

Hanna INDYCHENKO
Kyiv

CORRELATION BETWEEN ECONOMIC-CULTURAL TYPES AND HISTORIC-ETHNOGRAPHIC COMMUNITIES IN THE CONTEXT OF ETHNOARCHEOLOGY

The issues of economic adaptation of primitive communities have been actively discussed since the middle of the 20th century. It was an Anglo-American scientific school, known as a “new archaeology” or “ethnoarchaeology” that set a task to shift from the archaeological vision to the historic vision of the epoch. The material culture of modern nations has become the object of investigation for ethnoarchaeologists, while the subject-matter of investigation is the specific character of peoples behaviour and their social interrelations as reflected in the material culture. At present “ethnoarchaeology” is interpreted as a method of application of ethnic sources to reconstruct the way of living of early primitive inhabitants, known from archaeological sources.

The investigations in this field by our experts were linked to the concept of economic-cultural type and historic-ethnographic communities. Both notions were formulated by the Soviet ethnography¹. Ethnographers define the economic-cultural type as “...the complexes of economic and cultural peculiarities that were formed historically and are peculiar to the peoples that live in certain natural conditions and have a particular level of social and economic development”². Modern archaeology regards economic and cultural types as models of adaptation to the surrounding medium. The category of economic-cultural type is closely connected with the category of historic-ethnographic community which is defined in ethnography as a territory “with a distinct cultural community formed as a result of long-term relations, mutual influence and of common destinies of the nations that inhabit this territory”³. The development of historic-ethnographic community was mostly influenced by ethnogenetic unity and mutual influence of the cultures it comprised; as for the economic-cultural type, the peculiarities of culture were defined, first of all, by the directions of economic activities within certain natural conditions. The categories of economic-cultural type and historic-ethnographic community are the most important interpretative categories in the history of the primitive society. In archaeology the basic principles of reconstruction of economic-cultural types and historic-ethnographic communities are represented by local variants of the material culture. Consideration of the factors that determine locality is an important part in the formation of hierarchy of the local variants. They were fully considered in the works by V.P.Liubin, who put forward a hypothesis that local variants consisted of the peculiarities of stone and bone implements of historical remains, peculiarities of household activities, domestic objects (the house, the hearth, etc.), specific evidence, connected with ideological beliefs (works of art, burial sites, etc.), as well as of the migration factor (introduction of cultural elements that are not typical of a particular territory)⁴.

Ethnic cultures of human communities are one of the ways to manifest local cultural diversity. While considering ethnic parameters of culture we deal with the specific character of historically developed methods of adaptation of various human communities regarded in correlation to each other. Local diversity of cultures is determined by “...the necessity to reflect concrete environmental conditions, assimilated by various historic human communities in the process of their development and to fix the specific features of this development in corresponding cultures as specific methods of adaptation to the environment”⁵.

According to physical and geographical division into the districts, there are two zones in the Ukrainian Upper Palaeolithic: Northern (pre-ice) and Southern. The climatic conditions, landscape and fauna of the two zones differ significantly. Consequently, the economic specialization differed too. In the Northern zone people hunted the mammoth, reindeer and other forest-tundra animals; in the Southern zone they hunted the bison, horses, saiga and other steppe animals. Within these zones there exist large ethnocultural regions – the Middle Dnieper Region (Seredniodniprovska) and Subcarpathian-Volynian Region. The remains of steppe zone occupy a separate place in the Upper Palaeolithic. The monuments of the Crimea also form a separate zone. Within ethnocultural regions some minor archaeological cultures are situated⁶.

The categories of economic-cultural type and historic-ethnographic community are genetically connected with each other via the element of the primitive community, which is the basic economic cell, the head production

group that jointly fights for the means of sustenance. In different years the problems of correlation between these categories were investigated by M.V.Voevodskiy⁷ and A.A.Formozov⁸ on the basis of Mesolithic and Neolithic materials. Principally new for the Upper Palaeolithic is an attempt by M.I.Gladkikh⁹ to trace dialectic interrelation between the economic-cultural types and historic-ethnographic communities, as related to the Upper Palaeolithic.

