

The Ancient Era and the Problem of the 'Break of Epochs' in Viktor Petrov's Vision: the Discreteness of the Ukrainian Historical Process

Vitaliy Andriyev (ORCID 0000-0003-1830-0629)
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University (Ukraine)

Alisa Lukasenko (ORCID 0000-0001-5136-5657)
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University (Ukraine)

The article is devoted to the study of the *Theory of Epochs* developed by the prominent Ukrainian thinker and scholar Viktor Petrov (V. Domontovych) and its verification based on the materials of ancient Ukrainian history, particularly the archaeological cultures of the Black Sea region and the Dnipro basin. Petrov's theory offers a fundamentally different view of historical development, rejecting its linearity and evolutionism. Instead, it defines the historical process as discrete, emphasizing the isolation and self-sufficiency of individual epochs in the formation of the Ukrainian people. In this context, an epoch is understood as a structural, internally closed entity determined by a dominant ideology, a stable economic foundation, and established social institutions. Rather than continuing one another, epochs replace or oppose each other, thus forming the overall historical process through "breaks" – ruptures and crises. The Ancient Era represents one such crucial stage in Slavic and Ukrainian ethnogenesis (Ith century BCE – IV th century CE). The article examines the chronological boundaries and conceptual content of this period, which Petrov viewed as a "barbarian variant" of the Hellenistic civilization north of the Black Sea. In particular, the study defines the role of Roman influence, which, according to Petrov, was not decisive but merely contributed to individual Romanization. Meanwhile, the Zarubyntsi and Chernyakhiv cultures are interpreted as examples of local modifications of self-sufficient ancient cultures that already displayed signs of universalization. The paper also defines the nature of the "break" of the Ancient Era, which led to the disappearance of the Chernyakhiv culture around the middle of the first millennium CE. Petrov believed that this rupture was caused by the deep crisis of the Roman Empire in the second half of the IVth century and the collapse of the old-world system of connections, based on Rome's supremacy among other peoples. The Hunnic invasion merely intensified the pre-existing crisis. The focus of the research is directed toward highlighting the connection between Ukrainian culture and European civilization as an equal and self-sufficient component whose roots reach back to Antiquity. Petrov's concept, emphasizing discreteness, ruptures, and autonomous development, is presented within the context of XXth–early XXIth century historical and archaeological thought as a novel and still scientifically relevant theory, confirmed by the works of modern researchers.

KEYWORDS

Viktor Petrov, Theory of Epochs, Antique epoch, Zarubyntsi and Chernyakhiv archaeological cultures, roman politics, romanization, antique society

Introduction

Viktor Platonovych Petrov (October 22 (10), 1894 – June 8, 1969) was a prominent figure in Ukrainian humanitarian thought of the 20th century, known under the pan name: V. Domontovych and V. Ber. He is renowned for his multifaceted activities as a literary critic, philologist, folklorist, ethnographer, historian, archaeologist, philosopher, and writer. Although Petrov gained recognition as a scholar and writer in the 1920s and 1930s, his figure and scholarly legacy were subsequently forgotten for a long time and removed from the intellectual life of both the USSR and the Ukrainian diaspora.

This study focuses on V. Petrov's work as a researcher of the "antique epoch" and his definition of its place in the history of Ukraine. In the 1940s, V. Petrov developed an original concept of the historical process known as the "theory of epochs." He outlined the main tenets of his historiography in a number of articles. Petrov's concept, as demonstrated by such researchers as Vira Aheieva (2006: 325-351), Vitaliy Andriyev (2008: 144-145), Nadiia Mishenina (2002); Solomiia Pavlychko (1999: 226-227, 262, 267, 325); Illya Fizer (1999. 42), developed within the intellectual current of ideas from thinkers like O. Spengler,



A. J. Toynbee, M. Berdyaev, F. Schmidt, D. Chyzhevsky, the existentialists, and M. Foucault.

Research methods

The research work is based on a comprehensive analysis of Viktor Petrov's historiographical legacy. Using historiographical and historico-philosophical methods, the authors not only reconstruct the *Theory of Epochs* (the ideas of the discreteness of time, the isolation of epochs, and the concept of the "break" or rupture between them) but also examine it within the broader context of XXth-century European historiography, contrasting it with linear and evolutionist approaches.

The application of critical source analysis allows for the evaluation of Petrov's specific archaeological and ethnogenetic arguments, particularly regarding the Chernyakhiv culture and its connection with ancient civilization. In our study, this is illustrated through Petrov's analysis of coin hoards (whose dating contradicts the hypothesis of migration during Trajan's campaign) and his reasoning against the Gothic theory of the origin of the Chernyakhiv culture.

