

Lina Doroshenko

**The formation of the Archaeological Slavic Studies:  
the autochthonism concept development of the Slavic antiquities  
in the historiography of the late 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup>**

**Keywords:** the Archaeological Slavic Studies, ethnogenesis, autochthonism, historiography, ethnic processes.

**Cuvinte cheie:** studii arheologice slave, etnogeneză, autohtonism, istoriografie, procese etnice.

**Ключевые слова:** археологическая славистика, этногенез, автохтонизм, историография, этнические процессы.

*Lina Doroshenko*

**The formation of the Archaeological Slavic Studies: the autochthonists concept development of the Slavic antiquities in the historiography of the late 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup>**

The article describes the process of formulating the concept of autochthonism, which was caused by the increased interest in the study of the problems related to Slavic ethnogenesis and the growth of the archaeological component in the scientific research. The autochthonism affirms itself as basic theory in the late 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

*Lina Doroshenko*

**Constituirea slavisticii arheologice: elaborarea conceptului de autohtonism al antichităților slave în istoriografia de la sfârșitul sec. XIX – începutul sec. XX**

În articol este prezentat procesul de constituire a conceptului de autohtonism – evoluția căruia a fost determinat de apariția interesului sporit față de studierea problemelor legate de etnogeneza slavilor. Autohtonismul ca teorie de bază a fost acceptat la sfârșitul secolului XIX – începutul secolului XX.

*Лина Дорошина*

**Формирование археологической славистики: разработка концепции автохтонности славянских древностей в историографии конца XIX – начала XX в.**

В статье рассмотрен процесс формулирования положений автохтонизма – течения, появление которого было вызвано повышением интереса к исследованию проблем славянского этногенеза, роста археологической составляющей в научных поисках. Рассмотрено утверждение автохтонизма как основной теории в конце XIX – начале XX века.

Autochthonism as the concept of the Slavs' origin started to spread under the influence of evolutionary ideas in late 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Representatives of this direction were V. Khvoika, Y. Kostrzewski, T. Lehr-Splawinski. However, scientists expressed commitment to this concept because of another reason.

The mentioned variability of opinion among the autochthonists originated from the work of L. Niederle (1865-1944), who was an undoubted authority for the researchers of this generation. In turn, L. Niederle largely developed the thoughts expressed by P. Safarik (1795-1861), trying to back them up regularly, in particular by appealing to new archaeological findings. He undertook the systematization of the available archaeological material, mainly from the territory of the Austria-Hungary and the Russian Empires, and also examined them tangent to the historiography, having considered

these materials in the broader context of historical, ethnographic, and linguistic sources. The result of this system analysis was summed up in the monumental work "Slavic antiquities", whose various editions were published in 1902 and 1934, and the final, shortened version was published after the author's death in 1953.

Interestingly, L. Niederle cannot be uniquely determined as "autochthonism" or "migrationism", his position was quite flexible, because it was not an encyclopedic coverage of all available groups of sources; sometimes it led to almost opposite conclusions. Analyzing the written sources, L. Niederle unconditionally accepted the concept of the Polish Slavist V. Surowiecki. This conception is approved in the historiography by the authority of P. Safarik. According to this concept, early Slavs identified with the Venetian of Pliny, Tacitus, Ptolemy, Peutinger table, Jordan.

L. Niederle realized that the name of “the Venetian” was not original, and was clearly ekzoetnonim [Niederle 1956, 21]. An additional argument for the correctness of this concept for L. Niederle was the message of the quite late sources (“Cosmography” of the anonymous of Ravenna with article VII and “Bavarian geographer” of the IX century). According to the observations of the researcher, at the time when Slavs were known in Europe, the world considered them people of Northern origin that coincided with the localization of the Venetian of Pliny and Ptolemy [Niederle 1956, 30]. With this in mind, L. Niederle did not support the quite stable at that time “Danubian theory”, that blindly followed the message of the Russian annalistic tradition. The uremia of the Slavs, according to the researcher, was to be found in the North of the Carpathians, whence they gradually moved South, to the Danube.