Three variants could be considered concerning the correlation of the archaeological culture and the economic-cultural type: first, territorial borders of archaeological culture and economic-cultural type coincide fully or partially; second, within the borders of one economic-cultural type there are several related or not-related archaeological cultures; third, different variants and sub-variants of archaeological culture belong to different economic-cultural types.

There is a range of factors that influenced the interaction between two categories during the period of the Upper Palaeolithic: social, natural and functional. Economic-cultural and historic-ethnographic roots of representatives of certain archaeological cultures are reflected in the categories of material culture of the Upper Palaeolithic artifacts (homes and dwellings, instruments and tools, works of art, etc.). Methods of usage of natural means of living depend, first and foremost, on social and economic development of the community, as well as on the character of the habitat. Specific features and peculiarities of cultural development, "...characteristic features of the works of art, house interiors, methods of processing the stone, certain types of flint and bone wares, etc., can be regarded as ethnic or even ethnographic characteristics"¹⁰.

The environment radically influenced on the outward appearance of the dwellings and the productive activities of the inhabitants. Thus, the layers of flint influenced the geography of dwellings of the Upper Palaeolithic people. Mapping of artifacts of this period displays a significant concentration of the artifacts in the regions rich in raw materials: the Crimea, Novgorod-Siverskiy region, the Middle Dniester region, etc. A number of dwellings were found in the regions with convenient relief. The Upper Palaeolithic dwellings of mammoth hunters were situated in valleys of the rivers with large water-meadows (Mizyn, Mezhyrich, Gintsi, Kyrlyivska). The artifacts of the Southern zone, bison hunters dwellings, prove that the primitive inhabitants of this region settled down in the places with clearly shaped outlines of the relief, which considerably eased baying the animals (Anetivka II, Amvrosvivka, Velyka Akkarja, etc.). In primitive times some natural barriers (mountain ranges, deserts, rivers) were used as ethnic boundaries.

The development of primitive groups of people was mostly influenced by cold climate conditions. Thus, mammoth hunters could not live outside warm houses. Numerous houses of such type were found on the sites of dwellings in the middle part of the Dnieper river – Mizyn, Mezhyrich, Dobranichivka, etc. Well-planned structure of the dwellings, which consisted of economic and domestic complexes, draws a lot of attention. The core of such complexes was made up of a solid house with a number of constructions, surrounding it. They were workshops for flint and bone processing, bag processing; pits for storing meat and bones; as well as fire places. To built houses, primitive people used mammoth bones and horns of reindeer. Those houses looked rather like northern yarangas. Like the Mizyn house that was thoroughly studied, the framework was made of wooden poles, fixed at the edge of the floor and jointed overhead in the middle. This framework was covered with mammoth skins. To strengthen the walls, primitive people used mammoth bones and the horns of reindeer. Slanting walls of the house were laid with skulls, pelvic and large bones of the mammoths extremities. The house was topped by the horns of reindeer. On the floor there were three fireplaces. Around the centre of the floor there were four groups of mammoth bones dug in the ground that were used as the props for the poles.

The remains of light framework houses were discovered at the sites of dwellings in the Southern part of Ukraine Apparently, these types of houses were covered by the bison skins. A complex planigraphic structure was traced in Amvrosvivka, Anetivka II and Velyka Akkarja dwellings. Some more early artifacts (Muralovka, Sagaidak, Yamy) had more primitive structure and were situated separately¹¹.

Animals' living conditions in southern and northern regions were different; as a result, it was necessary to use different hunting methods and skills. Bison hunting was conditioned by seasonal migration, according to which primitive communities developed hunting strategy¹². The problem of seasonal dwelling of the Upper Palaeolithic localities is still under discussion. O.A.Soffer believes that the Upper Palaeolithic dwellings discovered here were inhabited seasonally¹³. However, taking into consideration the latest investigations and analysis of fauna materials, it is assumed that mammoth hunters did not aim at hunting fur animals; they lived in the dwellings all year round for many years¹⁴. The weight of mammoth considerably exceeds the weight of the bison. The animals have different speed movement, the characteristic features of their living differ too. Thus, hunting efforts and hunting methods differed as well. Bison hunters, who represented economic-cultural type, used artificial enclosures or natural precipice when hunting. The majority of the Upper Palaeolithic mammoth hunters dwellings were located near the water. It gives us grounds to assume that primitive hunters killed the animals after baying them into marshes or onto thin ice. Primitive deer hunters in the northern region cracked ice at the places of mass river crossing by the animals during their seasonal migration. The majority of dwelling of the Upper Palaeolithic reindeer hunters were located near the water, which made collective deer hunting much easier.

