

DOI: 10.14258/tpai(2021)33(3).-05

УДК 902(571.1)

PRESERVATION AND USE OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL HERITAGE IN WEST SIBERIA

Sergey S. Tikhonov

Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography of SB RAS, Novosibirsk, Russian Federation
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6909-0727>, e-mail: semchi957@gmail.com

Abstract: Archaeological sites are the only source of information on the preliterate period in the history. In West Siberia and further to the east of the Ural mountains written sources appear only after arrival of Russians at the end of the 16th century. Therefore, the value of archaeological materials in studying of pre-Russian Siberia cannot be overestimated. Therefore, the effective system of protection and using of archaeological heritage of natives of Siberia is necessary. The special federal law is directed on it. However, in practice of archeologists there are nuances which the legislation does not regulate. This situation is analyzed by the author of article. First of all, this is due to the fact that it is advisable to excavate archaeological sites in those regions that have been most developed. This is due to both the significance of the sites, its accessibility, and the cost of archaeological work. Hundreds of interesting objects have been excavated, but the materials of many are unpublished, which hinders the growth of the available source base. However, the obligation to introduce the materials into scientific circulation in a timely manner is not imposed on researchers. I particularly note the inattention to the publications of organizations that conduct rescue and new-build archaeological work. The second aspect is related to the increasing attention of Russian citizens to antiquities, which they often find during trips. It is impossible to say how many such finds are eventually lost. The situation could be corrected by the interaction of the sites protection bodies, museum institutions and citizens. However, it happens that it is easier for citizen to throw away a find than to carry it to a cultural institution. This situation requires a legislative solution.

Keywords: archaeological heritage, research, using, preservation, source

For citation: Tikhonov S. S. Preservation and Use of Archaeological Heritage in West Siberia. *Theory and Practice of Archaeological Research*. 2021;33(3):81–88. (In English) DOI: 10.14258/tpai(2021)33(3).-05

СОХРАНЕНИЕ И ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЕ АРХЕОЛОГИЧЕСКОГО НАСЛЕДИЯ В ЗАПАДНОЙ СИБИРИ

С. С. ТИХОНОВ

Институт археологии и этнографии СО РАН, г. Новосибирск, Российская Федерация
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6909-0727>, e-mail: semchi957@gmail.com

Резюме: Археологические памятники — единственный источник информации о дописьменном периоде в истории. В Западной Сибири и далее к востоку от Уральских гор письменные источники появляются только после прихода русских в конце XVI в. Поэтому значение археологических материалов в изучении дорусской Сибири невозможно переоценить, и необходима эффективная система охраны и использования археологического наследия аборигенов Сибири. На это направлен специальный федеральный закон. Но в практике археологов есть нюансы, которые законодательство пока никак не регламентирует. В первую очередь раскопки археологических памятников целесообразно вести в наиболее освоенных регионах. Это связано со зна-

чимостью памятника, его доступностью и стоимостью археологических работ. Интересных памятников раскопаны сотни, но материалы многих не опубликованы, что препятствует росту доступной источниковой базы. Однако обязанность своевременно вводить материалы в научный оборот на исследователей не возложена. Особо отмечу невнимание к публикациям организаций, ведущих спасательные и новостроечные археологические работы. Второй аспект связан с усиливающимся вниманием граждан России к древностям, которые они часто находят во время выездов на природу. Невозможно учесть, какое количество таких находок в конце концов теряется. Ситуацию могло бы исправить взаимодействие органов охраны памятников, музейных учреждений и граждан. Но бывает так, что простому гражданину легче находку выбросить, чем нести в учреждение культуры. Эта ситуация требует законодательного решения.

