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The article is devoted to the description of first years of Ukrainian studies in the ancient city of Olbia Pontica. Special attention was paid to the range of problematic issues that formed the main features of modern Ukrainian classical archaeology.
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Olbia Pontica, an ancient city in southern Ukraine, is one of the pearls among the Greek colonies of the Northern Black Sea. The history of its archaeological investigations is quite complex and uneven. Non-systematic excavations in the territory of its hill-fort in the XIX century provided minimal information about the city’s history, layout and planning. The episodic nature of these studies and, often, the absence of specific tasks led to the inability to create a general understanding of the history and culture of this ancient city. Systematic and large-scale excavations here were started only in the first years of the XX century under the guidance of the representative of the Imperial Archaeological Commission B. V. Farmakovskiy (Fig. 1). The results of these studies quickly led Olbia to the rank of the most interesting archaeological sites of antiquity in the Northern Black Sea (Kapacsb 1976, c. 13—21). Pre-revolutionary excavations of B. V. Farmakovskiy in Olbia are exemplary for his time and have identified the main research objectives for many years. However, these systematic studies were interrupted by the stormy events of the First World and Civil Wars, the revolution. B. V. Farmakovskiy remained on the territory of the Soviet state and continued his study of antiquity in Leningrad, which was probably largely stimulated by his close friendship with V. I. Ulianov (Lenin) in their childhood (Фармаковская 1976, c. 11). This opened up some prospects for continuing interrupted researches. However, Olbia was located at that time in the south of Soviet Ukraine, a republic that had its own state authorities, the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences (hereinafter — AUAS) and the All-Ukrainian Archaeological Committee (hereinafter — AUAC), which could not miss Olbia’s excavations.

Restored and headed by B. V. Farmakovskiy, the excavations in Olbia covered 1924—1926, which became a continuation of pre-revolutionary investigations. At the same time, it was a period of attempts by the AUAC (in the conditions of almost complete lack of funding and staffing shortages) to create its own school of classical archaeology and education of Ukrainian specialists in the field of ancient history.

Therefore, the main purpose of our study is to shed light on the peculiarities of the organiza-

1 Farmakovskiy Boris Vladimirovich (1870—1928) — a prominent classical archaeologist from the time of the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union. He graduated from the Faculty of History and Philology of Novorossiysk State University in Odessa in 1892. In 1902 he received a master’s degree in theory and history of art in Odessa. In 1906—1909 he was a scientific secretary of the Russian Archaeological Society. In 1914 he was elected a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences. Since 1918 he worked at the State Academy of the History of Material Culture (hereinafter — SAHMC). He is also a professor at the Petrograd University, the Pedagogical Institute and the Institute of Art History. He studied ancient history, archaeology, the art of the Northern Black Sea. He headed the Olbian archaeological expedition since 1901 (he discovered the crypt of Jevresivij and Aretha, explored the city blocks and found the city limits). In addition, he participated in excavations in Kyiv in 1908—1909 and in Evpatoria in 1916—1917. He wrote 131 scientific publications (Мезенцева 1997, c. 99).
tion of Olbia’s research process, officially led by B. V. Farmakovskiy and with the participation of the Archaeological Committee at the AUAS, revealing its characteristic features, covering the first attempts and conditions of Ukrainian classical archaeology formation.

The official activity of the All-Ukrainian Archaeological Committee on the restoration of excavations at the territory of Olbia begins on July 11, 1924, when its leadership was notified by a letter from Leningrad from the Russian Academy of the History of Material Culture (hereinafter — RAHMC) about coming of B. V. Farmakovskiy to Ukraine for further investigations of Olbia (STAI NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 2 and back). It was pointed out that very limited funding has been allocated for the excavations, which is sufficient only for the research of objects already opened in pre-revolutionary period. At the same time, a request was made to the AUAC to facilitate the successful conduct of these excavations.

Almost a week later, on July 17, a meeting is held at the AUAC where it was stated that the restoration of excavations at the territory of Olbia is “very desirable” and the committee, through the leadership of the AUAS, addresses the Scientific Committee of “UkrGolovProfOsvity” about the necessity to send B.V Farmakovskiy appropriate certificate. However, at the same time, the condition was stipulated that “all the acquired things will not be taken outside of Ukraine and will be transferred to the Regional Museum of Odessa” (STAI NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 4). This indicates that, although not capable of leading these excavations, the AUAC is at least concerned with the interests of national science and insists on the preservation of the materials extracted within Ukraine.