Although, it's very likely that basic methods of carcass skinning were very similar, still certain divergence could probably be traced, as the animals of strategic importance had different weight, skeleton structure, etc. The model of such skinning in the Southern region of Ukraine was reproduced by I.A.Snizhko, who based his researches on the data from the Upper Palaeolithic dwelling Amvrosiivka¹⁵. A killed bison was utilized on the spot. The procedure of utilization consisted of several stages: during the first stage the carcass was skinned and divided into segments; during the next stage the carcass was dismembered into smaller pieces. At both stages the marrow was extracted. Carcass parts with meat were taken to the dwelling where they were used as food.

Production tools reflect both ethnic and economic belonging of settlers. Economic-cultural background of the dwellers could be traced down in the tools used for specific activities. Bison hunters, for example, used spears with bone (Amvrosiivka) or horn (Anetivka II) points. In the dwellings of the Middle Dnieper region there were found bone points of spears, used by mammoth hunters¹⁶. A great number of pestle grind-stones found in the Dniester region testify to the importance of gathering there. As it is stated in scientific works, the traces of flint microtools in the dwellings of the steppe region revealed the specific features of economic specialization¹⁷. In a range of remains of steppe zone microtools make up 40 – 50 per cent. Other categories of working tools (axes, daggers, etc.) apart from economic characteristics can reflect ethnic belonging of the dwellers. The specific environment should be taken into consideration while studying these tools. Thus, an axe found in the peripheral zones of the steppe region can testify to particular economic-cultural occupation of the dwellers, while various types of axes found in the forest zone reflect ethnic belonging of the dwellers¹⁸. Individual characteristics of different types of stone influenced the form and functions of the tools used, which could not be shaped in the same way, thus, promoting the variety of stoneware. The specific feature of the Upper Palaeolithic technique in the West of Ukraine is the use soft types of stone, processed by cutting, polishing and boring. The traditions of processing the stone had been forming for many years by many generations. The materials of archaeological findings testify to the changeability of the tools in the process of their production. This factor, indicative of locality, was singled out by M.I.Gladkikh¹⁹. Every community accumulates certain experience while interacting with environment and other communities. There are two ways of transferring on this experience: genetic and non-genetic. The information that is most essential for human communities' is gradually getting stereotyped. It helps not only to preserve selection but to save its working volume in the process of constant renovation. A craftsman, for example, acquires individual, original and unique experience while producing his tools. An altered tool joined real objects and became one of the sources to create ideal models. The difference between stone implements could be explained in most cases by exogamous traditions. When neighbouring exogamous communities exchanged marriage partners they also exchanged cultural traditions, which brought about technical and typological differences and came as a result of new techniques within each primitive community. Flint collections of certain Upper Palaeolithic dwellings represent a certain archaeological culture. Thus, the flint tools of Mizyn dwelling differ from the flint tools of Mizhrichi, Dobranichivka and Gintsi. However, a number of common features of material and spiritual culture of the dwelling with cultural and historic unity, represented by the remains of the Mezhyrich type, makes it possible to assume that there is a common basis for historic and cultural development of the dwellers. Common features of the material culture of the two cultural and historic communities are reflected in the constructions and decoration of homes, stylistic peculiarities of fine arts, arrangement of household and living complexes. Archaeological collections of flint implements contain most often some elements that are typical of another culture. There are some points of similarity of flint implements between Amvrosiivka dwelling and the second layer of Telman stopping place at Kostionky X. Thus, the second layer of Telman stopping place might testify that there was certain relationships of the dwellers with the steppe zone region²⁰. Specific cultural features could be observed in the Upper Palaeolithic dwelling of Zhuravka. Although the dwelling was located in the Middle part of the Dnieper river, its flint implements remind those of the southern region. Stable ethnic traditions, discovered in another economic zone and connected with migrations of the primitive communities, are also traced down in the remains of the Upper Palaeolithic dwelling in Siberia – Malta. Without going into the debatable problem of the origin of Maltyn culture, it is necessary to note that, resulting from the examination of constructions, dwellings structure, bone tools and decorations the scientists managed to discover a number of features similar to the artifacts of Willendorf and Kostionkiv culture. It is obvious that cultural traditions that had been transferred so far away were changed; thus it makes it possible to single out independent Maltyn culture, still it is not possible yet to trace down the site where this culture originated from²¹.

