

VIKTOR PETROV (1894–1969): THE SCYTHIAN ISSUE IN THE SCIENTIFIC HERITAGE OF SCIENTIST

Andryeyev V. M.

INTRODUCTION

Viktor Platonovych Petrov was born on the 10th (23rd) day of October, 1894 in the city of Katerynoslav. He studied at gymnasiums in Odessa and Chełm. After graduating from Chełm Gymnasium in 1913, he entered Kyiv University named after Saint Volodymyr, Faculty of History and Philology (Department of Slavic-Russian Philology). After graduating from the university, with a silver medal, a capable young scientist stayed at the department of the Russian language and literature as a professor's fellow. (1917–1920).¹

All his life, starting from 1919, not counting a forced break in 1942–1956, V. Petrov devoted himself to the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. He was one of the first scientists of the All-Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, working actively and fruitfully in various academic establishments. Thus, in 1919–1920 he was a secretary of the Commission for the Compilation of the Historical Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language. In January 1920 he started working as a research assistant and later as a secretary (1923–1927) and as a head (1927–1933) of the Ethnographic Commission of Academy of Sciences of the USSR, and edited various editions of the commission. In 1930 he received a PhD in Philology for his monograph about Kulish². From 1933 V. Petrov held a position of research assistant and from 1939 he was a head of the Prefeudal and Feudal Archeology of the Union of Institutions of Material Culture (since 1934 the Institute of History of Material Culture, which was subsequently reorganized into the Institute of Archeology of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic). In February 1941 the scientist became director of the newly established Institute of Ukrainian Folklore of the Academy of Sciences of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. This period of his research activity is represented by quite considerable scientific work – about 100 works³.

¹ Автобіографія Віктора Платоновича Петрова / Вступне слово та примітки В. Корпусової. *Слово і час*. 2002. № 10. Ст. 51–52.

² Петров В.П. Пантелеймон Куліш у 50-ті роки. Життя, ідеологія, творчість. Монографія. *Збірник Історико-Філологічного Відділу Української Академії Наук*. № 88. Київ, 1929. 572 ст.

³ Автобіографія Віктора Платоновича Петрова. Ст. 51-52; Петров В.П. Язык. Этнос. Фольклор. Автореферат по совокупности работ на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. К.,

During The Eastern Front of World War II, Viktor Platonovych served in the ranks of the Red Army, was an intelligence operator in the enemy rear area. In 1945–1949 he worked in the sphere of Ukrainian emigration in Bavaria. He became one of the founders of the Ukrainian Art Movement (UAM), editor of literary periodicals, teacher at the higher educational establishments of Ukrainian emigration (Ukrainian Free University, The Theological Academy of Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church, Ukrainian Technical and Economic Institute), and worked extensively scientifically. Formally, until 1950, V. Petrov served in the Ministry of Foreign Trade of the USSR as a research assistant. In 1950–1956, after a mysterious return from Germany, this scientist worked as a researcher at the Institute of Material Culture History of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in Moscow, and from December 1956 until his death (June 08th, 1969) he worked at the Institute of Archeology of the Academy of Sciences of the the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic⁴.

Petrov's first archaeological research started in the pre-war years and was related to the Trypillian culture. The scientist discovered and interpreted the Late Trypillia monuments of the so-called Horodskyi type. At the same time, he was one of the first who drew attention to the culture of “burial fields”, discovered by the prominent Ukrainian archaeologist V. Khvoyko, later known as Zarubints culture (III century BC – II century AD) and Chernyakhov culture (III – V century AD). In general, V. Petrov made considerable efforts to study and introduce the heritage of his predecessors, first of all V. Khvoyko, into the scientific circulation. In the late 1930s, he initiated the creation of a group of researchers to study these cultures which were directly related to the issue of Slavic ethnogeny. According to the plan of the scientist the result of large-scale work was to become a collective work in several volumes, which was to be published by the Institute of Archeology. The war prevented the publishing of the materials worked out and prepared for printing by a team of scientists led by V. Petrov. But all the achievements of this group of researchers became the basis of a series of volumes published in the postwar years from the series “Materials and Studies in Archeology of the USSR”. After the war, the scientist, while studying the Chernyakhov culture, carefully studied the settlements of the early Slavic period of VI – VIII centuries, as well as the monuments of Kyiv Rus'⁵.

1966. 62 ст.; Віктор Платонович Петров. *Український історичний журнал*. 1969. № 9. Ст. 158; Березовський І. Визначний дослідник. *Народна творчість та етнографія*. 1970. № 6. Ст. 57–58; Франко З. Він не встиг написати мемуарів. *Київ*. 1984. № 12. Ст. 84–85; Франко З. Людина покликання та обов'язку. *Літературна Україна*. 1984. 1 листопада. № 44 (4089). С. 5 тощо.

⁴ Толочко П.П. Віктор Петров – дослідник українського етногенезу. *Петров В. Походження українського народу*. К.: МП «Фенікс», 1992. Ст. 3-4; Блокін С. Довкола таємниці. *Ibid.* Ст. 165–192.

⁵ Толочко П.П. Віктор Петров – дослідник українського етногенезу. *Ibid.* Ст. 4; Його ж. Слово про В.П. Петрова – видатного українського археолога. *Проблеми походження та історичного розвитку слов'ян. Збірник наукових статей присвячений 100-річчю з дня народження Віктора Платоновича Петрова*. Київ–Львів: «РАС», 1997. Ст. 6.

V. Petrov started studying the Scythology issues in the 1940s. The history of the Scythians was in the range of his scientific interests in connection with the study of the Ukrainian and Slavic ethnogeny. The Scythian plot was reflected both in the special works of the researcher and in the corresponding sections of his monographs devoted to the origin of the Ukrainian people and Slavs. He outlined the basic principles of his original concept of the history and ethnogeny of the Scythians in a lecture “The origin of the Ukrainian People” (1947), which was published only after his death in 1992⁶.

In the future, the researcher developed his views in a number of works, such as “Scythian Genealogical Legend”⁷, “From the Ethnonymy and Toponymy of the Northern Black Sea”⁸, “The Ancient Slavs and Their Origins (Before the Issue of Slavic Ethnogeny)”⁹, “The Scythians. Language and Ethnicity”¹⁰, “Ethnogeny of the Slavs. Sources, state of development and problems”¹¹, etc. Thus, it may be affirmed that the Scythian theme occupied a prominent place in the scientific work of V. Petrov, but was not the main one. However, with rare exceptions, researchers of the scientist’s life and work have bypassed this significant component of his intellectual biography¹². So in this paper we will try to correct this omission of modern historiography.

The methodological basis of the scientist’s research was the theory of academician M. Marr. In the 1930s, working at the Institute of Material Culture, V. Petrov, like many other scientists, stood for glotogonic theory that emphasized the autochthonous development of peoples and opposed the migrations concepts of the Western scholars. The basis of theory established a postulate that linguistic genesis proceeded by mixing and

⁶ Петров В. Походження українського народу.

⁷ Петров В.П., Макаревич М.Л. Скифская генеалогическая легенда. *Советская археология*. 1963. № 1. Ст. 20–31.

⁸ Петров В.П. Из этнонимии и топонимии Северного Причерноморья. *Материалы по археологии Северного Причерноморья*. Одесса, 1962. Вып. 4. Ст. 230–238.

⁹ Петров В. Давні слов’яни та їх походження (До проблеми слов’янського етногенезу). *Український історичний журнал*. 1963. № 4. Ст. 36–44.

