Chapter 3

Aneta Gołębiowska-Tobiasz

Territorial and Chronological Scope of Polovtsians Stelae

The first attempts to date and determine the boundaries of the diffusion of anthropomorphic stelae took place in the mid-19th century. Previously, nobody paid particular attention to combining those monumental sculptures found *in situ*. It has been generally determined that they were found in the range of steppes from the Ural Mountains to the Danube River. In the mid-19th century A.I. Piskariiev was the first researcher to document the status of 645 registered anthropomorphic stelae. Although his study is considered to be a historical resource, it is an excellent documentary concerning the territorial scope of stone statues before 160 years ago. Half a century later the Countess P.S. Uvarova, based on collected data concerning 1133 discovered objects, developed a mapping of their locations.

For the next half-century, no one was interested in the problem of defining the limits of spread of medieval stelae in Europe, nor in attempts to date them. G.A. Fedorov-Davidov, as the only scholar guided by the methods of documentation developed by these two pioneers, marked areas where statues occurred. He also placed on the map stelae found in contemporary museum collections, which had in their records the exact description of the site where they had been found. As a result he observed concentrations of sites with statues in a clearly defined territory. The northern border, beyond which he did not record any stelae, was the forest steppe zone and upper Don. The eastern border was the Volga River, and regions of the Northern Caucasus formed the border to the south. The final border of occurrence of stelae was the Dnieper River. However, occasionally they were also found at the mouth of the Danube River. The greatest concentration of anthropomorphic stelae, attributed to the Polovtsians, was registered by the author in the lower course of the Dnieper, Seversky Donets and Don Rivers, in the area of the Azov Steppes and the Black Sea Steppes up to western areas of the Ciscaucasus (Fedorov-Davidov, 1966, 188). The researcher based the chronology of stelae on the details depicted on them and their analogues, known from burial inventories. Another dating criterion was sites where nomadic burials and fragments of broken stelae had been discovered. In the latter case, he did not notice that burial hills, in which cracked sculptures were found, were not originally associated with Polovtsian burials. Fragments of stone stelae were used as a secondary raw material to strengthen the burial mound.

Fedorov-Davidov dated all types of stelae back to the 12th – early 13th centuries (Fedorov-Davidov, 1966, 186). Based on source descriptions by Nizami and Willem de Ruysbroec, on his own specific chronology and geographical boundaries, as well as on earlier proposals by Veselovski, the researcher inclined to the opinion that the anthropomorphic statues should be linked with the Polovtsian-Kumans (western Kipchaks). He also stressed that stelae coming from the Transvolga Region, similar to such well-known monuments of the art of the Altay and Mongolia, should to be linked with the eastern tribes of Kipchaks (Fedorov-Davidov, 1966, 188-189).

S.A. Pletneva managed to determine the more or less exact origins of 913 out of 1323 exemplars of statues catalogued in her publication. She transferred this topographical data on to a map and was able, as a result, to obtain a picture of the distribution of monumental sculpture in the territory of Eastern Europe, including centres of the highest density. The concentration of sites with stelae was recorded in the middle Dnieper basin and the basin of the Seversky Donets River in its middle course, covering mainly its right-bank tributaries. A larger number of these sites was recorded along the coast of the Taganrog Bay. Smaller concentrations of statues were located at the interface between the steppe and the forest steppe in the upper course of the Seversky Donets and in the Azov Upland and Ciscaucasus. In particular, many statues were recorded in the upper course of the Kuban River. The least stelae came from the Don and Volga interfluves, lower Dnieper and Crimea. According to Pletneva, the southern limits of the occurrence of anthropomorphic statues included the Crimea, Azov area and Ciscaucasia. From the east, the zone of occurrence reached the Volga Region. The researcher pointed out that these limits were very fluid, as the Polovtsian anthropomorphic stelae occurred in the Volga Region occasionally. The northern border, beyond which no sites with stelae were detected, ran along the zone of the steppe and forest steppe. To the west, on the right bank of the Dnieper, there were no sites with sculptures *in situ*. Single statues appeared up to the left bank of the Inhulets River, used by the Polovtsians as a frontier of their lands in relation to the Rus, along the south-west part of the steppe (Pletneva, 1974a, 13, 18). B.A. Rybakov, analysing a journey made by of Al-Idrisi in 1154, divided the Black Sea Steppes into two parts: the White and Black Kumania. This division was also adopted by Pletneva in her dissertation and cited in her monograph (Pletneva, 1958, 221-223; Pletneva, 1974a, 18-19). Analysing historical sources and her own typological and comparative study, she distinguished seven federations of clans, calling them "Polovtsian associations", and assigning them to specific geographical areas. Most often, she linked their names with hydronyms or geographical names of the territories to which they were conventionally assigned. According to Pletneva, the Dnieper association included three groups of tribes: Orel, Samara and Zaporozhye, camping in the basins of the Orel River, Samara River and the left bank of the lower Dnieper

