

EM. Kolpakov and L.B. Vishnyatsky

CURRENT THEORETICAL DISCUSSION IN SOVIET ARCHAEOLOGY: AN ESSAY

Abstract

The article summarizes briefly the present state of research on the theory of archaeology in the USSR.

E. Kolpakov, Leningrad University, Historical Faculty, Leningrad, Mendeleevskaya 5, USSR. *L. Vishnyatsky*, Institute of Archaeology, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 191065 Leningrad, Dvortsovaya nab. 18, USSR.

Introduction

This article presents a survey of Soviet theoretical archaeology for approximately the last ten years. Earlier periods of the history of theoretical research in Soviet archaeology are elucidated in well-known works by L.S. Klejn (Klejn, 1977; Bulkin, Klejn & Lebedev, 1982), which are easy accessible for Western readers. The list of quoted literature in the latest of these two publications ends at 1979, and this date has determined the chronological framework of our essay. Of course, when it is necessary, we shall turn our attention to the works published before 1979, but we shall do so only in order to understand better the roots of the problems which exist in Soviet theoretical archaeology of the 1980s.

All such problems are examined here in separate sections. The quantity of the problems is great, while the size of the article is limited; that is why our account is of very brief and sometimes even thesis character. Nonetheless, we hope that the main contents of theoretical debate in Soviet archaeology will become more clear for the readers of this work.

It should be noted also that all of the following appraisals, some of which may be perceived by somebody as too sharp or/and categorical (allowing of no appeal), are entirely the views of the authors.

The book by L.S. Klejn published in 1978 was the first properly theoretical monograph to be published in the USSR since 1930.' Following it other monographical works devoted to different theoretical problems of archaeology began to be published in the 1980s (Gening, 1983, 1989; Gening et al., 1988; Victorova, 1989) and several theoretical dissertations were written (Kudryavtseva, 1988; Gandja, 1988).

Not only the number of theoretical publications has increased, but also the number of those who take part in theoretical debates. Correspondingly, the geography of these debates has extended remarkably. While previously discussions on the theory of archaeology took place only between the scientists of Leningrad (Bokharev, Grigoriev, Klejn, Lebedev, Sher, etc.) and Moscow (Zakharuk, Kamenetsky, Ribakov, etc.), now we can see among the active participants of the discussions our colleagues from Kiev, Novosibirsk, Sverdlovsk and of some other scientific centres as well.

An other important feature of the development of theoretical archaeology in the USSR in the 1980s is its administrative registration. The departments of theory and methods of archaeological research have been created in the Institutes of Archaeology of Kiev (under the leadership of V.F. Gening) and Moscow (under V.I. Gulyaev). The department in Moscow does not have at present its own "head" and its work proceeds rather imperceptibly. However, in Kiev it has

formed what we may without exaggeration call a school of theoretical archaeology. Whether we like it or not, Gening's school really exists and works very actively. There is a group of Ukrainian archaeologists who are distinguished by a certain ideological (in a scientific sense) proximity and who work out the theory and methodology of archaeology along very similar lines which have been developed by V.F. Gening over a long time.

Following Gening's ideas they consider the subject and the object of archaeology (see the next section for more details) on two levels: the empirical and the theoretical. On the first (empirical) level the object of archaeology consists of artefacts, and the subject is the laws of archaeological fossilization; on the second (theoretical) level the object is the concrete communities of the past, while the subject is the historical development of the social structures of these communities. They also incline to consider archaeological cultures as the direct reflections of ancient communities. Lastly, they tend to proceed from *a priori* theses of a fairly rigid correspondence between the form and the contents of investigated phenomena.

On the basis of the quantity and volume of publications it is very easy to gain the impression that the Ukrainian school of theoretical archaeology plays a leading role in the USSR. Theoretical books (monographs and collections) are being published in Kiev regularly, at least one book per year (see bibliography). However, many Soviet archaeologists see the majority of these works rather as curiosities and do not appreciate them seriously. The critics have already noted a touch of dilettantism, which is characteristic of the works of the founder of the school (see, for example, Klejn, 1986), and this is also the case in some works of his disciples.²

We must emphasize one peculiarity, which must be taken into consideration in order to understand who is who in Soviet archaeology. This is bound with the restricted publishing opportunities in our country. These limited opportunities have been and still are unevenly available among scientists and, unfortunately, by no means in any accordance to the creative activity of archaeologists. The number of published works, and especially monographs, often depends to a marked degree on the administrative position of the scientist and his personal connections, but not on the intensity of his work. Accordingly, it would be erroneous to consider all outbursts in publishing activity in Soviet archaeology as really reflecting the outbursts of scientific thought.