¹⁰ Петров В. Скіфи. Мова і етнос. К., 1968. 149 ст.

¹¹ Петров В. Етногенез слов’ян. Джерела, стан розвитку і проблематика. К., 1972. 214 ст.

¹² Андреев В. Віктор Петров: Нариси інтелектуальної біографії вченого. Дніпропетровськ: Герда, 2012. Ст. 256–292; Його ж. Скіфська генеалогічна легенда в інтерпретаціях Віктора Петрова. *Південний архів. Історичні науки*. Херсон: Вид-во ХДУ, 2009. Вип. 31/32. Ст. 15–29; Його ж. Віктор Петров: «скіфський сюжет» інтелектуальної біографії. *Український історичний журнал*. 2010. № 2. Ст. 190–202; Його ж. Віктор Петров: вирішення проблеми скіфської мови у науковому спадку вченого. *Гуманітарний журнал*.

Дніпропетровськ, 2010. Вип. 3/4 (літо-осінь). Ст. 30–38; Його ж. Скіфська державність у працях В. Петрова: політичний та етнічний аспекти. *Література та культура Полісся*. Ніжин: Вид-во НДУ ім. М. Гоголя, 2011. Вип. 63. Ст. 92–98; Його ж. Антична доба в історії України в контексті «теорії епох» В. Петрова. *Наукові праці. Історія*. Миколаїв: Вид-во ЧДУ ім. Петра Могили, 2012. Вип. 195 (Т. 207). Ст. 70–74; Andryeyev V., Karjaka O. Problems of the Baltic-Slavic Linguistic unity and Ancient Prussian language in the scientific heritage of Victor Petrov. *Східноєвропейський історичний вісник*. Вип. 10. 2019. Ст. 8–17.

“crossing” languages. From this it turned out that all peoples were formed autochthonously. According to M. Marr’s teachings, language, culture, race, religion, etc. are historical categories, and cultures and languages, including ancient ones, were not merely mixed but also class in nature¹³. In addition, Marr has strongly advocated interdisciplinary research that should combine the efforts of linguists, archaeologists and other humanitarians. The new complex science was called “Japhetic theory”¹⁴. V. Petrov also insisted on solving the issues of ethnogeny of any people, including the Scythians, applying a comprehensive approach with the use of data of linguistics, archeology, history and ethnography. As a versatile scientist, he successfully applied multidisciplinary approaches in his own research¹⁵.

In the 1950s and 1960s, while studying the Scythians, V. Petrov applied Marr’s approaches in his ethnogenetic studies, at the same time warning against the uniquely simplified and general interpretation of the theoretical works of M. Marr and his followers¹⁶. According to the scientist, the purpose of historical studies of ethnos is to reproduce the peculiarities of the condition of a certain humanity in the presence of all sources – language, culture, socio-economic system objectively and completely and to determine its position in the genetic sequence: “Preference should not be given to autochthonism and not migrations as such, but historicism above all”¹⁷.

1. The Issue of the Scythian language in the research of V. Petrov

First of all, addressing the issue of the origin of the Scythians, the scientist considered the issue of the Scythian language. For V. Petrov, as a linguist, the Scythian period was the starting point, because precisely at that time the written sources provided material of specific historical content for the first time, i.e. preserved language was defined in time and space. Linguistic analysis in his work covers categories of names referring to the names of the Scythian deities, tribes and hydronyms of Scythia according to ancient sources¹⁸. V. Petrov’s researches are based on the wide involvement of Indo-European language material, which expands the range of etymological parallels for the names of the Scythian era and

¹³ Юсова Н. Становлення радянської етногенетики (в світлі глотогонічної теорії М. Марра). *Проблеми історії України: факти, судження, пошуки. Міжвідомчий збірник наукових праць*. Вип. 15. К.: Інститут історії НАН України, 2007. Ст. 172–174.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* Ст. 170–171.

¹⁵ Браїчевський М.Ю. В.П. Петров – учений-універсал. *Археологія*. 1990. № 3. Ст. 95–100.

¹⁶ Юсова Н. Становлення радянської етногенетики. Ст. 176.

¹⁷ Петров В. Етногенез слов’ян. Ст. 118.

¹⁸ Петров В. Скіфи. Мова і етнос. Ст. 50–114.

“breaks the monopoly of Scythian-Iranian correspondences”, characteristic of the researches of the previous time¹⁹.

According to the scientist, modern Scythology went a wrong way categorically accepting the Iranian language of the Scythians. Thus, examining the historiography of issue, he analyzed the researches of his predecessors, beginning with K. Mullenhof and W. Miller (founders of the study of the Scythian language, who established the Iranian language of the Scythian world). The researcher believed that the Iranian-Ossetian concept of Mullenhof-Miller, which originated in the second half of the nineteenth century²⁰, was supported by the following generations of researchers (F. Justi, V. Tomaschek, I. Markvart, M. Vasmer, V. Abaev, J. Harmatta, L. Zgusta) and acquired the value of the historiographic norm, and the thesis of the Iranian language of the Scythians was transformed into a principle of methodology. Most archaeologists unconditionally accepted this position. But this approach was considered false by the scientist, because “it does not take into account the question of studying the preserved language whose ethnic is unknown.” In his view, these researchers ignored this fact and considered the language of the ancient population of the Dnieper as a predetermined. Thus, “the unknown was proclaimed known,” and the contingent assumption, “which was yet to be proved, transformed into an unbreakable dogma.” Thus, in Scythology, a kind of “Pan-Iranism” was established. Thus, the famous Iranian scientist V. Abaev proclaimed: “Anything that is not explained from the Iranian, in most, is not explainable at all²¹.”

However, none of the following researchers dared to point out the incorrectness of similar statement of a question from Petrov’s point of view. He also believed that the instructional technique, “based on the principle of monolingual convergence, explaining the preserved Scythian and Sarmatian language with the help of Iranian”, was clearly unacceptable. The scientist insisted that the comparative-historical method requires “the attraction of all those languages that are part of the examined linguistic community”, and with the help of monolingual Iranian-Ossetian analogies it is impossible to prove that “the Scythians are Iranians and that they are the direct historical ancestors of the Ossetians”²².

¹⁹ Петраускас О.В. Балто-слов’янські відносини за роботами Віктора Платоновича Петрова. *Проблеми походження та історичного розвитку слов’ян. Збірник наукових статей присвячений 100-річчю з дня народження Віктора Платоновича Петрова*. Київ-Львів: «РАС», 1997. Ст. 20–21.

²⁰ Müllenhoff K. *Über die Herkunft und Sprache der pontischen Skithen und Sarmaten. Monatsberichte der K. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. 1866. S. 549–576; Міллер В. Осетинские этюды. Ч. 1–3. М., 1881–1887.

²¹ Абаев В.И. Осетинский язык и фольклор. М.; Л., 1949. Т. I. Ст. 37.

²² Петров В. Скіфи. Мова і етнос. К., 1968. Ст. 6–33; Петров В. Етногенез слов’ян. Джерела, стан розвитку і проблематика. К., 1972. Ст. 207–208.

In his works, the scientist consistently proved that the Scythian language is not Iranian and “especially not Pro-Ossetian”. In his opinion, it was an independent language, one of the Eastern Indo-European languages, which shows “the closest affinity with the languages of the adjacent territories, according to its geographical location: in the East – Indo-Iranian, in the North – with the Baltic and in the South-West – with the Thracian”²³.

