

**МЕТОДОЛОГІЯ,
ІСТОРІОГРАФІЯ ТА ДЖЕРЕЛЮЗНАВСТВО**

УДК 903'15(477.7)“18/19”

DOI 10.12958/2227-2844-2021-4(342)-4-15

Zamuruitsev Oleksii Viktorovich,

PhD (History), Associate Professor of the
Bogdan Khmelnitsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University,
Melitopol, Ukraine.
sarmat254@ukr.net
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4193-5745>

Krylova Alla Mykolayvna,

PhD (History), Associate Professor of the
Bogdan Khmelnitsky Melitopol State Pedagogical University,
Melitopol, Ukraine.
allakr2014@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9507-1818>

**RESEARCH OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONUMENTS
OF THE LATE NOMADS OF SOUTHERN UKRAINE
IN THE XIX–XX CENTURIES:
A NEW VIEW ON HISTORIOGRAPHY**

The term „late nomads” in modern science refers to several nomadic peoples who successively replaced each other in the steppes of the Northern Black Sea coast during the X–XIV centuries. Usually, these include Pechenegs, Turks (Guzovs), Polovtsians and Tatars (or Tatar-Mongols).

The problem of studying their political history, many important elements of material and spiritual culture, continues to be quite relevant today. Domestic archeology has made a significant contribution to the development of this issue.

The first works in which an attempt was made to investigate the history of these peoples appeared in the second half of the XIX century. They belonged to the pen of domestic researchers N. Aristov, I. Berezin, P. V. Golubovsky and others (Aristov, 1877; Berezin, 1864; Golubovsky, 1883). The basis of their work was a variety of written sources, including the work of Constantine Porphyry „On the management of the empire” (mid-tenth century), descriptions of the travels of the pope's envoys to the Mongol khan, the Dominican monks Plano Carpini and Rubruk (mid-thirteenth century) and numerous ancient Russian chronicles. Despite their relatively incomplete and

fragmentary nature of these reports, they became an important element of the overall historical picture of the political life of nomadic peoples in this period (Makhnovets, 1989; Kostyantyn Porphyrogenitus, 1989; Shastina, 1957).

At the end of the XIX – beginning of the XX century, domestic archeology is actively involved in these researches. Thus, in particular, M. E. Brandenburg excavated the Chernoklobutsk mounds in Poros (Right Bank of the Dnieper), V. A. Gorodtsov studied nomadic burials in the Seversky Donets basin, D. I. Yavornytsky – in the Lower Dnieper (Brandenburg, 1908; Gorodtsov, 1907; Evarnitsky, 1907).

The researchers immediately tried to determine the ethnicity of the monuments they discovered. The well-known Russian archaeologist A. A. Spitsyn took an active part in this work, dividing all the burials excavated in Poros into Pecheneg, Torche and Berendei (Spitsyn, 1899).

At the same time, in a number of works, researchers continued the initiated by A. A. Spitsyn's scientific understanding of burial mounds, trying to connect them with nomadic peoples, which are quite clearly localized in written sources of the time. When dividing the materials into groups, they are primarily due to the fact that each nation had its own special funeral rite, which was unique to him (Baran et al., 1986, p. 17).

However, for a long time, these attempts were rather isolated and fragmentary. Archaeological science came to the need to develop a fairly effective methodology and typological – chronological processing of monuments of late nomads only in the middle of the XX century, and until now it was limited to the active accumulation of archaeological material.

Giving a general assessment of pre-revolutionary research, we can determine that they were conducted by individual enthusiastic scientists and therefore were often limited and superficial. Much of the archaeological material accumulated during these years was later lost forever. Despite this, such studies marked the beginning of the study of the cultures of nomadic peoples of the tenth – fourteenth centuries. and the accumulation of scientific knowledge about them.

Further work in this direction was continued during the Soviet era. This was facilitated by certain steps taken by the Soviet government in this direction. These include decrees and regulations on the protection of historical and cultural monuments and the creation of an appropriate system of archaeological institutions, which organized and managed the relevant scientific research throughout the country.

