

Sytnyk O. Innovative aspect of the Analytical Archeology course in the process of studying the archaeological monuments of the North-Western Azov region. «Humanitarian paradigm». No. 4. «Humanitarian paradigm». 2021. C. 18-28.

УДК 94.601(477.7)

INNOVATIVE ASPECT OF THE «ANALYTICAL ARCHEOLOGY» COURSE IN THE PROCESS OF STUDING THE ARCHEOLOGICAL MONUMENTS OF THE NORTH-WESTERN AZOV REGION

Olexander Sytnyk

Bogdan Khmelnytsky Melitopol state pedagogical university

Introduction. It is well known that the territory of Ukraine contains an extremely large number of artifacts and objects of various archaeological cultures. And many of them remain unexplored. And due to objective reasons, field archeology will not be able to investigate a significant part of them in the near future. Among the main reasons for this critical situation, the following should be highlighted: destructive consequences of the activities of "black diggers" (so-called "black archaeologists"); the existence of archaeological sites (such as the "Zona Supperta"), the study of which is extremely problematic with the available methods of field archeology; Russian-Ukrainian war, etc. Therefore, there is a need for an alternative, theoretical-analytical study and rethinking not only of lost and little-studied archaeological objects, but also of the entire huge spectrum of archaeological cultures already investigated by field archaeology. In particular, the task of comprehensive summarization of existing archaeological assets and research is relevant. Thus, according to L. Zaliznyak, the need to develop and improve modern periodization schemes remains urgent. Developing this opinion in the context of the study of Late Paleolithic sites on the territory of Ukraine, the scientist emphasizes the need for a comprehensive rethinking of this era [3, c. 3, 4]

Analysis of research and publications on the issue The theoretical basis of the research was the works of Y. Boltryk [1], O. Bondarets [2] and L. Zalizniak [3; 4] V. Otroshchenko [12] and foreign archeological scientists, such as: I. Kamenetskyi, B. Marshak and Y. Sher [5], D. Clark [16; 17], L. Klein [6; 7; 8], G. Lebedev [9], A. Martynov and Ya. Sher [10], I. Rose [18] and others.

Aim of the article is: characteristic of the innovative content of the «Analytical Archeology» course in the process of studying the archaeological monuments of the North-Western Azov region.

Research results. According to A. Martynov and Ya. Sher, considerable attention is paid to monuments in the process of archaeological research. However, in contrast to the historical image and imagination of a monument as a monument, obelisk or sculpture, etc., in archeology monuments are any remains of ancient buildings, remains of work or cult activity of ancient people, as well as the oldest artifacts made by man at one time or adapted by her for her needs [10, p. 5]. With such a development of archaeological science under the conditions when research scientists and various scientific institutions have accumulated a considerable amount of artifacts and in the presence of whole strata that have not yet been explored, there is a need to rethink and analyze the already existing finds and form directions for further perspective research.

This is especially true of the North-Western Azov region, which contains a number of unique objects of archaeological heritage. These are, first of all: the National Historical and Archaeological Reserve "Stone Tomb", with unique rock images - petroglyphs (their study requires a combination of archaeological, ethnographic and literary materials) [11, p. 20]; a whole complex of barrows and burial mounds, of which, according to V. Timofeev, there are more than 400 in the territory of Melitopol and the Melitopol district, and 7,145 in the Zaporizhia region [14, p. 470, 471] and "Zona Supperta" - the likely location of the necropolis of the royal Scythians. The latter is identified by Herodotus with Gerros - the Scythian "city of the dead".

According to Y. Boltrik, the most acceptable variants of the identification of Herr (Γέρρος) - according to Herodotus (book IV, 19, 20, 56) is the name of the seventh river of Scythia (Milky or Horse). This archaeologist-scientist emphasized that Herra is a place mentioned by Herodotus (IV, 53, 71) as a secret burial place of Scythian kings, a burial and cult center of Scythia in archaic times. However, there is no definite localization of it. According to one version, Gerra is considered a legendary country [1, p. 94]. Thus, it should be stated that field archeology cannot always provide the necessary information for scientists. Therefore, there is a need for an alternative, theoretical-analytical study.

The current tendency to limit the subject of archeology to excavations, description and systematization of materials, and to attribute the historical information contained in artifacts to the field of studying "prehistory", has not been effectively implemented [18]. After all, with such an approach, as L. Klein noted at one time, we have an artificial gap of different levels of the procedure of researching the object of archeology [8, p. 42–44]. Therefore, potential opportunities for the progress of archeology can have such directions as descriptive archeology (descriptive archaeology), theoretical archeology (French school), social archeology (K.

