

УДК 622.012.2-029:9]:001.82

ON THE USE OF THE CONCEPT “PIT” IN ARCHEOLOGY

Brovender Y. M.

ПРО ВИКОРИСТАННЯ В АРХЕОЛОГІЇ ПОНЯТТЯ «КОПАЛЬНЯ»

Бровендер Ю.М.

The article is devoted to the methodological aspect of the basic concept of the new direction in Ukrainian archeology (mining archeology) - the concept of “pit”. Some researchers regard this term incorrectly and it often leads to delusions. Consequently, the ideas as to the real scale of mining works carried out in antiquity are misrepresented; accordingly, the data as to the amounts of metal obtained after processing are distorted. In general, the very nature of metal production activity in antiquity seems also distorted.

The author focuses attention on the fact that until the clarification of the issue whether mining operations took place simultaneously or in different periods of time, the concepts of “pit” and “pits” in the territory of one ore manifestation should be used with restriction. Analyzing the production activities of the ancient population within the territory of the particular ore manifestation the author considers it appropriate to discuss the number of mine workings, differentiating them by their types. The issue referred to the number of mines operating in the territory of the particular ore manifestation requires further consideration.

Key words: *mining archeology, mine working, Donetsk mining-and-metallurgical center, Kartamysh archeological microdistrict, metal production, pit, ore manifestation.*

Large-scale archaeological excavations of ancient mining sites in Eastern Ukraine in the first decade of the 21st century actually laid the foundation for a new direction in Ukrainian archeology, that is, mining archeology [Brovender, Otroshchenko & others, 2007]. S.I. Tatarinov was the founder of this trend in Ukraine, and he devoted many years of his life to the study of the ancient mining-and-metallurgical sites of Donbass [Tatarinov, 1993, 2003, 2006]. Mining archeology as a new interdisciplinary knowledge in Ukraine based on the results of a comprehensive analysis of sources originating from the ore territory of Donbass provides the most comprehensive information in order to recreate a holistic picture of metal production in the Paleometal era [Brovender, Shubin, 2014].

The pursuit of a comprehensive study of the ancient metal production activity, where each of its production cycle is a link in the chain of a complex process of obtaining metal, determined the need to combine all knowledge about metal production into a unique system

that could become the theory of the ancient metal. This branch of archaeological knowledge, which A.D. Pryakhin named as paleometallic studies [Pryakhin, 2007, p. 18], was formed and developed by E.N. Chernykh. The basic branch of paleometallic studies as a complex of knowledge about ancient metals is mining archeology. The object of its study is mining-and-metallurgical sites.

The development of any scientific knowledge is impossible without the conceptual apparatus which is one of the most important tools of scientific knowledge. In the 60s of the XX century E.N. Chernykh guided by this methodological setup made an attempt to bring the terms concerning the problem of metal production and used by the archeologists into a certain system. At the same time he tried to define the most frequently used concepts [Chernykh, 1967]. Enlargement of the source base, as well as the development of issues related to the ancient metal production, allowed E.N. Chernykh took steps aimed at some regulation of the conceptual apparatus in the 70s [Chernykh, 1976, 1978, 1978a]. In fact, the article, published by E.N. Chernykh in 1967 was the only comprehensive theoretical study devoted to the conceptual apparatus of the ancient metal industry. Short comments on particular concepts (hearth, province, zone), as well as the characteristics of specific types of mining works and their traces (mines, tunnels, excavations, holes) were given by E.N. Chernykh in several subsequent works [Chernykh, 1976, p. 166-168; 1978a, p. 262-263; Chernykh, Lebedeva, 2002, p. 25-30]. Attempts of some researchers to argue metal science concepts did not bring anything new, since they were based on the methodological approaches previously applied by E.N. Chernykh. An example of such attempt was the report of V.M. Kurtamasheva [2002] at the conference in Barnaul, which was a kind of review presentation on the article published by E.N. Chernykh in 1967.