A striking example of this was the construction of Dniproges. In 1927–1932, comprehensive research was conducted in the area of the proposed works, during which, among other things, the burials of nomads of the X–XIV centuries were discovered. In the late 1940s – early 1950s in connection with the planned construction of hydraulic structures and the creation of the Kakhovka reservoir, in areas that needed flooding, large-scale archaeological work was carried out (Grakov, 1950, p. 4–5).

Important for their continuation was the beginning of the construction of a wide network of irrigation systems throughout the South Ukraine in the mid-1960s. For scientific works in the area of their construction, the Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences organized permanent archaeological expeditions (Pletneva, 1981, p. 34–35).

Thanks to the success of domestic archeology in the 1960s and 1970s, the first generalizing works on this issue were published, which were based on a huge accumulated archaeological material. Among them, it should be noted the monograph of G.A. Fedorov-Davydov, in which the author, having studied more than 1000 known at the time, burial complexes, divided all this very significant material of the late nomads into certain dated blocks: X–XI century; XI century; end of XII – beginning of XIII century.

In the fourth block the author included materials of the XIII–XIV centuries, the time of domination and prosperity of the Golden Horde.

In addition to inventory analysis, G. A. Fedorov-Davidov developed a typology of features of the funeral series, characteristic of each of the periods. Using the distribution of monuments by chronological periods and comparing the data with information from written sources, he tried to establish possible types of burial structures that allow ethnic characteristics. It turned out that the quantitative subtypes of the so-called „pure” complexes with reliable ethnic characteristics are extremely small. The vast majority of them were represented as if „mixed” types of burials, which were the result of ethnocultural contacts of different nomadic peoples.

Typologically, such mixed features were traced in the borrowings of certain features of the tomb structure, in particular the burial chamber; means of laying the skeleton of the deceased and his horse, the orientation of the burial, etc.

Examining the burial inventory of such burials, this researcher came to the conclusion that changes in the burial complexes of nomads of the Golden Horde were associated with other nomadic ethnic groups who came with the Mongols from Siberia, which had new features, namely burials with a northern orientation, lining graves, stone calculations over graves, etc. (Fedorov-Davidov, 1966).

Research G.A. Fedorov-Davidov were continued in the works of other scientists. Among them, it should be noted the famous researcher S.A. Pletnev. which for the first time defined the main features of the funeral rite and material culture of various ethnic groups of nomads of this time, which became to some extent textbook in domestic archeology.

However, S. A. Pletnyova noted that the bulk of nomadic burials in all periods, especially in Polovtsian (XII – early XIII centuries), were mixed: Pecheneg-Torches-Polovtsian. According to her, as a result of constant population movements and mixing of different hordes in the steppes, a new funeral rite was formed, which reflected the features of the rites of all three major nomadic ethnic groups. Thus, unlike other researchers, she believed that

the meridional orientation of burials, which prevailed in the Golden Horde times among the nomadic population of southern Ukraine, actually appeared much earlier - in the Polovtsian period. Such an unusual orientation, according to the researcher, has analogies not only in distant Asian burials, but also in earlier times in the Eastern European steppes (Pletneva, 1975).

According to her, the „classical” monuments of Pecheneg culture were characterized by shallow inlet graves, with burials of the horse's head and legs to the left of the man, the western orientation of the burial, the presence of tombs-symbols (cenotaphs). Funeral equipment includes: stirrups with a blindfold, ring bridles, short straight sabers, bows with heavy medium overlays, pendants in the form of stylized birds and more (Pletneva, 1990, p. 150).

At the same time, according to S. A. Pletneva, among the burials of Pechenegs unaccompanied by a stuffed horse, more than half of the dead were imprisoned without any belongings. Among them are sometimes skeletons with a skull to the south. Most likely, the author concludes, these are burials made according to the Muslim rite. In her opinion, this indicates that Islam began to penetrate the nomadic European steppe long before the emergence of the Golden Horde (Pletneva, 2003, p. 77).