It should be noted that these were not purely declarative statements, recorded only on paper. The case was brought under some control and the Archaeological Committee monitored the conditions. Illustrative about this are the documents where in the correspondence the leadership of the AUAS, after the end of Olbian expedition of this year (probably based on unknown to us private sources of information), is interested in the directorate of the Mykolaiv and Odessa museums — do they know that part of things was exported by B. V. Farmakovskiy from Ukraine to Leningrad (STAI NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 44—47)? The Odessa Museum unequivocally denies this fact and states that all things acquired in Olbia in 1924 are stored in the territory of Ukraine with the exception of only two ceramic fragments — a black-figured fragment and a lid of an Ionic vessel (issu to professor B. L. Bogaevskiy for scientific investigation (STAI NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 46) and “cover” from archaic burial (issued to Farmakovskiy for a temporary exhibition in the Hermitage (STAI NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 47). In both cases, however, it was emphasized that items issued temporarily and should be returned to the Odessa Museum. In one of the letters it was marked: “Professor Farmakovskiy, foreseeing that all things should remain, at the disposal of the AUAS, in Odessa, for processing them made many photographs, for which a photographer of the Hermitage was at the expedition” (STAI NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 47).

At the same time, the resumption of Olbian expedition coincided with the intensification of the Kherson Regional Museum work, which, according to the correspondence, itself offered scientific cooperation with the Archaeological Committee, which was given a positive response to the completion of which the Kherson Museum was commissioned to control realization of Archaeological Committee instructions in Olbian excavations. Also, the museum was allowed selecting for its collections and exhibitions findings from excavations of “duplicate nature”, for which it was proposed to “enter into an understanding with the Regional Museum of Odessa” (STAI NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 21).

In addition to preserving the findings, the leadership of the Archaeological Committee advocated the need to publish the results of Olbian excavations in the territory of Ukraine, and stated in one of its letters to B. V. Farmakovskiy regrets that the report on the excavations results in Olbia in 1924 will not be published in Ukraine (STAI NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 43). Finally, the rest of this year’s excavation materials were published two years later in Leningrad (Фармаковский 1926, с. 143—163).
Thus, it must be admitted that Olbian excavations of 1924, according to the materials of the AUAC archives, were supported by the Archaeological Committee, but the expedition was almost completely finished by Russian researchers under the direct guidance of professor B. V. Farmakovskiy. Officially to work on this expedition went the staff of Leningrad (RAHMC). Directly about the participation of researchers from Ukraine in the work of this expedition is known only about the director of the Mykolaiv Museum F. T. Kaminskyi (Fig. 2) (he himself mentions this in one of the letters). Official representatives of Ukraine from the Archaeological Committee of the AUAS at the excavations of Olbia were not appointed. Despite this, the archaeological commission was pleased with the results of the excavations of Olbia in 1924, the report of which was read as early as October 16 at the committee meeting by professor B. L. Bogaevskiy (a representative of the RAHMC), on the basis of which it was decided to express its gratitude to the professor and “to petition the AUAS before the Central Government for the allocation of funds for Olbian excavations of the future 1925” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 25, 26).

In 1925, in fact, to the excavations in Olbia, the activities of the AUAS began again with a letter from the Russian Academy of History of Material Culture from Leningrad on July 29, personally signed by academician M. Ya. Marr, in which the desire to continue Olbia’s excavations and the mission of B. V. Farmakovskiy were notified. In the letter it was emphasized that the report for the excavations of previous year to the AUAS was provided in time by the researcher, and all the things found during the excavations, according to the instructions of the AUAS, were submitted to the Odessa Regional Historical and Archaeological Museum. It was also emphasized that the deputy of the People’s Commissar of Enlightenment of the USSR in his letter from October 24, 1924 thanked B. V. Farmakovskiy “for organizing an expedition to Olbia in 1924” and “inviting him to lead the expedition in 1925” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 48). Thus, the excavation of Olbia was officially supported by the Ukrainian authorities, and in order to prevent possible misunderstandings with the leadership of the AUAS, they were invited to cooperate and organize possible assistance to the expedition both in Kyiv and in the field.

Immediately after the Academy’s official announcement, B. V. Farmakovskiy announced his intention to come to Kiev around August 8—9 with the aim of making a report on Olbia “with slides” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 52). However, these plans had to be changed because the field season had already begun and it was hard to find any archaeologist in Kyiv who could be interested in Boris Vladimirovich’s lecture. “The Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, in case of the departure of the Kyiv’s archaeologists (for) excavation, requests to postpone a report (until) your return (from) Olbia” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 55).

The work of the expedition unfolded on its own course, as evidenced by the report of F. T. Kaminskyi, where he informs that the expedition staff gathered in Mykolaiv on August 18 and went to Parutyne village on the same day. Head of the expedition B. V. Farmakovskiy ordered the immediate commencement of an external survey of the hill-fort, especially of its south-eastern part (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 62). External examinations were held the next day — August 19. An overview of the old excavations was accompanied with “a detailed corresponding explanation by academician B. V. Farmakovskiy” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 62 and back).
Incidentally F. T. Kaminsky also described the very beginning of investigations in the territory of the north-eastern part of the Upper City of Olbia, which eventually resulted in one of the largest and most famous excavations — “I”. Thanks to the activity of the director of the Mykolaiv Museum this territory was included in the boundaries of Olbian Reserve. The first excavations here began on August 20, 1925 (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 62 and back).