Ключевые слова: археологическое наследие, исследование, использование, сохранение

Для цитирования: Тихонов С. С. Сохранение и использование археологического наследия в Западной Сибири // Теория и практика археологических исследований. 2021. Т. 33, № 3. С. 81–88. DOI: 10.14258/tpai(2021)33(3).-05

Problem

I believe, that completeness and reliability of archaeological researches in many respects depends on qualification of the scientist, on methodology applied by it and a technique of works, and a condition of source's base. Eventually the scientists can gather experience and increase qualification, improve the methodology and a technique. However, the sources require special attitude as:

- it is impossible to excavate the dug-out archaeological sites for the second time second time;
- the quantity of archaeological sites is great, but not boundless and with increase of economic activity their number is steadily reduced.

Therefore, preservation of archaeological sites, their careful research and careful using are a very important task. In this work I will consider two problems connected with use of materials of archeological excavations in scientific activity, and safety of archaeological monuments.

Sources are the data which I collected during archaeological expeditions and ethnoarchaeological work carried out by me for the last twenty five years in Omsk, Kemerovo, Tyumen areas, the Altai and Krasnoyarsk Krai.

Other part of the materials concerning the problem under research, was obtained in the process of work in the museums of the state and pedagogical universities of Barnaul, Kemerovo, Novosibirsk, Omsk, Surgut, Tomsk, the state museums of Omsk, Tobolsk, Khanty-Mansiysk, the museums which are parts of the system of the Russian Academy of Sciences in Tyumen and Novosibirsk.

Similar data were received during the visit to the university and state museums in the Republic of Kazakhstan in the cities of Alma-Ata, Karaganda, Kokchetav, Petropavlovsk. Therefore, I will assume that the situation with the use of archaeological materials in Western Siberia and Kazakhstan is nearly identical.

Unfortunately, I am unaware of the research conducted by Russian researches in this field of study, so I cannot provide the exhaustive bibliographic list of works on this subject.

Preliminary remarks

Before passing to a statement of an essence of a problem, I will make some explanations. The first of them concerns *the legislation of Russia* on protection of sites of history and culture,

including archaeology, and practice of its application. In the Federal law No. 73-FZ “About the objects of a cultural heritage (history and culture monuments) of the people of the Russian Federation”, the following definitions are given:

- **the object of archaeological heritage:** “... partially or completely hidden in the ground or under water traces of human existence in past eras (including all archaeological objects and cultural layers associated with such traces), the main or one of the main sources of information about which are archaeological excavations or finds. The objects of archaeological heritage are, among other things, fortifications, mounds, earthen burial grounds, ancient burials, settlements, sites, stone statues, steles, rock carvings, remains of ancient fortifications, industries, canals, ships, roads, places of ancient religious rites cultural layers classified as objects of archaeological heritage”;
- **the subject of archaeology:** “... movable things, the main or one of the main sources of information about which irrespective of circumstances of their detection are archeological excavations or finds, including the objects found as the result of such excavation or finds”;
- **occupation layer:** “... the layer in the earth or under the water, containing traces of existence of the person, which time of emergence exceeds hundred years, including archaeological objects”.

All of them — object, a subject, a layer — can have the federal, regional or municipal status, and around them there is a security zone. Further the law determines the order of carrying out archeological excavations, procedures of the use of objects of cultural heritage, their protection and property. Provisions of the law assume that carrying out the specified actions guarantees the safety of the site.

This law is more perfect, than the laws on protection of monuments of history and culture of times of the USSR, and is widely applied. However, in life there are situations which the legislator cannot foresee.

The second explanations is devoted to a *natural and geographical situation in West Siberia and the related system of an arrangement of archaeological sites*. I will remind that West Siberia is a vast plain between the Ural mountains and the Yenisei River. Its area is about 3 million square kilometers. The northern part of the plain adjoins to the Arctic ocean, where the tundra is situated. The central part of the plain is presented by coniferous forests which in Siberia are called “taiga”. The southern areas adjoining to Kazakhstan is the steppe. West Siberia from the South to North is crossed by the river Ob, and its large tributaries — Tobol, Irtysh, Tom. The tributaries falling into these rivers most often flow in the width direction. In the territory of West Siberia are a large number of swamps. The biggest one, the Vasyugan Swamp, is comparable to a selva of the Amazon.

