

Taras Mylian\*, Aleksandr Diachenko\*\*

## Rescue Archaeology in Ukraine: Traditions, Achievements and Issues

### Abstract

Mylian T., Diachenko A. 2014. Rescue Archaeology in Ukraine: Traditions, Achievements and Issues. *Raport 9*, 417-422

This paper deals with the development of rescue archaeology in Ukraine. Despite the political and economic issues, this field was being developed within a period of 150 years. Thousands of burials and settlements were investigated over this period. Numerous data were incorporated into databases. The main issues of the cultural heritage protection are the legal framework, data publication and funding.

**Keywords:** burials, expedition, rescue archaeology, settlement, Ukraine

Rescue archaeology in Ukraine was being developed for a period of almost 150 years. Excavations of this kind almost always played a key role in a process of gathering new data. As a time flows, rescue archaeology obtained its own specific features. However, quality of the work depends upon the general level of achievements in local archaeology, while the amount of excavations and surveys depends upon the political situation in a country. Therefore, it would be reasonable to analyze the development of rescue archaeology in regards to Ukraine's political history.

### ■ RESCUE ARCHAEOLOGY BEFORE 1914

1864 was the beginning of the purposeful development of rescue archaeology when the position of "conservator" appeared in Lvov (that time located in Austrian Empire). Conservator was a person officially responsible for the preservation of objects related to science and culture; he was paid by the State. This position was officially supported by the special government act regarding the preservation of cultural heritage in Austrian Empire by the Cesar-King's Committee. This Committee performed the work, including archaeological studies in

the Western Ukraine, until 1919 (Булик 2006, 60-61). Mieczysław Ludwik Potocki, famous by the find of Zbruch idol, obtained the conservator position in 1864 (Kuśnierz 2010, 95).

Archaeological investigations in the Central and the Eastern Ukraine being the part of Russian Empire required special permission from the Emperor's Archaeological Committee since 1899. Museums and Scientific societies were active in preserving the cultural history as well. The most influential organizations were the Emperor's Odessa Society in History and Antiquity and the Kiev Society in Preservation of the Antiquities and Arts. Despite all those activities, numerous sites were destroyed that time (Нестерова 2008, 275).

The first period of development of the rescue archaeology in Ukraine was stopped by World War I. Investigations of the second half of the 19th – the beginning of the 20th century were characterized by positivist views, but methodology of excavations and interpretations still did not exist as a set of necessary rules (Лех 2006, 23). That period opened a history of official organizations that were responsible for the cultural heritage preservation.

\* Scientific Research Centre "Rescue Archaeological Service" Institute of Archaeology of the National Academy of Science of Ukraine, 79008, Lviv, Vynnychenko st, 24, e-mail: mylian@ukr.net

\*\* Institute of Archaeology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 04210, Kiev, Geroiv Stalingrada 12, e-mail: oleksandr.diachenko@gmail.com

## ■ RESCUE ARCHAEOLOGY IN 1914 – 1945

Further development of rescue archaeology in Ukraine covers a period of two world wars, revolutions and dramatic changes in political life. Intensive studies were not performed during wars. However, different political regimes founded the institutions to protect the cultural heritage.

The law on formation of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences was signed by Hetman P. Skoropadsky on 24 of November, 1918. Institute of Archaeology in Kiev was founded within a short time, in 1918. In a year (1919), the Committee on Development of the Archaeological Map of Ukraine was formed as a part of Academy of Sciences. The Committee was reorganized into Archaeological Committee of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in 1921 that later (1922) was reorganized into Archaeological Committee as a part of Department of History and Philosophy of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. In 1924 this organization became a base for the formation of the All-Ukrainian Archaeological Committee (hereinafter – AUAC) that was reorganized into the Institute of History of the Material Culture in 1934. Among other goals, the AUAC was focused on cultural heritage protection in the areas of intensive construction. Moreover, this Committee worked on organization principles of rescue archaeology, applied for funding and tried to provide archaeological expertizes prior to industrial construction (Толочко 2012, 103, 107).

Besides the Academy of Sciences, newly formed Ukrainian museums were focused on rescue excavations. The most intensive investigations covered a period of 1924 – 1930. However, the quality of excavations, data publication, and analytics followed old trends. If the very beginning of the Soviet Marxist archaeology was in many ways similar to Processual Archaeology of the 1960s (see: Biehl, Gramsch and Marciniak 2002), the museums were doing traditional archaeology that was often accompanied by excavations of the poor quality. Unfortunately, the dichotomy of two traditions ended up tragically. Archaeologists who worked for the museums were repressed (Яненко 2012, 345-347), while the progressive trends in early Marxist archaeology were replaced by dogmatism.