Renfrew school), interpretive developments of the socio-cultural character of US archaeologists, and ultimately - "New archeology" or analytical archaeology.

It should be noted that the procedure of scientific analysis in archeology and the problems of reconstructive developments based on archaeological materials constantly worried the scientific world of the 20th century. Research programs of various schools and directions were distinguished by both scientific effectiveness and a number of flaws [9, p. 56–58]. Despite a somewhat exaggerated interest in formal procedures, often a low level of generalization of various analytical and descriptive schemes, the direction of descriptive archeology still to some extent raises the issue of logic and methodology of scientific knowledge [17, p. 1-60]. In general, "New archeology" sets the task of reconstructing the economic, social and ideological systems of ancient societies, studying the general patterns of cultural and historical development. At the same time, it is important to widely use the hypothetical-deductive method, the method of system analysis and modeling [4, p. 46]. It is believed that the analytical direction of archeology originated in England and got its name from D. Clark's book "Analytical Archeology". It was a distinctly European direction, rooted in European schools, with traditional interests: types and archaeological cultures, succession and reconstruction of historical events. Therefore, the founder of this direction is considered to be D. Clark, one of the most famous British archaeologists. His monumental works are archeology classics. However, after living 39 years, working in Cambridge and founding his school, D. Clark never became a professor. At the same time, he never managed a large excavation in his life. Instead, his contribution lies precisely in the theoretical sphere.

D. Clark became one of the founders of procedural archeology ("New archeology") - a direction in archeology that arose in the second half of the 20th century, which, in contrast to the cultural direction in archeology, pays the main attention to the process of transformation of cultures of the past, trying, in addition to simple collection of archaeological information, to interpret it in such a way as to be able to get an answer to the question: why certain changes in archaeological cultures occur. The basis of processual archeology is the philosophy of positivism, in particular its position that knowledge can be obtained through the application of the scientific method.

D. Clark paid special attention to the Mesolithic era. He also showed considerable interest in the British Neolithic and Bronze Age beaker cultures. The volumes of theoretical books that laid the foundations of analytical archeology are well known. Also known is a monumental two-volume work on British cup cultures, mainly ceramics, with a detailed

classification or typology of ceramics. D. Clarke paid a lot of attention to typology, which is reflected in the two-volume "Cup Cultures of Great Britain and Ireland" (1970) and his main work, "Analytical Archeology" (1968). This book is based on a classification (typological) approach: the researcher moves along the path of the classifier in an inductive procedure - from smaller cells to increasingly larger ones, generalizing them. Such a peculiar system of D. Clark follows from the principles of the hypothetico-deductive procedure followed by L. Binford and his followers. First of all, D. Clark studies elementary samples, artifacts and signs of archaeological material. He then proceeds to typology and analyzes how archaeological types are composed of features, and further demonstrates how specific types shape archaeological culture. At the same time, at each level, the scientist analyzes the possibilities of determining larger or smaller cells of a certain level. In particular, at the level of layering of archaeological cultures, these are subcultures, and at the stage of combining groups of certain cultures, according to the scientist, a kind of "Technocomplex" is formed. Because D. Clark considered each level according to the same principles, one of his critics (K. Muberg) claimed that Clark's book is "repeating the same rules over and over for almost 200 pages." Undoubtedly, structurally, the work is built in such a way. However, the essence of D. Clark's innovation is that all the diversity of levels is reduced to a common denominator and covered by one structure. Although, of course, there are certain shortcomings and miscalculations in the book, there are also innovative thoughts [16]. D. Clark's work "Analytical Archeology" became a unique research on archaeological methodology. At the same time, it laid the theoretical basis of all archaeological analysis, regardless of the period or era. The first edition of this work provided an assessment of the radical changes in methodology that occurred as a result of the development of sciences related to archaeology, such as: cybernetics, computer science, geology, geography during the 1950s and 1960s. At the same time, D. Clark was convinced that archeology was a self-contained discipline with its own methods and procedures. He also sought to clearly define the essence of archaeological attributes, artifacts, types, complexes, cultures, and cultural groups [16, p. 4–37]. In the reprint of this work, D. Clark further developed this approach more thoroughly.