River. With time, the Lukomorsk Polovtsians also joined that association, having their pastures between the mouth of the Inhulets and Dnieper Rivers and the basin of the Molochna and Tokmak Rivers. The Crimea Polovtsian association camped on the Crimea. Donetsk clan associations included tribes occupying areas of the upper Seversky Donets (Upper Donets association), central basin of this river (Don association), and its lower basin (Lower Donets- or Donets association). The steppe area between the Lukomorye association and the Mius River was occupied by the North Azow association (**Поморское объединение** – see: Pletneva, 1974a, 22-23), which was quickly subordinated to the Donets association. The interfluvium of the central Don and Volga Rivers was occupied by the Volga Polovtsians. Territories to the south of the Sal and Manych Rivers up to the right bank of the Kuban and the left bank of lower Kuma Rivers belonged to the Ciscaucasus horde (Pletneva, 1974a, 19-23). According to Pletneva's theory, together with the stabilisation and enrichment of hordes, different weaker associations of clans were absorbed by two expansive associations: the Donets, identified with the Black Kumania (under the leadership of the Sharukan family - **Шарукан**) and the Dnieper River Basin association, corresponding to the White Kumania (under the leadership of the Burdzhogly family in Ruthenian historical sources also called Burchevitsch - **Борчевич**).¹² Pletneva has examined the composition of stelae in relation to the distribution of outcrops of various species of rocks in the territories of individual Polovtsian associations. On this basis she has concluded that stonemasons, in workshops located near quarries, were processing primarily local and easily accessible material (Pletneva, 1974a, 53). Based on a typological analysis of the classification she developed for anthropomorphic stelae, she identified the chronological framework of the emergence and disappearance of stelae, as an interval between the 10th/11th and 13th centuries. The oldest statues with archaic features were associated with steppe areas in the Volga Region, Don River Basin up to the Azov Steppes and the Seversky Donets River Basin, occupied by groups of nomads. The expansion of the nomads flourished at the end of the 10th and beginning of the 11th century. Stelae associated with the heyday of Polovtsian political power were dated back to the second half of the 12th and beginning of the 13th century. Their location includes the entire steppe region between the Volga and the Dnieper. These objects were characterised by an abundance of details, established canon of

12 Turkic böri – wolf (Siemienieć-Gotaś, 2000, 50). The nickname can be translated as: wolf-like. The Ruthenian annals provide names of kyshlyks (wintertime encampments) probably derived from names of khans regaining particular territories. One of them was named Sharukan-Tscheshuev: sharukan, in the old Hungarian language, indicates a dragon, and tscheshuev, in the Russian literary language, means scale (from the Russian чешуя) (Bubienok, 1997, 105).

poses, and diversity of materials. The most recent stelae, dating back to the 13th century, occurred in the area of Volga steppes. Despite the continued artistry in the presentation of details, these exemplars display a reduction of details of the silhouette and symbolism of some of the presentations.