Torches burials, in her opinion, were almost indistinguishable from Pecheneg. The most characteristic feature of this group is the placement of the remains of a horse not next to a person, but on a separate longitudinal step, on the side of it, or on a special wooden ceiling of the grave. Their total number is relatively small, they differ from similar Pecheneg monuments, mainly by some features in the design of the burial chamber (the presence of a longitudinal step, a wooden ceiling) (Garustovich&Ivanov, 2001, p. 39).

They are united with the previous monuments by a whole series of common features. These include: western orientation of burials; introduction into the composition of the funeral set similar remains of a horse (head and limbs); almost the same (by type) set of inventory. This allowed some researchers to conclude that Torche burials are almost indistinguishable from Pecheneg burials (Garustovich&Ivanov, 2001, p. 41).

At the same time, in the works of S. O. Pletneva noted that such differences still exist and they are manifested primarily in the features of the funeral rite. In this case, only „pure” or „classic” torches are considered. The most characteristic feature of this group, in her opinion, is the placement of the remains of a horse not next to a person, but on a separate longitudinal step, on the side of it, or on a special wooden ceiling of the grave (Baran et al., 1986, p. 390).

In the „classical” funeral rite of the Polovtsians, the researcher singled out the presence of stones (crepes) in the construction of the tomb; dominance of the eastern orientation of burials; placing in the grave, next to a man, a whole skeleton of a horse or his stuffed animal. Funeral items are

characterized by: very curved long sabers, oval armchairs, silver and iron „rods”, earrings with a fake biconical bead, etc. (Baran et al., 1986, p. 392).

Most Polovtsian burials took place in mounds of earlier epochs, mounds of earth and stones were poured over especially wealthy Polovtsians, and a stone sculpture was placed on top.

In addition to male burials, there are also female burials. They all have a relatively rich funeral inventory: earrings, breast ornaments, pendants, metal mirrors, rings, sometimes twisted hryvnias (symbols of power). All this inventory testifies to the rather high position of women in Polovtsian society (Pletneva, 1975, p. 116–122).

From household items in the graves of late nomads of the middle of the 11-first half of the 13 century AD. there are armchairs, knives, scissors, metal mirrors, boilers, bowls, earthenware, fishing hooks. Armchairs have an open oval with curved ends, an oval or a rectangle. In some burials, including women's, there are ancient russian elements.

The nomads of this time had the following main features of the funeral rite:

- inlet graves in the mounds of earlier epochs in rectangular or oval pits. The deceased lies elongated on his back, most often in a coffin, less often in a log or wooden cemetery; often burial is accompanied by horse bones lying in anatomical order;

- burial in a rectangular pit with a step on which, as a rule, the horse was placed; the deceased was laid stretched out on his back in a coffin or on a litter;

- similar burials previous with wooden flooring;

- similar burials to the previous ones in the tomb with lining.

Almost all burials are accompanied by a variety of inventory that determines the social status of the buried (Baran et al., 1986, p. 509–511).

A special and unique element in the funeral rite is the presence of stone „women” on the mound. These stone sculptures have undergone their evolution from sculptures with a barely defined face without arms to statues with clearly defined sexual characteristics, the presence of hands, a vessel at the level of the abdomen. Sometimes the stone „women” were almost portraits. But somewhere at the end of the XII century, both among men's and women's sculptures began to be observed a certain primitivization (Pletneva, 1975, p. 153–155).

In the middle of the XIII – XIV centuries. the south-eastern part of the Lower Dnieper was captured by the Tatar-Mongols and became part of the Golden Horde, but this circumstance did not have a significant impact on the ethnic composition and cultural traditions of the region. The new conquerors quickly dissolved into the total number of local nomads. Data from modern archeology show that the nature of the funeral rite retains the main features of the Polovtsian period. This indicates the acceptability of the population of the region. At the same time, the ritual of erecting stone statues and shrines

disappears. The only find in the territory of modern Ukraine of the burial of the Polovtsian aristocracy – the Chingul mound (the middle of the XIII century) belongs to the same period.