Some attempts to create a theoretical foundation for geoarcheology in terms of definitions for basic concepts which characterize ancient metal production were undertaken by a team of Russian researchers under the

supervision of V.V. Zaykov [Zaykov, Yuminov et al., 2011, p. 256-263]. In general, it should be noted that the theoretical foundations of mining archeology, as well as the principles of paleometallic studies laid by E.N. Chernykh in the 60s of the 20th century unfortunately was not further developed, which, to a certain extent, held back the development of research ideas as to the early stages of the metal production activity in the Eastern European steppe and forest-steppe. The situation was overcome only in the 90s of the 20th century when the researchers advanced to the microregional level of source analysis. The efficiency of such approach, especially in recent decades, has been clearly demonstrated by the experts [Gershkovich, 1995; Brovender, 1997, 2000, Savrasov, 1998; Chernykh, Kuzminykh and others, 1999, 2005; Chernykh, 2002, 2007; Matveeva et al., 2004; Tatarinov, 2006; Sanzharov, 2010]. An example of such approach is the study of the sites of Kartamysh archeological microdistrict (KAM) of the Donetsk mining-and-metallurgical center of the Bronze Age (DMMC) [Brovender, Otroshchenko et al., 2010; Brovender, 2012, 2016].

One of the basic concepts in the assessment of the production activities of the DMMC, like any other mining-and-metallurgical center, where mining is the main type of production activity, is the concept of "pit". An incorrect understanding of this term often leads the researchers to misconceptions. Thus, for some archaeologists, "mine working" and "pit" are synonymous terms. In this case, the number of mine workings coincides with the number of pits. Such a notion (Tatarinov, 1993, 2003, 2006) distorts the real scale, as, in fact, the very nature of metal production in antiquity.

In terms of the definitions of contemporary mining science, a pit (mine administration) is considered as several mines and surface workshops, united by a single administrative and economic administration, having a common centralized facilities for processing and transporting the minerals [Kiliachkov, 1971, p. 13]. In this regard, an ancient pit should be determined as a set of mine workings operating at the same time in the territory of one particular ore manifestation, or even one large-scale open-pit mine with surface (anthropogenic) mineral processing sites, representing a single production complex. In other words, a pit is an industrial complex of various underground and surface facilities simultaneously functioning on one ore manifestation for sinking, mining and processing of the ore body.

Isolation on the territory of an ore manifestation, having traces of ancient mine workings, of one or several pits makes certain difficulties. Thus, three lenses of ore are developed in Kartamysh ore manifestation; they are located in an echelon manner, separated by barren intervals and extended over a large area. Such a nature of ore lenses extension in ancient times led to the mining of those ore bodies in three open-pit mines. However, the question of functioning of one or several mines in the territory of a particular (Kartamysh) ore manifestation remains open. This question also arises in relation to the other ore manifestations of the Bakhmut basin, in

the territory of which traces of mining activity have been revealed. To resolve this issue large-scale studies of the entire archaeological microdistrict (Kartamyshsky, Klinovy, Mednorudinskiy, Pilipchatinsky) are needed. Evidences of simultaneous operations of all mine workings and the corresponding infrastructure provided by surface production (including anthropogenic) sites as well as settlements of ancient miners, cooperatively forming a single residential-production complex, operating within a single population array are needed. In this regard, it becomes apparent that the number of pits determined by some researchers in absolute terms is relative. The notions of "pit" and "pits" in the territory of one ore manifestation are also debatable. They are given by researchers before large-scale works carried out in the area of the entire archaeological microdistrict which they are an integral part of. Thus, at the initial stage of the study of Kartamysh ore manifestation the nature of the mine workings (open and underground) and the peculiarities of their location due to disturbance of ore lenses fixed on the surface by the landscape character were applied as a principle for identifying mines.

Taking into account the above mentioned, when analyzing the production activities of the ancient population within a specific ore manifestation, it is more correctly to speak about the number of mine workings, differentiating them by their type, leaving the question about the number of pits operating within a specific ore manifestation for further consideration. E.N. Chernykh describing the scale of industrial activity in Kargalinsky mining-and-metallurgical center applied the concept of mine working. The concept of a pit in this case was not used [Chernykh, Lebedeva, 2002]. The Kazakh researcher of mining-and-metallurgical sites A.Kh. Margulan [2001] also used this concept carefully. Concerning KAM, in the territory of which large-scale excavations have been carried out, there are some reasons to assume the functioning of its sites (the pits of Chervone Ozero-I-IV, the anthropogenic section of the pit of Chervone Ozero-I, the settlement of Chervone Ozero-1, the first chronological horizon of the settlement of Chervone Ozero-3) as a single residential-production complex, operating within a single population array [Brovender, 2012, p. 552].