After a detailed statistical analysis of all Asian and European medieval anthropomorphic stelae, L.A. Geraskova divided their occurrences into several chronological periods. Following the datings previously proposed by Ya. A. Sher and L.R. Kyzlasov for Asian stelae, Geraskova distinguished the first stage from the 6th – 8th centuries and the second stage from the 8th – 10th centuries. To the first stage she assigned four types of stelae, according to her own classification. These included anthropomorphic stelae with symmetrically arranged arms (i. e. holding a vessel in both hands) and asymmetric arms (holding a vessel in the right hand and putting the left hand on a belt). Characteristic of the second stage were statues with symmetrically arranged arms, classified by the researcher into three types of her own typology. She dated the European stelae, after Fedorov-Davidov and Pletneva, back to the 11th – 13th centuries (Geraskova, 1991, 52). She agreed with the conclusions of Pletneva concerning the borders and distribution of Polovtsian stelae in the East European Steppes. However, her greatest contribution to the study is the comparison of statues, in terms of their quantity and raw materials, with natural outcrops of various species of rock within bands of the steppe. Her detailed analysis showed that the concentration of stelae occurred in two centres. One of them was the Donetsk Upland, rich in various types of sandstone, where a concentration of stelae made of this rock was observed. The second region was a range of steppe covering the area from the northern Dnieper River Basin to the lower Priazov area, where numerous outcrops of granite and limestone were detected. Stelae found *in situ* in that area were most often made of the most readily available type of the abovementioned rocks (Geraskova, 1991, 31-33). Summing up the geological data and the analysis of the author's own typological system, Geraskova established the territorial scope of statues, separated into two "wings". The east wing covered the Donetsk Upland (now Donetsk and Luhansk Districts in Ukraine) and the Ciscaucasia (Krasnodar Krai and Stavropol Krai Districts in Russia). According to Geraskova's researches, most sculptures from that area belonged to the sitting or standing type with a pedestal. The west wing, which included the lowland areas of the Black Sea Plain from the mouth of the Danube River to the Azov Upland, the mouth Don River and the Crimea, was characterised by the predominance of standing stelae without pedestals (Geraskova, 1991, 88, 100). The east wing was identified by the author with the Black Kumania (Donets association according to the division and naming of Pletneva), and the western with the White Kumania (Dnieper association) (Geraskova, 1991, 99).

In a monograph issued several years later, K. I. Krasilnikov focused on determining the scope of anthropomorphic stelae in the Luhansk District. Most of the objects catalogued by him had a record of the place where they were

found and delivered to the nearest museum or park. The 1970s and '80s were a period of increased transport of stelae. At that time in the Ukraine, local cultural and educational institutions were established on a large scale and usually had district administrative status. A few exemplars were found *in situ*. For about 19 objects we have information preserved only in oral communications, but the author did not include them in the mapping (Krasilnikov, 1999, 86). Inclusion of the locations of 115 stelae on the map gave a possible image of their distribution in the past. According to the picture obtained in this way, the largest concentration of statues in the modern day Luhansk District was in its southern part. The conventional border of the concentration of stelae sites from the north-east was the Seversky Donets River, with all right-bank tributaries, and from the south-west the Mius River (Krasilnikov, 1999, 98). The resulting picture of the distribution of sites with stelae seems to be probable, when the data obtained by Krasilnikov in the scale of a micro-region compared with results of the cartographic analysis conducted for the entire area of the southern and eastern Europe developed by Pletneva and Geraskova. Determining the chronology of occurrence of stelae, the author took into account the development of the canon of silhouettes and depicted details. The analysis concerned both the collection in question and the territory of the Luhansk District. Dating of the medieval monumental sculpture was confined by Krasilnikov to the 11th – first half of 13th centuries (Krasilnikov, 1999, 26).