For example, relatively good publishing opportunities are now available to the archaeologists of Siberia and especially, of Novosibirsk. They publish annually several collections, many of which include articles on the theory of archaeology. Some of these articles are highly interesting. At the same time, however, the contents of theoretical works in Siberian collections often consist of a simple retelling of something already written by others, or even reflect the absolute unpreparedness of the authors for the discussion of theoretical problems.

Meanwhile, many of the most important theoretical studies, which have the highest indices of quotation, have been published only in the form of theses of lectures (two-three pages) and, as a rule, in poor-quality booklets, which literally fall to pieces, when anyone takes them in his hands (Theoretical bases of Soviet Archaeology, Leningrad, 1969: The subject and the object of archaeology and the problems of methodology of archaeological investigations. Leningrad, 1975 etc.).

The definition of archaeology

According to a tradition dating back to the last century, further developed in the 1930s, interrupted and renewed again in the 1970s, the problem of the definition of archaeology occupies a very important place in Russian and Soviet archaeology. As a rule, it is formulated as the problem "of the subject and the object of archaeology".

The thesis that any science can be defined only through its subject and object dominates in Soviet philosophical literature, and from there it has been borrowed by archaeologists and prehistorians in general. This thesis is, for example, very explicitly expressed in the introduction to the latest Marxist three-volume summary on the history of primitive society: "The major criterion of Marxist systematization of the fields of knowledge is their classification according to the subject and the object of study" (Pershits, 1983, p. 10). It is curious that any generally accepted definition of "the subject" and "the object" is absent. Philosophers understand these terms differently and accordingly each archaeologist gives them his own meaning. Moving from one author to the other the terms "subject" and "object" often exchange place, as already mentioned both by philosophers (Bibler, 1969, p.91) and by archaeologists (Klejn, 1986, p.210).

For example, G.P. Grigoriev considers as the object of archaeology the archaeological record, material antiquities and "the totality of fossil materials *sensu lato*" (Grigoriev, 1973, p.42, 1981, p.4). while L.S. Klejn prefers to consider the same as the subject of archaeology and rejects the term "object" in general (Klejn, 1986). At the same time Klejn fails to avoid his

own criticism of the "bifurcation" of conceptions meaning by "the subject" what others mean by "the object", he implies that the aim of archaeology is information about the past, which can be extracted from the archaeological record, i.e. what others define as the subject of archaeology (Klejn, 1986, p.212). Thus, the difference comes out only in words.

We could adduce many other examples of confusion with the terms "subject" and "object", but, nevertheless, they are as popular as before. This may be seen even in the title of the book by V.F. Gening, published in 1983: "The object and subject of science in archaeology".

The debates about the definition of archaeology are perceived now by many representatives

of this science in the USSR with scepticism and irony, as something useless and very remote from the real tasks and problems which we have to solve. However, thanks to the efforts of our other colleagues the debates do not cease and, moreover, there has been some growth in interest in this problem over the past years.

On the other hand, in spite of the fact that the number of publications devoted to the problem of definition of archaeology have increased remarkably during the 1980s (Grigoriev, 1981; Gening, 1982a, 1983, 1988; Klejn, 1986; Zakharuk, 1988; Kiriushin & Plakhin, 1988; Anikovich, 1989; Vishnyatsky, 1989a), the set of existing views as well as the arguments of the participants of the discussion remain as before, without any visible change. The old arguments recur, the positions are being explained and defined more precisely, yet new ideas do not emerge. The discussion goes on as if by inertia and an impression is being created that it is no longer fruitful and, hence, the discussion has fallen into deadlock.