In the 1940s-1960s, as today, most scholars acknowledged the Iranian language of the Scythians, and similar attempts of V. Petrov to refute the points of view established in historiography, required a remarkable scientific courage and self-righteousness. After all, any attempts of individual scientists to violate the “Iranism” of the Scythians received a rather sharp response from the monolithic groups of Scythologists and Iranists. Thus, for example, only for doubts about the existence of “Iranian unity”²⁴, the leading Ukrainian archaeologist E. Chernenko became the object of criticism of colleagues for the fact that he “without any motivation proclaims the existence of Iranian unity as “problematic”. So, the majority of the scientific community remained at their former positions and did not share the views of V. Petrov.

However, the Ukrainian archaeologist, M. Brichevskyi, supported the findings of the researcher. Thus, he pointed out, referring to V. Petrov’s research that the existing statement that the Scythians spoke the Iranian language was not confirmed; he affirmed that the Scythians were a separate Indo-European people with their own language, which had much in common with the languages of the Iranians, Thracians, Balts, Slavs and Indo-Aryans. Following V. Petrov, he noted that the proclamation of the Scythians as “Iranians” was based on the use of a false methodology: Accepting the Iranian hypothesis a priori, the researchers looked for comparative material for interpreting the Scythian glosses and onomastic names only in the languages of the the Iranian group²⁵.

Therefore, V. Petrov became a harbinger of new searches in the language archaism of Prypontida²⁶ in the native Scythology, as he raised doubts about the postulate of the Scythian’s was the Iranian language²⁷. The

²³ Петров В. Етногенез слов’ян. Ст. 207–209.

²⁴ Яценко И.В., Раевский Д.С. Некоторые аспекты состояния проблемы (обзорная статья). Круглый стол «Дискуссионные проблемы отечественной скифологии». *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1980. № 5. Ст. 105).

²⁵ Брайчевський М.Ю. «Русские» названия поргов у Константина Багрянородного. *Земли Южной Руси в IX–XIV вв. К.*, 1985. Ст. 22–23.

²⁶ Корпусова В.М. В.Петров (Домонтович): етногенетика як свобода самовиявлення. *Слово і час*. 2002. № 10. Ст. 24.

²⁷ Петров В. Походження українського народу. К. МП: «Фенікс», 1992. 192 ст.; Петров В. Скіфи. Мова і етнос. К., 1968. 149 с.; Петров В. Етногенез слов’ян. Джерела, стан розвитку і проблематика. К., 1972. 214 ст.

researches of the Indo-European linguistics later came to the conclusions similar to scientist's opinions.

With his new approaches to seemingly resolved issues, V. Petrov stimulated further development of the Scythology and creation of new approaches and theories. Thus, the Indo-Aryan hypothesis demonstrating the idea of resettlement of Indo-Aryan peoples in the East Pnyasovia, had been developing in 1920s–1940s, but was finally stated and formulated in the works of the prominent Moscow linguist O. Trubachov in 1970s–1990s. The researcher, localizing the ancestral homeland of Indo-Iranian peoples in the Eastern Europe, considered that after the division of this community into Indo-Aryan and Iranian languages, a part of Indo-Aryan peoples continued to live on the south of the Eastern Europe and was assimilated with the Scythians spoke Iranian language. Despite of assimilation, the Indo-Aryan language layer, determined by O. Trubachov based on the materials of onomastics of the North region of the Black Sea, toponymics, etc., was sufficiently noticeable on the general Iranian background, showing language diversity of peoples living in Scythia²⁸.

Moscow scientist-iranist L. Lelekov²⁹ and Leningrad researcher L. Klein³⁰ continued the work aimed at determination of Indo-Aryan component and its role in the formation of the world of Scythians and Sarmatians. They developed an idea about the presence of Indo-Aryan elements in the Scythian culture. Thus, researchers consider that a thesis that the Scythian cultural morphology is more similar with the Indo-Aryan and less similar with Iranian, causes no doubts³¹. Besides L. Klein insists on the special, “bypassing the Iranians”, similarity of the Scythians with the Indo-Aryan people. In his opinion, the sources of similarity of the

²⁸ Трубащов О.Н. О синдах и их языке. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1976. № 4. Ст. 39-63; Його ж. Лингвистическая периферия древнейшего славянства. Индоарийцы в Северном Причерноморье. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1977. № 6. Ст. 13-28; Його ж. «Старая Скифия» (Αρχαία Σκυθία) Геродота (IV. 99) и славяне. Лингвистический аспект. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1979. 4. Ст. 29-45; Його ж. Выступление на круглом столе «Дискуссионные проблемы отечественной скифологии». *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1980. № 5. Ст. 117–118; Його ж. Indoarica в Северном Причерноморье: Источники. Интерпретация. Реконструкция. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1981. № 2. Ст. 3-21; Його ж. Indoarica в Скифии и Дакии. *Этногенез народов Балкан и Северного Причерноморья*. М., 1984. Ст. 148–152; Його ж. Этногенез и культура древнейших славян. Лингвистические исследования. М.: Наука, 2003. Ст. 74–75, 165–166 тощо.

²⁹ Лелеков Л.А. R. Girshman. L'Iran et la migration des Indo-Aryens et des Iraniens. *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1978. № 5. Ст. 225; Його ж. Выступление на круглом столе «Дискуссионные проблемы отечественной скифологии». *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1980. № 5. Ст. 125–128; Його ж. Проблемы индоиранских аналогий к явлениям скифской культуры. *Скифо-сибирское культурно-историческое единство*. Кемерово, 1980. Ст. 122–123 тощо.

³⁰ Клейн Л.С. Откуда арии пришли в Индию. *Вестник Ленинградского университета*. 1980. Вып. 4 (20). Ст. 35–40; Його ж. Третья гипотеза о происхождении скифов (Выступление на круглом столе «Дискуссионные проблемы отечественной скифологии»). *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1980. № 6. Ст. 72–74; Його ж. Индоарии и скифский мир: общие истоки идеологии. *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1987. № 5. Ст. 63–82 тощо.

³¹ Лелеков Л.А. Выступление на круглом столе «Индоарии и скифский мир: общие истоки идеологии». *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1987. № 5. Ст. 86.

Scythians and Indo-Aryan people relate not to the first, as it had been considered before, but to the second millennium BC³².

Besides, investigating ethnogeny of Slavs and in this connection binding the Scythians, Slavs Ukrainians from the point of view of language and culture, V. Petrov expressed some opinions that in some degree conform with proofs of other scientists (linguists and anthropologists), that the population of Ukraine absorbed the Scythian understratum³³.

2. The Issue of Ethnogeny of the Scythians

Certainly, the most important and at the same time controversial aspect of the Scythian issue was the issue of ethnogeny of the Scythians and Scythian culture. In 1940–1960 in his “Scythian Studios” V. Petrov insisted on the autochthony of the Scythian population in the territory of Ukraine. He wrote: “They (Scythian – *A.B.*) is a ethnogenetic product of development of previous (Post-Trypillian, Pre-Scythian) period, next, late period of deformation of aboriginal people, that had been formed in Ukraine in Usativsko-Horodske Post-Trypillia”³⁴. Therefore, the scientist firmly stood for aboriginal-Ukrainian origin of Scythians, although, in his opinion, the imperial Scythian had been iranized due to a long-term staying in Iran. His point of view in this matter organically blended in with discussions of that time between supporters of two hypothesis, which could be called “migrational” and “autochthonous”.