In the neo-positivist philosophy of science, the notion that it is generally possible to develop such a logical procedure that will automatically lead from material to conclusions, and absolutely unambiguously, always in the same form, was quite common. From description to interpretation. This idea was put forward even before the advent of computers. This ideal logical procedure earned the name "analytical machine" among neo-positivist philosophers of science. This

was the basis of the title of D. Clark's work. Like many scientists who were fascinated by neopositivist ideas and who used the term "analytic", Clark tried to realize this ideal in archaeology. The mentioned scheme of D. Clark, for the most part, concerned the hidden mechanisms of the development of material culture. At the same time, this formulation of the problem has almost the most universal appearance, as it leaves room for taking into account the relativity of the phenomena under consideration, which is necessary in archaeological research, the object of which belongs to the natural sphere (material remains in relation to geological and soil layers), and the subject to humanitarian sphere (man and society). In general, analytical archeology makes it possible to construct schemes of interpretation of some problematic issues related to the transformation of funeral rites, etc. [13, p. 180, 181].

Clark wasn't the only one with such goals. The Americans were the first: A. Kreber (1940), A. Krieger (1944), and then E. Spaulding (1953 and 1960), who proposed similar concepts. The "analytical typology" of Leopolis (1957) was similar. But in Clark's Analytical Archeology (1968) the concept of this kind was developed especially clearly and thoroughly. Later, after his death, his students published an abridged edition of his Analytical Archeology and a collection of his works under the title Analytical Archeologist (1979). The entire path of the development of archaeological culture is defined by Clark as a certain "trajectory" that cannot be seen. However, thanks to archaeological research, individual moments of a certain path of cultural development are revealed, as a result of which different points on this trajectory are revealed, which makes it possible, thanks to interpolation, to reconstruct the entire path of the development of a certain culture. The systematic approach allowed D. Clark to give his typologies an orientation to the reconstruction of the cultural whole, to ask questions about the functioning of certain social formations, to turn archaeologists from the study of details to the holistic study of cultures as a reflection of the life of communities of the past. At the same time, Clark considers culture as a dynamic system in ethnographic and archaeological terms. With the help of correlation. Their stable, constantly repeating combinations - types are revealed. Closely related types are organized into archaeological cultures. The changes of these cultures, their transformation, translated into the language of historical interpretation, reveal the essence of historical events. Clark saw the task of formalization in the fact that it is necessary to free this crystallization process from subjectivism and prejudiced ideas. This meant building some kind of algorithm from logical operations, some kind of "analytical machine" capable of being integral, rational and under control, in order to

reliably and unambiguously translate a chaotic mixture of empirical observations into historical and cultural reconstructions [16].

According to L. Klein's ideas, archeology is not a part of history and not a parallel history ("history armed with a shovel"), as claimed by the influential school of Russian archaeology, but a source discipline, methodologically similar to forensics. It processes archaeological sources, translates them into the language of history and conveys them through historical synthesis. Her usual questions are what, when, where, how, while the historian's questions are why, for what reason. This teaching ran counter to the traditional Soviet understanding of historicism as the subordination of all the humanities of history. In the West, this concept also has quite a few supporters. According to L. Klein's belief, the archaeologist's task is to reconstruct artifacts and the past at the simplest level. As a detective, an archaeologist reconstructs past events. Although, at the same time, he does not have a deep interest in the reasons for which they arose. Klein clearly distinguishes between archaeological theory and theoretical archaeology. For him, the first concept characterizes the research tool, the second - the set of applications of this tool in science. Defending the need for theories, L. Klein came up with a program to recognize empiricism in archeology [7]. In order to bring the theoretical work within the scientific limits, D. Klein criticized all the ideas about theory in archeology that exist both in the USSR and outside it and formulated his concept [6].

Among the priorities of analytical archeology, the analysis and understanding of archaeological artifacts, cultures, their typology, systematization and determination of their role in the development of civilization occupy a prominent place. This is especially true of Ukraine, where, due to its geographical location, a huge number of archaeological monuments and cultures are concentrated (National Historical and Archaeological Reserve "Kamyana Mohyla", State Historical and Architectural Reserve "Ancient Kyiv", State Historical and Cultural Reserve "Trypil Culture ", National Historical and Archaeological Reserve "Olvia", National Reserve "Khortytsia", National Historical and Cultural Reserve "Chygyrin", etc.). Moreover, some of them still remain virtually unexamined. In particular, a unique example of this is the "Support Zone" ("Support object") [15, p. 9–28]. Such large-scale and complex (first of all, in terms of bioenergy) archaeological objects are quite difficult to investigate using conventional methods. Therefore, in this case, analytical archeology can and must act no longer as a final, final analysis, but as a certain historical reconstruction or its interpretation of history.