J. Daszkiewicz and E. Tryjarski, based on an analysis of historical and contemporary materials and publications, proposed new a definition of the scope of occurrence of anthropomorphic stelae. The authors, not being archaeologists themselves, criticised the narrow limits of the distribution of anthropomorphic statues proposed by Fedorov-Daviydov and Pletneva. According to them the sites with Turkic stelae covered areas including, from the south-west, the left bank of the lower Danube, the basin of the Dniester River and the basin of the middle and lower Dnieper (Dniester-Dnieper interfluvium). From the west, statues occupied the central area of the Podolia to the right bank of the Dnieper River. According to the authors, the scope of occurrence of sculptures should be marked up to the "north of Kiev". Next, the border ran on the left bank of the middle Dnieper, including Poltava, Tschernikhov and Kharkiv. From the north-west the scope of occurrence of stelae ran far beyond the forest steppe zone, reaching the Oka River Basin and the western borders of the city of Moscow. The north-eastern zone of the sculptures included the Volga Basin River, Astrakhan and Orenburg Steppes. From the south, statues bordered with the North Caucasus and Crimea (Daszkiewicz, Tryjarski, 1982, 86-97). The authors based their argument on pre-revolutionary data and on information concerning stone stelae mentioned by scholars of the first half of the 20th century, ignoring the brevity of such information which was restricted to a descriptive determination of the amount of stone sculptures. These records are

characterised by the lack of exact find sites, description of stelae and discovery context. There is no information whether, at the time of documenting, the stelae were located on mounds or were found during excavations in the shell of a mound, or moved from another location, etc. This context is extremely important in determining the cultural affiliation and dating of statues. The researchers did not distinguish Kipchak stelae occurring on the Transvolga Region (including the Orenburg Steppes), executed in a different manner and within the adjustable cult-sacrifice places of a different design than the statues erected within the other temple complexes in Black Sea Steppes. They accepted as credible the information coming from historical sources concerning the location of statues, taking uncritically for granted, for example, locations of objects standing near Moscow, in Chernihiv or Kiev as the *in situ* location (Daszkiewicz, Tryjarski, 1982, 91, 94). The extension of the area of occurrence of anthropomorphic statues to territories that were never in the range of Turkic camps (e. g. dense forest ranges, wetlands areas, poor river networks, etc.) resulted from the recognition of the methodology of archaeological research as an insufficient source, presenting the narrower scope of actual occurrence of stelae. However, the authors themselves did not notice the subjectivity of historical sources upon which they built their own concept of the territorial distribution of stone stelae. They made no effort to describe how they examined the sources, whether the cited travellers (or as frequently cited scientists, such as A. V. Tereshchenko) had reported information concerning the Scythian, Kimmerian, Neolithic and finally Turkic (in the broad sense) stelae seen. According to the researchers, who based their proposals concerning dating of the Turkic stone statues in Eastern Europe on original communications of Venetian merchants of the mid-15th century and works of researchers of the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries (D.I. Ilovayskiy, N.I. Veselovskiy, V.V. Bartold), the chronological framework associated with the phenomenon of stone stelae should be confined within the range of the 6th – 15th centuries (Daszkiewicz, Tryjarski, 1982, 111-115). The lower limit is indicated by the appearance of the Proto-Bulgars at the Black Sea Steppes, recognised by the authors as the first creators of anthropomorphic sculptures. In the following centuries, according to the theory developed by these researchers, all nomadic Turkic tribes (Pechenegs, Torks, Polovtsians, early Mongol-Tatars) erected stone statues in the honour of outstanding representatives of their tribes (Daszkiewicz, Tryjarski, 1982, 195). T. Nagrodzka-Majchrzyk did not agree with that point of view (Nagrodzka-Majchrzyk, 1985, 143). According to Daszkiewicz and Tryjarski, the upper limit was the end of shamanism, which was linked with the cult of stelae. The researchers believed that stone statues were made by all Turkic peoples. They rejected the theory that the inarguable creators of anthropomorphic monumental sculptures were the Polovtsians. This theory has been proven through many years of archaeological research on nomadic sites and analysis of stone stelae in the context of places of worship, including

written sources from the middle of the 13th century (Nizami, del Carpine, de Ruysbroec). Instead, they proposed the analysis of the ethnographic data from the middle of the 19th century, which was supposed to provide evidence for the "multiethnic attribution of stone babas" and the analysis of the demographic data (Daszkiewicz, Tryjarski, 1982, 109-110). The researchers estimated, based on the analysis of written sources, that in the steppe area during the time in question (i. e. from the 6th to the 15th century) there could have been as many as 40000 exemplars of stone stelae (Daszkiewicz, Tryjarski, 1982, 79-80, 111).