The comparative-historical method employed by the authors – entailing the juxtaposition of different historical phenomena, cultures, or concepts to identify commonalities or differences – enabled the comparison of Petrov's *Theory of Epochs* with cyclical theories of social development (Spengler, Toynbee). This provided grounds to conclude that Petrov was the first in Ukrainian scholarship to define Ukrainian culture as genetically linked to European civilization through the Ancient Era.

Results and Discussion

In the focus of V. Petrov's attention is the refutation of the idea of the continuity or linearity of historical development. The foundation of his *Theory of Epochs* consists of the concepts of 'discreteness of time' and the 'isolation of individual epochs,' which are connected to one another through negation and the rejection of the idea of development. In his view, the historical process does not constitute a continuous flow of being, but rather is 'segmented into specific gradations of time. (Petrov, 1946: 7).

'Epoch' for V. Petrov is a self-sufficient and internally closed segment of time defined by a dominant ideology (Andrieiev, 2008: 323-329). The scholar did not provide a clear definition of this concept, but it follows from the context of his works that an 'epoch' is a specific component of the historical process that is understood as a structural integrity, characterized by: the presence of a dominant ideology, a stable correlation of certain interconnected forms of economy, social institutions, and cultural phenomenon. Each 'epoch' possesses its own community that is distinct from the community of another epoch. History is the process of being and the "change of distinct self-sufficient epochs that succeeded one another, often opposing one another". The researcher attempted to explain how one "epoch" transforms into another. In his opinion, the change of epochs arises as a result of the function of "overcoming", "contrasting" or "transforming" an epoch into its opposite, rather than in the aspect of time. He even points to "the laws of the change of epochs" (Petrov, 1992: 20, 26).

Thus, the historical process, according to V. Petrov, is a sequential change of epochs, within the confines of which processes unique only to them occur. Each epoch, in its distinctness, is closed within itself. The change of epochs happens as a result of negation, the historical dimension of which is change, rupture, and movement. In his vision of the historical process, the scholar drew attention

not only to categories such as development and permanence, but also to regression and instability (Petrov, 1992: 25). In contrast to linear, evolutionist concepts, V. Petrov put forward his own. According to it, history develops not through an evolutionary path, not along an ascending line, but through displacement, rupture, and breakdown between epochs the historical process is discrete. V. Petrov, in proclaiming the discreteness of historical existence and rejecting the idea of constant progress, denied the creative self-sufficiency of time. The chronological succession of an epoch does not yet guarantee its superiority compared to the previous one (Ber, 1946: 40).

History as a science, in V. Petrov's view, should illuminate the changes of epochs, yet the historian's goal is not to search for the ultimate truth about humanity, which is revealed only by mythology and theology. The goal of history is 'to clarify the methodology of the change of epochs,' or 'how a given epoch transforms into another (Petrov, 1949: 9). Thus, in the scholar's opinion, the main unit of the historical process that a historian must study is the "epoch". The issues of ethnogenesis Slavic and Ukrainian people were at the center of the researcher's attention in the 1940s. He began developing an original concept of Ukrainian history, which was outlined in his work "The Origin of the Ukrainian People". Much later, in the work *Ethnogenesis of the Slavs* (1972), V. Petrov presented his expanded vision of Ukrainian history (Petrov, 1972). In his opinion, the history of Ukraine is discrete, containing "breakdowns" between epochs. The researcher distinguished four epochs in the ancient history of Ukraine: Trypillian, Post-Trypillian, Scythian, and Antique (Petrov, 1972: 38). V. Petrov attached particular importance to the Antique epoch in the history of Ukraine and the formation of Ukrainian ethnographic culture, in which he distinguished two periods: Zarubyntsi and Chernyakhiv. Thus, the Antique epoch succeeds the Scythian epoch. V. Petrov noted that without a clear understanding of the "breakdown" that separates the Scythian age from the Zarubyntsi period, it is impossible to grasp the content of the historical process, "regardless of whether we refer to migration or not". The issue of migrations is, essentially, not the primary one for the scholar. The core is the "epoch" and the "breakdowns".

V. Petrov noted that the new epoch eliminates the socio-economic and property-class divisions between the owners of huge herds and the livestock-less poor, between pastoralists and farmers, and between nomads and settled populations. From this follows the changes in the territorial structure of Eastern Europe – the unity of the Scythian times, stretching from the Don to the Danube, becomes segmented into several regions. Transhumant pastoralism, with its zonal-seasonal grazing of livestock, dies out. There are no longer large herds that require defense and winter camps. Armed retinues are now unnecessary. The powerful Scythian fortified settlements cease to exist. The structure of the economy fundamentally changes. It becomes associated with the settlement and the homestead and subsistence farming. Settlements are located on the spurs of steep river banks. Each community defends itself. The village community represents an undivided whole without the class-property segmentation that was the inherent characteristic of the Scythian-era social order. "All this, in turn, could not but affect the processes of linguistic development of the local population of the Dnipro region", – wrote V. Petrov (1972: 209).