In general, it is believed that the description, classification and dating of archaeological sources are ultimately necessary for the reconstruction of

the history of human society, that is, for interpretation. The peculiarity of historical interpretation lies in the fact that in this way there is a "translation" from the language of archaeological sources to the language of history, that is, the transition from the formalized links of archaeological source studies to the reconstruction of the historical picture of ancient society, from the formalized language to the meaningful, historical language. There is no direct causal relationship between the formalized procedure and its historical interpretation. Historical interpretation is the result for which all source work was performed [5, p. 111, 112]. Therefore, a general methodology of rethinking different historical periods and their historical interpretation is being formed. This applies, in particular, not only to ancient history, but also to the Middle Ages.

L. Zalizniak was one of the first in Ukrainian archaeological science to combine the systematization and periodization of cultural phenomena of a certain period with the reconstruction of the life of people of this era and the generalization of the entire complex of archaeological materials. After all, an essential aspect of archeology is the processing and interpretation of archaeological materials found in the field for the purpose of reconstructing the prehistoric past of mankind [4, p. 172, 173]. The above is quite closely related to master's training at the National University "Kyiv-Mohyla Academy". In particular, with such directions as "Theory and history of culture", "Museum work and protection of monuments of history and culture" and "Archaeology and ancient culture". And in 2000, the master's program "Archaeology and ancient history of Ukraine" was created at this university (project leader - professor, doctor of historical sciences L. L. Zaliznyak) [12, p. 3]. All this made it possible to develop not only the source science, but also the interpretive aspect of archaeology. Among other things, the goal of these master's programs was to form in students a deep understanding of the complex world of primitiveness, to master the source science base and methods of its interpretation for independent research of ancient history. In practice, archaeological interpretation was considered as the final step in the process of scientific analysis in archaeology. Such a paradigm, according to O. Bondarets, is interconnected with a rather problematic situation in archaeology, which during the 1990s developed by inertia in the old direction. Accordingly, the methodological developments of the department/sector of the theory and methodology of archeology of the Institute of Archeology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in the 1980s and early 1990s, which were based primarily on the concept of the systematicity of the socio-historical organism, need to be revised from the standpoint of today. As an argument, the author puts forward the opinion that the theory of the cultural-historical process, which is based on the principles of stagedness, polylinearity and

civilizational uniqueness, could probably function along with other theories as a theoretical-methodological basis of knowledge at the level of a number of specific disciplines. Therefore, attention is drawn to a fairly new field of knowledge - rheology, which should clarify the special essence of things, their own, non-functional meaning, independent of utilitarian purpose, commodity value, aesthetic merits, etc. At the same time, different interpretations of the concept of "thing" by traditional archeology and cultural studies are also noted [2, p. 51].

For several years, at the second master's level of education at the Melitopol State Pedagogical University named after Bohdan Khmelnytskyi, the innovative educational course "Fundamentals of Analytical Archeology" has been taught for the specialty 032 "History and Archeology". The object of his study is, first of all: the ancient history of Ukraine and humanity in a conceptual dimension; monuments of archaeology, history and culture, historical memory; categorical apparatus, theoretical concepts and methodological tools used in the process of historical knowledge, etc.

At the same time, another innovative educational course "Analytical Archeology" is being taught at the third educational level Phd in Melitopol State Pedagogical University named after Bohdan Khmelnytskyi. Its main aspect is to develop in the acquirers of this educational level research analytical and practical skills in the subject field, through the perfect mastery of relevant competences, the development of critical thinking and in-depth understanding by the acquirers of discussions on the topic of the role of history and the process of historical research. It should be emphasized that the training courses "Fundamentals of Analytical Archeology" and "Analytical Archeology" have no analogues in world educational practice and are an innovation of the sixth order, according to which scientific and educational systems acquire a new look with a qualitative change in the functional properties of the system while preserving the system functional principle