There are a lot of shades and nuances in opinions of different authors about the functions and competence of archaeology in the process of historical cognition, but on the whole one may speak about the existence and opposition of two approaches and all expressed points of view can, by and large, be reduced to these two. The supporters of the first approach (Gening, 1983, 1988, 1989; Zakharuk, 1988) consider archaeology as a science with the same functions and

competence as history (and partly sociology), i.e. as a science which has to reconstruct the culture and sociology of ancient societies and to study their development and even the laws of this development. "Soviet archaeology", — Gening writes in his latest book, — "sees the principal aim of archaeological cognition in the study of the socio-historical development of separate societies of the past. The materialistic comprehension of history and its kernel - the doctrine of social and economic structures, is the theoretical and methodological basis of such cognition" (Gening, 1989, p. 19). The essence of such views is best of all expressed in a notorious pronouncement by A.V. Artsikhovskiy: "Archaeology — is history armed with the spade".

It can be noted that the supporters of the first approach much like to emphasize that their and only their understanding of archaeology's functions and goals is properly Marxist. They do not notice (and cannot because they read, as a rule, only in Russian) that the same understanding is most widespread in Western literature.

The representatives of the opposite approach consider archaeology as a science which is, first of all, one dealing with the records. The data of this science, obtained as a result of processing archaeological records, can give historical information only on more elevated, trans-archaeological levels of research, after synthesis with the data of other disciplines sciences (Grigoriev, 1981; Klejn, 1986; Vishnyatsky, 1989a).

As one may see, the described approaches assume and, moreover, dictate very different comprehensions of the subject-matter of archaeology.

In the framework of the first approach its supporters, as a matter of the fact, identify the practice of archaeologists with archaeological practice, while the supporters of the second approach see such an identification as absolutely erroneous. Historical and even sociological problems may, of course, be considered by archaeologists, "and there are many such examples in the literature, but it does not automatically make the research archaeological. An ethnographer or a historian may try to solve the same problems too, and the number of such efforts are not less" (Vishnyatsky, 1989a, p.4). The old joke "archaeology is what the archaeologists do", appears to be the motto for the adherents of the first approach (whether they want this or not). The definitions of archaeology proposed by them can be designated as "certifying". The definitions elaborated by those who try to distinguish in the practice of archaeologists its properly archaeo-

logical part (the second approach) one may consider as "distinguishing".

For the adherents of the "distinguishing" definitions "archaeology is not all that what archaeologists do, but it is only what no-one else but archaeologists is able to do" (Vishnyatsky, 1989a, p.5), and, first of all, the cultural and chronological arrangement of archaeological materials, ascertaining their place and function in ancient cultural contexts.

"Scientific disciplines don't exist in reality, but scientific investigations do exist. To divide the science into sciences is to classify the investigations. To define a science is to distinguish it and every such definition does not answer the question "what is archaeology (linguistics, mathematics, etc.)?" but answers the question "what set of investigations would be most expedient to consider as archaeology (linguistics, mathematics, etc.)?" (Vishnyatsky, 1989a, p.5).

Generally speaking, all the debates on the theme may be reduced to one especially practical question: must archaeologists (and are they able to) accomplish alone the whole procedure of investigation - from excavation to the all-round cultural and historical interpretation of the data of different relevant sciences? It may seem, at first glance, that there are no obstacles to consider archaeology as a science dealing with the records, and at the same time, that archaeologist can accomplish the synthesis of all sources about the past alone, independently, performing the role of historian or of cultural anthropologist (c.f. Taylor, 1948, p.29, 43). However, this idea is turned down by the supporters of the "distinguishing" definitions of archaeology. We think that it would be worthwhile if the synthesis of all the sciences of the past (archaeology, ethnology, anthropology, paleopsychology, written history, paleogeography, etc.) be carried out by the professionals in a specific discipline — prehistory.

The archaeological record

Special consideration of this conception in Soviet archaeology may seem strange to some extent. However, all discussions about the specificity of the archaeological record, as well as the definition of archaeology "reflect, ultimately, the aspiration to understand how and what an archaeologist does, whether he does it correctly or incorrectly, how he comes to his inferences, whether these inferences may be obtained by

any other way and whether it is necessary to aspire to get them" (Kolpakov, 1989a, p. 109).

L.S. Klejn, who has written about the specificity of archaeological records, discerns this specificity in what he has called as "double gap: in traditions (between the remote past and the present) and in objectivation. i.e. in the forms of embodiment of the information (the gap between the world of objects and the world of ideas, by means of which we can operate in the science)" (Klejn, 1978, p.61). The gap in traditions separates archaeological objects from ethnographical ones. The gap in objectivation also creates a difference between the archaeological record and the written ones. To bridge the "double gap" we are in need of special methods and theories, i.e. we need a special scientific discipline - archaeology (see also Plakhin, 1985 - this article represents a simple retelling of Klejn's books, added to by several of the author's examples).