An interesting question arises about the representation of the AUAC in the excavations in Olbia in 1925. On August 10, a letter was sent to the director of the Odessa Museum of History and Archaeology S. S. Dlozhevskyi 3 (Fig. 3) in which, “According to the resolution of the Plenum of the Archaeological Committee dated by 5 August”, the authority is given to be a representative of the Archaeological Committee during the excavations in Olbia, to be conducted under the guidance of prof. B. V. Farmakovskiy, as well as “please inform it of the progress and consequences of the excavation”. Accordingly, the things that will be found during these excavations should be donated to the Museum of History and Archaeology in Odessa (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 57). Professor S. S. Dlozhevskyi in his letter to the AUAC (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 59) expressed his consent and gratitude for the granting of such authority, but at the same time informed M. O. Makarenko 4 (Fig. 4), that now he can’t go to Olbia. In May this year, the Odessa Museum was closed by the Audit Commission for more than a year as an institution that, under the cover of the Soviet authorities, is engaged in the storage of the escaped property of the bourgeoisie (Білокінь 2009, с. 151—151; Охотников 2010, c. 63). A number of other serious allegations were also raised. Therefore already on August 17 the management of the AUAC changes the representative of Olbian excavations, appointing to this position the director of the Mykolaiv Museum F. T. Kaminskyi. “According to the impossibility for you to take part in Olbia’s excavations, as you have informed M. O. Makarenko by letter, the AUAC forced to entrust the representation to the Head of Hist.-Arch. Mus. in Mykolaiv F. T. Kaminskyi, that’s why also the things obtained by excavations should be transferred for interim to the Hist. Arch. Museum in Mykolaiv” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 61).

It should be noted that in addition to representation on the expedition, as in the previous year, a fundamental question was raised as to where the find-

3 Dlozhevskyi Serhii Stepanovych (1889—1930) — philologist, historian, archaeologist. He was born in Kamianets-Podilskyi. He studied at the Kyiv University at the Faculty of History and Philology (Пам’яті Длощевського 1931, с. 95), where in 1912 he was “left to prepare for the professorship” (Білокінь 2009, p. 151). He moved to Odessa in 1920. Worked and held positions: Director of the Odessa State Historical and Archaeological Museum in 1920—1930 and others. (C. С. Длощевський... 1930; Пам’яті Длощевського 1931, c. 95). He participated in the I Archaeological Meeting in Kyiv in 1925, at the Archaeological Congress in Kerch in 1926, at the I International Archaeological Congress in Berlin as a delegate from the Ukrainian SSR and made a report on excavations in Olbia. There he was also elected as full member of the German Archaeological Institute (Шульц 1931, c. 32). He also took care of inventing new antique monuments in Odessa.

4 Makarenko Mykola Omelianovych (1877—1938) is a prominent Ukrainian archaeologist, art critic, museum expert. He got his higher education at the St. Petersburg Archaeological Institute in 1905. 1902—1919 — Chief Guardian Assistant of the Hermitage. He had been teaching and since 1910 had become a full member of the Council of the Imperial Archaeological Commission. In 1919 he moved to Kyiv and headed the art section of the Ukrainian Scientific Society and joined the Commission on the compilation of an archaeological map of Ukraine at the Ukrainian Academy of Science. In 1920—1925 he was the director of the Kyiv Museum of Arts and other institutions. Professor of Kyiv and Odessa Art Institutes as well. Since 1924 he became a full member of the AUAC. He has led and conducted excavations in many monuments of the USSR in different periods. In 1926 he was the official representative of the AUAC in Olbia excavations, where he expressed a principled position regarding the need to involve Ukrainian specialists in these excavations and to change the internal structure and principles of this expedition in favor of Ukrainian national science (Карлека 2016). In 1934, he was the only one out of 11 members of the commission who refused to sign the act of destruction of St. Michael’s Cathedral and protested against the government’s decision. On December 25, 1937, he was sentenced to death by decree of “Troika”. Rehabilitated in 1989. Author of about 180 works and 10 monographs (Інститут археології... 2015, с. 503—505).
ings from the Olbian excavations would be deposited, since at that time there was some problem for many provincial museums (and in this situation, especially for the Mykolaiv Museum) in filling of exhibitions and funds. The letter from the director of the Mykolaiv Museum F. T. Kaminskyi (sent on 6, but received on August 10, 1925 — the very day when it was decided to appoint S. S. Dlozhhevskyi as a representative of the AUAC), in which he directly insists, based on the great work that he personally does to save and investigate Olbia, on the need to transfer Olbian finds to the Mykolaiv Museum. This was justified by practical needs — in fact, all the work to supervise the monument was laid on the Mykolaiv Museum. During 1924, its director personally visited Olbia at least once a month to check its condition (noting that now he had to do this less with the lack of funds). He also emphasized that the whole matter of protection, care, resolution of controversial and economic issues in the reserve also was laid on him. In addition, he made excursions at the monument. However, despite all this, only things that were bought by random persons from the local population and donated to the museum were included in the Mykolaiv Museum. “Mykolaiv should have a certain base before replenishment of the museum. (...) In view of all the above, we ask you to bring the monuments of Olbia to the Mykolaiv Museum” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 58).