V. Petrov assumed that during the Scythian Age, the language of the Scythians-Borysfenites demonstrated

close linguistic ties with the Proto-Baltic languages prevalent in the East European Forest zone. The subsequent Zarubyntsi stage was characterized by the weakening of this affinity, the loss of the language's original Balto-Iranian coloring and archaic features, which led to its modernization toward 'slavization' (Petrov, 1972: 210).

However, V. Petrov did not try to oversimplify the solution to complex ethno-historical problems:

Instead of failing to find a proper, historically justified answer, calling the Zarubyntsi population of the Dnipro region Slavs and thereby considering the problem of ethnogeny solved, it is better and more convincing to point to the sequence in the change of epochs. There is no doubt that the formation of regional territories during the Zarubyntsi period must have affected the process of language formation, leading to the delineation of tribal dialects and bringing about the dialectal affinity of adjacent regions (Petrov, 1972: 211).

Researchers of the Zarubyntsi culture – Y. Kukharenko, Y. Maksymov, K. Kasparova, L. Pobol, and others – although having certain disagreements in interpreting its ethnic composition, are united in the view that the Zarubyntsi culture became an important milestone in the process of the formation and development of the ancient Slavic ethnoses. (*Davnia istoriia Ukrainy*, 2000: 25-26).

The Chernyakhiv culture succeeds the Zarubyntsi culture, bringing new changes with it. The partial territorial-tribal differentiation characteristic of the Zarubyntsi epoch disappeared. In *Ethnogenesis of the Slavs*, V. Petrov recognizes the polyethnic, or more accurately, the super-ethnic character of the Chernyakhiv culture. However, the scholar leaned toward the view that the main creators of this culture were the ancestors of the Slavs and noted that the language of the Chernyakhiv population already bore clear signs of Slavic characteristics. (Petrov, 1972: 212-213).

V. Petrov believed that, unlike the Latinized ethnic communities of Europe that were conquered by Rome, the peoples to the north and east of the limes did not lose their ethnic features. In persistent armed struggle and prolonged wars with Rome, they preserved their nationhood, defended their inviolability, independence, social order, and language. The researcher considered the Zarubyntsi and Chernyakhiv cultures to be a unique variant of antique civilization, closely related to Hellenistic cultures.

V. Petrov was the first among scholars to note and substantiate the significance of the Antique Age and civilization for the ancient population of Ukraine, illuminating the forest-steppe archaeological cultures as variants of the antique (Kravchenko, 2001). Thus, the scholar viewed the Zarubyntsi and Chernyakhiv cultures as modifications of the antique culture, something like Hellenistic cultures. V. Petrov believed that to the north of ancient Greek city Olbia and other ancient centers of the Northern Black Sea region, starting from the middle of the 1st millennium BCE, as «barbarian» variant of the antique culture was forming, which he linked to the development of the indigenous population. That is, the population of Ukraine was not merely an object of influence of antique civilization but, by adopting the achievements of antiquity, created its own original culture. (Petrov, 1992: 57).

From V. Petrov's point of view, the Scythian age, characterized by the mounted pastoralist, gradually recedes into the past. The nomad becomes an economic, political, and social relic. As the Dnipro region was drawn into the orbit of the antique world, and the process of hellenization of the indigenous population intensified, the importance of pastoralism, seasonal nomadism, fortified settlements as

local centers for the mounted elite, and war and plunder as a direct source of their enrichment diminished. You cannot simultaneously trade and wage war. The mounted pastoralist transforms from a nomad into a grain exporter. Instead of wandering with large herds of livestock in the grassy steppes of the Black Sea region, Cis-Urals, and Trans-Urals, he sits at a tavern table in Olbia or Chersonesus. He is interested in news brought by sailors about fluctuations in grain prices on the exchange in Alexandria or Rhodes. "The taste of wine compels him to forget the taste of steppe kumis". (Petrov, 1992: 61). V. Petrov artistically portrays these processes in his academic work. Incidentally, these ideas were first expressed by him as early as 1942 on the pages of *Ukrainskyi Zasiv* in excerpts from the novel *Bez Gruntu* (eng. *Without Soil*) and the article *Goths in Ukraine and the Culture of Burial Fields* (Petrov, 1942; Domontovych, 1942; Domontovych, 1943).

V. Petrov believed that the pastoralist elite did not show sufficient flexibility to master the new processes under the changed conditions and to retain their former economic power, as well as to maintain political authority over the masses, as they had in the previous epoch when farming was only an insignificant supplement to animal husbandry. In the post-Scythian period, class distinctions become leveled. In the first centuries CE, a new system of power emerges; a new elite, the upper stratum of societies, is born, which has nothing in common with the previous one, growing from the ranks of agricultural communities. (Petrov, 1992: 62).