Kolpakov demonstrates that there is no gap in traditions. The use of the term "archaeological record" instead of "the ancient material record" may be explained by several superficial causes. If we try to find an explanation of the essence of "archaeologicality" in the archaeological record, then it consists in the untriviality of the demands which are presented to the objects. Only archaeology has to extract from artefacts information about the economy and social structure of ancient societies, about their interaction with the environment, about ethnogenesis, religions, etc. Ethnography also studies material culture, but an ethnographer will not attempt to reconstruct the social system after the plans of dwellings (Kolpakov, 1989a, p.107-108).

The procedure of archaeological research

There have been no discussions devoted to the procedure of archaeological research in Soviet literature, but two works should be noted. Klejn has pointed out that besides inductive and deductive procedures, which have been debated actively in Western literature, the third intermediate procedure has been existing for a long time. This is the procedure described for the first time by W. Taylor (1948, p.152-202). Klejn has designated it as "aim-oriented".

Klejn believes, that occurring in all three procedures is "the one and same cycle, consisting of four groups of operations: a) preparation of initial facts, b) providing oneself with the hypo-

thesis, c) elucidation of independent facts and d) examination of the hypothesis. The difference consists in the fact that in the inductive procedure "new materials are considered as the initial facts, and the results of previous investigations are linked for the examination of hypothesis, while in the two other procedures all is vice versa: "the results of previous investigations are considered as the initial facts, and new materials are taken under examination. The difference has an influence on the way of working with new data: in the first case these data are collected for all possible hypotheses (i.e. totally), in the second — for a certain group of hypotheses, in the third - for one given hypothesis (i.e. selectively)" (Klejn, 1978, p.21).

Gening, who is not acquainted with foreign literature and with the discussion about different procedures of archaeological research, has proposed an inductive procedure in the following form. On the empirical level: 1) collection and definition of artefacts, 2) revealing the empirical rules, classification and typology. On the theoretical level: 1) reconstruction of the ways of life of separate communities, 2) reconstruction of the social system, analysis of social structures, 3) comparison of the reconstructed social system with surrounding ones and with certain stages of social and economic development (Gening, 1983, p.200-211).

Archaeological classification

The origin and history of discussion of this **Acme** in Soviet archaeology are well known to Western readers thanks to L.S. Klejn (1982).

Klejn proves the existence of the two principally different methods of grouping our materials: one of them is classification and the other is typology. Classification is important in the initial stages of research for solving the tasks of description (and for keeping and searching for information). Typology is applied in the following stages for building typological sequences, for revealing evolution and for distinguishing archaeological cultures (Klejn, 1982, 1987).

Kolpakov demonstrates that there are no privileged classificational procedures which would allow to distinguish the typology. From the operational point of view, in his opinion, there are only procedures of classifying, while procedures of typologizing do not exist. Hence we may call "typology" any kind of classification and it is a purely terminological question! (Kolpakov, 1987b & 1989b).

A terminological glossary on the theory of archaeological classification, prepared by a group of archaeologists from Leningrad under the leadership of Kolpakov and Bochkarev (the initiator of this work is L.S. Klejn) is now in press. More than 400 terms and their definitions are collected and systematized in the glossary. As far as we know, this book is the first experience of such kind in world archaeological literature.

Archaeological culture

This concept has traditionally been at the centre of attention of Soviet archaeologists and recent years are no exception.

Gening has written that "archaeological culture is the most fundamental category in the system of archaeological cognition, and the task of building a general theory of archaeological culture has become an actual one" (Gening, 1985, p.50). He has attempted to consider the concept on two levels: theoretical and empirical. "An archaeological culture is a distinct community of the past, which can be investigated through the remains of its material universe" (1985, p.67). Writing thus, Gening recognizes that the formal distinguishing of an archaeological culture "as the totality of archaeological sites of a certain type" is the task of the empirical level (Gening, 1985, p.73).