As in West Siberia there are no mountains, and absolute marks of heights are close to 120–160 m, the width zonation of natural and geographical zones here is well expressed. Lack of mountains facilitates to penetration of cold Arctic air into West Siberia which makes the climate sharply continental, with long cold winters, and short warm summers. Natural-geographical conditions formed the system of moving of inhabitants of West Siberia in the ancient time and the Middle Ages, and respectively and system of an arrangement of archaeological sites.

By my calculations, based on the lists of the settlements of 1857–1927, the materials of maps created in 1745–2000 the most part of the population of the Western Siberia lives on the banks of the large rivers — Ob, Irtysh, Tobol, Tom and in lower reaches of their large tributaries. A large number of the population lives along the Trans-Siberian railway line. These are the places most convenient for living. These are the same places on the first terrace of the rivers, and in their flood plains, where up to 70% of known archaeological sites are situated [Tikhonov, 2006, p. 265–294].

Now in the territory which I describe, lives about 12,6 million people. Among them 9.5 million (75%) are city dwellers, and 3.1 million people live in rural areas. Population density in the middle and upper part of the taiga's rivers, in deep areas of the steppe and in the tundra makes 1–1,5 people per square kilometer and less. At the beginning of 1990 many villagers moved from villages to the cities therefore big territories became without population.

Thirdly, industrial development of the region considerably influences intensity of archaeological work. It is known that over the past 60 years Western Siberia has become a region where oil and gas production is developing rapidly, pipelines are being built for pumping them, and giant hydroelectric power plants are being built. Naturally, this requires the construction of roads, bridges, and so on. In accordance with the legislation, all these measures are possible only after carrying out archaeological work, which, as a rule, is carried out.

The fourth: the tourism organization including scientific one, in the locations of sites is complicated as they are not always accessible and it is not always possible to reconstruct a monument as timber, the main construction material of inhabitants of Siberia, is poorly stored. Therefore, after excavating a site, information about it can be obtained in the report, in field diaries and drawings, and when working with collections.

Current situation

To the middle of the 20th century archeologists studied the sites mainly in southeast part of West Siberia which is sometimes called South Siberia. This is the upper course of the Yenisei in the Sayan Mountains, and the upper course of the Ob in the Altai Mountains and the steppe adjacent to them from the north. The excavations were carried out by archaeologists from the Institute for the History of Material Culture in Moscow and the Leningrad Branch of the Institute for the History of Material Culture (now St. Petersburg). Archaeologists who constantly lived and worked in Western Siberia — V. I. Matyushchenko, A. I. Martynov, T. N. Troitskaya — began their excavations in the early — mid-1950s. However, since they had little experience, and the beginning of industrial construction was supposed to start exploration of large territories, these large territories were studied by other archaeologists.

I will show it at by the example of the works of M. P. Gryaznov, a famous Soviet archaeologist from Leningrad. At that time in 1952 he was an experienced fifty-year-old archaeologist who excavated the sites in Altai, in the Sayan Mountains, in Kazakhstan. Therefore, he was instructed to carry out excavations in the flood zone of the Novosibirsk hydroelectric power station on the Ob River south of Novosibirsk. After filling the reservoir bed, a water mirror was formed from Novosibirsk to Kamen-on-Ob, about 175 km long and up to 18 km wide. For three years of work, several hundred archaeological sites of different eras were found, excavations were carried out at some of the most scientifically significant ones. The expedition

fulfilled its the task, since at that time it was not supposed to fully study the territory, but to excavate only the most typical, and the collections were added to the depositories of museums. Everything else disappeared under water, and is now inaccessible to archaeologists, which is very bad.