References

1. Brovender Yu.M. On the issue of separating the Don-Donetsk industrial zone of metallurgy and metalworking in the Late Bronze Age (Donetsk region) / Yu.M. Brovender // Bronze Epoch of the Don-Donetsk Region: Materials of the 3rd Ukrainian-Russian Field Archaeological Seminar. - Kiev - Voronezh - Perevalsk, 1997. - p. 6-11.
2. Brovender Yu.M. Settlements of a log community in the middle stream of the Seversky Donets / Brovender Yu.M. - The dissertation of the candidate of historical sciences. - 07.00.04. - Kiev, 2000. - 486 p.
3. Brovender Yu.M. Results of the study of a complex of mining and smelting sites at the Kartamysh ore occurrence of Donbass / Yu.M. Brovender // Problems of the Study of the Archeology Monuments of Eastern Ukraine: Proceed-

- ings of the III International Historical - Archaeological Scientific Conference - Lugansk, 2012. - P. 551-556.
4. Brovender Yu.M. Donetsk Mining and Metallurgical Center of the Bronze Age / Yu.M. Brovender. - Abstract of the doctor of historical sciences. - 07.00.04. - Kyiv, 2016. - 30s.
 5. Brovender Yu.M. Donbas State Technical University in the study of the ancient production activity of tribes of the Eastern European steppe and forest-steppe (to the university jubilee) / Yu.M. Brovender, V.V. Otroschenko, A.D. Pryakhin // Problems of Mining Archeology: Materials of the VI Kartamish International Field Seminar. - Alchevsk: DonSTU, 2007. - P. 5-10.
 6. Brovender Yu.M. Kartamish Complex of Mining and Metallurgical Bronze Age Monuments in the Central Donbass / Yu.M. Brovender, V.V. Otroschenko, A.D. Pryakhin // Archeology. - №. 2. - 2010. - P. 87-101.
 7. Brovender Yu.M. Mountain archeology: the question of the conceptual apparatus / Yu.M. Brovender, Yu.P. Shubin // Collection of scientific works. - Issue 2 (43) 2014. - Alchevsk: DonSTU, 2014. - P. 53-66.
 8. Gershkovich Ya.P. About the nature of the settlement of the Middle Donetsk in the era of the late bronze / Ya. P. Gershkovich // The Bronze Age of the Donor-Donetsk Region: Materials of the Ukrainian-Russian Field Archaeological Seminar. - Lugansk, 1995. - P. 37-38.
 9. Kilyachkov AP Mining Technology / AP Kilyachkov - Moscow: Nedra, 1971. - 285 p.
 10. Kurtomashev MV To the discussion of the terms and concepts "mining metallurgical region", "metallurgical center", "the focus of metallurgy" / M.V. Kuratomashov // Northern Eurasia in the Bronze Age: Space, Time, Culture: Materials of the International Conference - Barnaul, 2002. - P. 174-176.
 11. Margulan A.H. Saryarka Mining and metallurgy in the Bronze Age. Dzhezkazgan - Ancient and Medieval Metallurgical Center (Milykuduk fortress) / A.H. Margulan - T. 2. - Almaty: Dike-Press, 2001. - 144 p.
 12. Matveeva G.I. Mining and Metallurgical Complex of the Bronze Age in the village of Mikhail-Ovsyanka in the south of the Samara region (first results of the study) / G.I. Matveeva, Yu.I. Kolev, AI Korolyov // Questions of archeology of the Urals and the Volga region. - №. 2. - Samara, 2004. - P. 69-88.
 13. Pryakhin A.D. On the study of metal and production activity in the Bronze Age on the spaces of the Eurasian forest-steppe and adjacent territories of the steppe zone at the present stage of archeology / A.D. Pryakhin // Problems of Mining Archeology: Materials of the VI Kartamish International Field Archeological Seminar. - Alchevsk: DonSTU, 2007. - P. 12-18.
 14. Savrasov A.C. Metal processing of the population of the Donets forest-steppe lumber culture / A.S. Savrasov // The author's abstract of the dissertation of the candidate of historical sciences. - Voronezh, 1998. - 23 p.
 15. Sanzharov S.N. Eastern Ukraine at the turn of the Middle Ages - Late Bronze / S.N. Sanzharov - Lugansk, 2010. - 488 p.
 16. Tatarinov S.I. Ancient metal of eastern Ukraine. Essays on the history of mining, metallurgy and metalworking in the Bronze Age / S.I. Tatarinov - Artemovsk, 1993. - 153 p.
 17. Tatarinov S.I. Ancient miners-metallurgists / S.I. Tatarinov - Slavyansk: Printing House, 2003. - 131 p.
 18. Tatarinov S.I. Ancient miners-metallurgists / S.I. Tatarinov - Slavyansk: Printing House, 2003. - 131 p.
 19. Tatarinov S.I. History of Mining, Metallurgy and Metalworking of the Bronze Age of Eastern Ukraine / S.I. Tatarinov // The author's abstract of the dissertation of the candidate of historical sciences. - Donetsk, 2006. - 23 p.
 20. Chernykh E.N. On the terms "metallurgical center", "hearth of metallurgy" and others / E.N. Chernykh // Soviet archeology. - №. 1. - Moscow, 1967. - P. 295-301.
 21. Chernykh E.N. Ancient Metalworking in the Southwest of the USSR // Ye.N. Chernykh - Moscow: Nauka, 1976. - 302 p.
 22. Chernykh E.N. Metallurgical Provinces and Periodization of the Early Metal Age in the USSR / E.N. Chernykh // Soviet archeology. - №. 4. - 1978. - P. 53-82.
 23. Chernykh E.N. Mining and metallurgy in the oldest Bulgaria / E.N. Chernykh - Sofia: Publishing house of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1978a. - 386 s.
 24. Chernykh E.N. Kargali: a phenomenon, paradoxes and a model of functioning / E.N. Chernykh // The most ancient stages of mining in Northern Eurasia. Kargalinsky complex: Materials of the International Field Symposium. - Moscow, 2002. - P. 85-86.
 25. Chernykh E.N. Kargali - Tom V / E.N. Chernykh. - Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, 2007. - 200 p.
 26. Chernykh E.N. Archaeological monuments of the Bronze Age on the Kargalah (settlement Gorny and others) / E.N. Chernykh, S.V. Kuzminykh, E.Yu. Lebedeva S.A. Agapov, V.Yu. Lun'kov, L. B. Orlovskaya, T.O. Teneyshvili, D.V. Valkov // Russian archeology. - №. 1. - 1999. - No. 1. - P. 77-102.
 27. Chernykh E.N. Pershing Necropolis: mound № 1 / E.N. Chernykh, S.V. Kuzminykh, E.Yu. Lebedeva V.Yu. Lun'kov // Kargali. - T. IV. - Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, 2005. - P. 21-48.
 28. Chernykh E.N. Mining developments and their main sites / E.N. Chernykh, E.Yu. Lebedev // Chernykh Ye.N., Lebedev E.Yu., Kuz'minykh SV, Lun'kov V.Yu., Gorozhanin V.M., Gorozhanina E.N., Ovchinnikov V.V., Puchkov V.N. Kargali - Volume I. - Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, 2002. - P. 25-38.