A.I. Gandja has undertaken an effort to trace the development of the concept of archaeological culture in the practical investigations of Soviet archaeologists from the 1940s to the 1960s through 157 doctoral dissertations. He has inferred that as a rule archaeological culture has been understood as the reflection of a concrete historical community (most frequently in its ethnical form) (Gandja, 1985).

O.M. Kudryavtseva maintains that two groups of definitions of archaeological culture stand out in contemporary Soviet archaeology: "in one of them archaeological culture is formulated and considered as a classificational concept, while in the other definitions also include historical and sociological characters of the community, reflected in archaeological culture" (Kudryavtseva, 1985, p.88). Kudryavtseva, as well as Gening, believes that the one and the same concept must be considered both on the empirical and the theoretical levels. Thus, she shares Gening's comprehension of archaeological culture.

A highly similar approach to the theme is also

typical of the works of Yu.P. Kholyushkin (Kholyushkin & Kholyushkina, 1985).

A different point of view is defended by Kolpakov. He has distinguished in current archaeological literature three approaches to defining archaeological culture: operational, phenomenological and "archaeologizing". In the framework of the first approach, archaeological culture is defined through the way it has been distinguished, for example, as a stable combination of the types in assemblages or as an area of identical distribution of several types. According to the second approach, an archaeological culture is defined directly after its conformity to historical phenomena of the past (a certain historical community or ethnos). The third approach attempts to define archaeological culture with the help of special ideas, which describe the societies of the past, but are especially adopted to the needs and the tasks of archaeology (Kolpakov, 1987c).

In the opinion of Kolpakov, only the first approach is methodically correct, because any synonymous correspondence between the communities of the past and their material remains does not exist. To achieve a cultural and historical interpretation of an archaeological culture, distinguished by means of classification, it is necessary to conduct a formation and selection of characters, their weighting and so on, proceeding from substantial criteria.

Periodization

There are no theoretical works devoted especially to the problem of periodization in Soviet archaeological literature,⁴ although the theme is touched upon in some publications. Presented below is an account mainly of our own views.

Palaeolithic archaeologists have probably written on the theme more often than others (Ranov, 1984; Gladilin & Sitliviy, 1986; Grigoriev, 1988). However, writing about periodization, they sometimes do not discern periodization from chronology and lump together the tasks of the former with those of the latter. For example, in the opinion of V.A. Ranov "archaeological periodization may have different foundations and may be based on geological stratigraphy, absolute chronology, typological data, etc." (Ranov, 1984, p.41). Of course, archaeological periodization must be based on the chronology of the materials, but the cornerstone

of any periodization is, in our opinion, classification. Periodization is, strictly speaking, classification turned into time. As to chronology, i.e. the distribution of archaeological assemblages in time relative to one another (which can be achieved by means of the methods of absolute and/or relative dating), it serves as distinguishing the periodizational taxons in the same way as data about the distribution of the sites in space serves as distinguishing archaeological cultures among simultaneous assemblages. To achieve periodization we must, at first, arrange our assemblages in linear vertical sequence, and then divide this sequence into segments in accordance with properly archaeological features.

On the whole archaeological periodization can serve two basic functions: 1) they serve as a means of orientation in archaeological time (in this capacity they are used only in archaeology itself), 2) they reveal archaeological cultures in time, i.e. they reflect the stages of development of the fossil part of the cultures (this aspect is especially important for transition to more elevated levels of research, for historical, ecological and other reconstructions and interpretations).

Some authors consider as "a great defect" of archaeological periodization its non-universality (Pershits, 1983, p.13). In our opinion, even if this is a defect, it is not one of periodization, but rather of the character of development of nature and society. Under close consideration it proves to be that not only archaeological periodization is non-universal, but even such a "sacred view" as the Marxist five-stage periodization of history (primitive society, slave-owning system, feudalism, capitalism, communism), "whose claims for world-historical importance are turning out now to be more and more unsound" (Vasiliev, 1988, p.66).

Hence, there is no point in trying to construct a single, universal, periodization suitable for all goals. It is senseless to aspire to fill the cells of archaeological periodization with social and economic features (Vishnyatsky, 1989b). As Bochkarev and Trifonov have pointed out, "archaeological time is autonomous and this fact explains the well-known cases where archaeological periodization does not coincide that of history, sociology, technology, etc. This discrepancy is the result of differences in the process, but not the consequence of our lack of knowledge" (Bochkarev, Trifonov, 1980, p.16).