The first third of the 20th century in Ukraine was a time of intensive industrial construction that was focused on reorganization of the rural area to industrial center. Archaeologists who worked for the AUAS and museums performed a great field work in the most of places of construction. Numerous famous sites,

including the Mariupol cemetery, kurgans near the “Azot Plant” and others, were investigated (Горішній, Отрощенко, Шапошникова 1987, 67; Кучугура 2007; Литвиненко 2012, 155).

The work of the archaeological expedition “Dneproges” that was organized in 1926 by Narkomat of Education and Academy of Sciences and headed by D. Yavornitskiy was one of the greatest achievements of the Ukrainian rescue archaeology between World War I and World War II. Excavations and surveys were performed in the Dnieper region near Zaporozhye at the sites that were destroyed by the construction of hydroelectric station and its infrastructure. Despite the lack of specialists and money, four years of work led to brilliant results, including the finds dated by Paleolithic time (Ковальова 2012).

The Western Ukraine in 1919 – 1939 was divided into two districts of the cultural heritage protection. The State Union of Conservators of the Prehistoric Sites of the Ministry of Religion and Education of Poland, and, later, the State Archaeological Museum in Warsaw, were responsible for the rescue excavations (Піотровська 2006, 67-69, 79). The work had a smaller scale than in the Soviet part of Ukraine and mostly covered the excavations prior to construction of roads or dwellings (Піотровська 2006, 80-83).

Summarizing the achievements of the rescue archaeology in Ukraine between World War I and World War II, we may trace some general trends. Despite different views on goals of archaeology that coexisted that time (Marxist methodology and culture history), different scientific organizations were focused on cultural heritage protection. This trend was supported by the Polish and the Soviet governments, both in terms of laws and funding. Meanwhile, the Soviet archaeology had the issues, mainly regarding the lack of professionals, information about the sites that were destroyed. Budgets of some rescue expeditions required more financial support (Ковальова 2012, 113).

## ■ RESCUE ARCHAEOLOGY IN LATE 1940S – 1980S

The next period of rescue archaeology covers a time from the end of World War II till the collapse of the Soviet Union. Rescue archaeology became necessary because of the recovering of the economy after the war and new industrial construction. Already in 1945 the Second Dneproges expedition was organized where V. Danilenko, M. Rudinskiy and M. Bodianskiy investigated numerous well-known sites before 1949 (Струкуленко 2012, 283).

Cultural heritage protection was made possible by the important laws that regulated the process of construction. The resolution “On the arrangements of the improvement of the cultural heritage protection” was proposed by the Soviet of Ministers of the USSR in 1948 (Постановление № 3898 от 14.10.1948 Совмина СССР о мерах улучшения охраны памятников культуры). The resolution structured the system of the rescue archaeology in terms of responsible organization and finance. The law of the USSR “On the protection and utilization of the objects of culture and history” (Закон УРСР № 3600-IX від 13.07.1978 про охорону і використання пам’яток історії і культури, articles 31, 35, and 36) made the expertise and excavations the mandatory stage of any construction. Besides official scientific institutions, including universities, population was invited to preservation of the cultural heritage as well. The Ukrainian Community of the Culture and History Protection was created for those purposes.

Intensive construction and melioration became typical for the development of the Southern and the Eastern Ukraine since 1960s. New set of researches was performed prior to construction of the Dnieper cascade of the hydroelectric stations. Experts (including A. Dobrovolskyi, D. Berezovets, E. Makhno, D. Blifeld, V. Dovzhenko, D. Telegin, N. Kuchera and many others) were provided by the Institute of Archaeology of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (Kiev), Institute of the Community Sciences of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (Lvov), local and state museums. This led to formation of the “archaeology of new constructions” in the Soviet Ukrainian archaeology. Of course, this trend was typical for other parts of the USSR, including Middle Asia (Массон 1985, 3).