References

1. Brovender Yu.M. K voprosu o vydelenii dono-donetskoy proizvodstvennoy zonyi metallurgii i metalloobrabotki v epohu pozdney bronzyi (Donetskiy areal) / Yu.M. Brovender // Epoha bronzyi Dono-Donetskogo regiona: Materialyi 3-go ukr.-ros. polevogo arheolog. seminaru. - K. - Voronezh - Perevalsk, 1997. - S. 6-11.
2. Brovender Yu.M. Poseleniya srubnoy obschnosti v srednem techenii Severskogo Dontsa / Brovender Yu.M. - Dis. ... kand. ist. nauk. - 07.00.04. - K., 2000. - 486 s.
3. Brovender Yu.M. Itogi issledovaniya kompleksa gornometallurgicheskikh pamyatnikov na Kartamyishskom rudoproyavlenii Donbassa / Yu.M. Brovender // Problemyi issledovaniya pamyatnikov arheologii Vostochnoy Ukrainyi: Materialyi III-go mezhdunarodn. istor. - arheolog. nauchn. konf. - Lugansk, 2012. - S. 551-556.
4. Brovender Yu.M. Donetskiy girnicho-metallurgiyinyi tsentr dobi bronzii / Yu.M. Brovender. - Avtoref. ... dokt. ist. nauk. - 07.00.04. - K., 2016. - 30s.
5. Brovender Yu.M. Donbaskiy derzhavniy tehničniy universitet u vivchenni davnoyi virobnichoyi diyalnosti plemen shidnoEvropeyskogo stepu ta lisostepu (do vuzivskogo yuvileyu) / Yu.M. Brovender, V.V. Otroschenko, A.D. Pryakhin // Problemi girnichoyi arheologiyi: Materiali VI-go Kartamiskogo mizhnarodn. polovogo seminaru. - Alchevsk: DonDTU, 2007. - S. 5-10.