L. Niederle analyzed the achievements of comparative linguistics and onomastics in a separate chapter. He accepted that all Indo-European languages had sprung off at the beginning of 2000 BC. The separation of the Lithuanians (the Balts) from the Slavs happened in 1000 or 2000 BC. As a result of this process, one people with one language and poorly marked dialectal differences was formed. During the first 1000 AD, their unity began to disintegrate, new languages developed. Based on dental, cultural and language differences the differentiation of the Slavs took place, which determined, first of all, the internal development of this community. Also slight phonetic, grammatical, lexicological differences and the dialects formed. These differences later amplified taking into account external factors, such as isolation or relocation of certain groups that led to contacts with speakers of other languages that contributed many borrowings from these languages [Niederle 1956, 22].

L. Niederle realized that linguistic processes were extremely difficult to date and localize, so without any reservations he tried to identify them with specific archaeological transformations. The researcher found Slavic tribes of the early Middle Ages, which were based on the messages of the authors and place names (written communication – area – archaeological sites = the definition of ethnicity according to the archaeological material). On this defined territory, he considered the discoveries of this period as Slavic. In particular, in semi-

subterranean dwellings and inhumated burials of the V century. L. Niederle saw the archaeological imprint of the Slavs. The territory inhabited by the Slavs before their wide dispersal, according to the researcher, was stretched between the river Elbe and the Middle Dnieper region (the Desna, the Pripyat, the Berezina).

L. Niederle departed from his own schema, expressing doubts about the inclusion in the cradle of the Western part of this area, which was located between the Elbe and the Vistula. The main argument for this was uncertainty about the identification of the local archaeological sites (“fields of graves”) with the Slavs. That was the peculiarity of these antiquities compared to the “standard Slavic” material culture as it was imagined by L. Niederle, that induced him to doubt the information of the written sources. It was one of the first times, when archaeological reasoning outweighed not only historical, but also forced to modify the concept as a whole. The researcher determined the Slavic area after their wide dispersal in this range: from the Elbe to the Don, from West to East and from the Baltic Sea in the North to the Alps and through the Balkans down to the Mediterranean Sea in the South.

L. Niederle paid special attention to the problem of the homeland of the Eastern Slavs, seeing their homeland in the Eastern part of the protoslavonic areas: the Pripyat region (Polesie), the area on the lower of the Berezina, the Desna and the Teteriv, Kyiv region. The researcher excludes the possibility of the arrival of the East Slavs to their homeland, the Dnipro river, only in the III or in V-VI BC centuries. The Value of the East Slavic homeland in the Middle Dnieper was evident. It was located on a significant cultural and colonization path. The river network connected as the remote territory of East European plain and the Baltic Sea, the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea. The Eastern branch of the Slavs, who lived here long ago, was so strong that started from here further expansion [Niederle 1956, 83-84].

L. Niederle found additional arguments in favor of the localization of East-Slavic homeland in the linguistic data. The South Slav neighbors were originally Thracians, who lived in the Carpathian Mountains and on their southern slopes. Later there appeared Gallic (Celtic) tribes, and with them the Bastani and the Pawky (between V and II centuries BC). The last penetrated into the Carpath-

ians separate Slavic tribes. Other neighbors of the ancestors of the Eastern Slavs in the South were the Iranians [Niederle 1956, 85-86]. So, without speaking about this right, L. Niederle supposed that the Slavic *urheimat* coincided with the East Slavic. The main object of L. Niederle's scientific criticism was the "Danube" concept, but he did not reject it, unlike the Orthodox autochthonists, the value of migration in the Slavic ethnogenesis. L. Niederle noted that the people called the Slavs, as the strong group, appeared at the beginning of our era, settled over a large territory between the Vistula and the Desna, and that this group did not appear in Europe in this period, but lived there for a long time before, in close interaction with other Indo-European peoples [Niederle 1956, 22].

L. Niederle's synthesis launched the "Vistula-Dnieper" theory of the origin of the Slavs. The *urheimat* of the Slavs, in his opinion, was located in the interfluvium of the Vistula and the Dnieper to the North of the Carpathians and Volhynia was the center of ancient Slavic lands. The Slavs, recognized as the branch of the Indo-European peoples, were the closest relatives of which are the Lithuanians.