“Autochthonous” or “Timber-grave”/“Volga” hypothesis of the origin of the Scythians for the first time was proposed by the Finnish archaeologist A. Tallgren in 1926³⁵ and developed by Leningrad scientist M. Artamonov (student and supporter of academician M. Marr). In the future this theory was supported by Moscow scythologists B. Grakov, G. Melyukova, O. Krivtsova-Grakova³⁶ and others. Supporters of the “autochthonous” theory based their argument on the idea of the Scythians

³² Клейн Л.С. Индоарии и скифский мир: общие истоки идеологии. Ст. 82.

³³ Кухаренко Ю.В. К вопросу о славяно-скифских и славяно-сарматских отношениях. *Советская археология*. 1954. Т. 19. Ст. 111–120; Зализняк А.А. Проблемы славяно-иранских языковых отношений в древнейший период. *Вопросы славянского языкознания*. 1962. Вып. 6. Ст. 28–45; Його ж. Контакты между славянами и скифосарматскими племенами. *Краткие сообщения Института славяноведения*. 1963. Вып. 28. Ст. 3–22; Алексеев Т.И. Этногенез восточных славян по данным антропологии. М., 1973. Ст. 256; Седов В.В. Происхождение и ранняя история славян. М., 1977. Ст. 78–100.

³⁴ Петров В. Походження українського народу. Ст. 47.

³⁵ Tallgren A. M. La Pondide Prescythique après l'introduction des metaux. *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua*. Helsinki, 1926. Vol. II. P. 223.

³⁶ Артамонов М.И. К вопросу о происхождении скифов. *Вестник древней истории*. 1950. № 2. Ст. 44–46; Граков Б. Скифы. К.: Издательство АН УРСР, 1947. 93 ст.; Граков Б.Н., Мелюкова А.И. Об этнических и культурных различиях в степных и лесостепных областях европейской части СССР в скифское время. *Вопросы скифо-сарматской археологии*. М.: Издательство АН СССР, 1954. Ст. 39–93; Кривцова-Гракова О.А. Степное Поволжье и Причерноморье в эпоху поздней бронзы. *Материалы и исследования по археологии СССР*. Вып. 46. М., 1955. С. 155, 161–162; Яценко И.В. Скифия VII – V вв. до н. э. М., 1959. Ст. 17 тощо.

consanguinity with Timber-grave culture bearers of Late Bronze Age. In their opinion timber-grave culture immediately proceeded Scythians one. But there was a difference in opinion among the supporters of “autochthonous” theory. Thus, M. Artamonov considered the timber-grave tribes to be ancestors of Scythians, but the formation of the triad (the concept “Scythian triad” was introduced into scientific parlance in the early 1950’s. M. Artamonov, referring to the Scythians of Dnieper, Crimea and Transnistria, noted that they had in common only some types of weapon, trappings and personal outfit, in the decoration of which images of animals were used. For the first time this term was used by B. Grakov and G. Meliukova, after which it became quite widespread in the scientific and popular science literature. The Scythian Triad combines the most striking elements of the material culture of the Scythians – weapon, trappings and animal style in art. This term has become a convenient and understandable “business card” of the Scythians. The Triad during Scythian period existed on a large territory from the Northern Black Sea Region to Tuva and the Minusinsk Hollow). It provided the Scythian culture with a characteristic look. The formation of the triad, from the point of view of M. Artamonov, took place not on a local basis, but during the stay of the Scythians in Western Asia under the direct influence of the culture of the region³⁷. According to B. Grakov, it was the Timber-grave culture that underwent significant changes during the transition from the Bronze Age to the Iron Age, and became the basis of a purely Scythian culture, the formation of which was reflected in the “transitional” monuments of the Montenegro and Novocherkassk type³⁸.

A special place belongs to the hypothesis of L. Klein. The scientist reasonably believes that he proposed the “truly autochthonous” hypothesis back in 1951. Relying on a wide range of sources, including archeological sources, he insistently proved the thesis about the genetic connection of the Scythians of the king with the bearers of pre-Caucasus Catacomb culture³⁹. Despite the fact that the point of view of this outstanding scientist was not recognized by most archaeologists, we mention it for the sake of

³⁷ Артамонов М.И. Киммерийцы и скифы (от появления на исторической арене до конца IV в. до н. э.). Л., 1974. Ст. 7, 34.

³⁸ Граков Б.Н., Мелюкова А.И. Об этнических и культурных различиях в степных и лесостепных областях европейской части СССР в скифское время. Ст. 66, 93; Граков Б.Н. Скифы. М., 1971. Ст. 23.

³⁹ Клейн Л. С. Территория и способ погребения кочевых скифских племен по Геродоту и археологическим данным. *Археологический сборник Государственного Эрмитажа*. Вып. 2. Л., 1961. Ст. 45–56; Його ж. Происхождение скифов царских по археологическим данным. *Советская Археология*. 1963. № 4. Ст. 27–35; Його ж. Легенда Геродота об азиатском происхождении скифов и нартский эпос. *Вестник древней истории*. 1975. № 4. Ст. 14–27; Його ж. Проблема «Х». *Проблемы скифо-сибирского культурно-исторического единства*. Кемерово, 1979. Ст. 18–22; Його ж. Третья гипотеза о происхождении скифов (Выступление на круглом столе «Дискуссионные проблемы отечественной скифологии»). *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1980. № 6. Ст. 72–74; Його ж. Индоарии и скифский мир: общие истоки идеологии. *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1987. № 5. Ст. 63–82 та ін.

completeness of coverage of the historiography of the issue and “scientific truth”.

The “migration” concept was actively supported by the Kyiv archeologists V. Iliinska, O. Terenozhkin and their followers. According to Herodotus, the researchers linked the emergence of Scythian tribes in Eastern Europe with their advance from the deep regions of Asia⁴⁰. According to O. Terenozhkin there was no succession, neither ethnic nor cultural, between the population of the Northern Black Sea of the pre-Scythian and Scythian period – Scythians came to these territories in the VII century. BC. and they brought with them mostly already formed culture⁴¹. So, it should be noted that from Herodotus and to modern researchers, the historical version of the emergence of the first Scythians in the Northern Black Sea (their arrival from Asia under the pressure of the Massagetae), traditionally enjoyed great confidence, at least with regard to one of the possible components of the formation of the Black Sea Scythian culture⁴².

However, despite all the incompatibility, at first glance, of the two concepts of ethnogeny of the Scythians, there are certain common features in the views of their adherents. After all, most Scythologists, no matter what concept they adhere to, believe that the formation of Scythians occurred as a result of interaction between local and foreign population. Thus, the differences between the “autochthonists” and the “migrationists” consisted only in a different assessment of the ratio of local and foreign components of the Scythian ethnic group and in determining the territory from which the migration from the East began⁴³.

Through the lens of the fact that the Scythian population is autochthonous in the territory of Ukraine, V. Petrov considered the Scythian genealogical legend⁴⁴. His interpretation of this legend was based on a wide range of written sources (writings by Herodotus, Diodorus Siculus, Valery Flack) and archeological sources (decorative art of the Northern Black Sea), analysis of the ethnonyms and toponyms of the Northern Black Sea, and was generally known. In Soviet literature of the 1920s and 1970s, economic-ethnic and ethnic interpretation of the legend

⁴⁰ Тереножкин А.И. Киммерийцы. К.: Наукова думка, 1976. 220 ст.; Ильинская В.А. Скифы Днепровского лесостепного Левобережья. К.: Наукова думка, 1963; Ильинская В.А. Скифия VII – IV до н. е. К.: Наукова думка, 1983. 378 ст.