At the same time, new features can be traced in it. They are expressed, in particular, in a wider range of orientation of graves, in a set of inventories (bone plates, quivers with original ornaments, rings, tweezers, ceramic necklaces and buttons covered with blue glaze, etc.). The number of burials without a horse is sharply increasing. Part of such burials with an orientation to the east, northeast and even north, usually with a large set of inventories, can be (assuming) attributed to the Polovtsians, and dated to the middle – the second half of the XIII century. Their emergence may be due to the general deterioration of the social and economic situation of some nomads who were under Mongol rule.

The other part of the burials, with an orientation to the west and southwest, is typical of the XIV century. Among them there are very rich burials, but in general the burials do not have a very large set of inventories or it is absent at all. The appearance and gradual spread from the end of the thirteenth century among the nomadic population of the Lower Dnieper without inventory burials with a characteristic orientation to the east, can be associated with the adoption of Islam in the nomadic environment.

Thus, the funeral rite of the late nomads of the mid-XI – first half of the XIII century carries elements of various funeral rites. The available inventory makes it possible to determine the ethnic and social affiliation of the buried.

Orientation of the buried is known to be only part of the funeral ritual and is observed not only within the „ethnic territory”, but also outside it. For this reason, revealing, as far as possible, the ethnocultural features of the Turks and Mongols, modern researchers have been able to justify and propose a specific ethnocultural attribution of different groups of nomads in Eastern Europe on archaeological evidence.

Among scholars, at that time there was some controversy about certain features of the funeral rite of different groups of late nomads. In particular, the work of domestic scientist A. G. Atavin, published in the 1980s, is devoted to this issue.

She, in particular, touches on the problem of typology of the remains of the legs of a stuffed horse in late nomadic burials. According to his conclusions, the articulation of the legs on the first and second joints is a sign of Pecheneg and Torche burials, and the articulation of the horse's skeleton on the third joint, as well as the burial of an entire horse's skeleton, was characteristic of Polovtsians. Thus, in his opinion, this funeral custom was a certain „ethnochronological” feature (Atavin, 1984).

He was objected to by S. A. Pletnyova, who believed that the burial with the third type of articulation of the horse's legs and the burial of his full skeleton was not an ethnic but a social feature, and it could be used to bury

any more or less wealthy nomad, regardless from his ethnicity (Pletneva, 2003).

Another controversial issue of that time was the problem of the origin and attribution of a separate group of burials of nomads in graves with linings. Many researchers, faced with the problem of determining the ethnicity of such burial structures, pointed to very similar monuments in Central Asia, in the early Middle Ages. The spread of these types of burials in the Golden Horde was associated with the possible transfer and spread of this tradition, along with its bearers, who came from the traditional habitats of the Genghisids. The existence of a similar method of burial in the medieval Mongols indicate the data of medieval sources (Garustovich, 2001).

The presence of non-inventory burials of the Golden Horde, some experts have considered as evidence of the presence of foreign ethnic components in a homogeneous nomadic environment, or the possibility of their correlation with the burials of the Islamic population is not excluded (Gening et al., 1990, p. 36–37).

The same type is widespread in early medieval Muslim necropolises. Thus, the researcher E. A. Khalikova, describing the canons of the funeral rite of Muslims, also pointed to this type of burial, as one of the main requirements of Islam to the funeral rite (Elnikov, 2004, p. 84-85).

The problem of correlation of different groups of burial monuments of the nomadic population of the modern South of Ukraine is reflected in the works of the domestic scientist O. O. Dobrolyubsky. Assessing the probable causes of mixing different forms of funeral rites, he hypothesized the existence of a certain „transitional” stage at which medieval nomads began to lose their characteristic features of the funeral rite since the „pre-Mongol” period. In his opinion, during the history of the Golden Horde there was a change in the traditional orientation of nomadic burials to one „common” – Western, which is rightly associated by many contemporary researchers with the general Islamization of the nomadic population of the Golden Horde.