In parallel with the development of these ideas, a similar concept in Ukrainian historiography is presented in the works of V. Khvoika. He, like L. Niederle, saw as the key to solving the problem of the origin of the Slavs an open mind on the interpretation of "culture urnfield". The first monuments of this cultural circle in the Middle Dnieper were found by V. Khvoika in the last years of the XIX century.

The Monuments, investigated by V. Khvoika, were the burial grounds without any signs of earthen mounds. Burials were made with two rites – cremation and burial. Discoveries made by V. Khvoika were important, because at the end of the XIX century monuments of culture urnfield were known in Central Europe and practically unknown in the East. Accordingly, by his discoveries, the researcher filled not only territorial, but also a chronological gap, taking a step which made possible not only regional generalizations.

V. Khvoika defined culture through the burial ritual. The unity of ethnic and cultural research explained through the unity of the funeral rite. In the article "To Question of the Slavs" (1902) V. Khvoika noted that the conclusions concerning the ethnicity enough such as burial ritual, anthropological char-

acteristics, culture and everyday things, that suggest a way of life. Thus, the researcher identified the archaeological culture of the ethnic group [Khvoika 1902, 495-505]. Unlike L. Niederle, V. Khvoika absolutized archaeological supervision and neglected the necessity of an interdisciplinary approach to solving ethnological issues.

For the Middle Dnieper, V. Khvoika developed periods ranging from Trypillian culture that consisted of seven periods of cultural development. Cremation rite, in his opinion, was not the main core, combining different stages, and recorded in the region from the late Neolithic to the spread of Christianity. The fifth period is connected with the fields of graves of Zarubintsy type, the sixth – with margins burial of Chernyakhivsky Type II-V centuries, the seventh - with margins graves containing Slavic pre-Christian era stuff. Accordingly, in the Middle Dnieper from Trypillian culture one people lived - the Slavs [Khvoika 1901, 171-190].

By the continuity of existence cremation ceremony as one of the key arguments, V. Khvoika appealed rather reluctantly, because at that time funerary monuments of Zarubynets'ka and Slavic circle were only known. The cornerstone of the concept of the researcher was the belief in the continuity of cultural development of the region that was settled by agricultural populations unchanged for a long time. Since the Middle Ages historical sources, this humanity appeared exactly as Slavs, then all its predecessors' *priori* considered as Slavs.

With the help of observations of archaeological materials, the investigator testified that in the forest-steppe region between the Carpathians and the Dnieper sedentary agricultural people – the Slavs lived, this territory was their European homeland. But the people was subjected to periodic impacts of the nomads. The presence of foreign elements, according to the researcher, was not a significant phenomenon, but rather superimposition on the local independent culture [Khvoika 1905, 103-104].

In the monograph "The Ancient inhabitants of the Middle Dnieper", which was the result of many years of research, the researcher presented a historical and typological survey of the antiquities of the region from the Stone Age to the Grand-Ducal era. The Zarubintsy burials and similar monuments of the II BC – II centuries were the link between the Scythian epoch and the age of urnfield Chernyakh-

hovsky type. They still retained the characteristics of the Scythian era, but also had new elements that were characteristics of the subsequent age, which were a testimony of the gradual development of the culture of the Middle Dnieper. During the II – V centuries, the fields of funerary urns became the dominant type of monuments, spreading to Podolia, Volyn and the Northern part of the Kherson governorates. The Migration Period was the time of maximal distribution of urnfields. Despite the fact that the period started with the relocation of the Goths in the Kyiv region, according to the researcher, Gothic antiquity missed. Consequently, the Goths did not use the Dnieper waterway, and passed through the Carpathian mountains to the rivers the Bug and the Dniester to the Black Sea. In the Dnieper, they could appear later and mostly in the southern regions, before reaching the Northern part of the Middle Dnieper. An Archaeological indicator of the Migration Period were jewelries from Pastoral settlements and findings, decorated with champlevé enamel [Khvoika 2008, 62-68; 1913, 43-49]. The researcher believed that the scene of large displacements of the epoch of the Migration Period of peoples (the Goths, the Huns, the Avars) were the southern areas of the Russian Empire and Adonidin, but not the middle Dnieper [Kolesnikova 2007, 58-61; 104-109].