According to V. Petrov, the insufficient study of archaeological sites led scholars to the view that Ukraine was considered a desolate area. Historians treated the country, supposedly deprived of population, as a temporary stopping place for peoples moving from north to south, from the Baltic to the Black Sea region, or from east to west, from Central Asia to the Balkans, the scholar wrote. He was critical of the concepts held by those researchers who viewed the territory of Ukraine "as prey" for accidental migrants who did not stay long on their migration routes (Petrov, 1992: 70-71).

Instead, V. Petrov shows a completely different picture of Ukraine during the Chernyakhiv period. Thus, the territory of Ukraine, from the Lower Danube region to the left bank of the Dnipro (the forest-steppe, partially forest, and steppe zones), was at that time densely populated by bearers of a highly developed material culture with clearly expressed features of universalism (despite local variants). The researcher links this universalism of the Chernyakhiv culture primarily to the leveling influences of the Mediterranean cultural world, rather than Rome. V. Petrov opposes the assertion of scholars who define the period of the 1st–5th centuries in the history of Ukraine as the age of Roman influences. In his opinion, Rome was neither the initiator of this leveling nor the monopoly factor in this process.

The concepts of researchers of antiquity also maintain the view (or: are in line with the assertion) that even after the Roman expansion into the East took place, the idea of Hellenism remained the dominant civilizational idea among the local peoples (Mommson, 2022: 254). Even the Roman state itself, in a certain sense, succumbed to the processes of Hellenization from the moment the Macedonian Wars concluded. The syncretism between Greece and Rome was so profound that it led to the formation of the idea of a joint Greco-Roman civilization within the concepts of the civilizational approach. It is not surprising that Rome followed the path of inheriting the customs and culture of the *Great Macedonian* it began to integrate the East not in a

Latin way, but in a Hellenistic way, thereby continuing a tradition that had been rooted by previous practices.

The idea of Latinization or Romanization of the north and east of the Roman frontier was never realized during the Republican era. The Roman nobilitas, in its civilizational convictions, also began to move away from the former 'ancestral traditions' (лат. *mos maiorum*) in favor of Greek utilitarianism. However, we cannot find a Roman military presence in the Northern Black Sea region during the Mithridatic Wars. Roman legions would only appear here for the first time in the mid-1st century CE, specifically during the campaign of Plautius Silvanus. Prior to this, even during the Republic, the Northern Black Sea region was within the orbit of Roman influence through the system of clientelism and alliance practices. This status meant dependence on Roman policy with defined obligations to the patron (during the Republican era this was the Roman civitas itself; Imperial Rome involved personal dependence on the emperor). The Bosporan Kingdom is an example of such a client in the Northern Black Sea region.

The Hellenic heritage remained present for a long time in the traditions of the local ruling dynasties, even though they had to adhere to 'Roman rules'. The most vivid example of this is the syncretism in the Romanization and Hellenization of the Bosporan rulers. While adopting the Roman client tradition, they received the Roman tria nomina, linking themselves to the Julio-Claudian imperial dynasty. An example is the Bosporan ruler Rheskuperis I Aspurg, yet the cognomen in this name remained Hellenic – Φιλορώμαιοι ('Lover of Romans'). Therefore, the scholar's conclusion: "Where they spoke of Rome, perhaps one should speak of the Hellenistic world" (Petrov, 1992: 74-75) should be considered relevant.

The integrational practices of the late Roman Republic were only beginning the creation of a new imperial identity, which advanced the idea of Romanization through duality of the concept of 'patria' into the Homeland by birth and the Homeland by citizenship (Tsytserson, 2020: II, 2.5). However, this practice could only be applied in the case of the annexation of a territory as a province. The provinces that exhibited the highest degree of integration were characterized by a prior client relationship with Rome, especially when it concerned the Hellenistic states of the East.

The expansion of the Empire's borders occurred during the campaigns of Octavian Augustus and Trajan. As a result of the successful campaigns of these emperors, they expanded to the banks of the Dniester River. However, the exact limit reached by the military actions of the Roman legionaries remains undetermined in contemporary scholarship. Recent research (Nechyporenko, 2021: 75), regarding the Roman military presence, in the form of Roman castra (forts), on the territory of Ukraine indicates the temporariness of their location. Therefore, only with the completion of Rome's formation as an Empire, particularly the frontier line (limes) of its provinces, did the Roman influence in the Danube-Bug estuary strip become noticeable to the local population, according to V. Petrov's conclusions, only in the 2nd–3rd centuries CE (Petrov, 1992: 76).