Economic specialization of primitive communities in some way influenced clothes and foot-wear production. Depending on economic orientation of the representatives of material cultures, the differences became apparent in the cut of the clothes and foot-wear, which sometimes had different styles of fur edging. Ethnic differentiating function that was evident in tools, clothes, footwear and other materials "... was more powerful in ancient times than in the late Middle Ages and new times"²². According to ethnographic data, the Eskimos wear two layers of fur clothings without fastening with a hood. The inhabitants of sub-ice zone used the same type of clothes, which

can be seen in the representation of similar clothes in a series of Palaeolithic statuettes made of mammoth tusk and found on the territory of Siberia (Malta and Buret'). Clothe fasteners made of mammoth tusk were found on the territory of Mizyn dwelling. They consisted of small rounded sticks with spherical bulgings and linking elements between them. Bison hunters did not need such warm clothes.

Works of art have double function: on the one hand, they are closely connected with peoples' ethnic consciousness, but on the other hand, they reflect specific features of economic structure, which, in its turn, in the process of historic interpretations requires to consider the material they were made of. In the northern regions people used mammoth tusk to produce works of art. The tusk technological qualities (solidity and elasticity) made it possible to produce bulky things and fine works of art made from plates. In the northern part of Ukraine the scientists found many statuettes of women carved from the mammoth tusk. There were also bracelets with meander pattern there. Sea and river mussels were of great importance in this region. They could be worn by and used in clothing of primitive hunters: they were sewn on the clothes and head-dresses as amulets, worn as bracelets or pendants. Thus, 829 mussels were found in the Upper Palaeolithic dwelling of Mizyn²³.

Amber decorations were also widely used (Gintsi, Mizyn, Mezhyrichi, Dobranichivka, Semenivka). The rituals of this region are connected with the cult of woman, while in the southern zone there was the cult of animal (bison)²⁴. During the digging of Anetivka II dwelling, a ritual complex was found. It revealed a special attitude towards the skulls of bison. There were also discovered big shoulder-blades that could function as constructive and ritual elements of some construction. To the attributes of the ceremonies bent bone points can be referred. A percussion "ensemble" was found in the dwelling of Mizyn that consisted of a shoulder-blade, a thigh-bone, pelvic bones, two jaws, a piece of a mammoth's jaw as well as sound-making instruments: rattle, hammer, "noise" bracelet²⁵. Other musical instruments – the "flute" and various pipes, made of the horns of reindeer, were excavated in the Upper Palaeolithic dwellings of the Dniester river – Molodova I and Molodova II²⁶. The pipe of the fourth layer of Molodova V dwelling has a number of openings and traces of cross-tying that helped to make different musical sounds. The Dnieper region presents the examples of visual art, i.e. schematised anthropomorphous images of people. As an element of decoration the primitive people widely used pendants made of animals teeth: horse teeth (Osokorivka, Dubova Balka), bear teeth (Anetivka II, Gintsi, Mezhyrichi) and polar fox teeth (Molodove V).