The scale of rescue expeditions reached that high level that the standing expeditions were organized, including the Kakhovskaya expedition (headed by A. Leskov), Ingul'skaya expedition (O. Shaposhnikova) and others (Горішній, Отрощенко, Шапошникова 1987, 68). Besides the standing expeditions, the Department of “archaeology of new constructions” was formed at the Institute of Archaeology in order to perform and coordinate the work. In the beginning it was headed by Yu. Zakharuk (Горішній, Отрощенко, Шапошникова 1987, 68). Within few years this Department was dismissed, but created again in some years and headed by M. Shmaglij. In 1976 the Department was discluded from the structure of the Institute, and brought back into it in 1983. By 1991 it was headed by P. Gorishnyi and O. Prykhodniuk.

Most of well-known Ukrainian archaeologists “were graduated” from the standing rescue expeditions. Let us name some of them. Verkhnetarasovskaya expedition worked in 1973 – 1976 in Dnepropetrovsk and Zaporozhye oblasts (regions) mainly focused on excavations of kurgans. The expedition was headed by E. Chernenko and I. Cherednichenko. S. Bessonova, Ya. Boldin, K. Buniatian, G. Evdokimov, S. Pustovalov, and Yu. Rassamakin were employed. 158 kurgans that contained 770 graves of different cultures were investigated (Струкуленко 2012, 283).

Zaporozhskaya expedition worked in 1967 – 1992 and was headed by V. Bidzilia, V. Otroshchenko, Yu. Rassamakin. Yu. Boltrik, S. Kruts, S. Pustovalov and other archaeologists and physical anthropologists excavated 189 kurgans that contained 762 graves (Струкуленко 2012, 284).

Ordzhonikidzevskaya expedition worked in 1970 – 1992 and was headed by B. Mazolevskiy and S. Polin. G. Evdokimov, A. Zagerebelnyi, S. Kruts, V. Murzin, S. Pustovalov, E. Chernenko and others excavated 831 graves in 143 kurgans (Струкуленко 2012, 284). Excavations of the “Tsar’s” Scythian kurgans, including the Tolstaya Mohyla, Haymanova Mohyla, Babyna Mohyla and Soboleva Mohyla were among the achievements of this expedition.

Severskodonetskaya expedition worked in 1971 – 1981 and was headed by N. Cherednichenko, S. Bratchenko, I. Pislariy. Donetskaya expedition worked in 1977 – 1980 and headed by S. Bratchenko. Those expeditions investigated over 500 kurgans and settlements of different time (Литвиненко 2012, 155-156).

Large-scale rescue work became complicated because the number of professional archaeologists in the Institute was too small to cover all rescue expeditions. This led to organization of the local archaeological centers, mainly on the base of universities. For example, the second Severskodonetskaya expedition headed by S. Bratchenko collaborated with the Donetsk University, where the special research group was formed in 1978. O. Privalov, S. Sanzharov, D. Kravets, A. Evglevskiy, R. Litvinenko and others worked in this group till 1992 and excavated about 1100 graves in more than 300 kurgans (Литвиненко 2012, 156-157). Dnepropetrovsk standing expedition of the Dnepropetrovsk University worked in 1972 – 1999 under I. Kovaleva. The work was mainly focused on kurgans between the Orel and the Samara rivers and in the Western bank of the Middle Dnieper. 4860 graves were investigated in 868 kurgans and 1363 graves were excavated in 382 kurgans in these two regions respectively (Струкуленко 2012, 284).

The rescue archaeology in Lvov University was organized in different way since 1985, when the Scientific Laboratory in Historic and Archaeological Studies organized under V. Kasiukhnych. Rescue work in this region was performed according to the orders. M. Peleshchishin, V. Tsyhylyk, L. Krushelnytska managed the work in different years (Чайка, Довгань 1992; Касюхнич 2005).

Thus, this period was the most productive for the rescue archaeology in Ukraine. Most of archaeologists from different institutions took part in those studies. Moreover, new centers were formed in order to teach new experts. Because of the massive construction, mainly in the Southern and the Eastern Ukraine, rescue studies in this area were the most numerous in the USSR (Шелов 1984, 5). It is important to note that the development of the rescue archaeology was supported by series of laws and government resolutions, as well as centralized funding. Large-scale excavations were performed on numerous sites. New finds led to introduction of the statistical methods to Ukrainian archaeology in order to deal with the massive data (Генинг *et al.* 1990).

However, those intensive excavations led to some issues as well. The heads of expeditions had exclusive rights to publish the data, but some of them did not have a time for analysis and writing the papers. In the result, about 50 % of complexes are still not included into scientific circulation (Симоненко 2012, 10-12).