However what could be even worse is that M. P. Gryaznov did not publish materials of the excavations, except for a small work written by him with several colleagues only 20 years after the completion of the work [Gryaznov et al., 1973]. However, let us not blame the scientist. He did not have time to process the materials, since he continued to lead the same large-scale work in other places: in the construction zone of hydroelectric power plants on the Angara and Yenisei rivers, as well as on Lake Baikal from 1955 to the mid-1970s. This means that he excavated large areas 3–4 months a year, and sometimes more. The rest of the time he was preparing a report on them. Therefore, he, and other leaders of the excavation, physically did not have enough time to prepare the materials for publication. For example, during excavations on the Yenisei, when the Krasnoyarsk hydroelectric power plant was being built, M. P. Gryaznov's expedition comprised several groups. However, as a result of excavations during his lifetime, only one book was published [Complex of archaeological monuments..., 1979]. Other materials were prepared for publication by his colleagues, but after the death of the scientist [Antiquities Baikala, 1992; Burial ground Kürgenner..., 2010]. The situation is very clear. In a remote region, it is necessary to develop industry, and there is a plan for commissioning facilities. This plan cannot be violated. But according to the law, it is necessary to excavate archeological sites beforehand. Therefore, archaeologists (and there are few of them) were on the expedition for the maximum possible time, as long as the weather permits, and the rest of the time they wrote a report on the work. The museums accumulate collections, field documentation, inventories, photographs, etc. The cycle repeats the next year and so it was during all the years of the existence of the Soviet Union: a gigantic volume of archaeological work, and a lack of time to process materials.

After 1970, universities were organized in Western Siberia in large cities (in Barnaul, Kemerovo, Kurgan, Omsk, Tyumen), and archaeologists began to work in them. They were constantly excavating, since most of the territory of Western Siberia in the archeological respect had not been studied, and were engaged in surveying the places of future construction. The number of excavated sites and archaeological materials increased significantly. And again, some of them lay on the shelves of museum depositories.

It turns out a paradoxical situation: the materials of the regions most studied by archaeologists are practically not published. I would like to point out to the credit of archaeologists that as soon as they have time, they publish their materials. For example, in the 1970s, under the Council of Ministers of the USSR, an archaeological expedition was organized to excavate the sites at the bottom of the future reservoir of the Sayano-Shushenskaya hydroelectric power station. Funding and supplies for the expedition were on the top level. However, generalizing monographs began to appear 15 or more years after the end of excavations. As an example, I will cite the books by D. G. Savinov [2009], who excavated sites in 1970 and later, and published them not so long ago.

So, the results of not all excavations have been introduced into scientific circulation, and this does not always allow taking into account all the nuances in the study. What way out I

see from this situation, which is not yet regulated by any section of Law No. 73-FZ? This is, at a minimum, a mandatory posting on the Internet of the following materials:

- field reports of researchers, or at least their brief versions;
- lists of field reports and field documentation kept in the museum;
- lists of collections available in museums.

Probably, it is necessary to consider some provisions of the copyright law, and think over amendments that, in the event of a long period of non-use, (the period can be determined based on the prevailing practice), of the excavation materials by the author, would allow making them open for any research. In Russia, this is a big problem, since ethical standards do not allow using materials without the author's permission. However, it happens that an archeologist is going to publish something all his life, and does not have time to do it. For example, Professor V. I. Matyushchenko did not manage to publish the materials of the excavations of the Late Bronze Age settlements Krasnoozerka on the Irtysh in the Omsk region and Elovka on the Ob in the Tomsk region, although he was going to do it all the time. These two sites became the main ones in the identification of archaeological cultures, but there is no complete publication of them, and, most likely, they will never be. That is precisely why I consider the timely and complete introduction of archeological materials into scientific circulation an extremely important task, and even the direct duty of an archaeologist, although the legislation does not regulate this in any way.