The situation seems quite clear, and the position of F. T. Kaminskyi is quite reasonable and logical, but on September 7 “Ukrnauka” as the main state body that financed the work of the Olbian expedition (apparently due to some complaints coming from Odessa) annuls the decision of the Archaeological Committee on the transfer of materials from the excavations of Olbia 1925 to the Mykolaiv Museum and definitely order that all of them should be transmitted to the Odessa Museum (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 64).

Since this moment we can see the beginning of some tension in the relationship, to some extent, a formal confrontation between the AUAC as a unit of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences and “Ukrnauka” in the matter of storage of Olbian collections. The Archaeological Committee for a number of reasons did not obey the order of the authority and finally all the findings this year were nevertheless transferred to the Mykolaiv Museum, which was certified by the acts of transfer of materials, respectively signed by B. V. Farmakovskyi as the leader of the Olbian expedition and F. T. Kaminskyi as the Director of the Mykolaiv Museum (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 64, 65).

The prohibition of “Ukrnauka” to store things in the Mykolaiv Museum caused a number of letters (e.g., a letter from F. T. Kaminskyi dated by December 15 (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 76) and various discussions within the walls of the Archaeological Committee. The problem of transferring and storing Olbian finds was discussed at the plenum of the All-Ukrainian Archaeological Committee on October 21, 1925, which was recorded by the extract from the journal of this plenary, where the fourth issue was discussed in addition to the RAHMC report on the excavations in Olbia, based on the information of professor S. S. Dlozhhevskyi on the closure of the Odessa Museum by the Audit Commission, which was confirmed by information of B. V. Farmakovskyi that there was still a part of Olbian finds not transported to Odessa. The indignant assembly of the plenum of the AUAC approved to declare “its surprise at the cancellation of “Ukrnauka” by his decree, which was dictated by the sealing of the Odessa Museum“, as well as “to ask “Ukrnauka” to discuss issues in the relevant commission and to establish certain principles in the allocation of the materials of Olbian excavations” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 73).

The next year — 1926 — is special in Olbia’s investigations. It was the large-scaled and most successful among the researches of B. V. Farmakovskyi in the post-revolutionary period, when it was possible to involve other specialists than archaeologists in the research of the monument. This made it possible to significantly expand the understanding of the history, culture and life of the population of this ancient city (Фармаковский 1929, с. 7—74; Карасев 1976, с. 20; Славин 1960, с. 54).

As a result of preliminary arrangements for excavations in Olbia for the 1926 season, “Ukrnauka” promised funding, which led to a significant revival in the preparation for the field season. Al-
ready from the beginning of the summer of 1926, the preparation for the work of the Olbian expedition began and in June a letter was sent from the Archaeological Committee to “Ukrnauka” explaining the need to send to the excavations of the monument six persons — a representative of the AUAC prof. M. O. Makarenko, representative of the Odessa Museum (to which the main collection of things should be transferred) prof. S. S. Dlozhevskyi, a representative of the Mykolaiv Museum F. T. Kaminskyi (“on which Olbia had direct care all along”), and three trainees — two from the AUAC and one from the Odessa Museum. It was also stipulated that the composition of the representatives of the Archaeological Committee and museums could be changed if necessary. At the same time, the Committee representatives asked “Ukrnauka” to take these wishes into consideration when “establishing the composition of the Olbian expedition and the distribution of appropriated funds” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 92).

Thus, the Archaeological Committee for the first time got a real opportunity to send its representatives to excavations in Olbia.

It should be noted that the representative of the AUAC Mykola Omelianovych Makarenko was under investigation and at the time the committee had to write a letter to the “prosecutor of Kyiv region” asking him to allow a full member of the AUAC and a professor to go to Parutino village for two months “as an Authorized Representative of the Committee” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 97).

Finally, on July 22, an estimate was sent from “Ukrnauka” to the AUAC (with copies to S. S. Dlozhhevskyi and F. T. Kaminskyi) for carrying out the Olbian expedition with sources of expenses for its participants. This estimate was printed on a typewriter, but later by hand of an unknown person it was made a specification to clarify which category of staff and from what source it had to be funded.

According to this document, it turned out that the expedition would work at the expense of “Ukrnauka” — the head of the expedition academician B. V. Farmakovskiy, the architect “acad.” (Sic !?) N.B. Baklanov, topographer, photographer I. F. Chistiakov, ceramics specialist I. P. Krasnikov, organic parts specialist M. I. Tyhyi.

Other staff had to come to the expedition at the expense of the organizations that sent them. Among them — from the RAHMC — research workers B. L. Bohaiievskyi, T. M. Devel, T. N. Knypovych, O. A. Pini; assistants I. I. Meshchaninov, T. O. Prushevsk; trainee V. Stein. It was planned to send from the AUAS M. O. Makarenko and several trainees. From the Odessa Museum — the director S. D. Dlozhhevskyi, research workers M. F. Boltenko and “Oksman, Domakion, Pora-Leonovich”. From the Mykolaiv Museum — the director F. T. Kaminskyi and research worker V. S. Kuznetsov. Dr. Gose came from the German Archaeological Institute. However, the representation of Russia was not limited to representatives of the Academy of Material Culture in Leningrad. The expedition also included representatives from the Research Institute of Archaeology and Arts at the Moscow State University — research workers V. D. Blavatskyi and M. I. Kobylina. Five students from the Leningrad University — “Karasev, Slavin, Farmakovskaya, Chubova, Yunovich”. By the way, this is the first and only year when Olbia’s eminent researchers L. M. Slavin and O. I. Karasev worked together on archaeological excavations with B. V. Farmakovskiy.