Thus, in constructing the periodization of a certain sequence of assemblages, we must proceed from present materials and only from these, paying no attention to both already existing

logical periodizations, or parallel non-logical ones (geological, anthropological, sociological, etc.). The task of an archaeologist is to reveal the breaks of graduality in the frameworks of given sequence of assemblages and to perceive the character of the development of archaeological materials.

Interpreting archaeological data. The methods of Maanack reconstruction

Theoretical works devoted to these problems appear now rarely, but in many investigations on concrete materials one may find numerous thoughts on the subject. Of course, it is difficult to characterize all such works, and we try to present the summary characteristics of the approach to the use of archaeological data for technological and sociological constructions in archaeology.

In fact, we believe that only two properly scientific methods of interpreting archaeological data exist: the retrospective one and the analytical-typological one. In both cases the basis of archaeological inference lies in comparison: analogy (Kolpakov, 1987a).

However, interpretation of archaeological data is made not only by means of properly scientific methods. The general theories of technological development and the functioning of societies also play a very important role. Sociologists, beginning from the 1930s, have tried to rely on an exclusively Marxist conception of history. The idea of the conformity of the relations of production to productive forces (the two form together the basis of society) seems to archaeologists to be the most important and useful one, because all other phenomena — the superstructure — are by and large conditioned by the basis. It seems to archaeologists that they are able to reconstruct the productive forces and then, using the Marxist theory, to restore all aspects of social system ("the method of ascending (order)" by Artsikhovskiy, 1929).

In spite of severe criticism of such an oversimplified application of Marxist theory, "the method of ascending" still remains highly widespread. Innumerable attempts to follow it lead, as a rule, to vulgar technological determinism (both in Soviet and in Western archaeology). It should be noted that Marx and Engels repeatedly spoke against the straightforward and simplified understanding of their idea about the connection between the basis and the superstructure. Soviet philosophers have also written for a

long time about the only ultimately determining role of the basis. Of course, in such form this thesis appears to be useless for archaeological reconstruction.

In archaeological publications, devoted to concrete historical and sociological reconstructions, one may find technological determinism, but also ecological ones, references to the particular role of certain social or ideological factors, which had influence on the development of the productive forces and the relations of production, and so on. Thus, there exists real diversity of opinion in Soviet archaeology, which is only slightly disguised by Marxist terminology and by forced ideological declarations.

In our opinion, the majority of properly archaeological problems do not depend on the sociological theories of higher levels, such as Marxism, cultural materialism, etc.

Historiography of the history of theoretical thought

The appearance of a great number of historical-geographical works, and of monographs among them, is one of the most characteristic features of the development of Soviet archaeology in the 1980s. Of course articles and even books devoted to the history of archaeology have been published in the USSR previously, but, as a rule, they have elucidated exclusively the history of expeditions, discoveries and of archaeological institutions, but not the history of ideas or theory. There is no doubt that grasping the meaning of the development of the latter began in earlier periods, but only now corresponding works have been published (Masson, 1980; Gening, 1982a, 1982b; Pryakhin, 1982; 1984, 1986, p.45-68, 109-145, 1989; Glushkov, 1983; Victorova, 1989, p.9-18).

The analysis of the theoretical discussions of the 1920s—1930s, when, as it is usually written, Soviet archaeologists mastered Marxism, holds a very important place in these works. Interest in this period of the development of archaeology has grown together with the rise of interest in the history of the country in general, which is conditioned by the policy of glasnost. We feel that the most interesting and profound essays on the history of Soviet archaeology as a whole, and of theoretical thought in particular, are being written now, and our recent conversations with some of our colleagues, the archaeologists of Leningrad, confirm this proposition.

Conclusion

As it is now widely known, the conceptions and the theories elaborated by Western archaeologists and prehistorians have often been discussed in the USSR as "bourgeois" ones. Usually those who use this label imply that "bourgeois" means "false", "wrong", etc. However, most Soviet archaeologists now appreciate the term as simply something habitual, as a word, which means "Western", "foreign", but not "bad" or "alien". We, as well as the majority of our colleagues abroad, aspire to assess all scientific conceptions and theories after their real contents, and not after their state or social links. This is all the more necessary as there are not so many differences between the theoretical views of Soviet and Western archaeologists, as we have thought. Twintheories have existed in both for a long time, but the authors of these theories have, as a rule, only a very poor acquaintance with the works of each other. We would be glad if our short essay stimulates interest in Soviet archaeology among our foreign colleagues.