⁴¹ Тереножкин А.И. Киммерийцы. Ст. 208.

⁴² Алексеев А.Ю. Хронография Европейской Скифии VII–IV веков до н.э. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Государственного Эрмитажа, 2003. Ст. 63.

⁴³ Мурзин В.Ю. Происхождение скифов: основные этапы формирования скифского этноса. К.: «Наукова думка», 1990. Ст. 5.

⁴⁴ Петров В.П., Макаревич М.Л. Скифская генеалогическая легенда. Ст. 20–31; Петров В.П. Етногенез слов'ян. Ст. 153–159; Його ж. Из этнонимиики и топонимиики Северного Причерноморья. Ст. 230–238.

became most widespread. Almost all researchers, although to different degrees and in different ways, argued their positions, asserted the thesis about the prevalence of local agricultural elements over foreign nomadic ones⁴⁵.

Today, V. Petrov's views on the issue of the Scythians' origin appear somewhat outdated. However, according to many reputable Scythologists, the "autochthonous" hypothesis most logically combines archeology, written evidence, and concepts of related sciences without losing its scientific value⁴⁶. Thus, it is safe to say that participation in the formation of the Scythian ethnic group of the autochthonous component is not denied by the majority of scientists, and therefore there is rational kernel in the research of V. Petrov.

3. The issue of ethno-cultural and economic division of Scythia

The scientist, arguing the autochthony of the Scythian population, also insisted on the recognition of their ethnic homogeneity throughout the territory of Scythia (Steppe and Forest-steppe). In this regard, he tried to refute the principle of "economic" and "ethnocultural" dismemberment of Scythian tribes – opposition of nomadic Scythians-pastoralists to settled agricultural tribes (forest-steppe – area of non-Iranian agricultural tribes, steppe – tribal zone of Iranian-speaking nomadic pastoralists)⁴⁷. Analyzing the historiography of the issue, V. Petrov emphasizes that in this case we are talking about "historiographic standards" which are "repeated from work to work". Arguing his own point of view, the scientist refers to the new, at that time, research data of the Scythian mounds in the forest-steppe near Boryspil (excavation of V. Iliinska) and notes that the newly discovered monuments are quite identical to the steppe burial mounds of Lower Dnieper, according to signs of burial rite and material culture. Thus, the author concludes that the zonal dismemberment of the Scythian culture is archeologically unsubstantiated, and at that time the cultures of the Steppe and Forest-Steppe were the only ones. In his opinion, "... riders and horsemanship as a social stratum were inherent in the steppe and forest-

⁴⁵ Варнеке Б.В. Легенди про походження скифів. *Записки Історико-філологічного відділу ВУАН*. 1928. № 76; Семенов-Зуссер С.А. Скифи-кочовники на території Північного Причорномор'я. *Наукові записки Харківського Державного педагогічного інституту*. Т. І. Харків, 1939. Ст. 170; Артамонов М.И. О землевладении и земледельческом празднике у скифов. *Ученые записки ЛГУ. Серия исторических наук*. № 95. Вып. 15. Л., 1948. Ст. 4–5; Граков Б.Н. Скифский Геракл. *Краткие сообщения Института истории материальной культуры*. Вып. XXXIV. М. –Л., 1950. Ст. 8–9; Його ж. Скифы. М., 1971. Ст. 21–22; Штителъман Ф.М. Поселения античного периода на побережье Бугского лимана. *Материалы и исследования по археологии СССР*. № 50. 1956. Ст. 266; Болтенко М.Ф. Herodoteanea. *Материалы по археологии Северного Причерноморья*. Вып. 3. Одесса, 1959. Ст. 38–55 тощо.

⁴⁶ Яценко И.В., Раевский Д.С. Некоторые аспекты состояния проблемы (обзорная статья). *Круглый стол «Дискуссионные проблемы отечественной скифологии»*. *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1980. № 5. Ст. 111.

⁴⁷ Петров В. Етногенез слов'ян. Ст. 162–163.

steppe Scythia. So is nomadic life and farming⁴⁸. “However, it should be noted here that in fact mounds near Boryspil are now defined by Scythian scholars as “steppe” in accordance with the landscape, because along the Dnieper River there is a steppe strip almost to the breadth of Kyiv, where the mound group referred to by V. Petrov was excavated. In modern Scythology, the infiltration of the steppe equestrian population within the limits of the forest-steppe is beyond doubt, but these monuments left by the steppes are significantly different from the local burial rites.

The researcher’s next argument in refuting the concept of the zonal-geographical division of forest-steppe and steppe economic systems is Herodotus’ writing of Scythian farmers and Scythian plowmen. According to Herodotus, V. Petrov believed that the Scythian steppe territory around Olbia in the lower reaches of the Dnieper and the Bug was inhabited by Scythian agricultural tribes (Herodotus *geōrgoi* and *aroteres*). However, localization of the Scythian farmers caused some difficulties for the researchers, because according to archaeological data in the specified territories in the times of Herodotus and somewhat earlier numerous settled populations were not fixed. This discrepancy between the data of the written source and archaeological realities was later explained by V. Abaiev. Researching the issues of the Scythians *geōrgoi*, he convincingly proved that the etymology of this ethnonym comes not from the ancient Greek, but from the range of Iranian languages. In his opinion, the term *geōrgoi* hides not the Greek word with the meaning of “plowmen” but the Greek transfer of the local Scythian name *gau-varga*. Such an ethnonym finds an exact analogy in the name of another Scythian (Saka) tribe *hauma-varga*, recorded in ancient Persian cuneiform texts. The researcher suggested to derive the word *geōrgoi* from Iranian and to consider it an outraged Scythian ethnonym *gauvarga*, which should be translated “breeders” (“breeders” – *varga*, “livestock” – *gau*)⁴⁹ or “worshippers (worship) cattle”⁵⁰. Thus, V. Abaiev found out that when Herodotus “Scythians farmer” appeared near the “plowmen”, to all questions of the Greek colonists and Herodotus to the locals, as the tribe is called, they received a single answer: *gauvarga*. In the Greek transmission, this Scythian word was supposed to turn into *geōrgoi*⁵¹. So, Herodotus *geōrgoi* are the same pastoralists and there is no relation to agriculture.

⁴⁸ Ibid. Ст. 163–164.

⁴⁹ Абаев В.И. Выступление на круглом столе «Дискуссионные проблемы отечественной скифологии». *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1980. № 5. Ст. 129–130.

⁵⁰ Абаев В.И. Геродотовские *Skythai Geōrgoi*. *Избранные труды. Религия, фольклор, литература*. Владикавказ, 1990. Ст. 99–100.

⁵¹ Абаев В.И. Выступление на круглом столе «Дискуссионные проблемы отечественной скифологии». Ст. 129–130; Його ж. Геродотовские *Skythai Geōrgoi*. Ст. 99–100.