It was also noted that people eligible for funding from sending organizations have a subsidy from “Ukrnauka” and that they are required to pay travel expenses on both ends of the expedition (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 99). At first glance, the distribution of funds in this document seems quite reasonable, but it considers the All-Ukrainian Archaeological Committee as an independent organization, which itself has to finance the business trip of its employees, which was not true, because in fact the AUAC did not have its own funding and was completely dependent on money, it was provided by “Ukrnauka”. In fact, according to this document, representatives of the AUAC found themselves outside the funding of both the expedition and the organization that sent them, which led to serious collisions in the future during works of the Olbian Expedition.

Meanwhile, in Kyiv it has already been decided concerning people who had to represent the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences at the excavations of Olbia and on August 2 to B. V. Farmakovskiy a letter was sent in which the Archaeological Committee informed that to the expedition would be sent in addition to the official representative M. O. Makarenko two other trainees — Sylvestr Sylvestrovych Magura and Illia Samoilovskyi with an estimate for the maintenance of the AUAC representatives, the total amount of which was 600 rubles (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 102). However, apparently, as further events unfolded, Boris Vladimirovich did not respond to this letter.

Soon, in early August, with the start of the expedition, the problem with the financing and retention of representatives of the Archaeological
Committee had appeared. It turned out that the terms of representatives’ payment for the excavations were not clearly stated (despite the preliminary estimate), which in this situation, as typical, resulted in absence of payment for the AUAC representatives. This is clearly evidenced by the stormy correspondence between the AUAC and “Ukrnauka”. For example, a letter from August 7 from the AUAC to “Ukrnauka”:

“Adding to this a copy letter of the AUAC representative at the excavations in Olbia, M. O. Makarenko and informing “Ukrnauka” that yesterday (6-VIII) M. O. Makarenko was sent a telegram about the complete impossibility for the AUAC — for lack of funds — to take on his further maintenance and to find the sums needed to pay the work of two trainees — I. Samylovskyi and S. Magura, who left for Olbia 2-VIII, — All-Ukrainian Archaeological Committee at the UAU considers at its duty to pay attention to the impossibility of the created situation.

The interests of Ukrainian science require the presence at Olbian excavations of the AUAC representative, M. A. Makarenko, whose participation in the excavation was almost conditioned by prof. B. Farmakovskiyi and who is currently conducting excavations at a certain section of Olbian territory. It is not necessary to speak on the need to prepare young archaeological forces in practical work on excavations.

The AUAC was assured that the expenses for the travel and maintenance of the people in a business trip would be covered by the expedition. Only on this basis the departure of M. O. Makarenko and his detention during these three weeks in Olbia were spent on borrowed funds, which had to be repaid that month.

After the statement of prof. Farmakovskiyi to M. O. Makarenko, that 60(0 carb.) were paid into the budget of the expedition to pay for the travel and maintenance of the Archaeological Committee representative and trainees, and after the departure of the trainees who were deliberately detained until the reply of M. O. Makarenko from Olbia — receipt from “Ukrnauka” on July 2 (2) “The expedition to carry out excavations in Olbia in 1926”, where our representatives appear under the letter “B” / at the expense of agencies in the business trip / was a complete surprise.

This surprise was all the more striking that, while representatives of Kyiv, Odessa and Mykolaiiv were brought in with letter “B”, from the Research Institute of Archaeology and Art in Moscow and from the Leningrad University seven people had driven and would live during the expedition.

Seeing this as a bit of a misunderstanding, the AUAC asks “Ukrnauka” to take urgent steps to eliminate it and to inform them by telegraph to Olbia.

On the decision of the AUAC case, it was asked “not to refuse to notify it (the AUAC — O.K.) in the near future” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 106).

Regarding the unfortunate misunderstanding with the representatives of Kiev for payment for the participation in the works in Olbian expedition, August 9, Mykola Omelianovych writes to the Archaeological Committee a quite emotional letter, and his emotions are rather clear: “I have the honor to request the Committee to inform me how to treat the messages of “Ukrnauka”…

Given that the Archaeological Committee not only did not have the appropriate funds, but also in general no funds what were known to “Ukrnauka” to the same extent as the Archaeological Committee, it should not be looked at as a refusal of “Ukrnauka” to help the Ukrainian Archaeological Committee to participate in Olbia’s excavations. Moreover, when you consider the number of St. Petersburg members of the expedition, paid from the expedition. Because what kind of money did the Committee have in mind when it made the order? Or, perhaps, such a message is an accidental mistake and as such that had already been corrected by “Ukrnauka”.