The scientific heritage of V. Khvoika is almost a reference sample of autochthonism approach to the question of the ethnogenesis of the Slavs in the Archaeological Slavic Studies. Moreover, the researcher appealed especially to the archaeological material, however, it is more a “squeezing” of these materials into a ready-made concept. According to some modern researchers, V. Khvoika was greatly influenced by L. Niederle’s views in forming his conceptual constructions [Abashina 2003, 71]. However, it should be recognized that Vladimir Khvoika borrowed rather general conclusions (and the ones that suited his vision problems), not the contemporary methodological principles.

Despite this, the fact of opening the cultural and chronological definition of Zarubintsy and Chernyakhovsky antiquities had significant weight, they made possible the consideration of Eastern Europe in the European context. Before the researches of V. Khvoika, archaeology of the 1000s AD was unknown, the monuments of this time were almost absent. Opening of the monument of Chernyak-

hovsky and Zarubintsy cultures that, according to the researcher, successively replaced each other, was an important event in the archaeological study of South-Eastern Europe and marked the beginning of a new stage in the study of the problem of the Slavic ethnogenesis. V. Spitsyn only provided that the solution of the Slavic problem was in the study of the fields of graves, V. Khvoika found the particular monuments and determined their place among the antiquities of the Dnieper region and the sequence of their development, ending the ancient monuments [Abashina 1999, 21].

M. Biliashivsky supported the opinion about Slavic affiliation of the fields of graves, but warned against the simplification of this definition for the monuments of the previous era. The significant place, according to the researcher, had the effect of a more developed culture on a less developed place. Indicators of this influence were imported ? things. He believed that the ancient Scythian epoch was characterized by the influence of Greek culture, and the antiquities that replaced them, were under Roman influence.

During 1902-1904 the controversy between M. Bilyashivsky and V. Khvoika, who defended the thesis of a continuous and consistent change of local culture and emphasized the autochthony of the Slavic population in the Carpathian region and the Middle Dnieper, occurred on the pages of the journals “Kiev antiquity” and “Archaeological record of South Russia”. Paying tribute to V. Khvoika for his contribution to the study of graveyards, M. Biliashivsky drew attention to the impact of Provincial-Roman culture, tangible in the types of brooches (fibulas), the presence of Roman coins, glassware. He doubted V. Khvoika’s assertions about the Slavic affiliation of the monuments of the Middle Dnieper since the Bronze Age due to the fact that cremation and dolihotsefaliya were common in the old times and occurred on territories where Slavs didn’t live.

Khvoika talked about the fact that in order to get an idea of the tribe as a separate unit, it is enough to know the funeral rite, anthropological data, culture, and everyday things that highlight the lifestyle, while M. Bilyashivsky noted that this can be done only by having all the characteristics that define it. The Researcher warned against the introduction of the national (ethnic in contemporary terminology) element to purely archaeological questions. Thus, the views of M. Bilyashivsky were



much closer to the concept of L. Niederle than the views of V. Khvoika.

In the 30-40s of the 13<sup>th</sup> century another concept, which offered a solution to the question of the Slavic ethnogenesis was the one of the Polish Scholars Y. Kostrzewski, J. Czekanowski, and T. Lehr-Splawinski. The main rules were formulated during the 1930s, but the monographical concept was formed only in the second half of the 1940s because of events of the Second World War. The political realities of the interwar period greatly influenced the academic interest of the mentioned researchers. The territorial claims were often settled by "historical right", and the last reached almost primitive times. Therefore, the "war on archaeological maps" became too relevant, which, understandably, had a negative impact on academic calculations. Polish researchers, with the help of archaeological data, revised the theory of L. Niederle and spoke for the West origins of the Slavs. The origins of the Slavic antiquities, according to this concept, contact the Lusatian culture, and the Slavic *urheimat* was localized in the Vistula-Oder region.