The establishment of the 'Roman Peace' (Pax Romana), in the scholar's opinion, contributed to individual cases of Romanization among local communities, however, this influence was not decisive for the formation of civilization here among the barbarian cultures. The scholar was the first in Ukrainian scholarship to express the interesting idea that the Chernyakhiv culture, being genetically linked to the Zarubyntsi culture - which already bore signs

of a certain universalization - was essentially close to Hellenistic cultures.

Utilizing the Roman presence in the Danube-Bug estuary region, the researcher asserts the implausibility of the Daco-Getic origin of the Chernyakhiv culture (Petrov, 1992: 78). Employing data from coin hoards, he refutes D. Samokvasov's thesis regarding the migration of Daco-Getae caused by Trajan's campaign. The main counterargument in this case was the established discrepancy regarding the coins, which, according to V. Petrov, should have dated to pre-Trajanic times – serving as evidence that the campaign forced them to abandon their usual dwellings and leave with light possessions. The scholar asserts that the majority of the discovered coin hoards indicate that the finds were already in circulation in the post-Trajanic period, which contradicts the thesis that Trajan's campaign was the primary factor in the migration.

V. Petrov disagreed with the Gothic concept of the origin of the Chernyakhiv culture, which had many adherents among German, Polish, Czech, and some Soviet scholars (and was later developed by Russian and Ukrainian researchers in the post-Soviet period). In V. Petrov's opinion, the Goths could not have brought this culture to Ukraine. This is because the Chernyakhiv culture stood at a significantly higher level of material development than the culture proper to the Goths, Gepids, and other Germanic tribes. The historian also pointed to the vast territory inhabited by the Chernyakhiv tribes, which does not correspond to the historical data regarding the Goths. However, he did not deny the role of the Goths in the processes that occurred in Ukraine in the first centuries CE. He even suggested that the Goths might have influenced the spread of Chernyakhiv cultural norms. (Petrov, 1992: 79-80).

Further development of archaeology demonstrated V. Petrov's correctness on many issues concerning the Chernyakhiv culture. For example, the discovery of monuments of the Wielbark culture, associated with the Goths, in Volyn undermined the concept of the purely Gothic nature of the Chernyakhiv antiquities (Davnia istoriia Ukrainy, 2000: 48). Today, most researchers recognize the polyethnic character of the Chernyakhiv culture.

V. Petrov held the view that the Chernyakhiv culture was of local origin and was not brought from outside, regardless of its ethnic affiliation. He also suggested that it was during the second stage of the Antique Age that the territory of modern Ukraine consolidated within the boundaries that subsequently formed the ethnographic territory of Ukrainians (Petrov, 1992: 82). This view is, to a certain extent, consonant with the point of view of M. Hrushevsky, who linked the beginnings of the history of the Ukrainian people to the same times (dating from the Antes).

The Ukrainian archaeologist and historian N. Kravchenko (a student of V. Petrov), developing the scholar's ideas about the influences of an epoch/civilizational center on the character of the local population's culture, noted that

...the Chernyakhiv culture by its nature was a phenomenon of a different order than the cultures that preceded or surrounded it. Its high technological level, orientation towards advanced technology and organization of production, as well as its super-ethnic character, allow us to define the large area of the Chernyakhiv culture's distribution as a unique civilization (Kravchenko, 2001: 192-193; Kravchenko, 1994).

V. Petrov's views are confirmed in the works of contemporary scholars. Specifically, L. Zaluzniak asserts that the influence of Greco-Roman civilization spread to Eastern

Europe primarily through the antique colonies of the Northern Black Sea region, within the territory of modern Ukraine. Thanks to this, the ethno-historical development of Ukraine preceded other, more distant regions of Eastern Europe and was comparable to the development pace of countries in Western and Central Europe, which also underwent strong antique influence. (Zalizniak, 2011: 204).

According to V. Petrov's concept, the Antique Age ends in the 4th–5th centuries, and the Slavic Age begins in the 5th–6th centuries. A rupture – a 'breakdown,' 'crisis,' or 'catastrophe' – occurred between the two epochs. The disappearance of the Chernyakhiv-type culture, in the scholar's opinion, 'should be considered decisive in the history of Ukraine' in the 1st millennium AD. The Antique culture perished and was succeeded by a completely different one, which sharply contrasted with it (Petrov, 1992: 84–85). In his point, the 'breakdown' that occurred around the middle of the 1st millennium was evident in all the characteristic features of the Chernyakhiv and subsequent cultures: the topography of settlements, the construction of dwellings, the composition of inventory, the types of metal objects, ceramics, decorations, burial rites, and so on (Petrov, 1965: 8).