This original polemic, led by the Polish Turkologist and Ukrainian historian with Russian archaeologists, has lost its relevance due to archaeological discoveries made in the last three decades. One valuable and still accurate observation made by the abovementioned authors is a comment about relocating stone stelae from their places of original exhibition, which occurred in the distant past (Daszkiewicz, Tryjarski, 1982, 67, 81-82). The only evidence of this process, reaching its apogee in the second half of the 19th century, is the concise information contained in the preserved documentation or reports made by officials of the tsarist government and, to a lesser extent, by archaeologists. This accurate observation, supported by numerous quotations from written sources, is an objective guideline for archaeologists engaged in the exploration of sites containing stelae. When a statue is found in a kurgan, the area around the site should be carefully examined in order to search for preserved architectonic stone details and pits, indicating the existence of a cult-sacrifice place. The finding of a stela or its fragments excavated from the shell of a kurgan, or even on the top of it, does not necessarily indicate that this is the statue's original setting. An object could have been relocated and re-dug in a kurgan quite recently. For example, in the "Khomutovsky Steppe" Nature Reserve (Telmanove Raion, Donetsk District, Ukraine) an anthropomorphic stela was buried vertically in the mound in the present day.

During the past several decades, archaeological research conducted in Eastern Europe has revealed several sites related to monumental nomadic sculpture. Relationships between the art of stelae and sacrifice-cult places and their cultural affiliations do not currently raise any doubts. Despite the state of publication of these complexes, the mapping of referenced sites is an excellent resource that allows the tracing of migration routes of the Polovtsians, concentration of their winter- and summertime encampments, as well as the development and changes in their structures of their temples. In the last decade, an analysis of mapping and chronological divisions of selected relics from burial inventories of the late nomads was conducted (Evglevskyi, 1998, 148, 150; Evglevskyi, Potemkina, 2000a, 158; Evglevskyi, Potemkina, 2000b, 190, 194). The authors considered typological and semantic problems in the light of some archaeological sources, and the results of their work is also useful for tracking changes in the environment of the nomads (including social changes, the inflow of new categories of objects, the evolution of selected artefacts, the

concentration of winter- and summertime encampments, etc.) and the defined borders of encampments together with indications of their centres. Comparison of the results of recent research and the abovementioned older studies indicates similarities with the boundaries developed by S. A. Pletneva.

Categories of artefacts found in late nomad burials, such as straightened bars (*распрямленные гривны*), neck bars (*шейные гривны*), sabres and steels within the chronological framework ending in the 12th to the first half of the 13th century, come from sites located within the limits outlined by the researcher. Thus, while the presence of certain types of sabres or steels within a broader chronology may raise controversies as to tribal membership, the straightened bars (*hryvnias*) occur only in burials of the Polovtsian aristocracy. Dating of that relic is confined to the 12th – 14th centuries. To this day, there is an ongoing dispute concerning the function of such objects. They were made of metal, smooth or twisted wire, and usually put in the right hand of the dead. Silver and iron straightened bars (*hryvnias*) are present in both male and female burials. Individual exemplars are made from gilded bronze and gold and are characteristic of male graves. These objects are interpreted as a symbol of dignity, the attribute of power, symbol of high birth, sign of the military hierarchy, or as a sign of the tree of life, a model of the cosmic order (Otroshchenko–Rassamakin, 1987, 32–33; Shalabudov, 1990, 118). According to this hypothesis, the straightened bar (*hryvnia*) sacralised the burial place of the deceased and helped ease their entry into the afterlife, and so indirectly was associated with the cult of ancestors. An interesting coincidence is the occurrence of burials signified with the straighten bars (*hryvnias*), in which vicinity temples with stelae were erected. The Polovtsian aristocracy were buried within separately constructed stone-ground mounds above the niche grave, usually close to the older cemetery. Creation of separated clan cemeteries was rare, and in most cases was related to the period of the Golden Horde. As a rule, older kurgans were used by digging a secondary burial in the shell of the kurgan. As already mentioned, the sacrifice-cult constructions associated with the ceremonies for departed souls were always constructed on older mounds. They were never placed at the Polovtsian burials. As the result of comparison between the distribution of sites with straightened bars (*hryvnias*) (Evgelvskiy, 1998, 150) with the map of sites with cult enclosures, the Polovtsian temples with stone constructions and pit-temples, we acquire a picture of a stable scope of encampments occupied by the Polovtsians, with centres that were good for resting after the seasonal migration with herds.