Archaeologist Y. Kostrzewski had a significant contribution in creating this theory. He regarded the cultures between the Vistula and the Oder as stages of development of a single population 2000 – first part of 1000 BC (the Trzciniec, the Lusatian culture) to the early Middle Ages. According to Y. Kostrzewski, the Przeworsk culture were heirs of the Lusatian tribes that emerged from the resettlement of the Lusatian culture among carriers of the Pomeranian culture. The Przeworsk culture is associated with historic Veneti [Kostrzewski 1949]. In fact, half a century later, the classic of the Polish archaeology repeated the questionable statements of V. Khvoika about the Middle Dnieper, but moved them to another region.

The linguist T. Lehr-Splawinski started from linguistic material in his own statements but once correlating the linguistic processes with changes in material culture, he appealed particularly to the schemes of Y. Kostrzewski, although not following them completely. According to the concept of T. Lehr-Splawinski, most of Eastern Europe until 2000 BC was inhabited by the Finno-Ugrians (the Culture of *grebnice* ceramics). At the turn of 3000-2000 BC, the part of the Indo-European carriers (the Corded Ware) moved from Central Europe to the Middle Volga and the North Caucasus.

the Balto-Slavs formed as a result of their mixing with the Finno-Ugrians in the space between the Vistula and the Oder. According to the researcher, the Slavs separated from the Balts, by the middle of 1000 BC, after the resettlement of the Pomeranian culture among the tribes of southern Poland from the lower territory of the Vistula. The same as Y. Kostrzewski this scientist believed that the Przeworsk and the Oksywska cultures were the archaeological equivalent of the Veneti, in which he unequivocally placed the Slavs [Lehr-Splawinski 1946].

The works of the Soviet researcher M. Marr were a separate phenomenon in the historiography of 1920-40s. He developed the "theory of stadial" and influenced on the development of the historical and archaeological researches. Because of quite different methodological basis of this unit of historiography we couldn't compare it with autochthonists-predecessors (and contemporaries from other countries), a comparative analysis of these concepts is inappropriate. The description of the views of the Soviet researchers of this period should be the subject of a separate study. To summarize, we note the following:

Despite the fact that L. Niederle cannot be defined as a proponent of the concept of the autochthonism, his ideas were exploited by the supporters of this concept;

One of the founders of the concept of autochthonism in Archaeological Slavic Studies was V. Khvoika, and he was the first in historiography who introduced archaeological components in the basis of his concept;

The concept of V. Khvoika, despite all its shortcomings, had been adopted in contemporary society, and existed not only when it appeared, but in the following period as well;

However, the appeal to archaeological material for V. Khvoika was rather an illustration of the already made ethnogenetic concept than material for separate analysis and comparison of the results of this analysis with calculations of other sciences (History, Linguistics, etc.), which significantly distinguishes the approach of V. Khvoika from the approach of L. Niederle;

The revision of the views of L. Niederle carried out by a number of Polish researchers in 1930-40s, which was caused not only by the accumulation of new materials, methodological innovations, but also by certain political interests.

It is significant that this revision soon turned out not to be too suitable, considering the archaeological components of the concepts of Y. Kostrzewski and T. Lehr-Splawinski: the identification in the second half of the XX century of the antiquities

of the Slavs and the determination of their genetic links with the antiquities of the previous chronological stages prompted to the researchers to return to L. Niederle's general scheme, which was built on a poor source basis.