Unlike the majority of scholars who considered the Hunnish invasion of 375 CE to be the reason for the decline of the Chernyakhiv culture (and the Antique epoch in Ukraine), V. Petrov held a different view. He argued that the decline was caused by a deep-seated crisis of the Roman Empire in the second half of the 4th century. The Huns merely intensified this crisis. The scholar emphasized that the key moment which determined the change of epochs was the collapse of the old-world system of connections based on the domination of Rome. It was this very system that had previously ensured the existence of the Chernyakhiv culture in the Dniro-Dniester region (Petrov, 1965: 10–11).

The scholar believed that several centuries were necessary to overcome the crisis and take a step forward. V. Petrov linked the new epoch with a number of cultures, and primarily with the Prague culture, on the basis of which monuments of the Luka-Raikovetska type (8th–10th centuries) emerged. A separate age (6th–10th centuries), in the scholar's opinion, separates "Chernyakhiv and Kyivan Rus". The culture of Kyivan Rus (Ruthenia) became the final link in the developmental process of the material culture of the post-Chernyakhiv times.

V. Petrov acknowledged that a succession exists between the Chernyakhiv culture and the subsequent historical period. However, he did not support the widespread thesis regarding the Slavic affiliation of the Chernyakhiv people. He considered the main problem of researchers is try to perception ethnos as a stable category, and ethnogenesis as a continuous, direct process. He emphasized that the ethnic communities of the 2nd–5th centuries and the later period are fundamentally different. The connection between them occurred through fundamental changes, which in some regions were accompanied by the complete destruction of the population. According to Petrov, the ethnogenetic processes of the 6th–8th centuries were identical in both Eastern and Western Europe and differed from the processes that occurred in the 2nd–5th centuries.

Due to the still insufficient research of Early Slavic sites in the 1960s, the scholar did not fully examine the 'Post-Antique' or 'Slavic' epoch, the final link of which became Kyivan Rus (Ruthenia). However, the conclusions reached

by the scholar and his vision of the historical and ethnogenetic processes on the territory of Ukraine have not lost their scholarly relevance even today. V. Petrov believed that Chernyakhiv traditions, particularly pottery, survived into modernity in the ethnographic culture of the Ukrainian people, primarily in the ethnographic crockery of Galicia and Volhynia. The researcher also finds analogies between the pottery of the Chernyakhiv culture and modern ethnographic ceramics of Galicia and Volhynia in materials from the 15th century, obtained during excavations in Lutsk. He explains this phenomenon by arguing that the population, which was annihilated in the Donets and Dnieper basins, remained on the territory of Volhynia and Galicia, preserving the same culture that 'our distant ancestors cultivated' in the 1st–5th centuries throughout the entire territory of Ukraine (Petrov, 1992: 85).

He put forward the key thesis that the roots of Ukrainian ethnographic culture should be sought in the antique culture. In his opinion, this culture began to form at the beginning of the Common Era, as evidenced by the material heritage of the Chernyakhiv culture (Petrov, 1992: 85–86).

These ideas of V. Petrov, expressed by him in the 1940s–1960s, align to a certain extent with the hypotheses of contemporary scholars regarding the ethno-cultural development in Ukrainian ethnic lands between the Carpathians, Prypiat, and the Kyiv Dnipro region, as well as in the lands of other large European ethnoses that were within the zone of influence of the Roman Empire. According to L. Zalizniak, the unique Ukrainian ethno-cultural complex, which contained elements of many ancient peoples of the territory of Ukraine (starting from Trypillia), formed in the 5th–7th centuries. Archaeological data, linguistics, anthropology, and written sources attest to the continuity and uninterrupted development in North-Western Ukraine of a single ethnic organism from the Dulebians, Sclaveni, and Antes (Prague-Korchak, Penkivka, and Kolochyn archaeological cultures) to modern Ukrainians (Zalizniak, 2011, 129; 204). The predecessors for the bearers of these named cultures were the Zarubyntsi, Kyiv, Chernyakhiv, and Przeworsk cultures of the first half of the 1st millennium, which, in the opinion of many contemporary scholars, fully or partially possess features that allow them to be placed as the substratum of the Slavs of the 5th–7th centuries (Motsia, 2011: 393).

Conclusion

V. Petrov's concept holds outstanding significance for understanding the development of Ukrainian historical science in the 20th century. The scholar applied a new, independently developed methodological approach to the study of history, and specifically the history of Ukraine, based on his 'theory of epochs,' using concrete historical material. Essentially, V. Petrov created a new model/concept for the study of history, particularly the ancient history of Ukraine, which at the time had no analogues in Ukrainian historiography and was firmly within the context of the development of European scientific and philosophical thought of the 20th century.