Describing the attempts of predecessors to correlate the burial monuments of medieval nomads with certain tribes and nationalities, A. O. Dobrolyubsky noted that they were rarely successful. Most researchers sought to identify and „fix” a certain set of formal and typological characteristics of the rite and inventory for different ethnic groups of nomads. Expressing his attitude to a number of types of burial structures of nomads, including those in which there is a predominantly western orientation, A. O. Dobrolyubsky emphasized their inherent mixture of different features. In his opinion, in the Golden Horde era, the process of ethnocultural assimilation of many groups of nomads was determined, in particular, in the refusal to preserve the orientations of graves around the world (Dobrolyubsky, 1988, p. 221–222).

Developing this idea, another scientist, E. I. Narozhny noted that such innovations in the system of funeral rites should be considered as a reflection

of certain processes that took place in a nomadic environment. In other words, we are talking about some very significant changes in the funeral rites, caused by changes both within nomadic society and the corresponding influence of external causes and conditions.

According to him, at the beginning of the history of the Golden Horde, not the Mongols and their accompanying ethnic groups from the depths of Central Asia, but their direct descendants, born and raised in Eastern Europe, become participants in the processes of mutual influence of cultures. The indisputable result of the latter was to be, at least, the spread of the same signs of a „mixed” funeral rite, about which O. O. Dobrolyubsky wrote. According to his conclusions, the Golden Horde burial complexes were the result of interethnic synthesis between the descendants of the Polovtsian and „Mongol” population of the XIV century. The process of ethnocultural mixing of Polovtsians and Mongols was to promote the manifestation of a kind of „ethno-unifying” processes in the Golden Horde (Narozhny, 2005, p. 197).

Among other scientific works, we can note the work of Ukrainian researcher M. V. Yelnikov, which provides a theoretical generalization of the burial monuments of the late nomads of the Lower Dnieper during the Golden Horde and reflects new views on the nature and extent of the tribes' influence on the funeral rite, the dependence of ethnocultural manifestations on the dynamics of development of the western wing of the state of Ulus Juchi is determined.

In his opinion, the presence of the Lower Dnieper in the Golden Horde caused a very difficult ethnocultural situation. Significant interaction between settled locals with nomads were mostly features of cultural and trade exchange and were not assimilative, the main reason for which was belonging to different religious denominations and household (Elnikov, 2004, p. 84-110).

Concluding the general review on a particular topic, it should be noted that despite the significant progress of domestic science in the XIX–XX centuries in this direction, many issues on this issue are still quite controversial and need further and careful study. At the same time, analyzing the general picture of the development of historiography in this period, it should be noted that it created the preconditions for its further scientific research today.

Список використаної літератури

1. Аристов Н. О земле половецкой. Одесса : Тип. В. И. Давиденко, 1877. 26 с. **2. Атавин А. Г.** Некоторые особенности захоронений коня в кочевнических погребениях X–XIV вв. *Советская археология*. 1984. № 1. С. 134–143. **3. Археология** Украинской ССР: в 3 т. / И. И. Артеменко (гл. ред.) и др. К. : Наук. думка, 1985–1986. Т. 3: Раннеславянский и древнерусский периоды / В. Д. Баран, Р. С. Орлов, П. П. Толочко и др. К., 1986. 573 с. **4. Березин Н. И.** Очерки внутреннего устройства Улуса Джучиева. *Записки Восточного отделения Русского*