6. Brovender Yu.M. Kartamiskiy kompleks gornichometalurgiyanih pam'yatok bronzovogo viku v Tsentralnomu Donbasi / Yu.M. Brovender, V.V. Otroschenko, A.D. Pryahin // Arheologiya. – №2. – 2010. – S. 87-101.
7. Brovender Yu.M. Gornaya arheologiya: k voprosu o ponyatiynom apparate / Yu.M. Brovender, Yu.P. Shubin // Zbirka naukovih prats. – Vyipusk 2 (43) 2014. – Alchevsk: DonDTU, 2014. – С. 53-66.
8. Gershkovich Ya. P. O haraktere zaseleniya Srednego Podontsovyaya v epohu pozdney bronzy / Ya. P. Gershkovich // Epoha bronzyi Dono-Donetskogo regiona: Materialyi ukr.- ros. polevogo arheolog. seminaru. – Lugansk, 1995. – S. 37-38.
9. Zaykov V.V. Osnovy geoarheologii / V.V. Zaykov, A.M. Yuminov, E.V. Zaykova, A.D. Tairov. – Chelyabinsk: YuUrGU, 2011. – 263 s.
10. Kilyachkov A.P. Tehnologiya gornogo proizvodstva / A.P. Kilyachkov. – M.: Nedra, 1971. – 285 s.
11. Kurtomashev M.V. K diskussii o terminah i ponyatiyah «gornometalurgicheskaya oblast», «metallurgicheskii tsentr», «ochag metallurgii» / M.V. Kurtomashev // Severnaya Evraziya v epohu bronzyi: prostranstvo, vremya, kultura: Materialyi mezhdunarodn. konf. – Barnaul, 2002. – S. 174-176.
12. Margulan A.H. Saryiarka. Gornoe delo i metallurgiya v epohu bronzyi. Dzhezkazgan – drevniy i srednevekovyy metallurgicheskii tsentr (gorodische Milyikuduk) / A.H. Margulan. – T. 2. – Almaty: Dayk-Press, 2001. – 144 s.
13. Matveeva G.I. Gorno-metallurgicheskii kompleks bronzovogo veka u s. Mihaylo-Ovsyanka na yuge Samarskoy oblasti (pervyye rezultaty issledovaniya) / G.I. Matveeva, Yu.I. Kolev, A.I. Korolev // Voprosy arheologii Urala i Povolzhya. – № 2. – Samara, 2004. – S. 69-88.
14. Pryahin A.D. K izucheniyu metalla i proizvodstvennoy deyatel'nosti v epohu bronzyi na prostranstvah Evraziyskoy lesostepi i smezhnykh territoriy stepnoy zonyi na sovremennom etape arheologii / A.D. Pryahin // Problemi gornichoy arheologii: Materiali VI-go Kartamiskogo mizhnarodn. polovogo arheolog. seminaru. – Alchevsk: DonDTU, 2007. – S. 12-18.
15. Savrasov A.S. Metalloobrabotka naseleniya donskey lesostepnoy srubnoy kul'tury / A.S. Savrasov // Avtoref. dis... kand. ist. nauk. – Voronezh, 1998. – 23 s.
16. Sanzharov S.N. Vostochnaya Ukraina na rubezhe epoch sredney – pozdney bronzyi / S.N. Sanzharov. – Lugansk, 2010. – 488 s.
17. Tatarinov S.I. Drevniy metall Vostochnoy Ukrainyi. Ocherki istorii gornogo dela, metallurgii i metalloobrabotki v epohu bronzyi / S.I. Tatarinov. – Artemovsk, 1993. – 153 s.
18. Tatarinov S.I. Drevnie gorniki-metallurgi / S.I. Tatarinov. – Slavyansk: Pechatnyy dvor, 2003. – 131 s.
19. Tatarinov S.I. Istoriya gornichoy spravi, metallurgiyi ta metalloobrobki dobi bronzyi Shidnoyi Ukrainy / S.I. Tatarinov // Avtoref. ... dis. kand. ist. nauk. – Donetsk, 2006. – 23 s.
20. Chernykh E.N. O terminah «metallurgicheskii tsentr», «ochag metallurgii» i drugih / E.N. Chernykh // SA. – №1. – M., 1967. – S. 295-301.
21. Chernykh E.N. Drevnyaya metalloobrabotka na Yugo-Zapade SSSR // E.N. Chernykh. – M.: Nauka, 1976. – 302 s.
22. Chernykh E.N. Metallurgicheskie provintsii i periodizatsiya epochi rannego metalla na territorii SSSR / E.N. Chernykh // SA. – №4. – 1978. – S. 53-82.
23. Chernykh E.N. Gornoe delo i metallurgiya v drevneyshey Bolgarii / E.N. Chernykh. – Sofiya: Izd-vo Bolgarskoy Akademii nauk, 1978a. – 386 s.
24. Chernykh E.N. Kargalyi: fenomen, paradoksy i model funktsionirovaniya / E.N. Chernykh // Drevneyshie etapy gornogo dela v Severnoy Evrazii. Kargalinskii kompleks: Materialyi mezhdunarodn. polevogo simpoziuma. – M., 2002. – S. 85-86.
25. Chernykh E.N. Kargalyi. – Tom V / E.N. Chernykh. – M.: Yazyki slavyanskoy kul'tury, 2007. – 200 s.
26. Chernykh E.N. Arheologicheskie pamyatniki epochi bronzyi na Kargalah (poselenie Gornyyi i drugie) / E.N. Chernykh, S.V. Kuzminykh, E.Yu. Lebedeva, S.A. Agapov, V.Yu. Lunkov, L.B. Orlovskaya, T.O. Teneyshvili, D.V. Valkov // RA. – № 1. – 1999. – S. 77-102.
27. Chernykh E.N. Pershinskii nekropol: kurgan № 1 / E.N. Chernykh, S.V. Kuzminykh, E.Yu. Lebedeva, V.Yu. Lunkov // Kargalyi. – T. IV. – M.: Yazyki slavyanskoy kul'tury, 2005. – S. 21-48.
28. Chernykh E.N. Gornyye vyirabotki i ikh osnovnyie uchastki / E.N. Chernykh, E.Yu. Lebedeva // Chernykh E.N., Lebedeva E.Yu., Kuzminykh S.V., Lunkov V.Yu., Gorozhanin V.M., Gorozhanina E.N., Ovchinnikov V.V., Puchkov V.N. Kargalyi. – Tom I. – M.: Yazyki slavyanskoy kul'tury, 2002. – S. 25-38.