#### LITERATURE

- Abashina 1999:** N.S. Abashina, Pershopotatki doslidzhen' poliv pokhovan' v Ukraïni. Arkheologiiia 4, 1999, 12-23 // Н.С. Абашина, Першопочатки досліджень полів поховань в Україні. Археологія 4, 1999, 12-23.
- Abashina 2000:** N.S. Abashina, Khvoika – pershovidkrivach poliv pokhoval'nikh urn v Ukraïni. In: Vikentii V'iacheslavovich Khvoika ta iogo vnesok u vitchiznianu arheologiiu (do 150-richchia vid dnia narodzhennia) (Київ 2000), 32-39 // Н.С. Абашина, Хвойка – першовідкривач полів поховальних урн в Україні. В сб.: Вікентій В'ячеславович Хвойка та його внесок у вітчизняну археологію (до 150-річчя від дня народження) (Київ 2000), 32-39.
- Abashina 2003:** Problemi metodologii etnichnoi identifikatsii kul'tur poliv pokhovan'. Arkheologichni studii 2 (Київ-Чернівці 2003), 70-79 // Н.С. Абашина, Проблеми методології етнічної ідентифікації культур полів поховань. Археологічні студії 2 (Київ-Чернівці 2003), 70-79.
- Khvoika 1901:** V.V. Khvoika, Polia pogrebenii v Srednem Pridneprov'e (raskopki V.V. Hvoika v 1899-1900 godah). Zapiski Russkogo arheologicheskogo obshestva XII, 1-2, 1901, 172-190 // В.В. Хвойка, Поля погребений в Среднем Приднепровье (раскопки В.В. Хвойка в 1899-1900 годах). Записки Русского археологического общества XII, 1-2, 1901, 172-190.
- Khvoika 1902:** V.V. Khvoika, K voprosu o slavianakh. Kievskaiia starina 6, 1902, 495-505 // В.В. Хвойка, К вопросу о славянах. Киевская старина 6, 1902, 495-505.
- Khvoika 1905:** V.V. Khvoika, Gorodishcha srednego Pridneprov'ia, ikh znachenie, drevnost' i narodnost'. Trudy XII Arkheologicheskogo S'ezda 1, 1905, 103-104 // В.В. Хвойка, Городища среднего Приднепровья, их значение, древность и народность. Труды XII Археологического Съезда, 1, 1905, 103-104.
- Khvoika 1913:** V.V. Khvoika, Drevnie obitateli Srednego Pridneprov'ia i ih kul'tura v doistoricheskie vremena (Kiev 1913) // В.В. Хвойка, Древние обитатели Среднего Приднепровья и их культура в доисторические времена (Киев 1913).
- Khvoika 2008:** V.V. Khvoika, Drevnie obitateli Srednego Pridneprov'ia i ih kul'tura v doistoricheskie vremena (s komentariiami i illiustratsiiami) (Kiev 2008) // В.В. Хвойка, Древние обитатели Среднего Приднепровья и их культура в доисторические времена (с комментариями и иллюстрациями) (Киев 2008).
- Kolesnikova 2007:** V.A. Kolesnikova, Vikentii (Cheslav) Hvoika. Storinki naukovoï biografii (Київ 2007) // В.А. Колеснікова, Вікентій (Чеслав) Хвойка. Сторінки наукової біографії (Київ 2007).
- Kostrzewski 1949:** J. Kostrzewski, Dzieje polskich badań prehistorycznych (Poznań 1949).
- Lehr-Splawinski 1946:** T. Lehr-Splawinski, O pochodzeniu i praoczyznie Slowian (Poznań 1946).
- Niederle 1956:** L. Niederle, Slavianskie drevnosti (Moskva 1956) // Л. Нидерле, Славянские древности (Москва 1956).

**Lina Doroshenko**, phd candidate, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kiev, 64/13, Volodymyrska Street, Kiev, 01601, Ukraine, e-mail: liadoroshenko240490@gmail.com

# CERCETĂRI INTERDISCIPLINARE – МЕЖДИСЦИПЛИНАРНЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ – INTERDISCIPLINARY SURVEYS