In the vicinity of such places, dead were buried and ceremonies for departed souls were performed.

Burials with straightened bars (*hryvnias*) do not cross the Inhul River from the west, nor reach the steppe and forest steppe frontier from the north. The exception is the conglomeration of these burials at the confluence of the Ros and Dnieper Rivers. In the second half of the 12th century the area was occupied by the Black Klobuk federation, which included the rich Polovtsian clans (Pletneva, 1973, 22-23;

Nagrodzka-Majchrzyk, 1985, 64-65, 74). From the east they reach the Jergeni Upland. Eastern most forward positions of straightened bars include kurgans above the upper Manych River (Stavropol Krai District, Russia and Republic of Kalmykia). The southern boundary of the occurrence of these artefacts is the right bank of the Kuban River. In the case of territories occupied by the nomads it is obvious that borders did not constitute an impassable barrier for the most active sections of the population. Therefore, there are only single sites and a few cemeteries, including the Polovtsian inventories, beyond the limits mentioned. For example, the site related to Polovtsians in the north-west direction of the conventionally defined border of encampments was a kurgan cemetery, discovered in the upper Southern Buh, explored in the pre-revolutionary period by N. E. Brandenburg (Pletneva, 1973, 23). Sites with Polovtsian straightened bars (*hryvnias*) furthest to the south-east reached the Stavropol Upland (Manych River Basin and Kuma River Basin), and did not cross the Kuban River to the south (Evgel'skyi, 1998, 150). When analysing limits of occurrence of sacrifice-cult places with both types of stelae (stone and wooden) the southern and south-eastern boundaries coincide with the sites with straightened bars. The practice never crossed the Kuban and upper Manych Rivers. Temple complexes are present in the Crimea. The Jergeni Upland is a contractual eastern border beyond which no such constructions have been detected yet. The location of cult sites does not exceed the steppe and forest steppe frontier from the north. From the west cult enclosures reached the lower Dnieper River (at the confluence of the Inhulets and the Dnieper Rivers a site with the Polovtsian temple was observed).

Most researchers, in order to establish the chronology of cult places, apply the typology of anthropomorphic stelae developed by Pletneva, because this is a framework (often the only one) allowing for the efficient establishment of a chronology. The period during which temples were erected covers the first half of 11th – the first half of the 14th centuries (e.g. Privalova, Minenkova, 1998, 63, 68; Gurkin, 1998, 35 and others). Based on the analysis of the construction several types of temples have been distinguished (Shvetsov, 1979, 208-209; Gurkin, 1987, 108; Guguyev, 2001, 79-80).

The published results of studies performed on cult places from the last two decades have proved the remarkable intuition of S. A. Pletneva. The author, writing her monograph about stelae in 1974, could not predict that findings of cult-sacrifice enclosures of the turn of the century would confirm her observations concerning the typology and the dating of stelae. She based her analysis on unreliable information. This was caused not only by incomplete catalogue descriptions of objects from museum collections, often coming from the pre-revolutionary period, but also the lack of certainty as to the actual place where the statue had been found. Despite these difficulties, conclusions drawn by Pletneva and concerning the scope of statue occurrences are still valid and it is probable that the situation will not change significantly in the coming years.