Therefore, the training course "Fundamentals of Analytical Archaeology" is designed to form in students of higher education knowledge and a holistic view of the origins and ways of forming theoretical knowledge in the field of archaeology; higher education students' understanding of the essence of the phenomenon of Ukrainian archeology as a determinant of social consciousness; improvement of the methodology and methods of archaeological research, taking into account individual examples of world archaeological practice, etc. Instead, the innovative course "Analytical Archeology" aims at a comprehensive generalization of domestic and foreign archaeological practice; improvement of the methodology and methods of archaeological research

taking into account the best examples of world experience in mastering the knowledge necessary for a teaching specialist in accordance with the specifics and features of the field of theoretical archeology and understanding of historical phenomena and processes on the basis of ancient history. In particular, it is not for the first time that a new view of prehistory is being formed, in particular - the Paleolithic - as an era where not stone, but wooden tools prevailed. At the same time, it was a dominant trend, when Homo habilis, Homo erectus, Homo ergaster, etc., for the most part, used wooden tools, which physically could not have survived to our time. Instead, stone tools, which were used less in ancient times (due to the complexity of processing compared to wood), were mainly preserved, which led to the name "Paleolithic". Therefore, the name "Stone Age" does not fully correspond to historical realities. And in the further development of prehistory, such conventions or even distortions were enough. Therefore, one of the tasks of the "Analytical Archeology" course consists precisely in identifying and correlating such debatable pages of prehistory and establishing reliable historical truth.

The training courses "Fundamentals of Analytical Archeology" and "Analytical Archeology" are aimed, first of all, at rethinking the phenomena of regional archaeological heritage, in particular in the comparative dimension. Thus, the course "Fundamentals of Analytical Archeology" is aimed at analyzing the archaeological monuments of the North-Western Azov region in comparison and drawing parallels with other similar archaeological monuments of Ukraine. Similarly, the educational course "Analytical Archeology" is designed to analyze the archaeological monuments of the North-Western Azov region according to the landmarks of the world archaeological heritage.

Conclusion. Thus, it should be concluded that the innovative aspect of the "Analytical Archeology" training course in the process of studying the archaeological monuments of the North-Western Azov region consists, first of all, in the theoretical understanding of archaeological cultures and their determinants. At the same time, it should be noted that the historiography of archeology cannot cover all urgent research layers. Only an analytical, complex summarization of the available archaeological heritage can give a more or less complete picture of ancient artifacts and the ancient world in general.

Список використаних джерел

1. Болтрик Ю. В. Енциклопедія історії України: у 10 т. / редкол.: В. А. Смолій (голова) та ін.; Інститут історії України НАН України. К.: Наук. думка, 2004. Т. 2: Г–Д. 518 с.

2. Бондарець О. В. До специфіки історії розвитку археологічних знань. *Наукові записки НаУКМА*. Т. 20–21. 2002. Теорія та історія культури. С. 46-53.
3. Залізняк Л. Моя археологія. Біографічні спогади та суб'єктивні враження про українську археологію. Київ: Темпора, 2020. 352 с.
4. Залізняк Л. Л. Періодизація та культурна диференціація верхнього палеоліту України. *Археологія*. 2010. № 4. С. 3–19.
5. Каменецкий И. С., Маршак Б. И., Шер Я. А. Анализ археологических источников (возможности формализованного подхода) / Отв. ред. Д. Г. Лахути; Гос. Эрмитаж. Изд. 2-е. М.: Наука, Главная редакция восточной литературы, 1975. 184 с.
6. Клейн Л. С. Археологическая теория (проблема статуса и дефиниции). *Проблемы археологии и этнографии*. Л.: Изд-во Ленинградского университета, 1978. Вып. 2. С. 8–17.
7. Клейн Л. С. К оценке эмпиризма в современной археологии. *Проблемы археологии и этнографии*. Л.: Изд-во Ленинградского университета, 1977. Т. 1. С. 13–22.
8. Клейн Л. С. К разработке процедуры археологического исследования. Предмет и объект археологии и вопросы методики археологических исследований. *Материалы симпозиума методологического семинара ЛОИА АН СССР*. Л.: Наука, ЛО, 1975. С. 42–44.
9. Лебедев Г. С. Системное описание археологической культуры. *Материалы симпозиума методологического семинара ЛОИА АН СССР*. Л.: Наука, ЛО, 1975. С. 56–58.
10. Мартынов А. И., Шер Я. А. Методы археологического исследования: Учеб. пособие для студентов вузов. М.: Высш. шк., 1989. 223 с.
11. Михайлов Б. Д. Кам'яна Могила – підземний «ермітаж» Приазов'я. Запоріжжя: Дике Поле, 2018. 180 с.
12. Отрощенко В. Десять років магістерській програмі «Історія. Археологія та давня історія України» в НаУКМА (Замість передмови). *Магістеріум. Археологічні студії* / Національний університет «Києво-Могилянська академія»; упорядн. Л. Л. Залізняк. Вип. 45. 2011. С. 3-4.
13. Ситник О. М. Аналітична археологія: витоки та завдання. *Вісник НІАЗ «Кам'яна Могила»*. Вип. 3. Запоріжжя: Дике Поле, 2018. С. 179–183.
14. Тимофеев В. М. Капсула времени. Мелитополь: Изд. Дом Мелитопольской городской типографии, 2020. 512 с.