Бровендер Ю.М. Про використання в археології поняття «копальня».

Стаття присвячена методологічному аспекту базового поняття нового в українській археології напрямку – гірничої археології – поняттю «копальня». Некоректне розуміння деякими дослідниками цього терміну, часто призводить до помилок. У підсумку спотворюються уявлення про реальні масштаби проведених у давнину гірничих робіт, а відповідно, й про об'єм отриманого в результаті переробки мідних руд, металу. Загалом спотвореним представляється сам характер металовиробничої діяльності у давнину.

Автор акцентує увагу на тому, що до моменту з'ясування питання про одноразовість або різночасність експлуатації гірничих виробіток, поняття «копальня» і «копальні» на території одного рудопроаяву, слід використовувати з застереженням. При аналізі виробничої діяльності давнього населення в межах конкретного рудопроаяву автор вважає за доцільним казати про кількість гірничих виробіток, диференціюючи їх за типами, залишаючи на майбутнє вирішення питання про кількість функціонуючих на території рудопроаявів копалень.

Ключові слова: гірничої археологія, гірничої виробітка, Донецький гірничо-металургійний центр, Картамиський археологічний мікрорайон, металовиробництво, копальня, рудопроаяв.

Бровендер Ю.М. Об использовании в археологии понятия «рудник».

Статья посвящена методологическому аспекту базового понятия нового в украинской археологии направления – горной археологии – понятию «рудник». Некорректное понимание некоторыми исследователями данного термина, зачастую приводит к заблуждениям. В итоге искажаются представления о реальных масштабах, проведенных в древности горных работ, а, соответственно, и объеме полученного в результате переработки медных руд, металла. В целом, искаженным представляется сам характер металлопроизводственной деятельности в древности.

Автор акцентировал внимание на том, что до момента выяснения вопроса о одновременности или разновременности эксплуатации горных выработок, понятия «рудник» и «рудники» на территории одного рудопроявления, следует использовать с оговоркой. При анализе производственной деятельности древнего населения в пределах конкретного рудопроявления автор считает целесообразным говорить о количестве горных выработок, дифференцируя их по типам, оставляя на будущее решение вопроса о количестве функционирующих на территории рудопроявления рудников.

Ключевые слова: горная археология, горная выработка, Донецкий горно-металлургический центр, Картамышский ар-

хеологический микрорайон, металлопроизводство, рудник, рудопроявление.

Бровендер Юрій Михайлович – доктор історичних наук, доцент, професор кафедри історії та археології Східноукраїнського національного університету імені Володимира Даля

Рецензент: д.і.н., проф. **Литвиненко Р.О.**

Стаття подана 10.04.2019.