CHAPTER THREE

CLASSIFICATION OF SITES AND THE PRIMARY FEATURES OF ANDRONOVO UNITY

According to the methodology introduced in chapter 2 the author assembled an archaeological data bank. The work was conducted in the following sequence. The data bank was supplied with materials from 400 cemeteries and settlements of the entire area, of which about 100 sites derived from different regions in the Urals and Kazakhstan, were examined and of these, 25 were excavated by the author (Maps 2, 3). In addition, there are more than 100 sites from Central Asia (Map 4; 30 investigated and excavated with the participation of the author).

A considerable part of the data is the result of the author’s research, which began in 1958. From 1959 the author led an expedition to the Elenovka group of

---

2 Other excavated materials as well as hoards and chance finds were studied from the museum collections of the State Historical Museum, the State Museum of the East, the Museum of Anthropology of the Moscow State University, the Department of Prehistoric Cultures and department of Central Asia in the Hermitage and the Museum of Ethnography in St Petersburg. Other sources were historical and regional museums, archaeological laboratories of the various universities and pedagogical institutes in Orenburg, Orsk, Chelyabinsk, Troitsk, Syktyvkar, Perm’, Izhevsk, Ufa, Nizhny Tagil, Ekaterinburg, Tyumen’, Tobol’sk, Omsk, Barnaul, Kemerovo, Krasnoyarsk, Novosibirsk, and in the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography of the Siberian Department of the Russian Academy of Sciences, in the Ethnological and Archaeological Museum of Tomsk University, in the museums of Aktyubinsk, Ural’sk and Emba, in the Central Museum of Kazakhstan in Almaty, in the Museum of Art and the Institute of Geology of the Kazakh- stan Academy of Sciences, in museums and archaeological laboratories at Karaganda, Petropavlovsk, Semipalatinsk, Ust’-Kamenogorsk, Dzhambul, Chimkent, and Bishkek, in the History and Art museums of Kirgizstan, the Institute of History and Archaeology of Kirgizstan, in Przheval’sk, in Tashkent, in the History and Art museums of Uzbekistan, the department of the History of Geology of the Central Asian State University in Samar- kand, in the Museum of History of Uzbekistan, Afrasiab, the Institute of Archaeology of the Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences, in Bukhara, Nukus, Khiva, Termez, Fergana, in Dushanbe in the museums of History and Ethnography, in the Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography of Tadzhikistan, in Ashgabat—in the museums of Turkmenistan History and Art, the Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography of Turkmenistan, and in the History Museum in Merv. Other collections consulted were the Ukrainian Historical Museum, the Ukrainian Institute of Archaeology in Kiev, the Institute of History, Archaeology and Ethnography of Tatarstan in Kazan’, the pedagogical institutes, universities and regional museums in Samara, Saratov, Simbirsk, Volgograd, and finally some collections of school museums and private collections. (I find it a pleasant duty to express my deepest gratitude to all the museum workers who assisted my work and also to colleagues who regularly provided me with new unpublished materials). Outside the former Soviet Union, the author consulted the Siberian and Central Asian collections in the Helsinki Historical Museum, in the Louvre, Saint-Germain, and Chernuschi in Paris, the Metropolitan Museum in New York, in the British and Victoria and Albert museums in London, the Bode Museum in Berlin, the Turkish Historical Museum in Ankara and the National Museum in Istanbul. Certain work was conducted in the museums of Iran, Afghanistan, India and Sri-Lanka. Materials from the archives of the IA AS, LOIA, IIMK,
the Orenburg region in its investigation of more than 50 sites in the Elenovka microdistrict of the southern Urals, including the Elenovka and Ushkatta mines and workshop complexes, settlements, and burials. Once the material recovered from the Andronovo sites had been assembled, it was necessary to systematize the data according to criteria that would be applicable to the entire territory. Taking into account the classification of East European and Siberian cultures established by V. A. Gorodtsov and S. A. Teploukhov, the burial rite was deemed the most significant feature for the purposes of cultural and ethno-historical reconstruction. The following features were recorded: 1) type of surface construction; 2) type of grave pit and evidence of recutting; 3) orientation; 4) cremation or inhumation and posture of the deceased; 5) other ritual features; 6) grave goods; 7) animal sacrifice; and 8) funeral feast (Figs. 1; 57).

The analysis of the technology of hand-made pottery largely comprises vessel form, technique of manufacture and decoration, and ornamental motifs; these are also very important ethnic indicators and are used as the basis for defining cultures, stages, local variants and types. The following analytical approaches have been employed in this work: 1) vessel manufacture and form according to the system of the author (Figs. 2, 11-13); 2) analysis of tempering/opening material; 3) surface treatment; 4) construction of ornament according to the system of S. V. Ivanov (1963) and S. V. Zotova (1965); 5) elements of ornament after M. N. Komarova (1962); 6) organization of decorative elements within zones and their combinations; and 7) the technique of figuring ornamentation (Figs. 12; 13).

The analysis was based on closed complexes of burials over the entire Andronovo area. These were classified within a single system, then the burial rite and ceramics were correlated, and then those sites with a stable assortment of features were united into types. The funerary ceramics were compared with the ceramics from the settlement and the latter were divided into types. We follow the definition of type employed by Yu. N. Zakharuk (1981) who regards it as a “universal unit of classification both for establishing within a small territory their genetic sequence over time and for establishing synchronous groups of sites on the territory of a single archaeological culture.” Sites of every type were mapped and local variants were defined.

IIA AS of Kazakhstan and a number of museums, personal archives of O. A. and B. N. Grakov, M. P. Gryaznov, S. S. Chernikov, V. S. Sorokin, A. N. Margulan were also employed. These sources were especially valuable in cases where the originals were now lost or exported.

3 Excavations were made on some settlements (Ushkatta 1, 2, 7, 9, Kiimbay, Kupukhta, Baytu, Shandasha, Tursumbay, and cemeteries at Ushkatta, Ataken-say, Baytu 1, 2, Kupukhta, Shandasha 1, 4, Tursumbay, etc. (Kuz’mina 1962a; 1963b; 1964a; 1964b; 1965a, etc.). Surveys were also conducted in western Kazakhstan, the Orenburg, Chelyabinsk and Kurgan regions in the Urals where we discovered or made secondary investigations of about 100 sites, and excavated cemeteries at Emba, Kozhumberdy, Tuktubaev, Kinzerskiy, and Alakul’, and the settlement of Chernorech’e (Kuz’mina 1961b; 1969; 1973a; etc). From 1961 we began conducting research expeditions in Central Asia, in Tadzhikistan headed by M. M. D’akonov and A. M. Mandel’shtam; in Uzbekistan headed by Yu. G. Gulyamov, in Turkmenistan headed by A. M. Mandel’shtam, A. A. Marushenko and V. I. Sarianidi. The author also became acquainted with the excavations conducted by G. B. Zdanovich in the Urals, G. B. Zdanovich and M. K. Kadyrbaev in Kazakhstan, P. N. Kozhemyako in Kirgizia, N. G. Gorbunova in Fergana, B. A. Litvinsky in Tadzhikistan, M. A. Itina in Khorezm, etc.