15. Ткаченко С. Диво мелітопольське. К.: Парлам. вид-во, 2016. 198 с.
16. Clarke D. L. Analytical archaeology-London: Methuen and COLTD, 1968. 684 p.
17. Clarke D. L. Models and paradigms in contemporary archaeology II Models in Archaeology I Ed. Clarke D. L. London, 1972. 1079 p.
18. Rouse I. Introduction to Prehistory: A Systematic Approach, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1972. 1972. 318 p.

References

- Boltryk, Yu. (2004). Entsyklopediya istoriyi Ukrayiny: u 10 t. / redkol.: V. A. Smoliy (holova) ta in.; Instytut istoriyi Ukrayiny NAN Ukrayiny. K.: Nauk. Dumka. *Vol. 2: H-D* [in Ukrainian].
- Bondarets', O. (2002). Do spetsyfiky istoriyi rozvytku arkheolohichnykh znan'. *Naukovi zapysky NaUKMA. Vol. 20-21. Teoriya ta istoriya kul'tury, 46-53* [in Ukrainian].
- Zaliznyak L. (2020). Moya arkheolohiya. Biohrafichni spohady ta sub"yektyvni vrazhennya pro ukrayins'ku arkheolohiyu. Kyiv: Tempora, [in Ukrainian].
- Zaliznyak L. (2010). Periodyzatsiya ta kul'turna dyferentsiatsiya verkhn'oho paleolitu Ukrayiny. *Arkheolohiya, 4, 3-19* [in Ukrainian].
- Kamenetsky Y. S., Marshak B. Y., Sher Ya. A. (1975). Analiz arkheolohycheskykh ystochnykov (vozmozhnomy formalizovannoho podkhoda) / Otv. red. D. H. Lakhuty; Hos. Ėrmytazh. Yzd. 2-e. M.: Nauka, Hlavnaya redaktsyya vostochnoy lyteratury, [in Russian].
- Kleyn L. S. (1978). Arkheolohycheskaya teoriya (problema statusa y defynytsyy). *Problemy arkheolohyy y étnohrafyy. L.: Yzd-vo Lenynhradskoho unyversyteta, 2, 8-17* [in Russian].
- Kleyn L. S. (1977). K otsenke émpyryzma v sovremennoy arkheolohyy. *Problemy arkheolohyy y étnohrafyy. L.: Yzd-vo Lenynhradskoho unyversyteta, Vol. 1, 13-22* [in Russian].
- Kleyn L. S. (1975). K razrabotke protsedury arkheolohycheskoho yssledovanyya. Predmet y ob"ekt arkheolohyy y voprosy metodyky arkheolohycheskykh yssledovanyy. *Materyaly sympozyuma metodolohycheskoho semynara LOYA AN SSSR. L.: Nauka, LO, 42-44* [in Russian].
- Lebedev H. S. (1975). Systemnoe opysanye arkheolohycheskoy kul'tury. *Materyaly sympozyuma metodolohycheskoho semynara LOYA AN SSSR. L.: Nauka, LO, 56-58* [in Russian].