The second issue of using and protection of archaeological heritage is connected with activity of nonspecialists. I do not mean the people who in Russia are called by "black archeologists". Actually, they are not archaeologists, but criminals plundering archaeological sites for replenishment of private collections or for sale. They can use metal detectors forbidden in Russia, small bulldozers, or work of illegal guest workers for search of antiquities. Their activity is the prerogative of law enforcement agencies.

However, there are many people who find ancient and medieval things from the settlements washed away by the rivers and burial grounds during rest, fishing, or hunting. I will remind that terraces of the rivers are formed with sedimentary rocks, and they are easily washed away by the rivers. Some people hand over the finds to the museums. For example, *I studied a bone dagger of an era of a late Paleolithic which is stored in the funds of Omsk State Museum of History and Regional Studies* [Tikhonov, 2012; 2013]. It was brought to the museum by a fisherman. It is a very rare find for Western Siberia as there are only six such things.

Other people store things for some years, and then transfer them to experts, but by that time they forget the circumstances and the location of the find. Some people having kept the finds for many years, throw them away, but in some cases report about them to archeologists if they appear in their village.

My colleague S. F. Tataurov and I since 2009 have been excavating cultural layers of the end of 16th — the beginning of the 18th centuries in the town Tara. It is the first Russian town on the Irtysh. For a long time it was the main fortress protecting the southern boundaries of Russian lands in Siberia. The locations of the Tobolsk gate, Prince tower, the Voevoda estate, a cemetery about church have been found and studied. During the work on studying of the Tara fortress, thousands of Tara residents and neighboring villagers visited the excavation. After that many of them informed about the antiquities once found, demonstrated interest in

rules of conducting excavation and search of antiquities; some people gave to archeologists some found ancient objects.

General impression from conversations with people is as following: when on picnic, many people found ancient objects, some brought them home, but they did not hurry to hand over them to the museum as they did not think that the ceramics, or rusty iron things can be interesting to science.

Therefore, in this case it is necessary to raise level of culture of people (lecture, demonstration of films, excursions in places of excavation and so on). Then the archaeologists will have many assistants who know the area of the living very well. The administration of governor generals in the Russian Empire in the second half of the 19th century had experience of such work when helping archeologists was a point of honor of educated people,

Here are two situations which are not reflected in the legislation but are quite common in practice of archeologists.

REFERENCES

Gryaznov M. P., Troickaya T. N., Umanskij A. P., Sevast'yanova E. A. Arheologicheskaya karta poberezh'ya Novosibirskogo vodohranilishcha [Archaeological Map of the Coast of the Novosibirsk Reservoir]. Nauchnye trudy Novosibirskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo instituta [Scientific works of the Novosibirsk State Pedagogical Institute]. Novosibirsk : NGPI, 1973. Issue 85. Pp. 3–44. (*In Russ.*)

Drevnosti Bajkala [Antiquities of Baikal]. Irkutsk : Izd-vo Irkut. gos. un-ta, 1992. 252 p. (*In Russ.*)

Kompleks arheologicheskikh pamyatnikov u gory Tepsej na Enisee [A Complex of Archaeological Sites near Mount Tepsei on the Yenisei] / Gryaznov M. P., Zavituhina M. P., Komarova M. N., Minyaev S. S., Pshenicyna M. N., Hudyakov Ju. S. Novosibirsk : Nauka, 1979. 167 p. (*In Russ.*)

Mogil'nik Kyurgenner epohi pozdnej bronzy Srednego Eniseya. [The Kürgenner Burial Ground of the Late Bronze Age of the Middle Yenisei] / Gryaznov M. P., Komarova M. N., Lazaretova I. P., Polyakov A. V., Pshenicyna M. N. Sankt-Peterburg : Peterburgskoe Vostokovedenie, 2010. 196 p. (*In Russ.*)