### ■ RESCUE ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE INDEPENDENT UKRAINE

The current state of rescue archaeology in Ukraine formally started with obtaining the independence. The field is being developed in the context of low funding and changing laws. Some of the issues were solved at the most general level, while most of the problems of rescue archaeology are still unsolved.

Legal base for the rescue archaeology was formed during 2000 – 2004 with the laws “On preservation of the cultural heritage”, “On preservation of the archaeological heritage” and improvement of the European Convention on the Protection of the Archaeological Heritage (Казимір 2010). Some years ago Ukrainian government rejected the mandatory archaeological expertise prior to construction. Intensive field work stopped in many regions (Козак 2009, 14-16). This problem was solved recently in the result of active position of the Institute of Archaeology of Ukraine and the Ukrainian Archaeologists Association (Козак 2014).

Because of the issues in economy, expeditions did not get the funding in the beginning of 1990s.

Difficulties with the legal framework and funding led to the formation of the organizations of a new type that focused on rescue archaeology exclusively. At first they were formed as the regional archaeological centers that solved administrative issues and organized groups of experts. Academic institutions followed older tradition of the “expeditions of new constructions” and special institutions that worked in large areas (usually covering some oblasts) or within the whole country.

Institute of Archaeology of the NAS of Ukraine and Institute of Ukrainian Studies (Lviv) were the leaders of reformation the rescue archaeology. The Rescue Archaeology Service was created in Lviv in 1991. At first this organization was headed by V. Ivanovskiy. Later O. Osaulchuk became its director. In some time this center was included into a structure of the rescue archaeological service of the Institute of Archaeology. During 1990s large-scale excavations were performed in Lvov, Galich and area of the construction of the oil-pipe Odessa-Brody. However, some of the materials were not published fully until the present (Конопля, Войнаровський, Онишук 2004; Конопля, Войнаровський, Филипчук 2004).

Situation was normalized since the beginning of 2000s. Institute of Archaeology created a state firm “Rescue Archaeological Service of Ukraine” that is focused on archaeological expertise and rescue excavations. Branches of this organization work in most oblasts of Ukraine (Козак 2009, 20-26). The relative number of rescue expeditions reached about 30 % (Козак 2007; 2010). The Rescue Archaeological Service of Ukraine employs experts in different chronological periods – B. Pryshchepa, B. Strotsen, A. Suprunenko, T. Mylian, I. Golubeva, Yu. Brovender, S. Pivovarov, M. Ilkiv, A. Zlatogorskiy and others. Administration and scientific coordination of different branches is managed by D. Kozak. Special department at the Institute of Archaeology employs the heads of all regional organizations.

Work on databases, expertise, and rescue excavations requires a special permissions (form 4 for the rescue excavations and form 6 for the expertise). This confirms the professional skills of archaeologist to perform the work. One more permission is required from the Department of the Preservation of the Archaeological Heritage of the Ministry of Culture of Ukraine. Permissions from different institutions solve the problem of possible monopolization of the rescue archaeology in Ukraine.

Number of experts that are able to perform large-scale excavations remains a problem since 1990s when numerous people left archaeology for economic reasons.

Full-time employment in Ukrainian archaeology is often associated with low payments. Therefore, expeditions sometimes meet the lack of professionals (Клочко 2007, 70; Козак, 2009, 14).

One of the most important problems in rescue archaeology inherited from the previous period. This is unpublished data. Cases of the reports that were not submitted are known as well. The former issue is being solved. Examples of correlation of the rescue archaeology and analytics of the high quality are still rare. However, the positive dynamics is traced. For example, S. Taranenko who works for the Institute of City Archaeology in Kiev performs fruitful studies on structure of the Kiev Rus capital basing on data from the rescue excavations (Taranenko 2012; Тараненко 2013).

Now the brief publications are mandatory for all archaeologists who received the permission for a field work. These papers are published in "Archaeological researches in Ukraine" (Козак 2009, 19). The data from rescue work in the Eastern and the Central Ukraine are mainly published in "Materials and Studies in Archaeology of the Eastern Ukraine" edited by S. Sanzharov. Materials from surveys and excavations in the Northern and the Central Ukraine may be found in "Archaeological Anal of the Eastern-Bank Ukraine" edited by A. Suprunenko. New journal of rescue archaeology in Ukraine, "Acta Archaeologiae Conservativae" was founded in Lviv by T. Mylian. The goal of this journal is to bring together

the data from rescue expedition, papers on legal, methodological and theoretical issues of archaeology. The first volume is forthcoming.