NOTES

- ¹ The book by V.I. Ravdonikas "For a Marxist history of material culture" was published in 1930.
- ² It should be noted that among the latter one may find also very interesting studies. One such work is, in our opinion, the book by E.P. Bunatyan (1985).
- ³ Evidently, Gening believes that the aims of Soviet archaeology must be distinct from the aims of non-Soviet archaeology.
- ⁴ The collection of articles under the title "Archaeological periodization" was prepared for publication under the leadership of L.S. Klejn in the beginning of the 1980s, but it is still in the state of manuscript (of course, through no fault of Klejn's).

REFERENCES

- Anikovitch, M.V. 1989. М.В. Аникович, О месте археологии в системе общественных наук. *Категории исторических наук*. Л., стр.73—98.
- Artsikhovskiy, A.V. 1929. А.В. Арциховский, Новые методы в археологии. *Историк-Марксист*, 14, стр. 136-155.
- Bibler, V.S. 1969. В.С. Библер, Исторический факт как фрагмент действительности. *Источникведение: Теоретические и методические проблемы*. М., стр.89-101.

- Bochkarev, V.S. & Trifonov, V.A. 1980. В.С. Бочкарев, В.А. Трифонов, Пространство и время в археологии. *Методика археологических исследований и закономерности развития древних обществ*. Ашхабад, стр.15-18.
- Bulkin, V.A., Klejn, L.S. & Lebedev, G.S. 1982. Attainments and problems of Soviet archaeology. *World archaeology*, vol.13, no. 3, p.272-295.
- Bunatyan, E.P. 1985. Е.П. Бунятян, *Методика социальных реконструкций в археологии: на материалах скифских могильников IV-III вв. до н.э.* Киев.
- Gandja, A.I. 1985. А.И. Ганжа, О понятии "археологическая культура" в советской археологии 40—60—х годов. *Археология и методы исторических реконструкций*. Киев, стр.50-74.
- 1988. А.И. Ганжа. *Историография проблемы археологической культуры в отечественной науке*. (Автореферат кандидатской диссертации). Казань.
- Gening, V.F. 1982a. В.Ф. Генинг, Объект и объективный предмет знания археологической науки. *Теория и методы археологических исследований*. Киев. стр.5-34. - 1982b. В.Ф. Генинг, *Очерки по истории советской археологии (У истоков формирования марксистских теоретических основ советской археологии: 20-е — первая половина 30-х годов)*. Киев.
- 1983. В.Ф. Генинг. *Объект и предмет науки в археологии*. Киев.
- 1985. В.Ф. Генинг. Заметки к построению теории археологической культуры. *Археология и методы исторических реконструкций*. Киев, стр.50-74.
- 1988. В.Ф. Генинг. Проблемные ситуации и на ученые революции в археологии. *Проблемная ситуация в современной археологии*. Киев, стр.26-84.
- 1989. В.Ф. Генинг, *Структура археологического познания*. Киев.
- Gening, V.F. et al. 1988. В.Ф. Генинг, С.В. Смирнов, Ю.Н. Захарук, Л.А. Черных, Е.П. Бунятян, А.К. Колесников, *Проблемная ситуация в современной археологии*. Киев.
- Gladilin, V.N. & Sitliviuy, V.I. 1986. В.Н. Гладилин, В.И. Ситливый, Принципы археологической периодизации палеолита. *Четвертичная геология и первобытная археология Южной Сибири*, Т.1. Улан-Удэ.
- Glushkov, I.G. 1983. И.Г. Глушков, Теоретическая мысль в археологии во второй половине 20-х — начале 30-х годов. *Этнокультурные процессы в Западной Сибири*. Томск.
- Grigoriev, G.P. 1973. Г.П. Григорьев, О предмете археологии. *Тезисы докладов сессии, посвященной итогам полевых археол. исследований 1972 г. в СССР*. Ташкент, стр.41-43.
- 1981. Г.П. Григорьев, О предмете археологии. *Описание и анализ археологических источников*. Иркутск, стр. 3-15.
- 1988. Г.П. Григорьев, Эпохи палеолита как показатель развития. *Закономерности развития палеолитических культур на территории Франции и Восточной Европы*. Л., стр. 13-15.
- Kholyushkin, Yu.P. & Kholyushkina, V.A. 1985. Ю.П. Холюшкин, В.А. Холюшкина, Методические аспекты исследования