Ukraine and the ethnic culture of Ukrainians, in V. Petrov's view, are genetically linked to European civilization, since their roots reach back to the Antique Age. Furthermore, it appears that Ukraine experienced all the same epochs as Europe (Antiquity, Middle Ages, Modern Age, and the contemporary period). The Ukrainian people preserved the achievements of antiquity over centuries and carried them through to the present day as a component of their own ethnographic culture. V. Petrov also repeatedly

expressed the view of Ukrainian culture as a full-fledged and self-sufficient part of European civilization in his literary, culturological, historiosophical, and other publications in the 1940s. However, according to V. Petrov, a deep watershed lies between the Chernyakhiv epoch and the age of historical Slavdom. The 'breakdown' was crucial. At the turn of the two epochs, the Chernyakhiv culture ceased to exist, and a culture of a different type emerged.

REFERENCES

- Aheieva, V. (2006). *Poetyka paradoksa: Intelektualna proza Viktora Petrova-Domontovycha*. [The Poetics of Paradox: The intellectual prose of Viktor Petrov-Domontovych]. Kyiv, Fakt. (in Ukrainian).
- Andriyeyev, V. (2008). Ukrainskyi metanaratyv: nelineinist ta dyskretnist istorii [The Ukrainian Metanarrative: Non-linearity and Discreteness of History]. *Eidos : almanakh teorii ta istorii istorychnoi nauky*, 3, 140-152. (in Ukrainian).
- Ber, V. (1946). Nash chas yak vin ye : z pryvodu statyi Normana Kaznsa «The Saturday Review of Literature» [Our Time as It Is: Regarding Norman Cousins's Article "The Saturday Review of Literature"] *Ridne slovo : visn. literatury, mystetstva i nauky*, 8, 28-40. (in Ukrainian).
- Domontovych, V. (1942) Bez gruntu [Without soil] *Ukrainskyi zasiv*. X, 2, 30-57. (in Ukrainian).
- Domontovych, V. (1943) Bez gruntu. Prodovzhennia [Without soil. Continued] *Ukrainskyi zasiv*. X, 4, 49-71. (in Ukrainian).
- Fizer, I. (1999). Ukrainskyi Fuko chy frantsuzkyi Petrov? Raziucha skhozhist dvokh istoriosofiv [Ukrainian Foucault or French Petrov? The striking similarity of the two historiographers]. *Naukovi zapysky. Filolohiia*, 1, 42-44 (in Ukrainian).
- Kravchenko, N. (1994). Cherniakhivske poselennia Obukhiv ta yoho "kyivske" otocennia: do vyvchennia kharakteru zviazkiv mizh cherniakhivskoiu ta "tradysiniymy" kulturamy rymaskoi doby [Chernyakhiv settlement of Obukhiv and its "Kyiv" surroundings: towards studying the nature of the connections between Chernyakhiv and "traditional" cultures of the Roman era] *Starozhytnosti Rusi-Ukrainy*. 1, 37-43. (in Ukrainian).
- Kravchenko, N. (2001). Drevniaia ystoriia slavian v kontseptsyakh sovremennoi ukraynskoï ystoriografyy. Dva metodolohycheskykh podkhoda [Ancient History of the Slavs in Concepts of Modern Ukrainian Historiography. Two Methodological Approaches]. *Slavic cultures in European civilization: to the 60th anniversary of Dr. of History, Prof. Alekseev Yuri Nikolaevich*, 1, 165-197 (in Russian).
- Mishenina, N. (2002). Istoriosofskyi motiv zminy epokh yak model vnutrishnoho intertekstu (proza Viktora Petrova-Domontovycha) [The Historiosophical Motif of the Change of Epochs as a Model of Internal Intertext (The Prose of Viktor Petrov-Domontovych)] *Slovo i chas*, 11, 26-32 (in Ukrainian).
- Mommsen, T. (2022). *The provinces of the Roman Empire*. Prague: DigiCat.
- Motsia, O. (2011). Ukraintsi: narod i yoho zemlia (etapy stanovlennia) [Ukrainians: the people and their land (stages of formation)]. Kyiv: Starodavnyi svit. (in Ukrainian).
- Nechyporenko, V. (2021). Rymski viiskovi tabori na terytorii Pivnichnoho prychnomoria [Roman military camps in the territory of the northern Black sea]. *Arkheolohichni doslidzhennia v Ukraini: zdobutky i perspektivy Zbirnyk materialiv X Vseukrainskoi studentskoi arkheolohichnoi konferentsii*. 72 – 77 (in Ukrainian).
- Pavlychko, S. (1999). *Dyskurs modernizmu v ukrainskii literatury* [The discourse of modernism in Ukrainian literature]. Kyiv: Osnovy. (in Ukrainian).
- Petrov, V. (1942). Hoty na Ukraini ta kultura poliv pokhovan [Goths in Ukraine and the culture of burial fields]. *Ukrainskyi zasiv*. – X. 1, 61-65. (in Ukrainian).
- Petrov, V. (1946). Istoriosofichni etyudy [Historical-Social Studies]. *MUR: zb. literaturno-mystetskoï problematyky*, 2, 7-19. (in Ukrainian).
- Petrov, V. (1965) Sloviany i Vizantiia. Pro zminu arkheolohichnykh kultur na terytorii Ukrainy v V-VII st. n. e. [Slavs and Byzantium. On the change of archaeological cultures on the territory of Ukraine in the 5th-7th centuries AD]. *Arkheolohiia*. Vol 18. 3 – 13. (in Ukrainian).
- Petrov, V. (1972) *Etnohenez slavian. Dzherela, stan rozvytku i problematyka* [Ethnogenesis of the Slavs. Sources, state of development and problems]. Kyiv: Nauk. Dumka. (in Ukrainian).
- Petrov, V. (1992). *Pokhodzhennia ukrainskoho narodu* [The origin of the Ukrainian people]. Kyiv: MP «Feniks» (in Ukrainian).
- Tolochko, P. P. (ed.), Borovskiy, Ya. (ed.) Baran, V. (ed.) (2000). *Davnia istoriia Ukrainy* [Ancient history of Ukraine]. Kyiv: In-t arkheolohii NAN Ukrainy. Vol. 3: «*Sloviano-ruska doba*». (in Ukrainian).
- Tsytserson M. T. (2020) *Pro zakony. Pro derzhavu. Pro pryrodu bohiv*. [The law, The republic, The origin of gods]. Lviv: Apriori. (in Ukrainian).
- Zaluzniak L. (2011) *Ukraiintsi: vytoky ta istorychni doli* [Ukrainians: origins and historical destinies]. Kyiv: Tempora. (in Ukrainian).