According to ethnographic observations, the difference between peoples could be traced in food, food processing, mealtime, etc. "The systems of nutrition generally correspond to historic and cultural regions, which the details make it possible to differentiate the ethnicities and sub-ethnic units, ... as for more general categories of nutrition models, they usually embrace larger areas that historic and cultural regions"²⁷. In accordance with economic specialization of representatives of certain economic-cultural types it is possible to investigate the differences in consumption, ways of storage and food processing, domination or lack of vegetation, etc. Nutrition systems contain a behavioral aspect: it means that two actions or processes are carried out with the same purpose, for example, meat processing for roasting could be performed in two different ways, which will have no influence on the final product, but they could play an important role while defining the boundary-lines of ethnocultural areas. It also concerns the standards of behaviour of meals consumption (for example, position of hands during eating, additional instruments for taking food, etc.).

The remains of Molodova culture dwellings show that gathering was most widely spread on the territory of the Sub-Carpathian regions and the Dniester river region. A significant number of pestle grind-stones was found in Molodova I and Molodova V dwellings. As a rule, the place of the pestle and the grind-stone was by the fire. Pestle grind-stones were of different forms – semi-cylindrical, cylindrical and cone-shaped. There is no doubt that they were used for quite a long time. As a result of digging of Volodymyrskiy Upper Palaeolithic dwelling, river turtles were found, which proved the significance of gathering at that time. Due to poor vegetation in the sub-ice steppes, the northern regions were not rich in vegetable diet. In the regions with mild climate conditions the wild herbs, fruits, nuts were widely used for food. They were eaten raw or roasted. Frozen ground served as a good storage medium for food. Mammoth hunters stored meat of killed animals in special storage pits. The period of active food storing coincided with the time when the weather conditions helped to keep supplies of food unspoilt. In the Arctic dwellings such periods were very short and they fell on the early spring or late autumn²⁸. The dwellers of the southern regions could dry or smoke meat in order to store it better. According to ethnographic data, the most desired food of the tundra northdeer-breeder was domestic reindeer meat, as well as internal organs and fresh blood of these animals²⁹. In ethnography some superstitions were mentioned related to consumption of certain kinds of food. In a number of American Indian tribes vegetable food and fish are mostly consumed³⁰. Such divergences are usually caused by natural conditions, but many of them could be explained by cultural traditions. Peoples that lived in such conditions had clearly expressed differences of this kind: the Ossets, for example, have well-developed pig-breeding traditions, but other peoples of the Northern Caucasian region very rarely keep pigs which reflects religious difference³¹.

The closest connection between economic-cultural type and historic-ethnographic community could be observed

at the early stage of its formation. It was the period of ethnic consolidation of dwellers, which was realized via family relations; yet, there is no separation of the ethnic parameters of culture. The culture of a certain community was subordinated to a number of norms, expressed in ethnic self-awareness that could be traced in ethnonyms. The most vivid examples of such self-awareness are presented in ethnographic materials of Siberia; there is a distinct understanding of “we” and “they”, “our” and “non-our”. Within a tribe or protoethnos of the final Palaeolithic communities, ethnic consciousness could not realize itself in full². One of the characteristic features of primitive ethnic communities, in comparison with ethnoses of later periods, is its less discrete character, its heterogeneity, instability, established self-awareness, connected with blood-related, economic and spiritual relations. We could assume that these characteristics were typical of primitive ethnoses of the Upper Palaeolithic period. Ethnic stereotypes, ethnic prejudices, including ethnoracial ones, sympathy and antipathy might have already existed and found their expression in historic and ethnographic community, inside which, there was an interaction of different groups of population, who represented different material cultures. Natural environment, which was often extreme and unstable, brought about special living conditions of the primitive communities. Within the boundaries of one region one could observe several archaeological cultures with the same type of economic, which testifies to a specific character of these communities. Due to these factors the economic-cultural type acquired ethnic features. During the process of ethnic and economic-cultural consolidation an ethnic macrosystem appears, which is based on a specific economic-cultural type. Such a system, being localized within certain natural, social and economic conditions, forms a historic and ethnographic community. As the economic-cultural type is getting more and more stable, it still remains a system on a microlevel, in social and living organisms. On higher levels the system is gradually undergoing the process of splitting up and it increases the distinguishing features in the variants of economic-cultural types.

