1997].

The “Gorodtsovian” stage is a time of classical archaeological research in the region by the leading Russian academic centers under the umbrella of the Archaeological commission, the time of the first steps in archaeological regional studies. The studies were dominated by the excavations of steppe kurgans and by verifying the dating of “stone babas”.

**The “Early Soviet” stage.** This stage is characterized by the creation of a branched network of various regional museums, which were the main centers for organizing and conducting archaeological field research, and by the activities of central and academic institutions. The basis of museum infrastructure was laid in the 1920s. It was a true parade of museums. Izyum (1920), Mariupol (1920), Stalin (1924), the Donetsk Museum of Social History (1924), the Artemovsk Museum (1924) and other museums were successively founded in the Donbass and its neighboring regions. The museum network was expanded in the 1930s after the Artemogorsk Museum was founded in 1935. The archaeological collections of these museums were initially quite large, if not prevailing. It is noteworthy that the interest in archaeology defined the professional interests of the museum staff. There formed a whole pleiad of highly professional regional archaeologists with close ties to the leading universities and academic centers of the country. Among them N. V. Sibilev and S. A. Odintsova [Tsveibel 1971], S. A. Loktyushev [Klyuchneva 2013], V. M. Evseyev [Kryzhaia 2012], P. M. Pinevich, G. G. Afendik [Grib, Kravchenko, Kuchugura 2014] and other researchers.
The excavations of the Mariupol burial ground in 1930 and the kurgans in Stalino by N. E. Makarenko hold a special place in the history of Donetsk archaeology [Markarenko 1933; Usachuk 1990]. Participation of the Artemovsk Museum staff in the construction of the Dnieper Hydroelectric Station in 1927–1932 deserves be mentioned as well [Kovaleva 1980].

The early Soviet stage of regional archaeology is a time of creation of the main centers (mostly museums) for archaeological regional studies and brilliant academic research, a time of shaping local archaeological staff. It is at that time that Donetsk archaeology was becoming independent.

**The “Middle Soviet” stage.** This stage is intrinsically connected with archaeological research at the Stalino Pedagogical Institute — Donetsk State University. It began with the arrival of D. S. Tsveibel in the liberated Stalino and eventually resulted in the establishment of a specialized department of archaeology, history of Antiquity and the Middle ages in 1973. The key figure of this stage was indisputably D. S. Tsveibel [Kolesnik, Panasenko 2012]. In the early 1960s she set to founding the regional archaeological center. The milestone of this stage is the establishment of Donetsk State University in 1965.

The Donetsk Regional Museum became another center for archaeological studies. In the first half of the 1950s the Stalino Regional Museum was headed by the professional regional archaeologist V. M. Evseyev [Kryzhnaia 2012]. In the second half of the 1950s — early 60s T. A. Shapovalov and A. K. Takhtay worked in the museum. It was, in fact, the time of shaping a local archaeological environment with a typically Soviet infrastructure that consisted of appropriate sections of the regional institute, regional museum and city and district archaeological clubs within the system of the Regional Department of Education. The training of local staff with special education qualifications was also performed.

The “middle Soviet” stage is a time of establishing of a regional archaeological center relying upon the local staff and of field works deployment by the Republican Institute of Archaeology.

**The “Late Soviet” Stage.** This stage was a renaissance for all intents and purposes. It is characterized by the establishment of a specialized department in 1973, continuously headed by A. A. Moruzhenko. She managed to conduct staff “shifts” to organize a department that would focus on archaeology and employ a group of qualified, PhD lecturers, and also to create a faculty museum of archaeology and ethnography. A little later, in 1978, a “housing development” expedition was established, and when the “Donetsk Archaeological Collection” journal was founded in 1992, publications followed. The “housing development” expedition performed large-scale field works within the Donbass, amassing huge archaeological collections, having their origin mostly from the excavated kurgans. Since the department functioned consistently without interruptions, we can state that the staff was sufficient. In 1983 T. A. Shapovalov and in 1989 L. G. Shchepko defended their PhD theses. In the same 1989, A. A. Moruzhenko became the first full professor of archaeology.

In 1985, a section (later, a department) of preservation of archaeological monuments was created in the Donetsk Regional Museum. Since 1986 this section has been conducting regional research, seminars and conferences on a regular basis. Extensive work on the certification of archaeological monuments was also started. In the 1980s a number of expeditions were arranged under the umbrella of the Local Department of Education. The
Donetsk Regional Organization of the Ukrainian Society for the Preservation of Historical and Cultural Monuments also played a special role.