Trying to prove his own point of view and destroy the concept of zonal-geographical division of economic systems of forest-steppe and steppe, V. Petrov proposed to use ethnographic sources. Thus, in his opinion, in this case it is best to turn to the materials of Central Asia, because the peoples of this region have for a long time kept the remnants of an ancestral organization, which makes it possible to understand the individual messages left by Herodotus about the Scythians. In addition, the scientist also appeals to A. Skalkovskyi⁵² ethnographic studies of the North Black Sea Nogayans. The researcher wrote: “When talking about the Scythians, they usually talk about pastoral and agricultural tribes. They say, “the population of Scythia was divided into nomadic pastoralists and settled agricultural tribes”. Such a concept could appear only because of insufficient attention to ethnographic data, which shows that the cattle and blood and economic-property ties have some kind of crossed (here V. Petrov disputes with the famous scytologist I. Yatsenko). Economic activity depended, within the family, on the property of the head of the family. Nomadism or sedimentation, shepherding or husbandry has been linked to this, but blood affinity, tribal affiliation, and family interdependence have not been violated. It is not the tribes-economy-zones that are separated but the property-economic groups and social strata in the middle of the same tribe”⁵³. Thus, V. Petrov considers that wealthy members of society and all the owners of cattle roamed, and those of the members of the family who did not have enough livestock, the poor did not roam and engaged in farming. Thus, in his opinion, the opposite is formed between pastoralists and farmers, which was caused not by the geographical conditions of the landscape zones, but by the property difference between the two economic groups in common in clan or breeding affiliation. In the same way, the researcher also solved the “economic settlement problem”; in winter the Scythians were together (nomads and farmers) in one place adapted for a sustainable life with herds, and in the spring the wealthy cattle ranch rolled from place to winter, moving cattle from place to place, in autumn again the nomads drove the herds to wintering, “where the indescribable poor poverty remained”⁵⁴. Such views of V. Petrov in no way contradict the conclusions of modern researchers of the history of nomadic peoples of Eurasia and, in particular, the Black Sea Nogayans⁵⁵, and therefore retain their scientific value.

⁵² Петров В. Етногенез слов'ян. Ст. 165–169.

⁵³ Ibid. Ст. 166–167.

⁵⁴ Ibid. Ст. 168–169.

⁵⁵ Грибовський В.В. Ногайські орди Північного Причорномор'я у XVIII – на початку XIX ст.: Дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. іст. наук. Запоріжжя, 2006. Ст. 143–166.

The significant expansion of the archaeological source base over the last decades confirmed V. Petrov's thesis about two socio-economic massifs within Scythia. However, in modern Scythology, the fact of zonal-geographical and at the same time ethnic, division of Scythia is widely accepted. Archaeology data testify to the traditional economic orientation of the steppe to nomadic farming, and to the forest-steppe to agriculture and grain production for sale. Instead, V. Petrov's thesis on the ethnic homogeneity of Scythia is unlikely to be agreed by most researchers today. The population of the forest-steppe Scythia was probably local and has continued its development since the previous era. Regarding the steppe Scythia, then here nomadic or royal Scythians predominately Iranian-speaking were the absolute masters in VII – III centuries BC⁵⁶.

In opinion of modern Scythologists, the population of Scythia was ethnically diverse, and the Scythian ethnic group had heterogeneous character, in other words, formed on the basis of both a local component (the culture of the historic Cimmerians, formed on the basis of a convenient culture of the Late Bronze Age) and of the arrived Proto-Scythian tribes. The process of formation of the Scythian ethnic group took place within the framework of a single ethno-social organism, formed as a result of the conquest of the Proto-Scythians / early Scythians of the Cimmerian tribes. The stability of this ethno-social structure, essentially, was ensured by the presence of a military-political organization, which was an instrument of domination of the ruling top of the Scythian society, which relied on "natural" subjects, over tributary groups of the nomadic population⁵⁷.

CONCLUSIONS

Although V. Petrov's unique approach to the issue of Scythian ethnos did not find support in a scientific community (except for M. Braichevskyi⁵⁸), but was not refuted by someone (although some of the Iranians and Scythologists felt a certain hostility to the views of the researcher⁵⁹). As a result, to a certain extent, this issue remains open in Scythology⁶⁰.

V. Petrov's thesis of the existence of the Great Scythian Empire (Horse Riding) extended from the Alps to the Altai failed to stand the test

⁵⁶ Толочко П.П. Слово про В.П. Петрова – видатного українського археолога. Ст. 8.

⁵⁷ Мурзин В.Ю. Происхождение скифов: основные этапы формирования скифского этноса. Ст. 79.

⁵⁸ Браичевський М.Ю. «Русские» названия поргов у Константина Багрянородного. Ст. 19–30.

⁵⁹ Грантовский Э.А., Раевский Д.С. Об ираноязычном и «индоарийском» населении Северного Причерноморья в Античную эпоху. *Этногенез народов Балкан и Северного Причерноморья*. М.: Наука, 1984. Ст. 52.

⁶⁰ Кравченко Н., Павленко Ю. Коментар до праці «Походження українського народу». *Петров В. Походження українського народу*. К.: МП «Фенікс», 1992. Ст. 129.

of time. At most, the Great Scythia, as a political union, since its rise in V century to the first half of IV century BC covered the borders of present-day steppe and forest-steppe Ukraine, Moldova and Dobruja. At the same time, the nomadic peoples of the Scythian cultural appearance actually occupied vast, mostly steppe areas of Eurasia, from the Danube to Mongolia and northern China.

In addition, according to modern Scythology, the development of Scythian statehood had a discrete character, because not only internal but also external objects of exploitation were required for the stable development of strong nomadic formations. The latter played a significant role in the nomads as a result of the limited economic opportunities of extensive livestock farming, as well as the military superiority of the settled peoples. Throughout their history, the Scythians have not neglected such sources of income as theft and the collection of tribute from the tributary population, as well as other similar means of obtaining the products of crafts and agriculture⁶¹. Modern researchers believe that the object of exploitation of the Scythian nomads was the population of the Transcaucasia and Western Asia (at the time of the “Kingdom of Ashkuz” in VII century to the first half of the VI century BC) and agricultural tribes of the Ukrainian forest steppe at the time of the existence of the Northern Black Sea Scythia (IV century BC). In addition, the consolidation of the nomadic population of Scythia was influenced by the confrontation between the nomads and the forest-steppe farmers.

In general, today Scythologists speak about the discreteness of the development of the culture of European Scythians, which is reflected in archaeological, political, economic, and geographical data. The gap in the history of European Scythia falls in the second half of VI century BC. Archaeological materials demonstrate the absence of a gradual transition from archaic pre-classical culture. Among the most probable reasons, the researchers call the forthcoming of a new population group that brought with it new traditions in all spheres of life, which led to the termination of Old Scythia’s culture, or at least to its major transformation.

In general, we can say that although not all ideas, including in the field of Scythian studies, expressed by V. Petrov were “heard” by contemporaries or withstood the test of time. However, his works are distinguished by the breadth of their approach to ethnic issues, and they are not based on a thorough scientific analysis, not from the point of national prejudice. Thus, today and in the future the researcher of the ancient

⁶¹ Хазанов А.М. Социальная история скифов. М.: Наука, 1975. 255 ст.; Тереножкін О.І. Класи і класові відносини у Скіфії. *Археологія*. 1975. Вип. 15. Ст. 10–11; Мурзин В.Ю. Происхождение скифов. Ст. 79.

history of Ukraine, and in particular the history of the Scythians, can not do without the scientific works of a prominent Ukrainian scientist.