археологического общества. Санкт-Петербург : б. и., 1864. Т. VIII. С. 387–494. **5. Бранденбург Н. Е.** Журнал раскопок 1888–1902 гг. Санкт-Петербург : Т-во Р. Голике и А. Вильборг, 1908. VII. 220 с. **6. Гарустович Г. Н.,** Иванов В. А. Огузы и печенеги в евразийских степях. Уфа : Гилем, 2001. 212 с. **7. Генинг В. Ф.,** Бунятян Е. П., Пустовалов С. Ж., Рычков Н. А. Формализованно-статистические методы в археологии (анализ погребальных памятников). К. : Наук. думка, 1990. 304 с. **8. Голубовский П. В.** Печенеги, тюрки и половцы до нашествия татар. *Университетские известия.* 1883. № 1. С. 131–154. **9. Городцов В. А.** Типы погребений печенегов, торков, половцев и татар до XIV в. *Труды XIII Археологического съезда.* М., 1907. Т. II. С. 39–41. **10. Граков Б. Н.** Отчёт Скифской степной экспедиции ИИМК АН СССР за 1950 г. М. : НА ИА НАНУ, 1950. **11. Добролюбский А. О.** Кочевники Северо-Западного Причерноморья в эпоху средневековья. К. : Наукова думка, 1988. 140 с. **12. Ельников М. В.** Грунтовый кочевнический могильник Мамай-Гора XIV века из Нижнего Поднепровья. *Татарская археология.* 2004. № 1-2 (12-13). С. 86–110. **13. Багрянородний Костянтин.** Об управлении империей. М. : Наука, 1989. 496 с. **14. Літопис Руський за Іпатським списком / пер. Л. Махновець.** Львів-К. : Дніпро, 1989. XIV. 590 с. **15. Нарожный Е. И.** Средневековые кочевники Северного Кавказа. Армавир : АГПУ, 2005. 212 с. **16. Плетнева С. А.** Половецкая земля. М. : Наука, 1975. **17. Плетнева С. А.** Половцы. М. : Наука, 1990. 208 с. **18. Плетнева С. А.** Кипчаки и половцы. *Кочевники южнорусских степей в эпоху средневековья. IV–XIII века.* Воронеж : Издательство Воронежского государственного университета, 2003. С. 149–169. **19. Спицын А. А.** Курганы киевских торков и берендеев. *Записки Русского археологического общества.* СПб., 1899. Т. XI. Вып. 1-2. С. 156–160. **20. Плетнева С. А.** Степи Евразии в эпоху средневековья. М. : Наука, 1981. 305 с. **21. Фёдоров-Давыдов Г. А.** Кочевники Восточной Европы под властью золотоордынских ханов. М. : Изд-во МГУ, 1966. 276 с. **22. Путешествия в восточные страны** ПIANO Карпини та Рубрука / Н. П. Шастина. М. : Географгиз, 1957. 272 с. **23. Эварницкий Д. И.** Раскопки курганов в пределах Екатеринославской губернии. *Труды XIII Археологического съезда.* М., 1907. Т. I. С. 108–157.

References

1. Aristov, N. (1877). O zemle poloveckoj [About the Polovtsian land]. *Zapiski Odesskogo obshchestva istorii i drevnostey – Notes of the Odessa Society of History and Antiquities.* Odessa: Tip. V. I. Davidenko [in Russian]. **2. Atavin, A. G.** (1984). Nekotorye osobennosti zahoroneniij konya v kochevnicheskikh pogrebeniyah X–XIV vv. [Some features of horse burials in nomadic burials of the X–XIV centuries]. *Sovetskaya arheologiya – Soviet archeology, 1,* 134–143 [in Russian]. **3. Artemenko, I. I.** (Eds.). (1985–1986).

Arheologiya Ukrainskoj SSR: v 3 t. [Archeology of the Ukrainian SSR: in 3 v.]. K.: Nauk. dumka. Vol. 3: Ranneslavyanskij i drevnerusskij periody [Early Slavic and Old Russian periods] / V. D. Baran, R. S. Orlov, P. P. Tolochko i dr. [in Russian].

4. Berezin, N. I. (1864). Oчерki vnutrennego ustrojstva Ulusa Dzhuchieva [Essays on the internal structure of Ulus Dzhuchiev]. *Zapiski Vostochnogo otdeleniya Russkogo arheologicheskogo obshchestva – Notes of the Eastern Branch of the Russian Archaeological Society, VIII*, 387-494. Saint-Peterburg [in Russian].

5. Brandenburg, N. E. (1908). Zhurnal raskopok 1888–1902 gg. [Excavation journal 1888–1902]. (Vols. VII). Saint-Peterburg: T-vo R. Golike i A. Vil'borg [in Russian].