¹ Левин М.Г., Чебоксаров Н.Н. Хозяйственно-культурные типы и историко-этнографические области (к постановке вопроса) // Советская этнография. – 1955. – № 4. – С. 3 – 17; Чебоксаров Н.Н. Проблема типологии этнических общностей в трудах советских ученых // Советская этнография. – 1967. – № 4. – С. 94 – 109; Андрианов Б.В., Чебоксаров Н.Н. Историко-этнографические области (проблемы историко-этнографического районирования) // Советская этнография. – 1975. – № 3. – С. 15 – 25; Андрианов Б.В., Чебоксаров Н.Н. Опыт историко-этнографического районирования некоторых районов Африки и Зарубежной Азии // Советская этнография. – 1975. – № 4. – С. 33 – 50; Андрианов Б. В. Закономерности географической среды и хозяйственно-культурная дифференциация народов мира // Этническая экология. – Москва, 1991. – С. 149 – 173.

² Левин М.Г., Чебоксаров Н.Н. *Op. cit.* – С. 4.

³ *Ibid.* – С. 10.

⁴ Любин В.П. К вопросу о локальных различиях в нижнем палеолите (по материалам Кавказа) // Каменный век Средней Азии и Казахстана. Ташкент. – 1972. – С. 15.

⁵ Маркарян Э.С. К проблеме осмысления локального разнообразия культуры // Советская этнография. – 1980. – № 3. – С. 71.

⁶ Гладких М.И., Станко В.Н. Эпоха пізнього палеоліту // Давня історія України в 3-х т. – Т. 1: Первісне суспільство. – Київ, 1997. – С. 53, карта.

⁷ Воеводский М.В. Мезолитические культуры Восточной Европы // Краткие сообщения о докладах и полевых исследованиях Института истории материальной культуры. – Вып. XXXI, 1950. – С. 96 – 119.

⁸ Формозов А.А. Этнокультурные общности на территории СССР в каменном веке. – Москва, 1959.

⁹ Гладких М.И. Прикарпатская зона хозяйственно-культурного типа охотников и собирателей позднего палеолита // Новейшие открытия советских археологов: Тез. Докл. Конференции. – Киев, 1975. – С. 56 – 57; Гладких М.И. К вопросу об разграничении хозяйственно-культурных типов и историко-этнографических общностей позднего палеолита // Палеоэкология древнего человека. – Киев, 1977. – С. 112 – 116; Гладких М.И. Содержание локальных вариантов позднего палеолита на Украине // Археологические исследования на Украине в 1976 – 1977 гг.: Тез. докл. XVII конференции ИА АН УССР. – Ужгород. – С. 22 – 23; Гладких М.И. Исторична інтерпретація пізнього палеоліту (за матеріалами території України). – Київ, 1991.

¹⁰ Шовкопляс И.Г. О локальных различиях в развитии культуры позднего палеолита (по материалам территории Украины) // VII Международный конгресс доисториков и протоисториков. Доклады и сообщения археологов СССР. – Москва, 1966. – С. 42.

¹¹ Миньков Е.В. Система природопользования в позднем палеолите: Метод и достоверность реконструкций (по материалам степной зоны) // Проблемы палеоэкологии древних обществ. – Москва, 1993. – С. 19 – 59.

¹² Кротова О.О. Про господарську діяльність пізньопалеолітичного населення степової зони Східної Європи // Археологія. – 1988. – Вип. 64. – С. 1 – 11; Кротова О.О. Виробництво та суспільні відносини населення Північного Причорномор'я в добу пізнього палеоліту // Археологія. – 1994. – № 1. – С. 19 – 31; Сапожников И.В. Хозяйственная специфика степной историко-культурной области // Краткие сообщения института археологии СССР. – 1992. – № 206. – С. 43 – 48; Краснокутский Г.Е. Охотничий промысел бизонов в позднем палеолите