As a representative of the Committee, I do not know for how long time I am forced to exist. Not on the same loan to which I and the trainees exist to this day?” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 113 and back).

A rather unpleasant situation was created for Ukrainian researchers, which made them decide to go to higher authorities. In one of the letters to B.V. Farmakovskiyi, among other things, was required to inform “Ukrnauka” — whether the head of the Olbian expedition received funds from the Russian Academy of History of the Material Culture and what they had been spent on (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 124). Also, on September 28, the leadership of the AUAC (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 126), and on October 9 the “People’s Commissariat of Education” of the Ukrainian SSR (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 139) to B. V. Farmakovskiyi was sent a direct letter demanding to pay daily to S. S. Magura and I. M. Samoilovskiyi “on the basis of the specified norm”. Unfortunately we do not have any data regarding the official answer of B. V. Farmakovskiyi. It is quite possible that he did not write such an appropriate letter, but only after direct pressure from “Ukrnauka” the situation regarding payment of at-
tendance and work on the Olbian expedition of the AUAC representatives gradually began to be resolved and after the expedition works in October the necessary funds were sent from Leningrad. Already on October 6, a message was sent about the transfer of money to I. M. Samoilovskyi (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 132). This is also evidenced by personal receipts of S.S. Magura (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 134) and I. M. Samoilovskyi (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 133).

However, the difficulties with paying the mission of the Archaeological Committee were far from unique. So, despite the budget estimates and plans discussed in advance, on August 14, less than half of the expedition’s works, the money provided at the initial stage of “Ukrnauka”, ended. Head of the expedition B. V. Farmakovskiy was seeking for an advance funding, but “Ukrnauka” simply did not answer. It is obvious that the bureaucratic system failed and its slow response threatened the continuation of Olbian excavations. After a ten-day wait, the expedition faced the need to stop works. To overcome this difficult situation, Boris Vladimirovich appeals to the management of the RAHMC in Leningrad and receives the necessary amount within a few days. This made it possible to continue the works of the expedition “to the great shame of the representatives of Ukraine” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 116 and back).

Such a situation, of course, caused a wave of indignation at the AUAC’s official representative M. O. Makarenko, who, while excavating in Olbia, was concerned not only with maintaining the pace of the expedition’s work, but also with questions of the authority of Ukrainian national science and the scornful attitude of officials to domestic researchers:

“Representative of the Arch. Committee had the unfortunate fate of stating “Ukrnauka’s” careless attitude to the promises that the expedition manager had such high hopes for.

... I have the honor to ask the Committee to inform what reasons prompted “Ukrnauka” not only to fail its promise, but also to forget about elementary ethics: we are dealing with representatives of the “Russian Socialist Federal Republic” and it seems that answering his request, or questions, is an elementary need for us to be treated respect”(Ibid).

As in previous years, the need for filling exhibits and funds with archaeological materials, and in particular antique materials from Olbia, has increased among museum institutions of the Ukrainian republic. For example, as early as November 11, 1925, the Zinovievsk Museum of Natural History and Archaeology (Zinovievsk — now Kropyvnytskyi) had turned to the AUAS with request the allocation to collect some materials for the museum. In this letter it is mentioned that during the season of 1925 an employee of the Zinovievsk Museum T. Diakov had already addressed to the head of the expedition B. V. Farmakovskiy with a request to allocate things, but he replied that the Archaeological Commission is engaged in the distribution of things (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 75). Obviously, obtaining a collection of new finds from Olbia’s excavations was one of the priority tasks of the Odessa and Mykolaiv museums, which had a direct bearing on the case of Olbia’s preservation and research.

Already from the very beginning of the expedition of 1926, disputes had begun between the “interested parties” as which museum would findings of the season be deposited to. The bright evidence of it is the letter of M. O. Makarenko of July 31, 1926. He officially put the inspector of the monuments of the Odessa district and the head of the Odessa Museum S. S. Dlozhevskiy, who apparently in too active form insisted that the findings from Olbia had to be stored in his institution, that the competence to distribute the finds by museums belongs to the Archaeological Committee of the UN and asked him officially to notify or entrust to the AUAC representative, this function (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 101).

In order to prevent all sorts of problems and misunderstandings, it was decided to establish a special commission for the distribution of Olbian finds for storage among the museums. This commission had to be composed of the head of the expedition and official representatives of these museums. A letter to “Ukrnauka” from August 3, 1926 reported: “Based on a message from the AUAC representative in Olbia, M. O. Makarenko, that in Olbia the force of the things acquired by the excavations of previous years, which the Odessa Museum (apparently due to their bulkyness) does not take and which the Mykolayiv Museum is not very willing to gather too, All-Ukr. Archaeol. Committee asks “Ukrnauka” to inform the Head of the Olbian Expedition, prof. B. V. Farmakovskiy about the need to form a commission on the distribution of findings that should be included in addition to prof. B. V. Farmakovskiy and M. O. Makarenko, directors of two of these museums.