6. Garustovich, G. N., & Ivanov, V. A. (2001). Oгуzy i pechenegi v evrazijskikh stepyah [Oguzes and Pechenegs in the Eurasian steppes. Ufa: Gilem [in Russian].

7. Gening, V. F., Bunyatyan, E. P., Pustovalov, S. Zh., & Rychkov, N. A. (1990). Formalizovanno-statisticheskie metody v arheologii (analiz pogrebal'nyh pamyatnikov) [Formalized statistical methods in archeology (analysis of burial sites). K.: Nauk. dumka [in Russian].

8. Golubovskij, P. V. (1883). Pechenegi, tyurki i polovcy do nashestviya tatar [Pechenegs, Turks and Polovtsians before the invasion of the Tatars]. *Universitetskie izvestiya – University news, I*, 131-154 [in Russian].

9. Gorodcov, V. A. (1907). Tipy pogrebenij pechenegov, torkov, polovcev i tatar do XIV v. [Types of burials of the Pechenegs, Torks, Polovtsians and Tatars before the XIV century]. *Trudy XIII Arheologicheskogo s"ezda – Proceedings of the XIII Archaeological Congress, II*, 39-41 [in Russian].

10. Grakov, B. N. (1950). Otchyot Skifskoj stepnoj ekspedicii IIMK AN SSSR za 1950 g. [Report of the Scythian steppe expedition of the Institute of History and Mathematics of the USSR Academy of Sciences for 1950]. M.: NA IA NANU [in Russian].

11. Dobrolyubskij, A. O. (1988). Kochevniki Severo-Zapadnogo Prichernomor'ya v epohu srednevekov'ya [Nomads of the North-Western Black Sea Region in the Middle Ages]. K.: Naukova dumka [in Russian].

12. El'nikov, M. V. (2004). Gruntovyj kochevnicheskij mogil'nik Mamaj-Gora XIV veka iz Nizhnego Podneprov'ya [Soil nomadic burial ground Mamai-Gora of the XIV century from the Lower Dnieper region]. *Tatarskaya arheologiya – Tatar archeology, 1-2 (12-13)*, 86-110 [in Russian].

13. Bagryanorodnij Kostyantyn. (1989). Ob upravlenii imperiej [On the management of the empire]. M.: Nauka [in Russian].

14. Litopys Ruskyi za Ipat'skym spyskom [Chronicle of the Russian according to the Ipat list]. (1989). Per. L. Makhnovets. (Vols. XIV). Lviv-K.: Dnipro [in Ukrainian].

15. Narozhnyj, E. I. (2005). Srednevekovye kochevniki Severnogo Kavkaza [Medieval nomads of the North Caucasus]. Armavir: AGPU [in Russian].

16. Pletneva, S. A. (1975). Poloveckaya zemlya [Polovtsian land]. M.: Nauka [in Russian].

17. Pletneva, S. A. (1990). Polovcy [Polovtsi]. M.: Nauka [in Russian].

18. Pletneva, S. A. (2003). Kipchaki i polovcy [Kipchaks and Cumans]. *Kochevniki yuzhnorusskikh stepej v epohu srednevekov'ya. IV–XIII veka – Nomads of the southern Russian steppes in the Middle Ages. IV–XIII*

centuries. Voronezh: Izdatel'stvo Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta [in Russian]. **19. Spicyn, A. A.** (1899). Kurgany kievskih torkov i berendeev [Mounds of Kiev torques and berendeevs]. *Zapiski Russkogo arheologicheskogo obshchestva – Notes of the Russian Archaeological Society*, XI, 1-2, 156-160. SPb. [in Russian]. **20. Pletneva, S. A.** (Eds.) (1981). Stepi Evrazii v epohu srednevekov'ya [Steppes of Eurasia in the Middle Ages]. M.: Nauka [in Russian]. **21. Fyodorov-Davydov, G. A.** (1966). Kochevniki Vostochnoj Evropy pod vlast'yu zolotoordynskih hanov [Nomads of Eastern Europe under the rule of the Golden Horde khans]. M.: Izd-vo MGU [in Ukrainian]. **22. Shastina, N. P.** (Eds.). (1957). Puteshestviya v vostochnye strany Plano Karpini ta Rubruka [Travels to the eastern countries of Plano Carpini and Rubruk]. M.: Geografiz [in Russian]. **23. Evarnickij, D. I.** (1907). Raskopki kurganov v predelakh Ekaterinoslavskoj gubernii [Excavation of burial mounds within the Yekaterinoslav province]. *Trudy XIII Arheologicheskogo s"ezda – Proceedings of the XIII Archaeological Congress*, 1, 108-157 [in Russian].