- Северо-западного Причерноморья: Автореф. дис...канд. истор. наук. – Киев, 1992; Залізняк Л.Л. Палеоекономічна реконструкція суспільств степових мисливців // Археологія. – 1996. – № 3. – С. 29 – 39.
- ¹³ Soffer O.A. The upper Paleolithic of the Central Russian Plain. – New York, 1985.
- ¹⁴ Саблин В.М. Палеозоология стоянок Верхней Десны: новые данные // Верхний палеолит – верхний плейстоцен: динамика природных событий и периодизация археологических культур (Материалы международной конференции, посвященной 90-летию со дня рождения А.Н.Рогачева). – Санкт-Петербург, 2002. – С. 107 – 109.
- ¹⁵ Сніжко І.А. Модель розбирання здобичі амвросіївськими мисливцями // Археологія. – 2002. – № 1. – С. 37 – 44.
- ¹⁶ Пидопличко І.Г. Позднепалеолитические жилища из костей мамонта на Украине. – Киев, 1969.
- ¹⁷ Борисковский П.И. Проблема развития позднепалеолитической культуры степной области // VII Международный конгресс антропологических и этнографических наук. – Москва, 1964; Смирнов С.В. О хозяйственных отличиях позднепалеолитических памятников степной полосы Европейской части СССР // Первобытный человек, его материальная культура и природная среда в плейстоцене и голоцене. – Москва, 1974. – С. 152 – 156.
- ¹⁸ Гладких М.И. К вопросу... – С. 114.
- ¹⁹ Гладких М.И. Мінливість знарядь в процесі їх виробництва та їх роль в утворенні локальних варіантів матеріальної культури (на матеріалах палеоліту) // Археологія. – 1977. – Вип. 24. – С. 17 – 21.
- ²⁰ Борисковский П.И. Критерии выделения позднепалеолитических историко-культурных областей (на примере степной зоны) // Проблемы культурной адаптации в эпоху верхнего палеолита (по материалам Восточной Европы и США). – Тез. док. Ленинград, 1989. – С. 24 – 27.
- ²¹ Аникович М.В. О миграциях в палеолите // Stratum plus. – 1999. – № 1. – С. 72 – 82.
- ²² Древняя одежда народов Восточной Европы: Материалы к историко-этнографическому атласу. – Москва, 1986. – С. 256.
- ²³ Шовкопляс И.Г. Мезинская стоянка. – Киев, 1965. – С.105.
- ²⁴ Гладких М.И., Станко В.Н. Мистецтво та світогляд пізньопалеолітичної людини (за матеріалами території України) // Археологія. – 1996. – № 3. – С. 39 – 48.
- ²⁵ Бибииков С.Н. Древнейший музыкальный комплекс из костей мамонта. – Киев, 1981.
- ²⁶ Черниш О.П. Палеолітична стоянка Молодове V. – Київ, 1961.
- ²⁷ Этнография питания народов стран зарубежной Азии: Опыт сравнительной типологии. – Москва, 1981. – С. 249.
- ²⁸ Крупник И.И. Арктическая этноэкология. – Москва, 1989. – С. 217.
- ²⁹ Ibid. – С. 99.
- ³⁰ Леви-Строс К. Первобытное мышление. – Москва, 1994.
- ³¹ Бромлей Ю.В. Культура и этнические аспекты экологии // Общество и природа. Исторические этапы и формы взаимодействия. – Москва, 1981. – С. 85 – 95.
- ³² Коен В.Ю. До проблеми типології етнічних спільностей (за матеріалами фінального палеоліту Середземноморської області) // Археологія. – 1997. – № 3. – С. 27.

Ганна ІНДИЧЕНКО
Київ

СПІВВІДНОШЕННЯ ГОСПОДАРСЬКО-КУЛЬТУРНИХ ТИПІВ ТА ІСТОРИКО-ЕТНОГРАФІЧНИХ СПІЛЬНОСТЕЙ В КОНТЕКСТІ ЕТНОАРХЕОЛОГІЇ

В статті, крізь призму археологічного джерела, розглядається питання співвідношення господарсько-культурних типів та історико-етнографічних спільностей. Діалектичний взаємозв'язок двох категорій, знаходив свій вияв в пізньопалеолітичну добу, через компонент первісної общини, в якій, в різних формах, відображалася матеріальна культура конкретних первісних угруповань. Матеріали пізньопалеолітичних пам'яток дають можливість виявити як така взаємодія залежала від соціальних, природних, та функціональних факторів. В контексті етноархеологічного підходу, широко використовуються археологічні та етнічні джерела.