Savinov D. G. Minusinskaya provinciya Hunnu (po materialam arheologicheskikh issledovanij 1984–1989 gg.) [The Minusinsk Province of the Xiongnu (based on archaeological research materials 1984–1989)]. Sankt-Peterburg : IIMK RAN, 2009. 226 p. (*In Russ.*)

Tihonov S. S. Ottok naseleniya iz taezhnyh rajonov Sibiri v tret'ej chetverti XX veka [The Outflow of the Population from the Taiga Regions of Siberia in the Third Quarter of the 20th century]. Etnografo-arheologicheskie komplekсы: problemy kul'tury i sociuma [Ethnographic and Archaeological Complexes: Problems of Culture and Society]. Omsk : Nauka, 2006. Vol. 9. Pp. 265–294. (*In Russ.*)

Tihonov S. S. Kostyanoj vkladyshevyy kinzhal iz Setkulovki [Bone Dagger from the Middle Irtysh Region]. Izvestiya OGIK-Muzeya [Bulletin of OGIK Museum]. Omsk : OGIK muzej, 2012. Issue 17. Pp. 133–138. (*In Russ.*)

Tihonov S. S. Kostyanoj kinzhal iz Srednego Priirtysh'ya [Bone dagger from the Middle Irtysh region]. Voennoe delo srednevekovogo naseleniya narodov Juzhnoj Sibiri i Central'noj

Azii [Military Affairs of the Medieval Population of the Peoples of South Siberia and Central Asia]. Novosibirsk : Izd-vo In-ta arheologii i etnografii SO RAN, 2013. Pp. 11–13. (*In Russ.*)

БИБЛИОГРАФИЧЕСКИЙ СПИСОК

Грязнов М. П., Троицкая Т. Н., Уманский А. П., Севастьянова Э. А. Археологическая карта побережья Новосибирского водохранилища // Научные труды Новосибирского государственного педагогического института. Новосибирск : НГПИ, 1973. Вып. 85. С. 3–44.

Древности Байкала. Иркутск : Изд-во Иркут. гос. ун-та, 1992. 252 с.

Комплекс археологических памятников у горы Тепсей на Енисее / Грязнов М. П., Завитухина М. П., Комарова М. Н., Миняев С. С., Пшеницына М. Н., Худяков Ю. С. Новосибирск : Наука, 1979. 167 с.

Могильник Кюргеннер эпохи поздней бронзы Среднего Енисея / Грязнов М. П., Комарова М. Н., Лазаретова И. П., Поляков А. В., Пшеницына М. Н. СПб. : Петербургское Востоковедение, 2010. 196 с.

Савинов Д. Г. Минусинская провинция Хунну (по материалам археологических исследований 1984–1989 гг.). СПб. : ИИМК РАН, 2009. 226 с.

Тихонов С. С. Отток населения из таежных районов Сибири в третьей четверти XX века // Этнографо-археологические комплексы: проблемы культуры и социума. Омск : Наука, 2006. Т. 9. С. 265–294.

Тихонов С. С. Костяной вкладышевый кинжал из Сеткуловки // Известия ОГИК-Музея. Омск : ОГИК музей, 2012. Вып. 17. С. 133–138.

Тихонов С. С. Костяной кинжал из Среднего Прииртышья // Военное дело средневекового населения народов Южной Сибири и Центральной Азии. Новосибирск : Изд-во Ин-та археологии и этнографии СО РАН, 2013. С. 11–13.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHOR / ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ

Sergey Semenovich Tikhonov, Candidate of Historical Sciences, Associate Professor, Senior Researcher of Omsk Laboratory of Archaeology, Ethnography and Museology of the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography SB RAS, Omsk, Russian Federation.

Тихонов Сергей Семенович, кандидат исторических наук, доцент, старший научный сотрудник Омской лаборатории археологии, этнографии и музееведения Института археологии и этнографии СО РАН, г. Омск, Российская Федерация.

Материал поступил в редколлегию 29.04. 2021.

Статья принята в номер 30.08.2021.