According to the AUAC consideration, which was agreed by prof. B.V. Farmakovskiy during his stay in Kyiv, heavier or for some reason inconvenient to carry things should be left in the Mykolaiv Museum, the rest of the things should be transported to Od. Museum.
M. O. Makarenko reports that the things that have been excavated in previous years are in danger of destruction. Therefore, the committee on distribution of things proposed by the AUAC should review the issue of leaving museum exhibits in Olbia to pass a resolution. In addition, the commission should speak on the formation of a fund of things (doublets and minor things) from which small exhibit collections could be made for other museums” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 103).

August 7, 1926 a letter to professor S. S. Dlozhevskyi received an order signed by the chairman of the AUAC academician O. Novitskyi and the Academic Secretary of the AUAC M. Rudinskyi, where it was explicitly emphasized that the distribution of things from the excavations is possible only by a stipulated commission and he asked to take measures, which were not done otherwise.

“The All-Ukrainian Archaeological Committee at the UAN considers it necessary that the temporary distribution of things acquired in Olbia by excavation between museums are carried out on the basis of principles developed by the commission and approved by the Archaeological Committee.

The commission should be composed of you, prof. B. V. Farmakovskiy; prof. M. O. Makarenko and director of the Mykolaiv Museum T. T. Kaminskyi.

Taking this into consideration, the All-Ukrainian Archaeological Committee at the UAN asks you to take all measures to ensure that the materials are not distributed before the matter is discussed in the Commission” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 105). As the correspondence shows, the Archaeological Committee did not, under any circumstances, take responsibility for the organization of the commission for the division of things from Olbian excavations and demanded the establishment of this commission by “Ukrnauka”. Obviously, the situation with the solution of this issue in the expedition reached a certain tension, as evidenced by the AUAC request to “Ukrnauka” “to accelerate the organization of the Commission in the distribution of things obtained during the excavations in Olbia” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 108).

Considering the circumstances from “Ukrnauka” to B.V. Farmakovskiy who was directly ordered to create a commission for the distribution of findings from the Olbian excavations a letter was sent, to “Wishing to prevent possible misunderstandings” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 124).

As a result of a long and rather complicated process of negotiations and correspondence between Olbian Expedition, the AUAC, “Ukrnauka” and museum directors, an act signed by B. V. Farmakovskiy, the AUAC representative M. O. Makarenko, director of the Odessa Museum S. S. Dlozhevskyi and the head of the Mykolaiv Museum F. T. Kaminskyi, in which it was concluded that it is convenient to store the findings in the Mykolaiv Museum, and especially the cumbersome and heavy things that will be problematic to transport, to be stored in Olbia. “In view of incompleteness of exact development of programs of the Odessa and Mykolaiv museums and big technical conveniences of delivery of antiquities from Olbia to Mykolaiv, as in the nearest point, now, to exact distinction of programs of gathering collections of the Odessa and Mykolaiv museums that to put in turn, it is expedient to transfer of antiquity from the excavations of 1926 to the Mykolaiv Museum, leaving temporarily particularly bulky objects to be stored in Parutino in a warehouse under the supervision of the guard of the settlement” (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 129). At the same time, due to the presence in the Odessa Museum of a “significant collection of amphorae stamps”, the Mykolaiv Museum was obliged to send to it the corresponding “stamps” from the excavations of 1926 (Ibid., point. 2). The coins that were found were handed over for restoration to the laboratory of the State Hermitage Museum in Leningrad under the supervision and responsibility of A. N. Zograf, whom “to ask (…) to send them back to the Mykolaiv Museum with the message of their definitions” (Ibid., point. 3). A first attempt was made to perform chemical analyses of local materials, for which pieces of local clay and ceramics were selected. Osteological materials were also selected. “To send clay specimens from the Olbia locality and shards of ancient vessels of no museum importance, selected by M. P. Krasnikov and bones of animals from excavations, selected by M. I. Tyhyi for analysis and determination to the Institute of Archaeological Technology in Leningrad, asking the mentioned specialists to report the result of the study of clays, shards and bones” (Ibid., point. 4). Copies of this act were sent to the AUAC, “Ukrnauiska” (in Kharkiv), as well as to the Odessa and Mykolaiv museums.

Two days later, on September 4, by B. V. Farmakovskiy and F. T. Kaminskyi the act on transferring of 3401 objects for storage to the Mykolaiv Museum was drawn up (SAIA NASU, f. AUAC, c. 263, p. 130), and apart from the things acquired during the excavation, there were also separate occasional finds and redeemed by the expeditions from the local population.

Thus, 1926 was not only one of the most successful in the studies of ancient Olbia during pre-war period, but was also accompanied by a widespread deployment of all the previous problems that had accumulated in the links between power, sci-
scientific and museum institutions. Appointment of M. O. Makarenko, a representative of the AUAC in these excavations, quickly identified numerous contradictions that needed immediate resolution. This year, for the first time, thanks to the promised funding, a full representation of Ukrainian researchers at Olbia excavations was organized by the Archaeological Committee of the AUAS, enabling the involvement of national experts in the excavations of this ancient city.