Fig. 3.1.. Cult enclosures with stone statues (red) and cave temples with wooden statues (blue).

List of sites with Polovtsians cult enclosures with stone statues and pit temples with wooden stelae. Cult enclosures with stone statues outside the cemeteries or single Polovtsian burials (marked red on the map – Fig. 3.1):

1. Chokrak, Lenine Raion, Autonomous Republic of Crimea (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
2. Dolinnoye, Bakhchysarai Raion, Simferopol District, Autonomous Republic of Crimea (Cherepanova, Shchepinskiy, 1968, 199)
3. Susanino, Saky Raion, Simferopol District, Autonomous Republic of Crimea (Olkhovskiy, 1988, 319)
4. Kairka, Chaplynka Raion, Kherson District (Kubyshev, 1988, 301).
5. Lvovo, Beryslav Raion, Kherson District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
6. Pervomaivka, Verkhniy Rohachyk Raion, Kherson District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
7. Davydovka, Yaymivka Raion, Zaporozhye District (Kubyshev, 1988, 301).
8. Radivonovka, Yaymivka Raion, Zaporozhye District (Kupriy, 1990, 144).
9. Bolshemikhaylovka, Pokrovske Raion, Dnipropetrovsk District (Shalabudov, Yaremaka, 1986, 152).
10. Aleksandrovka, Kramatorsk Raion, Donetsk District (Sanzharov, 1987, 408).
11. Tekstilshchik-Donetsk, Donetsk Raion, Donetsk District (Shvetsov, 1979, 199).
12. Shevchenkovo, Volodarske Raion, Donetsk District (Minenkova, 2004, 156).
13. Samoylovo, Novoazovsk Raion, Donetsk District (Shvetsov, 2008, 251-252).
14. Novoselovka, Telmanove Raion, Donetsk District (Shvetsov, 1979, 203).
15. Petrovskoye, Starobesheve Raion, Donetsk District (Privalova, Minenkova, 1998, 209).
16. Kamenka, Starobesheve Raion, Donetsk District (Shvetsov, 1979, 205).
17. Zhytenko, Amvrosiivka Raion, Donetsk District (Privalova, Minenkova, 1998, 67).
18. Dibrovka, Shakhtarsk Raion, Donetsk District (Privalova, Minenkova, 1998, 67).
19. Utkino (Mechetne pole), Perevalsk Raion, Luhansk District (Sanzharov, Brovender, Britiuk, 2004, 191, 196).
20. Samarskiy cemetery II, Matveyevo-Kurgansky Raion, Rostov District (Larienok, 1997, 214).
21. Yekaterinovka, Matveyevo-Kurgansky Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
22. Darievka, Neklinovsky Raion, Rostov District (Atavin, 2008, 156).
23. Tavria, Neklinovsky Raion, Rostov District (Larienok, 1998, 79).
24. Gaevka-Kaimak, Neklinovsky Raion, Rostov District (Atavin, 2008, 156).
25. Pokrovskoye, Neklinovsky Raion, Rostov District. (Larienok, 1998, 53).
26. Oktiabrskiy I, Krasnosulinsky Raion, Rostov District (Prokofiev, 2002, 119).
27. Astrakhovo, Sverdlovsk Raion, Luhansk District (Shvetsov, 1979, 206).
28. Blagovka, Sverdlovsk Raion, Luhansk District (Posrednikov, 1987, 103).
29. Kalinov, Krasnosulinsky Raion, Rostov District (Atavin, 2008, 156).
30. Repnyi, cemetery I, Kamensky Raion, Rostov District (Guguyev, 2001, 72-73).
31. Ozierki, Oktyabrsky Raion, Rostov District (Atavin, 2008, 156).