Сергей Коваленко, Роман Кройтор

## Производственный и хозяйственный инвентарь из кости, рога и бивня с многослойной стоянки верхнего палеолита Косэуць

**Key words:** Moldova, Dniester, Cosăuți Site, Upper Palaeolithic, Bone and Antler Tools, Ivory Artifacts.

**Cuvinte cheie:** Moldova, Nistru, stațiunea Cosăuți, paleoliticul superior, unelte de os și corn, piese de fildeș.

**Ключевые слова:** Молдова, Днестр, стоянка Косэуць, верхний палеолит, изделия из кости, рога и бивня.

*Serghei Covalenco, Roman Croitor*

### **Bone, Antler and Ivory Tools and Wares from Multilayer Upper Palaeolithic Site Cosăuți**

The article proposes a discussion of results of a revision of the collection of artifacts made of bone, antler, and ivory material yielded by the multilayer Upper Palaeolithic site Cosăuți (Moldova) situated on the Middle Dniester and dated back to 20000 to 16000 years BP according to radiocarbon dating. The proposed classification describes industrial equipment (handles, sleeves, hammer-like tools, anvils) and household ware (axe, adzes, picks, hoes, needles, awls, tubular cases for needles, and polishers) typical of the “kill sites” of reindeer hunters. Fishing tackle (small harpoons) and rare artifacts with controversial destination (some fragments of artifacts made of reindeer antlers, knockers, hairpin, rectifier of bone shafts) deserve a special attention. The majority of artifacts and tools are made of reindeer antlers. An important part of tools is made of postcranial bones of horse, bison, and mammoth ivory.

*Serghei Covalenco, Roman Croitor*

### **Unelte din os, corn și fildeș din situl pluristratificat atribuit paleoliticului superior Cosăuți**

Articolul este dedicat rezultatelor cercetării uneltelor de os, corn și fildeș din stațiunea paleoliticului superior Cosăuți (Moldova), localizată pe Nistru Mijlociu și datată după C14 de la 20 până la 16 mii de ani. În clasificarea propusă a descoperirilor sunt examinate categoriile uneltelor de producere (mânere, manșoane, toporașe, nicovale) și de uz casnic (toporaș, tesle, săpăliși, ace, străpungătoare, lustruitoare etc.), specifice vânătorilor de reni. Merită atenție uneltele de pescuit (harpoanele) și unele piese mai rar întâlnite, utilizarea cărora nu este clară (fragmente de piese din corn, ciocane mari, agrafe, redresoare pentru tije de săgeată). Cea mai mare parte a artefactelor au fost lucrate din corn de ren. Pentru producerea uneltelor erau utilizate, de asemenea, oase de la membrele inferioare/superioare și coaste de cai, bizoni, fildeș de elefant.

*Сергей Коваленко, Роман Кройтор*

### **Производственный и хозяйственный инвентарь из кости, рога и бивня с многослойной стоянки верхнего палеолита Косэуць**

Статья посвящена результатам изучения коллекции изделий из кости, рога и бивня с многослойной стоянки верхнего палеолита Косэуць (Молдова), расположенной на Среднем Днестре и датируемой по C14 от 20 до 16 тыс. лет назад. В предлагаемой классификации находок рассматриваются производственный (рукоятки, муфты, молотковидные орудия, наковальни) и хозяйственный (топор, тесла, кирки, мотыжки, иглы, шилья, игольники и ложила) инвентарь, характерный для «поколочных лагерей» охотников на северного оленя. Заслуживают внимания орудия рыболовства (остроги) и редкие предметы, чье предназначение спорно (роговые фрагменты от неких конструкций, колотушки, заколка, выпрямитель древков). Большая часть артефактов изготовлена из рога северного оленя. На их изготовление также шли кости конечностей и рёбра лошадей, бизонов, слоновая кость.

Многослойная стоянка верхнего палеолита Косэуць<sup>1</sup> получила широкую известность

1. Стоянка открыта И.А. Борзияком и М.В. Аниковичем в 1978 г. к западу от с. Косэуць Сорокского района (Молдова), на первой надпойменной террасе по правому краю долины р. Днестр. Верхняя часть отложений на месте стоянки уничтожена карьером, а на сохранившемся участке было зафиксировано не менее 20 культурных слоев.

благодаря своей уникальной сохранности, многочисленным находкам кремневых изделий эпиграветтского облика, богатому и разнообразному инвентарю из кости, рога и бивня. Ряд статей, посвященных костяной индустрии этой стоянки и различным аспектам хозяйственной деятельности её обитателей [Borziac 1991;