Замуруйцев О. В., Крылова А. М. Історіографія дослідження археологічних пам'яток пізніх кочівників Півдня України у ХІХ – ХХ ст.

У статті розглядається питання дослідження у вітчизняній науці археологічних пам'яток, так званих, пізніх кочівники у ХІХ–ХХ ст. На основі існуючих джерел, автори визначили його основні етапи та найбільш характерні риси. Зокрема, визначається що перші подібні спроби були зроблені ще у дореволюційний період і вони поклали початок вивченню культур кочових народів Х–ХІV ст. та накопиченню наукових знань про них. У подальшому ці дослідження отримали новий підхід. Так, завдяки успіхам вітчизняної археології у 60–70-х рр. ХХ ст. вийшли перші узагальнюючі роботи, серед яких слід відзначити монографію Г. А. Федорова-Давидова, який уперше розділив пам'ятки пізніх кочівники на певні датовані хронологічні блоки.

Ключові слова: пізні кочівники, пам'ятка, поховальний інвентар, археологія.

Замуруйцев А. В., Крылова А. Н. Історіографія дослідження археологічних пам'яток пізніх кочівників юга України в ХІХ–ХХ вв.

В статье рассматривается вопрос исследования в отечественной науке археологических памятников т.н. поздних кочевников в ХІХ–ХХ вв. На основе существующих источников, авторы определили его основные этапы и наиболее характерные черты. В частности, первые подобные попытки были предприняты еще в дореволюционный период и они положили начало изучению культур кочевых народов Х–ХІV в. и накоплению научных знаний о них. В дальнейшем, эти исследования

получили новую жизнь. Так, благодаря успехам отечественной археологии в 60–70-х гг. XX в. вышли первые обобщающие работы, среди которых следует отметить монографию А. Федорова-Давыдова, который впервые разделил памятники поздних кочевников на определенные датированы хронологические блоки.

Ключевые слова: поздние кочевники, достопримечательность, погребальный инвентарь, археология.

Zamuritsev O. V., Krylova A. M. Research of archaeological monuments of the late nomads of Southern Ukraine in the XIX–XX centuries: a new view on historiography

The article considers the issue of research in domestic science of archeological monuments, the so-called, late nomads in the XIX–XX centuries. Based on existing sources, the authors identified its main stages and most characteristic features. In particular, it is determined that the first such attempts were made in the pre-revolutionary period and they marked the beginning of the study of nomadic peoples of the tenth-fourteenth centuries and the accumulation of scientific knowledge about them. Later, these studies received a new lease of life. Thus, thanks to the success of domestic archeology in the 1960s – 1970s, the first generalizing works were published, among which the monograph of G. A. Fedorov-Davydov, who first divided the monuments of the late nomads into certain dated chronological blocks. These studies have been continued in the works of other scientists. Among them, it should be noted the famous researcher S.A. Pletnev. which for the first time defined the main features of the funeral rite and material culture of various ethnic groups of nomads of this time, which became to some extent textbook in domestic archeology. At the same time, the authors determine that despite the significant successes of domestic science in the XIX–XX centuries in this direction, many issues on the outlined issues still remain quite controversial and need further study.

Keywords: late nomads, monument, funeral inventory, archeology.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 12.04.2021 р.

Прийнято до друку 30.04.2021 р.

Рецензент – д. і. н., проф. Набока О. В.