1926 was the last year when Olbia’s excavations were conducted under the leadership of B. V. Farmakovskiy. The following year, Boris Vladimirovich was not able to lead the work of the expedition because of illness, and in 1928 shortly before the start of the field season he was gone (Farmakovskaya 1988, c. 190). The works of Olbian expedition since 1927 were managed by the Scientific Council (Крыжицкий 1985, c. 26—27; Крыжицкий, Русяева и др. 1999, c. 18—19), which consisted, as a rule, of a few representatives of both Russia and Ukraine, which became a new stage in the study of this monument of antiquity.

Thus, our findings indicate that the young archaeological science in Ukraine in the post-revolutionary period underwent a period of formation in very difficult conditions, with very little or no funding and a strong dependence on bureaucracy, which led to many misunderstandings, significantly limiting the possibility of scientific growth. This situation is especially noticeable in the efforts to create a Ukrainian national school of classical archaeology. In the first place, it influenced at the involvement of new young professionals in the study of antiquity, and in particular Olbia Pontica investigations.

Characteristic features of the described stage — taking care of the interests of a young national Ukrainian science: limitation of export of materials, the requirement to publish a report on excavations primarily in the territory of Ukraine, an attempt to educate their own specialists and researchers. This can be traced from the very beginning of the AUAC’s focus on Olbia’s research.

Of course, financial difficulties and some “temporary misunderstandings” may be regarded as minor trifles against the backdrop of scientific research in the field of archaeological investigations in Olbia at that time, but it should be noted that these “trifles” became systematic and typical over time, repeated from year to year and became the main problematic background of Ukrainian researchers, were a significant obstacle in the formation of Ukrainian circle of classical archaeology.
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ПЕРШІ РОКИ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ ДОСЛІДЖЕНЬ В ОЛЬВІЇ ПОНТИЙСЬКОЙ

Характеризуються відсутність організаційних процесів у дослідженнях Ольвії Понтійської, які проходили в перші роки становлення української національної античної археології. Головна роль у цьому належала Всесвітньому археологічному комітету при ВУАН (Київ) та представникам історико-археологічних музеїв Одеси та Николаєва. Розглядалися вопроси між офіційними керівниками академії Б. В. Фармаковським (Ленінград) та представниками українських наукових центрів. Ситуація значною мірою була змінена спілкуванням з владними органами, які розглядали археологічні дослідження як об’єкт для маніпуляцій. Характерними рисами цих процесів були визнання вкрай розвинуту бюрократизацію, яка гальмувала дослідження, а також намагання власти зіштовхувати інтереси окремих наукових центрів. Головне косяком було те, що вже на самому початку українські археологи мають значну зацікавленість у дослідженнях античної Ольвії та від- стояли інтереси розвитку молодого українського антиконосвства, яке тільки народжувалося. Автор виявив, що основна роль у вирішенні цих питань належала М. О. Макаренку — представнику ВУАКу. Вирішення численних протирічок проходило на тлі формування наукової ідеї в українській науці. Факти та процеси, описані в статті, мали значний вплив на формування організаційних принципів Ольвійської експедиції на багато десятиріч.

Ключові слова: Ольвія Понтійська, археологія, історія досліджень, формування науки.
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ПЕРВЫЕ ГОДЫ УКРАИНСКИХ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЙ В ОЛЬВИИ ПОНТЬЙСКОЙ

Статья посвящена характеристике организационных процессов в исследованиях Ольвии Понтийской, которые проходили в первые годы становления украинской национальной античной археологии. Главная роль в этом принадлежала Всеукраинскому археологическому комитету при ВУАН (Киев) и представителям историко-археологических музеев Одессы и Николаева. Рассмотрены отношения между официальным руководителем экспедиции Б. В. Фармаковским (Ленинград) и представителями украинских научных центров. Ситуация в значительной степени была усложнена обещением с органами власти, которые рассматривали археологические исследования как объект для манипуляции. Характерными чертами этих процессов необходимо признать крайне развитую бюрократизацию, которая тормозила исследования, а также стремление власти столкнуть интересы отдельных научных центров. Главный круг проблем между представителями институтов был связан с местом хранения находок, представительства украинских исследователей в составе экспедиции, авторством отчетов и распределением финансовых средств. Ярким проявлением специфических отношений власти и научной среды были почти полное отсутствие финансирования и провинциальное отношение к украинским исследователям. Доказанным следует считать, что уже в самом начале украинские археологи имели большой интерес к исследованиям античной Ольвии и отстаивали интересы развития молодого украинского антиконосвства, которое только зарождалось. Автором выявлена ключевая роль в решении данных вопросов Н. О. Макаренко — представителя ВУАК. Разрешение многочисленных противоречий происходило на фоне украинизации и общего подъема национальной идеи в украинской науке. Факты и процессы, описанные в статье, имели значительное влияние на формирование организационных принципов Ольвийской экспедиции на многие десятилетия.

Ключевые слова: Ольвия Понтийская, археология, история исследований, формирование науки.
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