- Martynov A. Y., Sher Ya. A. (1989). *Metody arkheolohycheskoho yssledovanyya: Ucheb. posobyе dlya studentov vuzov*. M.: Vyssh. shk., [in Russian].
- Mykhaylov B. D. (2018). *Kam"yana Mohyla – pidzemnyy «ermitazh» Pryazov"ya*. Zaporizhzhya: Dyke Pole, [in Ukrainian].
- Otroshchenko V. (2011). *Desyat' rokov magisters'kiy prohrami «Istoriya. Arkheolohiya ta davnya istoriya Ukrayiny» v NaUKMA (Zamist' peredmovy)*. *Mahisterium. – Arkheolohichni studiyi / Natsional'nyy universytet «Kyyevo-Mohylyans'ka akademiya»*; uporyadn. L. L. Zaliznyak. Vyp. 45, 3-4 [in Ukrainian].
- Sytnyk O. M. (2018). *Analitychna arkheolohiya: vytoky ta zavdannya*. Visnyk NIAZ «Kam"yana Mohyla». Vyp. 3. Zaporizhzhya: Dyke Pole, 179–183 [in Ukrainian].
- Tymofeev V. M. (2020). *Kapsula vremeny*. Melytopol': Yzd. Dom Melytopol'skoy horodskoy typhrafyy, [in Russian].
- Tkachenko S. (2016). *Dyvo melitopol's'ke*. K.: Parlam. vyd-vo, [in Ukrainian].
- Clarke D. L. (1968). *Analytical archaeology*-London: Methuen and COLTD.
- Clarke D. L. (1972). *Models and paradigms in contemporary archaeology II Models in Archaeology I* Ed. Clarke D. L. London.
- Rouse I. (1972). *Introduction to Prehistory: A Systematic Approach*, New York, McGraw-Hill.

Ситник Олександр. Інноваційний аспект курсу «Аналітична археологія» в процесі вивчення археологічних пам'яток Північно-Західного Приазов'я

Анотація. У статті розкривається інноваційний аспект навчального курсу «Аналітична археологія» при вивченні археологічних пам'яток Північно-Західного Приазов'я. Актуальність дослідження зумовлена необхідністю переосмислення феноменів регіональної археологічної спадщини, зокрема в компаративістському вимірі. Рівень інновації представленого дослідження полягає в розробці унікального навчального курсу «Аналітична археологія», котрий має на меті комплексне узагальнення вітчизняної й зарубіжної археологічної практики; вдосконалення методології й методики археологічних досліджень з урахуванням найкращих зразків світового досвіду щодо опанування необхідними для фахівця-викладача знаннями відповідно до специфіки та особливостей в галузі теоретичної археології й розуміння історичних явищ і процесів на ґрунті прадавньої історії.

Об'єкт дослідження полягає в осмисленні історико-археологічної спадщини України в загальносвітовому контексті. Предметом дослідження є визначення ролі курсу «Аналітична археологія» при вивченні археологічних пам'яток Північно-Західного Приазов'я. Наголошено, що серед провідних завдань аналітичної археології є теоретичне осмислення археологічних культур і їх детермінантів. Зазначено, що серед пріоритетів аналітичної археології чільне місце посідає аналіз археологічних артефактів, культур, їх типологія, систематизація та визначення їх ролі в розвитку цивілізації. Зауважено, що аналітичне, комплексне узагальнення наявних археологічних надбань може дати більш-менш повну уяву про стародавні артефакти й давній світ загалом.

Ключові слова: аналітична археологія, археологічні пам'ятка, археологічна культура, археологічна типологія, методологія археології, артефакти.

Sytnyk Oleksandr. An innovative aspect of the Analytical Archeology course in the process of studying the archaeological monuments of the North-Western Azov region

Abstract. The article reveals the innovative aspect of the "Analytical Archeology" training course in the study of archaeological monuments of the North-Western Azov Region. The relevance of the study is determined by the need to rethink the phenomena of the regional archaeological heritage, in particular in the comparative dimension. The level of innovation of the presented research consists in the development of a unique educational course "Analytical Archeology", which aims at a comprehensive generalization of domestic and foreign archaeological practice; improvement of the methodology and methods of archaeological research taking into account the best examples of world experience in mastering the knowledge necessary for a teaching specialist in accordance with the specifics and features of the field of theoretical archeology and understanding of historical phenomena and processes on the basis of ancient history. The object of the study is to understand the historical and archaeological heritage of Ukraine in the global context. The subject of the study is the determination of the role of the Analytical Archeology course in the study of the archaeological monuments of the North-Western Azov region. It is emphasized that among the leading tasks of analytical archeology is the theoretical understanding of archaeological cultures and their determinants. It is noted that among the priorities of analytical archeology, the analysis of archaeological artifacts, cultures, their typology, systematization and determination of their role in the development of civilization occupies a prominent place. It is noted that an analytical,

comprehensive generalization of the available archaeological heritage can give a more or less complete picture of ancient artifacts and the ancient world in general.

Key words: analytical archaeology, archaeological sites, archaeological culture, archaeological typology, archeology methodology, artifacts.