Антична доба та проблема "зламу епох" у візії Віктора Петрова: дискретність українського історичного процесу

Віталій Андреев (ORCID 0000-0003-1830-0629)

Київський столичний університет імені Бориса Грінченка (Україна)

Аліса Лукашенко (ORCID 0000-0001-5136-5657)

Київський столичний університет імені Бориса Грінченка (Україна)

Стаття присвячена дослідженню «теорії епох» видатного українського мислителя та науковця Віктора Петрова (В. Домонтовича) та її верифікації на основі матеріалів давньої історії України, зокрема археологічних культур

Причорномор'я та Наддніпрянщини. Теорія Петрова пропонує принципово інший погляд на концепцію історичного розвитку, відкидаючи його лінійність та еволюціонізм. Натомість, вона визначає історичний процес як дискретний, наголошуючи на ізольованості та самодостатності окремих епох у становленні українського народу. Епоха у цьому контексті є структурною, внутрішньо замкнутою цілісністю, визначеною домінуючою ідеологією, стабільною економічною основою та соціальними інститутами. Змінюючи або протиставляючи одна одній, а не продовжуючи, епохи творять загальний історичний процес, що відбувається через «злами» (розриви та кризи). Антична доба – один із таких ключових етапів слов'яно- та україногенезу (I ст. до н. е. – IV ст. н. е.). Розглянуто хронологічні межі цієї доби та її змістовне наповнення, яке В. Петров бачив як «варварський варіант» елліністичної цивілізації на північ від Чорного моря. Зокрема, в роботі означено роль римського впливу, який, на думку Петрова, був не вирішальним, а лише сприяв індивідуальній романізації. Натомість, зарубинецька та черняхівська культури розглядаються як приклади локальної модифікації самодостатніх античних культур, що вже несли ознаки універсалізації. Означено сутність «зламу» Античної доби, що призвів до зникнення черняхівської культури близько середини I тис. н. е. Петров вважав, що цей злам був спричинений глибинною кризою Римської імперії у другій половині IV ст. та розпадом старої світової системи зв'язків, що базувалася на першості Риму серед інших народів. Гунська навала лише посилила вже існуючу кризу. Акцент дослідження спрямовано на висвітлення зв'язку української культури з європейською цивілізацією як її повноправної та самодостатньої частини, коріння якої сягає Античності. Концепція В. Петрова, що наголошує на дискретності, розривах та самостійному розвитку, висвітлюється у контексті розвитку історичної та археологічної думки XX – початку XXI ст. як новаторська і така, що зберігає свою наукову актуальність, знаходячи підтвердження у працях сучасних дослідників.

Ключові слова: Віктор Петров, «теорія епох», «антична епоха», зарубинецька та черняхівська археологічні культури, римська політика, романізація, античне суспільство.

Received (Надійшла до редакції): 28.08.2025,

Accepted (Прийнята до друку): 18.09.2025

Available online (Опубліковано онлайн) 30.09.2025