V. Petrov had a passion for nontrivial scientific hypotheses, which he put forward and developed in his various scientific studios. This trait could not affect the attitude of the scientific community to his work. Often it was very critical, and sometimes it was expressed in the direct rejection or ignoring of his ideas. However, today, from a certain point of view, it becomes clear what an important thing a person who constantly paid research attention to non-traditional concepts and approaches to solving scientific issues becomes aware of, because this is so often lacking in everyday scientific life.

SUMMARY

125 years since the birth and 50 years since the death of Viktor Platonovych Petrov marks in the year 2019. This Ukrainian intellectual, with extraordinary erudition and breadth of scientific interests and views, can certainly be called the outstanding figure of humanitarian thought of the XX century; he is historian, archaeologist, philologist, philosopher and talented writer among neoclassics (literary double Domontovych and Ber). However, he remains little known not only in the world scientific space, but also in its homeland. V. Petrov's multifaceted scientific heritage is covered by oblivion. The "Scythian component" of the scientist's work is not an exception, which is still out of the sight of most modern researchers. In this article the author analyses V. Petrov's views on various issues of the history of the Scythians.

REFERENCES

1. Абаев В.И. Осетинский язык и фольклор. М.; Л., 1949. Т. I. 607 ст.
2. Абаев В.И. Выступление на круглом столе "Дискуссионные проблемы отечественной скифологии". *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1980. № 5. Ст. 129–130.
3. Абаев В.И. Геродотовские Skythai Geōrgoi. *Избранные труды. Религия, фольклор, литература*. Владикавказ, 1990. Ст. 98–101.
4. Автобіографія Віктора Платоновича Петрова / Вступне слово та примітки В. Корпусової. *Слово і час*. 2002. № 10. Ст. 51–52.
5. Алексеев Т.И. Этногенез восточных славян по данным антропологии. М.: Наука, 1973. 332 ст.
6. Алексеев А.Ю. Хронография Европейской Скифии VII–IV веков до н. э. Санкт-Петербург: Издательство Государственного Эрмитажа, 2003. 416 ст.

7. Андреев В. Віктор Петров: Нариси інтелектуальної біографії вченого. Дніпропетровськ: Герда, 2012. 476 ст. (серія “Dniproviana”).
8. Андреев В. Скіфська генеалогічна легенда в інтерпретаціях Віктора Петрова. *Південний архів. Історичні науки*. Херсон: Вид-во ХДУ, 2009. Вип. 31/32. Ст. 15–29.
9. Андреев В. Віктор Петров: “скіфський сюжет” інтелектуальної біографії. *Український історичний журнал*. 2010. № 2. Ст. 190–202.
10. Андреев В. Віктор Петров: вирішення проблеми скіфської мови у науковому спадку вченого. *Гуманітарний журнал*. Дніпропетровськ, 2010. Вип. 3/4 (літо-осінь). Ст. 30–38.
11. Андреев В. Скіфська державність у працях В. Петрова: політичний та етнічний аспекти. *Література та культура Полісся*. Ніжин: Вид-во НДУ ім. М. Гоголя, 2011. Вип. 63. Ст. 92–98.
12. Андреев В. Антична доба в історії України в контексті “теорії епох” В. Петрова. *Наукові праці. Історія*. Миколаїв: Вид-во ЧДУ ім. Петра Могили, 2012. Вип. 195 (Т. 207). Ст. 70–74.
13. Артамонов М.И. О землевладении и земледельческом празднике у скифов. *Ученые записки ЛГУ. Серия исторических наук*. № 95. Вып. 15. Л., 1948. Ст. 3–20.
14. Артамонов М.И. К вопросу о происхождении скифов. *Вестник древней истории*. 1950. № 2. Ст. 37–47.
15. Артамонов М.И. Киммерийцы и скифы (от появления на исторической арене до конца IV в. до н. э.). Л.: Изд-во ЛГУ, 1974. 156 ст.
16. Березовський І. Визначний дослідник. *Народна творчість та етнографія*. 1970. № 6. Ст. 57–62.
17. Білокінь С. Довкола таємниці. *Петров В. Походження українського народу*. К.: МП “Фенікс”, 1992. Ст. 165–192.
18. Болтенко М.Ф. Herodoteana. *Матеріали по археології Северного Причорномор'я*. Вып. 3. Одесса, 1959. Ст. 38–55.
19. Брайчевський М.Ю. “Русские” названія порогов у Константина Багрянородого. *Земли Южної Русі в IX – XIV вв.* К., 1985. Ст. 19–30.
20. Брайчевський М.Ю. В.П. Петров – учений-універсал. *Археологія*. 1990. № 3. Ст. 95–100.
21. Варнеке Б.В. Легенди про походження скіфів. *Записки Історико-філологічного відділу ВУАН*. 1928. № 76. Ст. 43–68.
22. Віктор Платонович Петров. *Український історичний журнал*. 1969. № 9. Ст. 158.
23. Граков Б. Скіфи. К.: Видавництво АН УРСР, 1947. 93 ст.

24. Граков Б.Н., Мелюкова А.И. Об этнических и культурных различиях в степных и лесостепных областях европейской части СССР в скифское время. *Вопросы скифо-сарматской археологии*. М.: Издательство АН СССР, 1954. Ст. 39–93.

25. Граков Б.Н. Скифский Геракл. *Краткие сообщения Института истории материальной культуры*. Вып. XXXIV. М. –Л., 1950. Ст. 8–9.

26. Граков Б.Н. Скифы. М.: Изд-во Москов. ун-та, 1971. 202 ст.

27. Грантовский Э.А., Раевский Д.С. Об ираноязычном и “индоарийском” населении Северного Причерноморья в Античную эпоху. *Этногенез народов Балкан и Северного Причерноморья*. М.: Наука, 1984. Ст. 50–54.

28. Грибовський В.В. Ногайські орди Північного Причорномор'я у XVIII – на початку XIX ст.: Дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. іст. наук. Запоріжжя, 2006. 200 ст.

29. Зализняк А.А. Проблемы славяно-иранских языковых отношений в древнейший период. *Вопросы славянского языкознания*. 1962. Вып. 6. Ст. 28–45.

30. Зализняк А.А. Контакты между славянами и скифосарматскими племенами. *Краткие сообщения Института славяноведения*. 1963. Вып. 28. Ст. 3–22.

31. Ильинская В.А. Скифы Днепровского лесостепного Левобережья. К.: Наукова думка, 1963. 267 ст.

32. Ильинская В.А. Скифия VII–IV до н. е. К.: Наукова думка, 1983. 378 ст.

33. Клейн Л. С. Территория и способ погребения кочевых скифских племен по Геродоту и археологическим данным. *Археологический сборник Государственнго Эрмитажа*. Вып. 2. Л., 1961. Ст. 45–56.

34. Клейн Л.С. Легенда Геродота об азиатском происхождении скифов и нартский эпос. *Вестник древней истории*. 1975. № 4. Ст. 14–27.

35. Клейн Л.С. Проблема “Х”. *Проблемы скифо-сибирского культурно-исторического единства*. Кемерово, 1979. Ст. 18–22.

36. Клейн Л.С. Откуда арии пришли в Индию. *Вестник Ленинградского университета*. 1980. Вып. 4 (20). Ст. 35–40.

37. Клейн Л.С. Происхождение скифов царских по археологическим данным. *Советская Археология*. 1963. № 4. Ст. 27–35.

38. Клейн Л.С. Третья гипотеза о происхождении скифов (Выступление на круглом столе “Дискуссионные проблемы

отечественной скифологии”). *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1980. № 6. Ст. 72–74.