One more issue was unrecognized for several years. It is a connection between the discipline and society. The formation of the Ukrainian Archaeologists Association (headed by D. Kozak) that includes professional archaeologists, students and large interested audience seems to be an important step in solving this issue.

## ■ CONCLUSIONS

Thus, we tried to trace the development of the rescue archaeology in Ukraine for a period of 150 years. On one hand, this long history of preservation the cultural heritage led to accumulation of the important experience. On another hand, the traditions were formed in totally different economic and political framework. Obviously, traditions are hard to be reformed. However, the reforms are necessary, because the field of science (especially the one that is strongly related to economy) cannot live "its own life" outside the general trends in the development of a country. Therefore, introduction of the experience of post-socialistic countries in the Central and the Eastern Europe into rescue archaeology in Ukraine is required now. We believe that this should help in solving the issues of legacy, relation of the field to education, data publication and other problems.

## Bibliografia

- Biehl P.F., Gramsch A., Marciniak A. (red.). 2002. *Archaeologies of Europe: History, Methods and Theories* (= *Tübinger Archäologische Taschenbücher* 3). Münster.
- Kuśnierz J. 2010. Mieczysław Ludwik Potocki (1810-1878) – konserwator zabytków Galicji Wschodniej, współodkrywca posągu Światowita ze Zbrucza, autor pierwszej monografii historycznej miasta Zamość. *Zamojsko-Wołyńskie Zeszyty Muzealne* 5, 93–104.
- Taranenko S. 2012. Methodological issues of the Kyiv Podil emergency excavations, W: W. Borner and S. Uhlirz (eds.), *Conference of Cultural Heritage and New Technologies, Abstracts* 17. Vienna, 64–65.
- Булик Н. 2006. Охорона археологічних пам'яток у Східній Галичині у ХІХ ст. *Археологічні дослідження Львівського університету* 9, 58–66.
- Генинг В., Бунятян К., Пустовалов С., Рычков Н. 1990. *Формализованно-статистические методы в археологии (анализ погребальных памятников)*. Киев.
- Горішній П., Отрощенко В., Шапошникова О. 1987. Дослідження на новобудовах України. *Археологія* 57, 67–74.
- Казимір О. 2010. Організація наукових археологічних досліджень (правові засади). *Археологічні студії* 4, 6–18.
- Касюхнич В. 2005. Двадцять років у пошуках скарбів давньої історії. *Археологічні дослідження Львівського університету* 8, 214–220.
- Клочко В. 2007. Проблема охорони пам'яток археологічної спадщини в Україні. *Праці науково-дослідного інституту пам'яткоохоронних досліджень* 2, 68–79.
- Ковальова І. 2012. Дніпрогесівська археологічна експедиція. W: П. Толочко (red.), *Історія археології: дослідники та наукові центри* (= *Археологія і давня історія України* 9), 113–115.
- Козак Д. 2007. Від редакції. W: Н. Гаврилюк (red.), *Археологічні дослідження в Україні в 2006-2007*. Київ, 5–6.
- Козак Д. 2009. *Стан та перспективи охорони і дослідження археологічної спадщини в Україні*. W: *Матеріали спільного засідання Головної Ради Українського товариства охорони пам'яток історії та культури і вченої ради Інституту археології НАН України*. <http://volynski-starozitnosti.net/load/19-1-0-21> (wgląd 07.08.2014).