32. Chaltyrskiy I, Myasnikovskiy Raion, Rostov District (Larienok, 2002, 237).
33. Rostov on Don, Rostovskiy Raion, Rostov District (Atavin, 2008, 156).
34. Livencovskiy, cemetery VII, Myasnikovskiy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 36).
35. Balabin, cemetery I, Semikarakorskoy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
36. Semikarakorsk, Semikarakorskoy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
37. Bogoiavlienskaya, Konstantinovskiy Raion, Rostov District (Atavin, 2008, 156).
38. Holodnyi, cemetery I, Tsimlyanskoy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
39. Semionkin, Tsimlyanskoy Raion, Rostov District (Atavin, 2008, 157).
40. Potaynoy, cemetery II, Volgodonskoy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
41. Semionkin, Volgodonskoy Raion, Rostov District (Atavin, 2008, 156).
42. Kremenskaya, Kletskiy Raion, Volgograd District (Atavin, 2008, 155).
43. Volgograd, Volgograd Urban Raion, Volgograd District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
44. Piervomayskiy, Zimovnikovskiy Raion, Rostov District (Parusimov, 1997, 47).
45. Novosadkovskiy, Martynovskiy Raion, Rostov District (Atavin, 2008, 156).
46. Moskva (Naberezhnyi-Veselyi), cemetery II, Vesolovskiy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
47. Koldyri, Vesolovskiy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
48. Otradnyi, Bagayevskiy Raion, Rostov District (Atavin, 2008, 155).
49. Manychkaya, Bagayevskiy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
50. Samarskoye, Azovskiy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
51. Krasnogorovka, Azovskiy Raion, Rostov District (Atavin, 2008, 155).
52. Sredniy Egorlyk, Tselinskoy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
53. Bolshoi Burunchun, Salskiy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
54. Unknown location, Salskiy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
55. Kamennobrodskaya, Peschanokopskiy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
56. Dmitrievskaya, Kavkazskiy Raion, Krasnodar Krai District (Atavin, 2008, 155).
57. Krasnogvardeyskoye, Novoalexandrovskiy Raion, Stavropol Krai District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
58. Salsk, Salskiy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
59. Kurgan near Solenoye, Gorodovikovskiy Raion, Republic of Kalmykia (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
60. Kurgan near Podgornoye, Remontnenskiy Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
61. Chogray, Iki-Burulskiy Raion, Republic of Kalmykia (Atavin, 2008, 155).
62. Chograyskiy, cemetery IX, Arzgirskiy Raion, Stavropol Krai District (Atavin, 2008, 157).
63. Beshpagir, Stavropolskiy Raion, Stavropol Krai District (Guguyev, Miroshyna, 2002, 53 - 66).
64. Grigoripolis, Novoalexandrovskiy Raion, Stavropol Krai District (Atavin, 2008, 157).
65. Razdolnaya, Korenovskiy Raion, Krasnodar Krai District (Atavin, 2008, 155).
66. Lebedi, Kalininskoy Raion, Krasnodar Krai District (Atavin, 2008, 155).

Pit temples with wooden statues outside the cemeteries (marked blue on the map – Fig. 3.1):

- I. Novoaleksandrovka, cemetery I, Azovsky Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
- II. Tuzluki, cemetery I, Bagayevsky Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
- III. Sagvanskiy, cemetery I, Semikarakorsky Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
- IV. Novyi, Martynovsky Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
- V. Koldyri, Vesolovsky Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
- VI. Moskva (Naberezhnyi-Veselyi), cemetery II, Vesolovsky Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
- VII. Srednaya Aiula, Salsky Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
- VIII. Pervomayskyi, Peschanokopsky Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
- IX. Holodnyi, cemetery I, Tsimlyansky Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
- X. Zhukovskaya, Dubovsky Raion, Rostov District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
- XI. Novoaksayskyi, Oktyabrsky Raion, Volgograd District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).
- XII. Dorofeevskyi, Oktyabrsky Raion, Volgograd District (Gurkin, 1998, 30).