The “late Soviet” stage was a time of establishing an extensive archaeological infrastructure and a system of training local staff as well as a network of archaeological expeditions of different departmental affiliation. Field archaeology was experiencing a renaissance.

**The “Contemporary” Stage.** The achievements of Donetsk archaeology in the 1970–1980s provided for its further progress after 1991 despite that fact that archaeology was going through a restructuring at the time. Departments of Archaeology, the History of Antiquity and the Middle Ages were disbanded. Soon after that dissolved the Monument Preservation Society, which had financially supported archaeological projects. There came an obvious stagnation of contract archaeology, and altogether, the total volume of field works dropped sharply.

Yet, there is no reason to call it a crisis. There still has been growth in a number of areas. The Donetsk Regional Museum's department for preservation of archaeological monuments has become increasingly active. It has initiated a further all-around certification of archaeological objects and held international conferences. A number of museum workers defended their theses and earned PhD degrees in archaeology (A. V. Kolesnik in 1994; V. V. Tsimidanov in 1997; Y. B. Polidovich in 2001; A. N. Usachuk in 2007). International contacts have strengthened.

Donetsk National University has started its own prestigious publications on medieval archaeology. PhDs have been defended in this area (R. A. Litvinenko in 1992; Kosikov in 1994; N. E. Minenkova in 2005; S. I. Tatarinov in 2006) and full doctoral degree (R. A. Litvinenko in 2009; L. A. Shchepko in 2012) theses on archaeology, or those based on archaeological sources. Notably, the theses of V. A. Kosikov, N. E. Minenkova, S. I. Tatarinov and L. G. Shchepko) were defended at Donetsk national university.

The number of publications by Donetsk archaeologists has risen sharply — up to 50 and more papers a year. A series of individual and collective monographs were first published. Full-fledged archaeological expeditions and an archaeological section (the MAN) in the system of people's education have been formed. Courses on archaeology have been delivered at regional colleges of the Donbass (Kramatorsk, Gorlovka, etc.).

An unprecedented publishing boom, comparable to the publishing in archaeology by research centers with older traditions, is a vivid marker of this period in regional archaeology. So far, there 32 issues of “Archaeological Almanac” (chief editor A. V. Kolesnik) have been published, 17 issues of “Donetsk Archaeological Collection” (chief editor of the latest five issues R. A. Litvinenko), and 12 volumes of “European Steppes in the Middle Ages” (ed. A. V. Evglevskii). A significant number of individual and collective monographs have also been produced.

The “Contemporary” stage is a time of reforming archaeology in the region and of creating conditions for new work. The main features of this stage are publishing, conferences for various audiences, and PhD and full doctoral theses.

Thus, each stage in Donetsk archaeology has its own characteristics, with the general trend being towards the shaping of a full-scale centre for archaeology in the region.

Up until 1917, archaeological research in Donetsk had been carried out under the umbrella of the central academic institutions of the Russian empire. Equally important roles had been played by the Emperor’s Archaeological Commission (Moscow), Kharkov
University, The Historical Artillery Museum (St. Petersburg). Independent status started to grow only in the 1920 and 30s when a number of major historical and regional museums were being formed. It took a long time — up until 1973 — for an independent school to crystallize. From then on, all major positions in the local archaeological institutions have been held by graduates of a specialized department of DonSU. Donetsk now has its own archaeological periodicals and explores an extensive variety of issues the Stone Age to the Early Modern Period. Access of archaeologists, educated in Donetsk, to the external academic market is a measure of stability.

To sum up, we can see that the pace of archaeology development in Donetsk was determined by a combination of internal and external factors. An integral assessment shows that, despite certain remoteness from major academic centers, regional centers still can enjoy successful growth and develop their own academic character. The special feature of Donetsk archaeology is its interest in ancient manufacturing while its highlight is on publications that became prominent in the 1990s and are now comparable by most standards with publishing in other Russian and Ukrainian regions. At the same time, Donetsk has fewer qualified archaeologists, including those with doctoral degrees, than the old centers of the “provincial university science” (Kharkov, Voronezh, etc.). The border between the “central” and “local” archaeology has become more permeable owing to the broad expansion of IT in Eastern Europe in the 1980s and 90s.

The selected stages in the development of Donetsk archaeology can be compared with the models of academic development in other secondary centers. This contributes to the discussion of regional academic centers and schools as a phenomenon, and to setting and solving general issues of science studies.
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