- Козак Д. 2010. Від редакції. W: Д. Козак (red.), *Археологічні дослідження в Україні 2009 року*, 7.
- Козак Д. 2014. Звернення ІА НАН України за підтримки ВГО САУ до Мінрегіонів України. [http://www.vgosau.kiev.ua/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=449:2014-05-08-12-05-22&catid=41:2013-02-06-17-44-54&Itemid=68](http://www.vgosau.kiev.ua/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=449:2014-05-08-12-05-22&catid=41:2013-02-06-17-44-54&Itemid=68) (wgląd 07.08.2014).
- Конопля В., Войнаровський В., Онищук Я. 2004. *Черняхівське поселення Глядки у верхів'ї Південного Бугу*. Львів.
- Конопля В., Войнаровський В., Филипчук М. 2004. *Лукаші. Багатошарова пам'ятка на Брідичині*. Львів.
- Кучугура Л. 2007. Дослідження видатного українського археолога М. О. Макаренка в м. Маріуполь у 1930-1933 роках. *Праці науково-дослідного інституту пам'яток охоронних досліджень* 2, 71–86.
- Лех Я. 2006. З історії польсько-українських зв'язків в археології (кінець XVIII ст. – 1939 р.). *Археологічні дослідження Львівського університету* 9, 17–53.
- Литвиненко Р. 2012. Новобудовна археологія в Донбасі: етапи, дослідники, досягнення. W: П. Толочко (red.), *Історія археології: дослідники та наукові центри* (= *Археологія і давня історія України* 9), 155–159.
- Массон В. 1985. Исследования на новостройках – новая функция советской археологической науки. W: В. Бочкарев, В. Массон (red.), *Археологические исследования в зонах мелиорации. Итоги и перспективы их интенсификации: Научно-практическая конференция, декабрь 1985. Тезисы*. Ленинград, 3–4.
- Нестерова О. 2008. Створення наукових товариств у пам'яток охоронній сфері наприкінці XIX – початку XX ст. на території України. *Археологічні студії* 3, 275–284.
- Піотровська Д. 2006. З діяльності польських служб охорони археологічних пам'яток у Західній Україні в 1919-1939 рр. *Археологічні дослідження Львівського університету* 9, 67–88.
- Симоненко А. 2012. О себе, о науке и об этой книге. W: (red.), *Золото, конь и человек. Сборник научных статей в 60-летия Александра Владимировича Симоненко*. Киев, 3–40.
- Струкуленко А. 2012. Новобудовні археологічні експедиції 70-90-х рр. XX ст. та їх внесок у дослідження давньої історії північностепової Наддніпрянщини. W: П. Толочко (red.), *Історія археології: дослідники та наукові центри* (= *Археологія і давня історія України* 9), 282–286.
- Тараненко С. 2013. Проблема сохранения и музеефикации деревянных конструкций из археологических объектов Подола Киева. W: Н. Лимберис, И. Марченко, Б. Раев (red.), *Шестая Международная Кубанская археологическая конференция; Материалы конференции*. Краснодар, 401–403.
- Толочко Д. 2012. Розвиток українознавства в галузі охорони та дослідження пам'яток археології, мистецтва і природи у 20-х – на початку 30-х рр. XX ст. (за матеріалами Наукового архіву Інституту археології НАН України). *Збірник наукових праць Національного науково-дослідного інституту українознавства та всесвітньої історії* 30, 99–103.
- Чайка Р., Довгань П. 1992. Археологічні дослідження в зонах меліорації Малеого Полісся і Прикарпаття. W: М. Пелещин (red.), *З історії стародавності і середньовіччя* (= *Вісник Львівського університету. Серія історична* 27), 46–49.
- Шелов Д. 1984. Полевая археология и охрана археологических памятников. *Советская археология* 1, 5–10.
- Яненко А. 2012. Музейная археология советской Украины 1920-х – первой половины 1930-х гг.: этапы развития. W: П. Толочко (red.), *Історія археології: дослідники та наукові центри* (= *Археологія і давня історія України* 9), 343–350.

## Summary

### Taras Mylian, Aleksandr Diachenko

*Archeologia ratownicza na Ukrainie: tradycje, osiągnięcia i problemy*

Archeologia ratownicza często odgrywała kluczową rolę w procesie zbierania nowych danych dotyczących dziedzictwa archeologicznego na Ukrainie. Specyfika takich badań kształtowała się stopniowo na przestrzeni ostatnich 150 lat, przy czym ich jakość zależała od ogólnego poziomu osiągnięć w lokalnej archeologii, a ilość od sytuacji w kraju. Z tego po-

wodu uznaliśmy za zasadne przeanalizowanie rozwoju archeologii ratowniczej w odniesieniu do historii politycznej Ukrainy i różnych realiów społeczno-gospodarczych, poczynając od drugiej połowy XIX w., a kończąc na czasach współczesnych. Archeologia ratownicza, jako gałąź nauki silnie związana ze stanem gospodarki, nie może żyć niezależnie od ogólnych trendów w przemianach w kraju. Skłania to do wniosku o potrzebie jej reformy, z użyciem doświadczeń innych krajów post-socjalistycznych w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej.

■