39. Клейн Л.С. Индоарии и скифский мир: общие истоки идеологии. *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1987. № 5. Ст. 63–82.

40. Корпусова В.М. В. Петров (Домонтович): этногенетика як свобода самовиявлення. *Слово і час*. 2002. № 10. Ст. 17–25.

41. Кравченко Н., Павленко Ю. Коментар до праці “Походження українського народу”. *Петров В. Походження українського народу*. К.: МП “Фенікс”, 1992. Ст. 114–164.

42. Кривцова-Гракова О. А. Степное Поволжье и Причерноморье в эпоху поздней бронзы. *Материалы и исследования по археологии СССР*. 1955. № 46. 166 ст.

43. Кухаренко Ю.В. К вопросу о славяно-скифских и славяно-сарматских отношениях. *Советская археология*. 1954. Т. 19. Ст. 111–120.

44. Лелеков Л.А. R. Girshman. L’Iran et la migration des Indo-Aryens et des Iranians. *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1978. № 5. Ст. 220–226.

45. Лелеков Л.А. Выступление на круглом столе “Дискуссионные проблемы отечественной скифологии”. *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1980. № 5. Ст. 125–128.

46. Лелеков Л.А. Проблемы индоиранских аналогий к явлениям скифской культуры. *Скифо-сибирское культурно-историческое единство*. Кемерово, 1980. Ст. 118–125.

47. Лелеков Л.А. Выступление на круглом столе “Индоарии и скифский мир: общие истоки идеологии”. *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1987. № 5. Ст. 86–88.

48. Миллер В. Осетинские этюды. Ч. 1–3. М., 1881–1887.

49. Мурзин В.Ю. Происхождение скифов: основные этапы формирования скифского этноса. К.: “Наукова думка”, 1990. 88 ст.

50. Петраускас О.В. Балто-слов’янські відносини за роботами Віктора Платоновича Петрова. *Проблеми походження та історичного розвитку слов’ян. Збірник наукових статей присвячений 100-річчю з дня народження Віктора Платоновича Петрова*. Київ-Львів: “РАС”, 1997. Ст. 20–25.

51. Петров В.П. Пантелеймон Куліш у 50-ті роки. Життя, ідеологія, творчість. Монографія. *Збірник Історико-Філологічного Відділу Української Академії Наук*. № 88. Київ, 1929. 572 ст.

52. Петров В.П. Из этнонимии и топонимии Северного Причерноморья. *Материалы по археологии Северного Причерноморья*. Одесса, 1962. Вып. 4. Ст. 230–238.

53. Петров В.П., Макаревич М.Л. Скифская генеалогическая легенда. *Советская археология*. 1963. № 1. Ст. 20–31.

54. Петров В. Давні слов'яни та їх походження (До проблеми слов'янського етногенезу). *Український історичний журнал*. 1963. № 4. Ст. 36–44.

55. Петров В.П. Язык. Этнос. Фольклор. Автореферат по совокупности работ на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. К., 1966. 62 с.

56. Петров В. Скифи. Мова і етнос. К., 1968. 149 ст.

57. Петров В. Етногенез слов'ян. Джерела, стан розвитку і проблематика. К., 1972. 214 ст.

58. Петров В. Походження українського народу. К. МП: “Фенікс”, 1992. 192 ст.

59. Седов В.В. Происхождение и ранняя история славян. М.: Наука, 1977. 156 ст.

60. Семенов-Зуссер С.А. Скифи-кочовники на території Північного Причорномор'я. *Наукові записки Харківського Державного педагогічного інституту*. Т. I. Харків, 1939. Ст. 168–173.

61. Тереножкин А.И. Киммерийцы. К.: Наукова думка, 1976. 220 ст.

62. Тереножкін О.І. Класи і класові відносини у Скифії. *Археологія*. 1975. Вип. 15. Ст. 3–13.

63. Толочко П.П. Віктор Петров – дослідник українського етногенезу. *Петров В. Походження українського народу*. К.: МП “Фенікс”, 1992. С. 3–8.

64. Толочко П.П. Слово про В.П. Петрова – видатного українського археолога. *Проблеми походження та історичного розвитку слов'ян. Збірник наукових статей присвячений 100-річчю з дня народження Віктора Платоновича Петрова*. Київ–Львів: “РАС”, 1997. Ст. 5–8.

65. Трубачов О.Н. О синдах и их языке. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1976. № 4. Ст. 39–63.

66. Трубачов О.Н. Лингвистическая периферия древнейшего славянства. Индоарийцы в Северном Причерноморье. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1977. № 6. Ст. 13–28.

67. Трубачов О.Н. “Старая Скифия” (Αρχαία Σκυθία) Геродота (IV. 99) и славяне. Лингвистический аспект. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1979. 4. Ст. 29–45.

68. Трубачов О.Н. Выступление на круглом столе “Дискуссионные проблемы отечественной скифологии”. *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1980. № 5. Ст. 117–118.

69. Трубачов О.Н. Indoarica в Северном Причерноморье: Источники. Интерпретация. Реконструкция. *Вопросы языкознания*. 1981. № 2. Ст. 3–21.
70. Трубачов О.Н. Indoarica в Скифии и Дакии. *Этногенез народов Балкан и Северного Причерноморья*. М., 1984. Ст. 148–152.
71. Трубачов О.Н. Этногенез и культура древнейших славян. Лингвистические исследования. М.: Наука, 2003. 489 ст.
72. Франко З. Людина покликання та обов'язку. *Літературна Україна*. 1984. 1 листопада. № 44 (4089). С. 5.
73. Франко З. Він не встиг написати мемуарів. *Київ*. 1984. № 12. С. 84–87.
74. Хазанов А.М. Социальная история скифов. М.: Наука, 1975. 255 ст.
75. Штителъман Ф.М. Поселения античного периода на побережье Бугского лимана. *Материалы и исследования по археологии СССР*. № 50. 1956. Ст. 255–272.
76. Юсова Н. Становлення радянської етногенетики (в світлі плотогонічної теорії М. Марра). *Проблеми історії України: факти, судження, пошуки. Міжвідомчий збірник наукових праць*. Вип. 15. К.: Інститут історії НАН України, 2007. Ст. 168–189.
77. Яценко И.В. Скифия VII–V вв. до н. э. М.: Наука, 1959. 214 ст.
78. Яценко И.В., Раевский Д.С. Некоторые аспекты состояния проблемы (обзорная статья). Круглый стол “Дискуссионные проблемы отечественной скифологии”. *Народы Азии и Африки*. 1980. № 5. Ст. 102–117.
79. Andryeyev V., Karjaka O. Problems of the Baltic-Slavic Linguistic unity and Ancient Prussian language in the scientific heritage of Victor Petrov. *Східноєвропейський історичний вісник*. Вип. 10. 2019. Ст. 8–17.
80. Müllenhoff K. Über die Herkunft und Sprache der pontischen Skithen und Sarmaten. *Monatsberichte der K. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. 1866. S. 549–576.
81. Tallgren A. M. La Pondide Prescythique après l'introduction des métaux. *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua*. Helsinki, 1926. Vol. II. P. 201–223.

Information about the author:

Andryeyev V. M.,

PhD hab. (History), Professor,
Professor at the Department of Ukraine's History,
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University
18/2, Bulvarno-Kudriavska str., Kyiv, 04053, Ukraine