отческих культур каменного века *Проблемы реконструкций* в Новосибирск, стр.23—45. Yu.F. &

Plakhin, V.T. 1988. Ю.Ф. В. Т. Плахин, О предмете *Методические проблемы Сибири*. Новосибирск, стр.5—18. LS. 1977. Panorama of theoretical archaeology. *Current Anthropology*, vol.18, no.1,

Л-С- Клейн, *Археологические источники*.

Archaeological Typology. *BAR International* - 153. Л-С. Клейн, О предмете археологии.

[*археология*, № 3, стр.209-219. Л С Клейн, Классификация и типология, ские чтения памяти М.П. Грязнова, «А Омск. стр.52-55. *tf*m*. Е.М. 1987а. Е.М. Колпаков, Религиозные представления и археологические данные. *отные представления в первобытном* М., стр.32-34.

Е.М. Колпаков, Типология и ... - г ккация. *Исторические чтения памяти МЛ Грязнова*, т.1. Омск, стр.35-38.

~ Е.М. Колпаков, Три подхода к ению археологической культуры. *советской археологии в свете решений XXVII съезда КПСС*. Суздаль, стр.121-122.

Е.М. Колпаков, Проблема спецификации "археологические источники". *«...»*. *Исторические науки*. Л., стр.99-114.

Е.М. Колпаков, *Понятия и методы отческой классификации*. Автореферат кандидатской диссертации). Л. «*fcwtseva. О.М. 1985. О.М. Кудрявцева, К вопросу об определении понятия "логическая культура" в современной "егской археологии. *Археология и методы исторических реконструкций*. Киев, стр.84-91. — W88. О.М. Кудрявцева, *Проблема выделения археологических культур (на примере культур йога бронзы)*. (Автореферат кандидатской жооертации). М.

V.M. 1980. В.М. Массой, У истоков - ^гретической мысли в советской археологии. *Краткие сообщения Института археологии*, - 16?.

Pershits, A.I. 1983. А.И. Першиц, Введение. *История первобытного общества*. Т.1. М., стр.5-32.

Plakhin, V.T. 1985. В.Т. Плахин, Гносеологическая специфика археологических источников. *Алтай в эпоху камня и раннего металла*. Барнаул, стр.15-28^

Pryakhin, A.D 1982. А.Д. Прянин, *Советская археология: периоды и этапы развития*. Воронеж.

- 1984. А.Д. Прянин, *Советская археология: периоды развития. Эпоха бронзы восточноевропейской лесостепи*. М. стр.3-28. — 1986. В.Д. Прянин, *История советской археологии*. Воронеж. Ranov, V.A. 1984.

V.A. Ранов, О соотношении хронологии и периодизации палеолита. *Проблемы исследования каменного века Евразии*. Красноярск, стр.41—43. Taylor, W.W. 1948. A study of archaeology. *American Anthropologist*, 50 (3), pt.2, *Memoir* 69. Vasiliev, L.S. 1988. Л.С. Васильев, Что такое "азиатский" способ производства. *Народы Азии и Африки*, № 3, стр.65—75. Victorova, R.D. 1989. Р.Д. Викторова, *Научный поиск в археологии*. Свердловск. Vishnyatsky, L.B. 1989а. Л.Б. Вишняцкий,

Определение археологии как классификационная проблема. *Актуальные проблемы запаносибирской археологии*. Новосибирск, стр.3-6.

- 1989б. Л.Б. Вишняцкий, Рецензия на: *Hunters in transition*. Oxford, 1986. *Советская археология*, №4.

Zakharuk, Yu.N. 1981. Ю.Н. Захарук, *Методологические проблемы археологической науки*. (Автореферат докторской диссертации). М.

- 1988. Ю.Н. Захарук, Историческое познание и археология. *Познание исторического процесса в археологии*. М., стр. 10—30.

* The list includes only the works which are referred to in the text. It by no means should be considered as the exhaustive bibliography of theoretical publications in Soviet archaeology of 1980es.